





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

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1867.

No. III.

ART. I.—*The Hebrew word יָשַׁב Yashabh.*

LANGUAGE is not a merely arbitrary invention, but partakes of the character of thought, whose vehicle it is. Consequently, its phenomena, its words and forms and constructions, are in no case purely dependent upon accident or caprice, but have arisen under the operation of fixed causes, and contain in themselves indications more or less clear of the sources from which they sprung. The language of any people is the mind of that people made external and tangible. It exhibits their inner life in its affinities with, and specific differences from that of other peoples, reveals the compass and range of their ideas, the extent of their knowledge, the character of their sentiments and feelings, their conceptions, whether of objects of thought or objects of sense, the impressions made upon them by surrounding nature, and even shows traces of the historical experiences through which they have passed. Recent scientific investigations and popular treatises have made us all familiar with the fact, that a careful study of the words of any language in their structure, usage, history and relations, not only reveals much that was unsuspected by superficial smatterers, but much also that had escaped those who were intimately and familiarly acquainted

with it as a vehicle of thought, but who had never directed attention to it as a depository of ancient relics, the symbols of a former life, some of which put us in connection with a period of which we have no other authentic record than that which is here supplied.

We propose in this paper, by way of experiment, to examine a single word in Hebrew, and to learn from it what we can. And for this purpose, we have selected almost at random the verb *ישב* to *sit*. It has the advantage of having been in familiar use in all periods of the language, with which we are acquainted, and of possessing a plain and obvious signification, denoting, as it does, a palpable outward act, respecting which there can be no vagueness nor obscurity. While, therefore, it will have none of the interest attaching to the settlement of controverted points, or the resolution of acknowledged difficulties, we shall feel at least that we are treading upon solid ground; and enough, we may hope, will be disclosed by the investigation to redeem it from being merely common-place.

The first question which it is natural to ask respecting this word, relates to the connections in which we find it employed. The passages in which mention is made of the act of sitting will disclose to us the usages of the time and of the people in regard to it; will show us when and how the Hebrews sat. We shall thus learn the archæology of the subject.

Sitting was the ordinary posture of wakeful repose, as distinguished on the one hand from lying down, as in sleep, or standing up, the attitude of activity and exertion. Accordingly, when the lawgiver would enjoin it upon the people, that they should be continually instructing their children, he bids them do so when they sit in the house and when they walk by the way, and when they lie down and when they rise up. Deut. vi. 7, xi. 19. He means by this enumeration to include the whole of their daily life. Downsitting is (Psalm cxxxix. 2, Lam. iii. 63), combined with uprising, and (2 Kings xix. 27, Isaiah xxxvii. 28), with going out and coming in, to denote the entire period of wakefulness, its repose and its activity. It is a departure from oriental usages and modes of thought to render Psalm cxxvii. 2, as in the common English version, "It is vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late"—meaning it is of no

avail to toil early and late without the Divine blessing. The Psalmist intended to say, "It is vain to rise up early, to *sit down* late." The man, who was at work, was on his feet, when he sat, he rested. The older English translations more accurately represent the original in this place; thus, the Psalter of the Prayer Book somewhat paraphrastically, "It is but lost labour that ye haste to rise up early, and so late take rest."

Oriental usually sit, not on chairs, but on mats or carpets spread upon the floor, or on cushions laid upon divans, on the low platforms which border one or both ends of their apartments. Chairs were used in ancient Egypt, particularly by the wealthy, as is shown by frequent representations upon the monuments. (Wilkinson's *Ancient Egypt*, ch. 6). But if they had been common among the Hebrews, they would doubtless have been mentioned in Lev. ch. xv., where the law of uncleanness communicated by the act of sitting is given with minute particularity. They are not, however, once alluded to. The general expressions which are employed, "whatsoever the unclean person sitteth upon," ver. 26, or, "the thing (Heb. כִּי) whereon he sitteth," refer to the mat or cloth, or whatever it might be which was spread for this purpose. The rich are described, Judges v. 10, as sitting upon "cloths" or "carpets," where our version erroneously has "sit in judgment." The nobles riding forth on white asses, the rich sitting in luxurious ease at home, and the poor, who walk by the way, as they go to their accustomed toil, are summoned to celebrate in unison the deliverance which the Lord has wrought by the hand of Deborah and of Barak. The witch of Endor had nothing to offer King Saul to sit upon but her bed, 1 Sam. xxviii. 23, probably a mattress spread upon the divan, which thus served as a seat by day as well as a couch by night.

The only word in Hebrew for an elevated seat is כִּסֵּא, from כָּפַף to cover, which means, therefore, according to its etymology, a *covered chair*, either one surmounted by a canopy, or over which a drapery has been spread. It accordingly denotes, not an ordinary seat, but a chair of state, a seat of honour or distinction, a throne, such as was occupied only by persons in high station or of exalted dignity. And even in the few passages in which our version renders it differently, it would have

been better if the word *throne* had been retained. Thus, where Eli is said, 1 Sam. i. 9, to have "sat upon a seat by a post of the temple," he was, as the Hebrew suggests, seated "upon the throne," the high priest's throne or cathedra, at the entrance to the temple; and the blessing thence pronounced upon Hannah is thus rendered more solemn and authoritative. So too, "the seat," 1 Sam. iv. 13, on which Eli sat trembling for the ark, and from which, ver. 18, he fell when he died, was his throne, which in his anxiety he had caused to be placed by the wayside at the gate of Shiloh. The seat from which the king of Moab rose to receive the dagger of Ehud, Judg. iii. 20, is in Hebrew a throne. The seat which Solomon caused to be set at his right hand for his mother, was a throne, 1 King ii. 19; so was the seat, to which Haman was promoted by Ahasuerus, Esth. iii. 1, the monarch being enthroned in the midst of his princes, as in the sublime imagery of the Revelation, the four and twenty elders with their crowns of gold sit on thrones surrounding the throne of the infinite Majesty, who is thus represented as the King of kings. Rev. iv. 4.

In Prov. ix. 14, likewise אָשַׁבֵּת is not "a seat" merely, but a *throne*. Folly is represented as not only sitting at the door of her own house, but enthroned in the high places of the city. It is not only in private life that she practises her deadly arts; she is found also in conspicuous stations, high rank and lofty official positions, and prostitutes them to her own detestable ends.

2 Kings iv. 10 is by high authorities regarded as presenting an exception to this constant usage. A אָשַׁבֵּת in our version, a *stool* together with a bed, a table and a candlestick constitute the furniture of the chamber built for Elisha by the Shunamite woman. Yet even here it is possible that an elevated seat or throne was placed in the prophet's room in recognition of his sacred and exalted dignity.

Thrones were preëminently for kings, who sat upon them not only when exercising regal functions, in the palace or in other public places, as the gates of the city, 1 Kings xxii. 10, but also in retirement, Judges iii. 20. Princes and other attendants stood before the monarch, Jer. xxxvi. 21, 22, 1 Kings x. 8, in an attitude of readiness to execute his will. In like manner, Isaiah

vi. 2, saw the seraphim standing beside the throne of the Lord, and the apostle John saw, Rev. viii. 2, the seven angels which stood before God, and all the angels standing round about the throne. Rev. vii. 11, comp. 1 Kings xxii. 19. And Elijah announces himself as the servant of the same great King, 1 Kings xvii. 1, when he says, "As the Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand."

To be seated with a king, or at his right hand, was not only a mark of honour, as in the case of Solomon's mother, 1 Kings ii. 19, and the queen of Artaxerxes, Neh. ii. 6, but of association in dignity and power, as MESSIAH at God's right hand, Ps. cx. 1, and the position solicited for James and John, that they might sit at the right hand of Jesus, and at his left hand in his kingdom, Matt. xx. 21; comp. Rev. iii. 21.

The throne was thus the symbol of royalty, Gen. xli. 40, and "to sit upon the throne" is the constant phrase for succeeding to the kingdom, 1 Kings i. 20, 35, ii. 12. And "to sit," in this eminent sense, is to be enthroned. So God is described as "sitting in the heavens," Ps. ii. 4, or "sitting on the circle of the earth," Isaiah xl. 22, or "upon the flood," Ps. xxix. 10; or is said to be enthroned in his earthly temple, as Ps. xcix. 1, "The LORD reigneth, let the people tremble; *he sitteth between the cherubims*, let the earth be moved." This phrase elsewhere translated, "dwelleth between the cherubims," 2 Kings xix. 15, denotes not simply residence, but sitting enthroned as king. In Hebrew, the word for *temple*, הֵיכָל, is identical with that for *palace*. It is not only God's dwelling-place, but his royal abode, the place of his throne, where he sits the monarch of Israel to give audience to his people, and the Lord of hosts attended by the cherubim, symbolical representatives of the heavenly host. Hence we find these titles repeatedly combined, "the LORD of hosts, which dwelleth," or sitteth "between the cherubims," 1 Sam. iv. 4, 2 Sam. vi. 2, Isa. xxxvii. 16, or rather as the prayer-book version has it, Ps. lxxx. 1, and as the LXX and Vulgate uniformly translate it, "sitteth *upon* the cherubim." "Between" is not in the original, and is erroneously supplied. The ark with its golden cover was not itself the throne, but only the visible base of an invisible throne. The invisible monarch was seated not between, but above the

cherubim, as is distinctly shown in Ezekiel's vision, i. 26, x. 1, and as is implied in the language of the psalmist, xviii. 10, "He rode upon a cherub and did fly."

There is more frequent allusion to the kingship of Jehovah under this figure in the Old Testament than the English reader would suppose, as it is often obscured in our common translation. Thus, Ps. ix. 7, "The Lord shall endure for ever," means rather, "the Lord shall sit for ever;" verse 11, "The Lord which dwelleth in Zion," should be, "which sitteth in Zion;" and Ps. xxii. 3, "Thou art holy, O thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel," converted in the LXX and Vulgate by a change of construction into "Thou inhabitest a holy place, O thou praise of Israel," means rather, "thou that art enthroned amidst or upon the praises of Israel."

Similar language is used of monarchs aspiring to be gods. The prince of Tyre says, Ezek. xxviii. 2, "I sit in the seat of God." And the king of Babylon, Isa. xiv. 13, "I will sit upon the mount of the congregation," *i. e.*, I will be enthroned upon the sacred temple mount, as some understand it, or, according to others, upon some fabled mountain of the gods. Imperial cities are also personified as reigning. Jerusalem is bidden, Isa. lii. 2, to shake herself from the dust, to arise and sit, *i. e.*, upon her queenly throne. So Babylon, Rev. xviii. 7, "I sit a queen."

This usage further illustrates two striking incidents in Old Testament history. When Moses was on the hill during the battle with Amalek, Ex. xvii. 12, the stone on which he sat was a rude throne, and the rod in his hand was a sceptre extended to command victory for Israel. The posture is not that of supplication, which his outstretched hands have often been understood to signify. Again, when Elijah sat on the top of the hill, 2 Kings i. 9, and bid fire come down from heaven upon those who were sent to take him, he was on his throne as the representative of God, bidding defiance to the impotent hostility of a human sovereign.

Thrones or chairs of state were also used by governors, Neh. iii. 7; princes, 1 Sam. ii. 8; generals, Jer. i. 15, xxxix. 3; and judges, Ps. cxxii. 5. Moses sat to judge the people, while the litigants stood, Exod. xviii. 13, 14. "I stand," said Paul,

“at Cesar’s judgment-seat,” Acts xxv. 10. Hence, *to sit*, and especially “to sit in the gate” of a city, 2 Sam. xix. 8, Jer. xxxviii. 7, where judicial business was commonly transacted, is sometimes equivalent to acting as judge. In this sense Deborah *sat* (LXX and Vulgate), not *dwelt* (E. V.) under the palm-tree of Deborah, Judges iv. 5. Perhaps, also, Mal. iii. 3, Messiah “shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver,” *i. e.*, shall exercise the office of a judge with a view to refine and purify.

The rabbins were mistaken, however, in inferring from Gen. xix. 1, “Lot sat in the gate of Sodom,” that he was promoted to the office of judge, or, as they affirm, of chief-justice in that wicked city; since the phrase is also used of those who frequented that place of public concourse for other purposes, Ruth iv. 1, Ps. lxxix. 12, Prov. xxxi. 23. We learn from the case of Naboth, 1 Kings xxi. 9–13, that in criminal trials the accused was placed in a conspicuous seat, and the witnesses were seated opposite to him.

Those who consulted a prophet, sat before him, Ezek. iii. 15, viii. 1, xiv. 1, xx. 1, xxxiii. 31; 2 Kings iv. 38, vi. 32, awaiting the communication to be made to them. And as he was upon a higher seat, and thus elevated above them, they sat at his feet; so the healed demoniac, Luke viii. 35, and Mary, x. 39, at the feet of Jesus, and Paul at the feet of Gamaliel, Acts xxii. 3. Our Lord was accustomed to sit when teaching; so in the synagogue at Nazareth, Luke iv. 20; on the mount, Matt. v. 1; in the ship, Luke v. 3, and in the temple, John viii. 2, Matt. xxvi. 55. This, too, as is well known, was the usage of the synagogue, Matt. xxiii. 2, and of the early Christian preachers, whose hearers sometimes, though not invariably, stood.

In contrast both with this official sitting on an elevated throne, and the ordinary sitting upon mats or carpets laid upon the floor, mourners sat upon the ground in the inactivity and negligence of grief, Job ii. 13, Isa. iii. 26, Lam. ii. 10, Judges xx. 26, Ezra ix. 3–5, Neh. i. 4, Ps. cxxxvii. 1, Ezek. viii. 14; or in ashes, Job ii. 8, and sackcloth, Jonah iii. 6; in solitude, Lam. iii. 28; in darkness and silence, Isa. xlvii. 5, Mic. vii. 8, Lam. iii. 6, Ps. cxliii. 3. Degradation is expressed by being obliged to leave the throne, and sit upon the ground, Isa.

xlvii. 1, Jer. xiii. 18, xlvi. 18, Ezek. xxvi. 16, comp. Eccles. x. 6, and exaltation by the reverse, rising from the dust to sit upon a throne, Isa. lii. 2.

Sitting is the attitude of inactivity, as an erect position is for motion or labour. Those sit who have nothing to do, or are in fact doing nothing, Num. xxxii. 6, 2 Sam. ii. 13, 2 Kings vii. 3, Jer. viii. 14, Zech. i. 11, or are waiting to see what will happen, Gen. xxi. 16, Exod. ii. 15, Judges xix. 15, or to meet with some one, Ruth iv. 1, Jer. iii. 2, it may be with evil intent, in ambush (comp. Lat. *insidiæ* from *sedeo*), Ps. x. 8, xvii. 12, or awaiting orders from a superior, as Mordecai sitting in the king's gate, Esth. ii. 19, 21, v. 13, vi. 10, or as soldiers guarding the wall of a besieged city, 2 Kings xviii. 27, Isa. xxxvi. 12. Whence the phrases, "to sit under one's own vine and fig-tree," 1 Kings iv. 25, Mic. iv. 4, denoting the enjoyment of undisturbed repose and peaceful security; "to sit under any one's shadow," Cant. ii. 3, Hos. xiv. 7, Ezek. xxxi. 17, to share his protection or the refreshment he affords; "to sit in darkness," Ps. cvii. 10, Isa. xlii. 7, to be confined in a prison or a dungeon.

Sitting was the ordinary posture of the Hebrews in eating from the days of the patriarchs to the end of the Old Testament, as appears from numerous allusions to the subject, Gen. xxvii. 19, xxxvii. 25, Ex. xxxii. 6, Judges xix. 6, Ruth ii. 14, 1 Sam. xx. 5, 24, Prov. xxiii. 1, 1 Kings xiii. 20, Jer. xvi. 8, Ezek. xlv. 3. The use of beds or couches for sitting or for reclining at meals is spoken of by Amos iii. 12, vi. 4, and by Ezekiel, xxiii. 41, as belonging to the luxury and effeminacy of a degenerate period. This latter had, as is well known, become the uniform custom in the times of the New Testament, where we never read, except in our version, of sitting at meat; the original invariably speaks of reclining.

In Egypt they sat, as we learn not only from native sources, ancient and modern, but from the brethren of Joseph when feasted at his house, Gen. xliii. 33, and from the children of Israel beside the flesh-pots, Exod. xvi. 3. But in Persia, at the grand festival of Ahasuerus, Esth. i. 6, and at the more private entertainment of queen Esther, the guests reclined, Esth. vii. 8.

The table of shew-bread was a cubit and a half in height, or about 2 feet 4 inches, which is nearly as high as our dining-tables. This was, of course, much higher than those in ordinary use, as it represented the table of the great King. The table in the temple of Herod was not much above a foot in height, as it is represented on the arch of Titus in Rome. King Saul at table sat upon his seat by the wall, 1 Sam. xx. 25, that is, upon the raised divan at the side or end of the apartment, which would admit of his having a higher table than those required who sat upon the floor. Lane thus describes the tables in use in modern Egypt, vol. i. p. 24. "For meals a round tray is brought in and placed upon a low stool, and the company sit round it on the ground." Dr. Robinson found the same in Palestine, vol. ii. p. 635. A simpler affair still is in use among the Arabs; a round leather or mat is laid upon the floor, provided with rings on its outer edge, so that after the meal is finished it can be drawn together like a bag, and suspended on a nail. Winer *Realw.* ii. p. 48, (note 10). Rœdiger finds in this an illustration of Psalm lxix. 22: "Let their table become a snare before them." If the psalmist had such a table as this in mind, the figure of the feet becoming entangled in it, would not be a violent one.

Sitting was further customary in such acts as required no exertion, and could therefore be as easily performed in this as in any other posture. Thus men sat to talk, Psalm i. 1, l. 20, cxix. 23, Jer. xv. 17, to consult together, Jer. xxxvi. 12, 2 Kings ix. 5, to read, Jer. xxxvi. 15, to warm themselves at a fire, Isaiah xlvii. 14, Jer. xxxvi. 22, &c.

We have now reviewed with, we fear, a wearisome particularity the various connections in which the word ישב *to sit* occurs in the Old Testament; and have ascertained as far as possible the usages of the Hebrews in this respect, the various modes in which different classes of the people sat, and the occasions upon which they sat. We may next inquire into the different meanings of this word ישב . We shall learn something about Hebrew association of ideas by discovering the bond which connects its secondary or derived senses with its primary signification. Language is not an incoherent mass of individual words, each of which is arbitrarily linked to its own separate

and distinct idea. Kindred ideas are attached to the same word, or to the several primary words which spring alike directly from one common root, or to the derivatives formed from the same primary. And thus the whole body of ideas expressed in any given language is grouped and arranged in a way peculiarly its own, affording often welcome glimpses into the habits of thought of the particular people by which it was spoken, or the character of the associations which they formed.

The word יָשַׁב has three clearly distinguishable meanings, *to sit*, *to remain*, and *to dwell*. Thus, when it is said that Joseph's brethren *sat* before him at the table, Gen. xliii. 33, and when Judah asked that he might be suffered *to remain* as a bondman instead of Benjamin, Gen. xlv. 33, and when Joseph gave his father and brethren permission *to dwell* in the land of Goshen, Gen. xlv. 10, the original word is the same in each case. He who sat down, indicated a purpose to remain, and he who dwelt in any place remained there continuously.

In this association of ideas there lurks, if we mistake not, a reminiscence of the early nomadic condition of the Hebrews. Their forefathers wandered about with no fixed or permanent habitation. They had no special attachment to one spot rather than to another. Wherever they sat down, that was for the time their home; and they moved their dwelling as they changed their seat.

With the Greek and the Roman, on the other hand, the associations were entirely different. In Greek *to dwell* is οἰκέω, or κατοικέω from αἶχος, *house*. A house, a fixed abode, a structure for his habitation, is fundamental to the conception. To have and occupy a house, to be domiciled, is the notion of dwelling here suggested. In Latin again, *to dwell* is *inhabito* from *habeo* to hold or possess, or *incolo* from *colo* to cultivate. A man is conceived of as dwelling where he has permanent possession, or where he cultivates the soil. The wandering patriarch did not require the ownership of the soil with the Roman, ever bent on sovereignty and control, nor with the more domestic Greek did he need to build his house in order to dwell. He had his home wherever he sat down.

Our words "reside" and "dwell" so far resemble the cor-

responding Hebrew term, that they point to the roving disposition of those who first employed them, but with an additional indication of their fierce and warlike character, which stands in marked contrast with the peaceful and pastoral life of the patriarchs. In the mouth of the Romans *resideo* was *to sit behind*, or to remain behind sitting after others had risen from that posture; we have from it our word *residue*. As caught up by the invading barbarians it stigmatized those who remained idly at home, while the able-bodied and the courageous went forth to war, or those who continued in their old settlements while the body of the advancing horde proceeded in quest of new seats. Continuous occupancy of one's home, was in the conception of migratory tribes "*to reside*," to stay behind in idleness. We do not lead a migratory life, but we retain the word in a sense which was first suggested by habits of migration. So "*to dwell*" is by the best etymologists associated with "*dull*," and is in its radical sense indicative of inactivity or want of energy. When the active and the enterprising were accustomed to rove freely for the sake of the chase, or for war, or to satisfy a restless disposition, it seemed *a dull* inactive life *to dwell* in one spot.

These different significations of יָשַׁב *to sit, remain, and dwell*, shade off into each other almost imperceptibly, so that it is sometimes difficult to tell which was intended by the writer. Or rather there are passages in which either meaning might seem appropriate, according to the aspect in which they are contemplated and in regard to which translators may be in doubt, or where authorities may differ from one another, or even from themselves in the rendering which they adopt. Many narrative passages gain new vividness and force by the substitution of the more specific sense *to sit* for the more vague or general *remain* or *dwell*, to which the common English version has accustomed us. Thus Gen. xix. 30, "Lot went up out of Zoar and dwelt in the mountain, and his two daughters with him; for he feared to dwell in Zoar; and he dwelt in a cave (Heb. *the cave*) he and his two daughters." The verb יָשַׁב occurs three times in this verse, and is in each instance represented in our version by the word *dwell*. The Vulgate followed by Luther render it with equal uniformity *remain*, (*manere*,

bleiben). But the LXX picture the scene far more vividly and perhaps more faithfully by translating it *sat* (ἐκάθητο) in the first clause, though adhering to *dwelt* (κατοικῆσαι, κατόκησεν) in the other two. "Lot went up out of Zoar, and sat on the mountain, he and his two daughters with him." We can almost see the father and his daughters, who had not dared to pause in their flight until they reached the mountain side, sitting down at length in their exhaustion and fright to recover breath and to collect their thoughts, to gaze back on the awful scene from which they had barely escaped with their lives, and to consider what was next to be done or whither they should go.

Again, in the account of the purchase of the cave of Machpelah, Gen. xxiii. 10, where our version follows the Vulgate and Luther in reading, "Ephron dwelt among the children of Heth," the LXX render more graphically and with a truer regard to the context "sat." Abraham first expressed to the children of Heth his desire to possess the cave, and asked their kindly offices with Ephron on his behalf. But Ephron, who was himself sitting among them, did not wait for further solicitation, but promptly and courteously acceded to his wishes.

So in the language of Boaz to Elimelech's next kinsman, Ruth iv. 4, "Buy it before the inhabitants," or as Luther phrases it, "before the citizens or burghers," (Bürgern,) is neither so graphic nor so suitable as the rendering of the LXX and the Vulgate "before those sitting here," (καθημένων, *sedentibus*), *i. e.*, the ten who had just been selected and asked to sit down to arbitrate or witness the case, and others who were there present.

During the seven days allotted to the consecration of Aaron and his sons, they were directed, as it is in the LXX, Levit. viii. 35, *to sit* at the door of the tabernacle day and night; our version has it more vaguely *to abide*. The ambush set by Joshua viii. 9, according to our version, "abode between Bethel and Ai;" the LXX and Vulgate have "sat," referring to their crouching posture in concealment. The promise, Zech. viii. 4, is thus given in our version, "old men and old women shall *dwell* in the streets of Jerusalem," which might seem to imply that they should be houseless and unsheltered; the LXX have "shall *sit* in the streets of Jerusalem." Jer. xlix. 30, The

inhabitants of Hazor are bidden to "dwell deep," *i. e.*, take up their abode in the deepest and most inaccessible solitudes of the desert in their flight from Nebuchadnezzar's invading host; the LXX phrase it, ἐμβαθύνετε εἰς χάθισον, *deepen in sitting, i. e.*, sit low, or sit in the depths, referring rather to the posture of mourners. In Ps. ci. 6, where David says, "Mine eyes shall be upon the faithful of the land, that they may *dwell* with me," the LXX has "*sit* (συγκαθίσθαι) *with me*," be my assessors, act as my judges and officers, assist me in the government.

Again, in sundry passages the English version adopts the more graphic and preferable rendering, where others are more vague. Thus Ps. ii. 4, "He that sitteth in the heavens," is seated, that is, upon the throne of the heavens, is better than the bare "dwelleth in the heavens" of the LXX, Vulgate, and Luther. Angels and the glorified just dwell in heaven, but God alone is seated on the heavenly throne. The language of the prince of Tyre, Ezek. xxviii. 2, "I sit in the seat of God," is a stronger assertion of his fancied divine prerogatives, than "I dwell in the dwelling of God," LXX (κατοικίαν θεοῦ κατοίχιστα). "A young lion *lurking* in secret places," Ps. xvii. 13, is a more lively figure of an enemy watching his opportunity, than one *dwelling* in secret places, as the LXX and Vulgate render it. "All the earth sitteth still," as the English version and Luther render Zech. i. 11, as a poetical description of the prevailing peace and security, is superior to the bald and prosaic rendering of the LXX and Vulgate, "All the earth is inhabited" (κατοικεῖται, habitatur).

Sometimes, on the other hand, one or more of the versions render שָׁבַת by *sit* where this is too specific, and *dwell* would be preferable. Thus the LXX, Vulgate, Luther, and English versions, prior to that of king James, translate 1 Chron. xvii. 1, "when David dwelt in his house," though for the identical expression in the parallel passage, 2 Sam. vii. 1, they have "sat in his house," which the authorized English version has in both passages. But the sacred writer does not mean to describe the posture in which David was when he proposed to Nathan to build a temple for the Lord; nor does his meaning seem to be fully given by using "*sit*" in a figurative sense, to suggest the repose and quiet which he enjoyed, now that his

active campaigns were terminated, "and the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies." There is evidently a designed contrast between the king securely dwelling in his house and the Lord dwelling in a mere tent. "I dwell," says he, in the immediately following verse, "in a house of cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth within curtains;" *dwell*, and not *sit*, would consequently seem to be the proper rendering in the preceding verse.

In a subsequent part of the same narrative it is said, ver. 18, "Then went king David in (*i. e.*, into the court of the tabernacle), and *sat* before the Lord," and offered a prayer there recorded. As sitting is nowhere else spoken of in the Old Testament or in the New as the posture of prayer, this has given no small trouble to commentators. The rabbins allege, on the basis of this passage, that this was allowable in kings alone; others have imagined that the king first sat down on entering the tabernacle court, but afterwards arose and offered his prayer; and others still render *remained* instead of *sat*, "he went in and remained before the Lord."

Again, it is said of king Uzziah, after he was smitten with leprosy for his impiety, 2 Chron. xxvi. 21, that "he *dwelt* in a several house." The LXX render this *he sat* (ἐκάθητο), meaning that he sat upon his throne, as is shown by their paraphrasing the very same expression in the parallel passage, 2 Kings xv. 5, "*reigned*" (ἐβασίλευσεν), where Aquila has ἐκάθητο *sat*, and Symmachus ἄξει *dwelt*. But the exercise of regal functions by a leper is quite incredible, even if it were not explicitly stated that the regency was conferred upon Jotham during his father's disability.

The few experimental citations thus far made from some of the leading versions, have been applied to matters lying within the domain of lexicography, exegesis, and hermeneutics. In these several fields they are capable of rendering eminent service, whether as aids in ascertaining the meaning of difficult or doubtful words, in determining the sense of obscure and perplexed passages, or in revealing the principles and methods of interpretation which prevailed when the version was made.

It may not be amiss to indicate further, as this same word will enable us to do, the use to which the ancient versions may

be put in the way of textual criticism. They may be regarded not only as renderings of the sacred text, which may help us to understand it, or show us at least how it has been understood in the different ages and the various regions in which these versions originated, but they may likewise be viewed as so many different forms of the text, and summoned to testify respecting its purity and correctness. If a version be translated back again into the language from which it was made, it ought to yield us the original text as the translators had it before them, or at least to enable us to conclude with a measure of certainty, and within given limits, upon the form of that text.

If in any given passage different manuscripts of equal value sustain different readings, and other considerations *pro* and *con* appear to be evenly balanced, that which has the sanction of the early versions is entitled to the preference. Great caution is requisite, however, in the critical employment of versions which in injudicious hands has been productive of more harm than profit, and has tended rather to the multiplication than the correction of errors.

Where two words agree in their letters and differ only in the vowel points, which had not yet been introduced when the oldest versions were made, it is not surprising if they sometimes depart in such cases from the received text; and yet these very departures are of such a nature as to indicate the source from which they sprang. Thus, שָׁבַת the infinitive of יָשַׁב *to sit* or *dwell*, and שָׁבַת that of שָׁבַת *to rest* (the root of our word *Sabbath*) have precisely the same consonants; so long, therefore, as no signs were in use for the vowels, they were identical in their written form. Hence it happens that in Isaiah lviii. 12 “the restorer of paths to dwell in,” both the LXX and Vulgate substitute *rest* for *dwell*; and in Num. xxi. 15 for “the dwelling of Ar,” the Vulgate has “rest in Ar.”

In Zech. x. 6 there is an anomalous grammatical form הוֹשִׁיבוּהֶם. The first part of the word gives it the appearance of being derived from יָשַׁב *to dwell*, and the latter part looks as though it came from שָׁבַת *to return*. And eminent scholars have actually maintained that the word is in reality formed by a fusion of these two words, and that the prophet designed by this singular compound to suggest the ideas of both; an opinion

which appears to have been shared by our translators, who have combined both meanings in the phrase which they have given as its equivalent, "I will bring them again to place them." Now that this word stood in the text anciently just as it does now, presenting the same remarkable structure and suggesting the same combination in itself, appears from the fact that the LXX translate it as though it were from one of these words, *κατοικιῶ αὐτούς* "I will cause them to dwell," while the Vulgate gives the other, *convertam eos* "I will bring them back."

In Ruth ii. 7 the reapers inform Boaz that Ruth has been labouring in the field ever since morning, "tarrying but little in the house." This last clause is omitted entirely in the Peshito or old Syriac version. But that it nevertheless belongs properly to the text and is not a spurious addition, appears from the fact that it is found in the Vulgate, which, however, renders it "she has not even for a moment returned to the house," or returned home, introducing a negative and substituting "return" for "tarry," as though the verb were not *שָׁבַר* but *שָׁבַח*, from which a form may be derived closely approximating that in the text, though not precisely identical with it even in its consonants. That the verbal form is not to be modified, however, into conformity with the rendering of the Vulgate, appears from the LXX, which likewise has the clause but differently worded still. In the Greek the verb is neither "return" as in the Vulgate, nor "tarry" as in the Hebrew, but "rested," implying an original with the identical letters which now appear in the text, and differing only in the vowel points, (*שָׁבַחָהּ*, *שָׁבַחָהּ*). And now that even this is not the genuine reading, sanctioned by an early and steadfast tradition, but one born of the caprice of the translators, appears from the fact that the Chaldee Targum in this passage sanctions the existing Hebrew text in every particular, in the meaning yielded by its vowel points as well as by its letters. The conclusion to which we are inevitably driven by a survey of the entire case, is that the current text of the passage is the true one, and to this the Chaldee has faithfully adhered. Since, however, the construction of the original is somewhat embarrassed and perplexed, the Syriac cut the knot and relieved itself from all difficulty by dropping the troublesome clause; while the LXX and the Vulgate have for the same

reason given a paraphrase each in its own way, instead of an exact translation, preserving the general sense but not the identical expressions of the original, and yet each so serving to correct the other as to show that the text as we now have it was the common source of both.

Such paraphrastic explanations frequently occur, in which the translators depart intentionally, or at least knowingly, from the exact language of the original, content with preserving the general sense or perhaps even desirous of making the meaning clearer than a precise word-for-word translation would make it. Thus in Micah iv. 4, instead of "they shall *sit* every man under his vine and under his fig tree," the LXX have "each shall *rest* under his vine, &c." In 2 Kings xv. 5 for "Uzziah dwelt" or sat "in a several house," they substitute "reigned," showing that they understood it to mean sitting upon a throne. Esther ii. 19, vi. 10, for "Mordecai sat in the king's gate," the LXX have ἐθξρόπνευσεν, *served* or *waited*, indicating that the posture was that of a servant or attendant awaiting orders. Hag. i. 4, for "is it time for you to *dwell* in your ceiled houses," the LXX substitute without a material change of sense, "to build your ceiled houses."

This disposition to modify the text for the sake of elucidation is no doubt the occasion of that remarkable alteration upon which they have ventured in Exod. xii. 40. Overlooking the fact that the genealogies of the period were abbreviated by the omission of unimportant names and misunderstanding the statement that the seed of Abraham should return to Canaan in the fourth generation, they concluded that four hundred and thirty years was too long a period for the residence in Egypt, and that it must include the preceding residence in Canaan likewise. They accordingly inserted a clause in the verse to this effect, making it read, "the sojourning of the children of Israel which they sojourned in the land of Egypt *and in the land of Canaan* was four hundred and thirty years." Our translators sought to compass the same end, while retaining the common text, by rendering "the sojourning of the children of Israel, *who dwelt* in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years." In this they were doubtless influenced by the statement of the apostle Paul, Gal. iii. 17, that the giving of the law was four hundred and

thirty years subsequent to the covenant with Abraham. But he does not say that this interval was only four hundred and thirty years; and his general reference to it no more binds us to believe that he was aiming at chronological exactness, than the statement of the same apostle Acts xiii. 20, that God gave to Israel judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years until Samuel the prophet, settles the vexed chronology of the book of Judges. The correctness of the existing text is, moreover, vouched for, and its true rendering given by the Vulgate, which is followed by Luther and by English versions prior to that of King James, "So the dwelling of the children of Israel, while they dwelled in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years."

It would be superfluous in any of these or similar cases to assume that the peculiar rendering of the version implies a various reading in the original. Much less is this the case where the apparent variance between the version and the original is due to an error not in the latter, but in the text of the version itself, as in Jer. xxx. 18, "the palace shall remain," or sit, where some copies of the LXX have *καθελθούσιν*, "shall sleep," though the true reading is unquestionably as it is in other copies, *καθελθούσιν*, "shall sit."

By such textual comparisons of the versions with one another, and with the original from which they have been made, we may further gain a more intimate acquaintance with the versions themselves, and with the relation in which they stand to the original, the ability and accuracy with which they are made, the degree of closeness with which they adhere to the original, or the liberties they allow themselves in departing from it. It may also lead to a better insight into the mutual relations between the versions themselves and the measure of their dependence one upon the other. It might be possible, for example, by an extended and careful induction of particulars, to trace the genesis of the authorized English version, to show how far its familiar renderings were influenced by preëxisting versions, and these by others still, and so on back to that earliest of all, the grand old Septuagint, which, though far from faultless, is yet, considering the period in which it was prepared, and the influence which it has exerted, worthy of a very

high degree of veneration and regard. The power it has wielded in fact approaches the awful, when we reflect to what extent it has controlled the entire body of translators from that date to this, and given shape to expressions which we read in our English Bibles at this present day, and even made itself felt by the inspired writers of the New Testament. Is it strange that early superstition fancied that it must have been itself inspired, and that such power could have been suffered only in the immediate organs of the Holy Ghost? an opinion which has been revived by a distinguished scholar of our own day.

One sort of influence belonging to this version, which the word that we are examining may serve to exhibit in one of its minor traces, is that which was exerted upon the Greek language itself, and which contributed to form the dialect of the New Testament, those lively oracles of the Christian faith. The modifications to which Greek was subjected, as spoken and written by Jews, naturally reach their maximum in this version made directly from the Hebrew Scriptures, which was itself one of the most powerful agents in their production. This phenomenon may likewise illustrate the general law, that two languages when brought into contact never fail to influence and modify each other.

The words *sit* and *dwell* are no more distinct in their meaning and incapable of interchange than are their equivalents in classic Greek, *κάθημαι* and *κατοικέω*. And yet a Hebrew accustomed to associate these ideas together, and express them by one word, would insensibly come to use the corresponding Greek term with a like latitude. Hence it has happened that *κάθημαι*, though properly meaning to sit, has in repeated instances been employed by the LXX to represent *נשׁב*, where the sense clearly is *to remain* or *to dwell*, and must have been so intended by the translators. It is used of the Levite dwelling with Micah, Judges xvii. 10; of the ark abiding in the cities of the Philistines, 1 Sam. v. 7; of Abiathar abiding with David, 1 Sam. xxii. 23; of David dwelling with Achish, 1 Sam. xxvii. 5; of Absalom in Geshur, 2 Sam. xv. 8; of Shimei in Jerusalem, 1 Kings ii. 36; of Solomon in his royal house, 1 Kings vii. 8; Jeroboam in Egypt, 1 Kings xii. 2; Canaanites dwelling in the land of Israel, Exod. xxiii. 33; Jews dwelling in Egypt, Jer.

xliv. 1; the inhabitants of Samaria, Isa. ix. 9; the inhabitants of the land, Exod. xxiii. 31; the inhabitants of the earth, Jer. xxv. 29, 30. And one of its derivatives, ἐγκαθήμεαι, is, with two or three exceptions, invariably used in the sense of dwelling.

We find this idiomatic usage of "sit" for "dwell" occasionally, likewise, in the Greek of the New Testament; as Rev. xiv. 6, "them that dwell on the earth," and Luke xxi. 35, "them that dwell on the face of the whole earth," where the original is καθήμενους, literally "sitting on the earth." Both of these may be reminiscences of the language of the LXX. Such Hebraisms may be admitted wherever there is an evident necessity, but they are not to be gratuitously assumed, nor the cases indefinitely and needlessly multiplied. The meaning "to dwell" is not to be forced upon καθήμεαι, whenever it is possible, even though "sit" would suit the context as well, or perhaps better. Thus when the impotent man is said, Acts xiv. 8, to have *sat* at Lystra, there is no reason why this should be converted into *dwelt* at Lystra. Still less is *dwelt* to be substituted for *sat*, Matt. iv. 16, comp. Luke i. 79, "them which sat in the region and shadow of death," where the evangelist has expressly changed the (κατοιχοῦντες) *dwell* of the LXX into (καθήμενοις) *sit*, for the sake of more vividly and accurately expressing the prophet's meaning.

Our knowledge of the word which we have under examination, cannot be considered complete until we have compared it with its synonyms, and adjusted its signification with theirs. The slight and often subtle distinctions which obtain between words, the discriminations made between such as at first sight seem to be promiscuously used, indicate various shades of thought or different aspects under which the same idea may be contemplated.

The number of such synonyms, compared with their equivalents in other languages, may give some hint of the relative copiousness of different tongues; in one of which a word may be used vaguely to cover a wide extent of meaning, which in other tongues is with more precision and definiteness parcelled among a number. Thus we find that the *kal*, or simple form of כָּשַׁב, answering to the active voice in other languages, is in our common version variously rendered in different connections by the words *sit*, *sit down*, *sit still*, *sit up*, *be set*, *be situate*, *lurk*,

remain, tarry, continue, endure, dwell, haunt, inhabit, be inhabited; and in the LXX it is rendered in twice as many different ways. This may give some idea of the number of terms in Greek and English which have a measure of correspondence under one aspect or another with this single Hebrew term, and show how far one language is from being able to offer an exact equivalent in all its phases to any given word in another. It may also suggest the comparative poverty of the Hebrew, which cannot muster anything like such an array of terms for these related ideas.

Of the synonyms of יָשַׁב it will be sufficient to notice briefly שָׁבַט and יָשַׁב, *to sit*, and יָשַׁב, *to dwell*, which are most nearly akin to it in its two leading significations. Others, which are more remotely related, need not be examined. And some terms which, according to our style of thinking or speaking, would belong to the same category with *sit*, or are intimately connected with it, as the *sitting* of birds upon their eggs, or the *setting* of the sun, are here absolutely excluded, for they pertain to an entirely different class of ideas in the mind of a Hebrew.

שָׁבַט is the ordinary word in Arabia for *sitting*, and as adopted into the Hebrew, it owes its peculiar character entirely to this, that it belongs not to the native stock of words in current and familiar use like יָשַׁב, but has been introduced from a foreign though kindred dialect. The distinction may find an illustration, though not an exact parallel, in the Saxon and Roman words of like signification in our own language, one the household term, in free familiar use, cherished by the masses; the other more stately, savouring of the ornate, and restrained to educated ears. In the case before us, as in most others of like nature, the foreign word is not admitted to the simple and easy style of prose, but belongs exclusively to the more ornate and artificial diction of poetry, to which it is all the better adapted from the strangeness of its aspect and the rarity of its employment. שָׁבַט in fact occurs but twice, and that in the highly wrought and imaginative Song of Solomon, iv. 1, vi. 5, which more than almost any other book of the Old Testament delights in foreign words. It is there poetically applied to a flock of goats *sitting* or reeling on Mount Gilad.

יָשָׁבוּ, the reciprocal form of יָשַׁב, corresponding to a certain extent with the Greek middle voice, is used in the sense of sitting, but always with special application to persons sitting together for the purpose of deliberation or consultation. It is so used in Ps. ii. 2, which is rendered in our version, "the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together," literally, they stand up and they sit down "against the Lord and against his anointed." Standing and sitting they are engaged in impotent hostility against this divinely established empire. The one posture is indicative of active resistance, the other of quietly concocting their rebellious schemes.

This word יָשַׁב is particularly interesting to us from the probability that it is from the same root with our own familiar word *to sit*. Comparisons between Semitic and Indo-European roots or themes are, it is true, somewhat precarious in the present state of our knowledge. But the highest authority in Hebrew lexicography is of opinion that the syllable *שַׁב* at the basis of יָשַׁב reappears in the Sanscrit *sad* with its causative *sāday*, whence the Gothic *sat* and *satja*, the German *sitzen* and *setzen*, and our own *sit* and *set*. The Latin also has its *sido* or *sedeo* and *sedo*, and the Greek in which the sibilant has sunk to an aspirate *ἕζομαι*, *ἕδομαι*. The same root appears likewise in the Celtic and the Slavonic. Every time that we use this familiar word "to sit" we touch a link in the great chain that not only unites us with all the Indo-European races, but connects us likewise with the Hebrews and all the affiliated Semitic populations. Moses, and David, and the prophets, and doubtless even our Lord himself, made use of this very same word, or one at least fundamentally identical in sound and in signification, and whose connection can be historically traced. It was transmitted to them as it has travelled down to us, the heirloom from a remote antiquity which we have no means of reckoning, a relic of that more ancient tongue which existed before the Indo-European or the Semitic dialects were born, the parent alike of both; before the nations or races speaking any of the historical tongues had as yet a separate existence, it was the medium of intercourse for the common ancestry of the whole. "Sit" is a veritable patriarch among words, whether we regard its own venerable age or the numbers of its descendants.

יָשַׁב accordingly is the ordinary Hebrew word for *sitting*, and is used exclusively, or almost so, of persons: while its Arabic equivalent يَجْلِس is rare and poetic, and applied to the recumbency of animals. יָשַׁב is the word for sitting in general, while יָשַׁב, which has passed likewise into the Indo-European languages, is employed only of sitting together for council or deliberation.

The verb יָשַׁב, like יָשַׁב, means *to dwell*, but with a difference of usage based on their respective primary significations. The original sense of יָשַׁב is *to sit*, an act distinctively human; hence in its derived sense of *dwelling* it is limited to the residence of men. יָשַׁב, which primarily means *to sink* or *settle down*, has no such inherent limitation, and is used not only of the abode of men, but also of irrational animals, cattle, wild beasts, fishes, birds, and even of inanimate objects, as the cloud on the tabernacle, Exod. xl. 35 (comp. Job iii. 5), and the tabernacle in the promised land, Josh. xxii. 19. Hence when a participle is to be used substantively to denote the human inhabitants of a city, or land, or the world, it is from יָשַׁב; but when Job speaks (xxvi. 5) of the waters and the inhabitants thereof, the participle is from יָשַׁב.

It is further a natural sequence that יָשַׁב was preferred in those cases in which the double meaning of יָשַׁב would have occasioned ambiguity. Thus when Isaiah (xxvi. 19) speaks of the dead as them "that dwell in dust," he uses the word יָשַׁב; יָשַׁב would simply have suggested the idea of "sitting in the dust" in humiliation or grief, as Isa. xlvi. 1. Again, when (Isa. lvii. 15) God is spoken of as *inhabiting* eternity, or *dwelling* in the high and holy place, the verb is יָשַׁב; יָשַׁב would have meant, as in Ps. ix. 7, Lam. v. 19, sitting for ever, and Ps. cxliii. 5, sitting on high, *i. e.*, on his eternal and heavenly throne. This distinction is maintained in their derivative nouns, מִשְׁבַּת from יָשַׁב, meaning both *a seat* and *a dwelling place*, while מִשְׁבָּת from יָשַׁב has only the latter sense, and was especially appropriated to the tabernacle as God's earthly dwelling place. This reacted upon the verb, and we accordingly find יָשַׁב employed with specific allusion to this sacred structure, when mention is made of God dwelling among his people, or causing his name to dwell among them, a usage reflected in a word

borrowed by our own language from the later Hebrew שְׁכִינָה , *shekinah*, the brilliancy betokening and symbolizing God's residence in the tabernacle and the temple.

This has also had its influence upon the language of the New Testament. The verb $\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{o}\omega$ occurs in it five times, and only in the writings of the apostle John, the most Hebraic of the New Testament writers, and each time with designed allusion to שְׁכִינָה , which it not only aptly represents in sense, but so nearly approaches in sound, that it would at once suggest it to a Hebrew ear, although in spite of this resemblance the roots are quite distinct. This association was likewise furthered by the LXX, which regularly renders שְׁכִינָה the sacred tabernacle by $\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{\eta}$ or $\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{o}\mu\alpha$, and שְׁכִינָה itself at times by a derivative verb, $\alpha\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{o}\omega$, 2 Chron. vi. 1, Neh. i. 9. Hence when it is said, Rev. xxi. 3, "the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell ($\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{o}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$) with them," and Rev. vii. 15, "He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them," the very sound of the verb, as well as the connection, suggests an allusion to the ancient tabernacle, in which God had dwelt among his people by a symbol, that is now to find its highest and most glorious realization. So John, i. 14, "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt ($\xi\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{o}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu$) among us." He who once dwelt in the tabernacle had now come to tabernacle among men in a tenement of flesh. And so, Rev. xii. 12, xiii. 6, "God's name and his tabernacle, and them that dwell ($\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$) in heaven." God had once fixed his dwelling in the midst of human habitations here on earth to signify that the habitation of men should one day be with him in his own dwelling-place in heaven.

The word שָׁבַח , which we are examining, may moreover afford us an indication of the measure of affinity subsisting between the various Semitic dialects, in all of which it occurs. It may naturally be expected that those tongues which are most closely allied with the Hebrew will most nearly accord with it in the form and meaning of this particular word; while those which are more remote in general character will here too present a greater divergence.

Few remains have been preserved of the language of Phœnicia. But fortunately among these we find the word of which

we are in quest; and although it reaches us by a strangely circuitous route, it yields a clear and satisfactory testimony to the point before us. The Phœnicians founded the city of Carthage, and transplanted their language thither, as is evidenced by its very name, קרת הרשה, equivalent to Neapolis or Newtown: the first member of the compound being the same as in the familiar names of Scripture, Kirjath- (or Kiryath-) Arba, Kirjath-jearim, Kirjath-sepher.

The literary treasures of Carthage, as of Phœnicia, have all perished. But happily the Roman comic poet Plautus, in his play entitled *Pœnulus*, introduces a Carthaginian speaking for a few lines in his native tongue. In this precious fragment occurs the word *lasibit*, which is the Hebrew לָשַׁבַּת as nearly as the Latin alphabet could represent it, and corresponds in Plautus' own translation to the word "habitare," to *dwell*. Notwithstanding the disadvantage of the foreign character, in which it is written, this word manifests its identity with the Hebrew in the letters of the root, in its signification, and in its peculiar grammatical form; this last is the more remarkable, since the other Semitic tongues depart more or less from the Hebrew in the formation of the infinitive. We accordingly reach, through the medium of this word, a conclusion which a more extended examination would but justify and confirm, that the Phœnician, which was in all likelihood identical with the language of the Canaanitish tribes, bears the closest affinity to the Hebrew of any of the Semitic tongues.

In the Phœnician, as we have seen, the verb לָשַׁבַּת reappears without change either of form or of signification. Next to this is the Aramean, including the Chaldee and Syriac, together with the mongrel Samaritan. Here the signification is preserved unchanged, both in the primary and derivative senses. The verb means still precisely as in Hebrew, to *sit*, *remain* and *dwell*. But the form of the root is slightly varied. The sibilant, as is very commonly the case in these dialects, has been changed into a dental; just as the Hebrew name of the city צור became in Aramean טור or Tyre, and as שור a bull became הור the Greek ταῦρος, so לָשַׁבַּת was hardened into רָהַב.

In Arabic and Ethiopic, which are still farther removed from the Hebrew, we find this verb not only different in form, but

changed in signification. The Ethiopic has the sibilant of the Hebrew, and the Arabic the aspirated dental of the Aramean, but both have a different semivowel as the initial letter, the Arabic being *wathaba* and the Ethiopic *vasaba* instead of וַשְׁבַּח . In this they have retained the more primitive form, which, though lost or changed alike in Hebrew and Aramean is still presupposed in some of their grammatical inflexions.

While, however, the southern dialects have in this instance preserved the older form with greater tenacity, the Hebrew and the Aramean have alone adhered to the original signification. The Arabic has diverged upon one side and the Ethiopic upon another, until there might seem to be no relationship between the thoughts which they respectively suggest and that of the source from which they were derived; and nevertheless the links of connection can still be distinctly traced, each having seized upon one particular application of the root, and confined its signification to that.

In Arabic, the verb usually means *to spring*, or *rush* upon any one. In Ethiopic its causative alone survives, and this has the sense of *marrying*. How such meanings as *rush* or *marry* could be attached to a verb, originally signifying *to sit*, may not at first be very obvious; and yet the Hebrew verb is itself used in such connections as suggest a ready explanation.

The consciousness of the original sense of the Arabic *wathaba* was so far preserved, that in the Himyaritic dialect it meant *to sit*, and a derivative noun signified *a seat*. Moreover, such phrases as Jer. iii. 2, "in the ways hast thou *sat* for them as the Arabian in the wilderness;" Psalm x. 8, "he sitteth in the lurking places of the villages;" Psalm xvii. 12 "a young lion sitting (or lurking) in secret-places" and the like, show how *sitting* may easily pass into *lying in wait* with hostile intent, as in Latin *insidiæ*, and our *insidious* from *sedeo*. From this the transition to springing or rushing upon one thus way-laid is not very difficult.

The Ethiopic couples together the significations *sit*, *remain*, and *dwell*, showing the same association of ideas with the Hebrew; but it has attached them to a different root, viz., the word *nabara*. The root נָבַח or in its Ethiopic form *vasaba*, is only retained in the causative with the meaning "to marry."

But here again we find the Hebrew word employed in a manner, which may explain this singular application of the term. When after the captivity several of the Jews contracted alliances with foreign women, Ezra and Nehemiah did their utmost to break up this forbidden and dangerous practice. They accordingly refused to sanction such illegal connections, or to dignify them by the name of marriages, or to call them anything but *cohabitation*. In speaking of them they use not the proper Hebrew phrase for marrying, *i. e.*, *taking a wife*, but adopt a form of expression, which conveys a censure that is lost in our common English version. In Ezra x. 2, 10, 14, 17, 18, the phrase rendered by our translators "taken strange wives," and in Neh. xiii. 27 that rendered "marrying strange wives," is in the original uniformly "causing foreign women to dwell" with them. In the Ethiopic usage the reproach conveyed by the term has fallen away, and he who has a woman to live with him is presumed to be lawfully married.

When we pass beyond the limits of the Semitic tongues and enter those of the Indo-european family, it becomes more difficult to identify the root before us; and it is in fact quite doubtful whether it can be traced, or anything properly cognate to it be found. As a prerequisite to any safe or satisfactory identification, it would be necessary to determine the primal form of the Hebrew root itself. The Semitic trilaterals, as is well known, are not in every case independent and ultimate roots. Groups of trilaterals, more or less numerous, often sustain such a relation to each other in form and signification, as to compel the conclusion that they have a common origin, and are to be referred to one source or one primal root. Where two strong consonants are associated with one of weaker sound, the latter is not infrequently an unessential or secondary addition, as is shown by the fact that other weak consonants may be substituted for it in connection with the same biliteral, merely modifying the fundamental signification which runs through the whole. We cannot thus reduce יָשַׁב , however, by rejecting the initial semivowel, and assuming that the biliteral שָׁב is its real base; for, although we find such words as שָׁבָה , שָׁבַח , שָׁבַע , שָׁבַע , שָׁבַע , there is no such connection in the meanings, *sit, return, lead captive, draw water, break, blow, think*, as to

justify us in deducing them from a single theme. If any reduction is possible it is more likely that the first two letters form the primitive theme, and that the final **ב** is a subsequent addition. **בִּשְׁבַּ** *to sit*, is doubtless cognate to **בָּשַׁב** or **בָּשַׁב** *to set or place*, which represents the transitive side of the same idea; and it is not improbably connected more remotely with **שָׁבַב**, **שָׁבַב**, **שָׁבַב** and thus with the particle **שָׁב** denoting *existence*. Sitting or dwelling, which is a mode of being, is not far removed from the idea of simple existence. And the readiness with which the transition may be made, appears from the fact that the LXX in their renderings have in several instances substituted one for the other. Thus, in Gen. xxix. 14 “he *abode* with him the space of a month,” Joshua xxiv. 7, “ye *dwelt* in the wilderness a long season,” and Jer. xxxviii. 7, “the king *was sitting* in the gate of Benjamin,” the Septuagint has $\eta\gamma$ *was*, or $\eta\gamma\tau\epsilon$ *were* in place of the exact translation of the original verb. And Psalm lv. 19, “he that abideth of old,” is in the same version \acute{o} $\delta\pi\delta\rho\chi\omega\nu$ $\pi\rho\delta$ $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\alpha\iota\acute{\omega}\nu\omega\nu$, *existing before the ages*. The intimate relationship in thought has also expressed itself in other tongues, as in the Gothic *visan*, *to dwell, remain, or be*, and the Spanish *ser, to be*, abbreviated from *sedere* (Diez, *Wörterbuch der Romanischen Sprachen*, i. p. 166), as its synonym *estar*, like the Latin *existo*, is based upon the idea of standing, which is another modification of being. If a nexus actually obtains between the Hebrew roots above named, as there appears to be some reason to believe, though it cannot be certainly affirmed, they may be compared with the Indo-European substantive verb as Sanscrit, $\acute{e}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$ Greek, *esse* Latin, *is* English.

This terminates our long and wearisome march. We have been endeavouring to study the Hebrew word **בִּשְׁבַּ**. We have looked at the phrases in which it occurs in the Old Testament, in order to learn the usages of the ancient Hebrews in this matter. We have traced the association of ideas involved in its several significations back to the nomadic life of the patriarchs. We have followed it through some of the principal versions for purposes of exegesis and of criticism; and have noticed its influence upon the Hellenistic dialect and New Testament Greek. We have examined its synonyms. We have pursued it through the different Semitic tongues, and have endeavoured

to get a glimpse of it in Indo-european territory, until it finally disappeared in a fog. We shall be only too happy if this nebulous termination shall not be thought to fitly represent the cloudy character of the entire discussion.

ART. II.—*The Aim of Christianity, for those who accept it.*

An Address delivered before the Religious Contribution Society of the Princeton Theological Seminary, April 22, 1867; by RICHARD S. STORRS, JR., D. D., of Brooklyn, New York.

IT is an immediate impulse of the educated moral nature in man—to which every system of practical philosophy, or of religion, under our civilization, makes its appeal—to estimate that system, in the first instance, by the end which it proposes to accomplish for those who accept it; the spiritual result, of attainment and character, to which its agencies are designed to conduct them. The question of the fitness and the competence of the system to accomplish this end must come up afterward, to assist us in ascertaining its practical value. But this is secondary. The other precedes; and the later question is never in order till the former has been answered. For no matter how admirable the adaptation of the system to produce its result, if that result be essentially a mean one we at once dismiss the whole from our thoughts. It is only when the aim proposed to be realized shows itself a grand one—in which our higher desires will be gratified, and our nobler powers will find at once their use and rest—that we turn with interest to consider the means by which it is sought to be accomplished.

We thus at once repulse from our minds all systems of heathenism, no matter how ancient, how widely extended, how profusely adorned with a lavish art, how rich in an engaging and a various literature; we repel them from our thoughts, and do not take the trouble even to examine their interior mechanism, because they profess only to establish men in normal relations with the gods through some outward contrivance, or some

intellectual state or operation, without working, or seriously seeking to work in them, any essential moral renovation. We say on the instant—the race says everywhere, as its culture advances, and its moral growth ripens—‘This is not what we want! Away with such inane and mischievous trash! Let the fires of sacrifice everywhere be quenched; and cast the idols, though cut in ivory, and with amethysts for eyes, to the moles and the bats! Better an earth with no one temple on its surface, than an earth whose temples do not seek to minister to what is most divine within us!’

So, too, in the criticism of special schemes, schemes of philosophy rather than of religion, we apply the same method. We test the Stoical system, at once, by the purpose it affirmed; so to limit, and indurate, and really reduce, the nature of man as to make him indifferent to enjoyment and to pain; a being of bronze, as Plutarch said, without emotion, and without sensibility; whose highest rule shall be that of a proud and rigorous reason; whose highest attainment a self-satisfied apathy. We say, on the instant, ‘This is untrue to life. The richness of our nature this would impoverish. For delicate tastes, exuberant sympathies, it would give us tough integuments, harder muscle. We will none of it.’ And we know that we are right in this peremptory judgment. No scholarship, and no enthusiasm of advocates, can after this commend the scheme to us.

We admire, on the other hand, the more copious and intellectual system of Plato, because he proposed the preparation of the soul for communion with the highest ideas and beings to be encountered in its future state, as the true end of effort; and because he sought to attain this end through a really genuine and generous culture,—not by the arts only, or by philosophy, but by laborious practice in virtue; by statesmanship, travel, meditation, great action, as well as by simple conference with the learned. Not wholly satisfied with either method or end, we yet do justice to the genius and the spirit by which both were suggested; and we are not surprised that some of the Fathers, like Justin Martyr, were prepared by their study of the Greek idealist to accept that final and greater light which Christianity brought, but which on his eyes had not shined.

On the contrary, we trample beneath our feet the system of

Epicurus, the sparkling Sadduceeism of Greece, because it only sought to satisfy man's susceptibility to pleasure, and lacked not only the supreme idea of religious consecration, but even the lower yet relatively high one of ethical pureness, temperance, and heroism. And we hardly now listen to the arrogant positive philosophy of Comte, because, though attempting in its later development to supply the defect which its friendliest critics observed in its earlier, by some recognition of the religious side of man's nature, it still recognizes no God beyond the aggregate of humanity, allows no worship except to the highest representatives of this, and seeks to make man only as great as Cæsar, Archimedes, or Socrates have been; thus setting a near and narrow limit to the vast aspirations which are lodged within the soul.

In a word, all such systems are brought, as I said, to an immediate measurement by us—they are tested instinctively, before we proceed to examine them further—BY THE AIM WHICH THEY PROPOSE; the FINAL RESULT, of attainment and character, toward which their agencies professedly tend. And if, in this, they do not answer to those desires whose motive force is properly supreme with us, we therefore, inevitably, dismiss them from our thoughts.

There is then no graver or more imperative question concerning the Christian system—which it is our privilege to believe and to teach—than this which meets us at the outset: What is the ideal personal attainment which *it* proposes? What the result, of individual character, and of spiritual experience, which it aims to realize in those who accept it? If this be paltry and superficial—a mere change of our manners, a mere addition to our knowledge of facts, or even to our powers of judgment and of memory—much more, if it be in essence a base result, the outward decoration of our natural earthliness, under pretence of supplying to us divine endowments—then Christianity itself is impeached. It cannot satisfy what is highest within us, of reason, conscience, and immortal aspiration. The external evidences will fail to hold our hearty and earnest allegiance to it. Or if, by the miracles, and the prodigies of foreknowledge, which are as burning gems on its breast-plate, we are constrained to accept it as from Him by whom

alone these can be wrought, we shall still be certain that we have not rightly apprehended its contents; have not interpreted the message which the miracle authenticates.

But if, on the other hand, the aim proposed to us by Christianity be inherently a grand and complete one, adapted to our nature, yet implying its immense exaltation and expansion—still more, if it be so essentially transcendent as to be above the range of philosophy, and to naturally surpass all dreams of poets, while still in the line of those desires of which the noblest hearts and minds are intimately conscious,—then we are prepared to accept the system which has this for its purpose as coming from God. Then the ulterior proofs which it brings are illumined, reënforced, by that impression which this prime feature in its structure makes on us. And then with gladness we advance to examine it for the practical plans by which it would accomplish, in us and for us, an end so august. To believe it is then an impulse of the heart, with which the reason coincides. To extend the knowledge of it to others,—it is not a burden; it is the very noblest office for which the earth affords us room. We are ourselves aroused and ennobled as we accept and strive to spread it. The most subtle and secret tendencies toward good which had lurked within us, before unrevealed, are startled and quickened, and we are aware of nobler possibilities than we had imagined investing our nature; of prophetic aspirations, still in embryo, but pricking beneath the shell of habit. An aim so divine we recognize at once as the crown of the system, whose other proofs are its weapons and its cuirass. And in it we see illustriously declared His perfect mind who knows the soul, and who knows as well the immortal realms to which this consciously is predestined.

What is then the result, of attainment and character, which Christianity proposes to those who accept it? It is indicated in many passages;—as in that in which John says that we are already, accepting Christ, the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but when it shall appear we shall be like Him, seeing him as he is; as in that in which Peter says that we are to be partakers of the Divine nature; or that in which the writer to the Hebrews declares that we are to share the holiness of God. But I do not know that anywhere else a

more complete and succinct exhibition of this aim of Christianity is given than by Paul, in his letter from Rome to the Christians in the cities and villages around Ephesus; and especially in that passage which immediately precedes the doxology that closes the third chapter in this Epistle.

It was natural, perhaps, that he *should* present, more distinctly and fully than any other, in a few rapid and crowded clauses, the spiritual result toward which redemption, as he understood it, continually tends. His mind was one of the most earnestly practical, as well as of the most acute and analytic, that has appeared among human thinkers. More than in that of either of his associates, there was combined in it, with splendid special intellectual forces, a noble philosophical power of intuition, by which moral ideas were represented to him with almost the distinctness of visible objects, and to which the ultimates toward which invisible tendencies moved were as vividly present as was the bridge across the Tiber, as was the golden house of Nero on the Palatine hill. The scientific faculty, the philosophical insight—really, though not formally, the poetical temperament—were remarkably associated in his kingly genius; while all that he had received by nature had been signally trained, by the discipline of the schools, by large intercourse with men, by the exercise of office, by a wide and various experience of life. When then his whole personality was pervaded with the force of inspiration, as well as with the glorifying spirit of love—when the light that had shined on him, outside Damascus, had struck its spiritual lustre on his soul, and the Master whom he had persecuted had set him apart by the gift of the Holy Ghost to be the great teacher in Christian truth of the Gentiles and of the world—it was but natural that the system of grace, revealed through Christ, should open itself in its fulness before him; and that the results toward which it wrought, in individuals, for the race, should become as a luminous presence to his thoughts.

While recognizing with a distinctness which in none was surpassed the defilement and debasement of man's natural estate, in which redemption had its occasion, he yet saw also, and with an amazing completeness of vision, the mighty and allied agencies of grace through which God was working to lift the

race from condemnation and darkness, the inward pain and paralysis of sin, and to make men free in the liberty of justification, pure and mighty in sanctity and in wisdom. The whole course of the Gospel in the world was portrayed to him; the weak things here overcoming the mighty; the base things bringing to nought the noble; and the things that were *not*, coming into development, and rising to unexpected supremacy, that they might be servants of the Lord and of his word. He saw as well the future world, in which the work of grace should be consummate, for the personal believer, and for the whole church. He saw it, not as John did, through crystal seas, and shining streets, and battlemented walls built up of jewels, the throne in the midst of crowned elders, and the rainbow about it like unto an emerald; he saw it as being permitted himself, in the ecstasy of his soul, to enter and partake the unsearchable glory, and to hear the words which it is not lawful for a man to utter. And so he has declared it to us, not through the images of another apocalypse, but in a more wholly intellectual expression; setting forth in terms the spiritual attainment which man is to seek; which through the work of Christ and the Spirit it is his privilege here to attain, at least in germ, and which will be his immortal possession when he has reached heaven.

Observe, in this view, the passage I have referred to; notice it in its context, and consider it in its particulars. It is the close of one of the sublimest prayers that ever broke from human lips. Throughout the Epistle—written, remember, by one in confinement, and probably from the obscure and filthy Jewish quarter, under Janiculum, and written to the scattered Christian communities in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, of merchants, mechanics, sailors, slaves, and praying women,—throughout the Epistle, the soul of the apostle, intensely active, charged with the truth, and enabled and guided by Divine inspiration, has poured itself forth with a fulness of thought and a fervor of utterance most remarkable and impressive. Almost without pause, in an impetuous outburst from his mind, his whole view of the Gospel—of the depth of man's need, of the riches of God's grace, of the infinite glories to be looked for in the future—has rushed into speech; shaping itself, as it poured

through the lips that leaped to utter it, into a rhythmic and royal expression. And now he prays. In the intensity and supremacy of the state to which he has come, there is no utterance left him but of prayer. "For this cause I bow my knees," he says, "unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family [or every family] in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge; that ye might be filled unto all the fulness of God"!

We pause, breathless, and almost bewildered, as we come to the end of this marvellous prayer! The thoughts it suggests are so high that they are well-nigh dreadful. We feel the total impression of it so strongly that we fear to mar that by an analysis of its parts. And we know beforehand that no analysis, and no meditation, can raise us to the height, or enlarge us to the compass, of the mind of the apostle while he uttered these words. And yet the passage, because of its author, and its place in the Scripture, and even because of its nature as a prayer, holds in it what we want. Beyond almost any other passage, of but equal extent, it sets before us, in complete exhibition, the result at which Christianity aims, in the character and attainment of those who receive it. And because of this, we must examine it; and to do so satisfactorily, must do it to some extent with an easy analysis.

What are then the parts, separable from each other, yet combined in the unity of this spiritual experience, for which the apostle, on behalf of the members of those missionary churches to which he is writing, so fervently prays? toward which the various agencies of the Gospel, as he understood them, in us as in them effectually work?

The first is, plainly, a constant indwelling of Christ in the heart, through our affectionate personal faith, apprehending, appropriating, and identifying with ours, His spiritual life. This, of itself, is a sublime aim; and aside from experience it might seem simply ideal. Yet no one can deny, if only as a

philosopher, the possibility of its accomplishment, admitting that Christ, and the Spirit who represents him in the world, are what they seemed to be to Paul. And no one can deny, as a student of history, that this has been in a measure accomplished, among those who have followed in character and life that Ignatius of Antioch who called himself "Theophorus," because he bore the Lord within him.

We are sympathetic and appropriative beings. All the quick outreaching sensibilities of the soul are so many ducts, through which we continually draw to ourselves, and consciously and intimately combine with our own, the spiritual force, the very central life-element, of one in whom we entirely confide; especially of one whom we perfectly revere. We thus replenish ourselves, without exhausting the other, and receive higher gifts than all books could bestow. So the child reproduces in after time the spirit of the parent—the firmness, manliness, intrepidity of the father, the tastefulness, sympathy, and self-sacrifice of the mother—whichever of them most has impressed and imbued that nascent personality. He has drawn his moral life from them, not merely or mainly through the accident of birth, but more through the subsequent operation of their souls, as matured and communicative, on his as plastic, confiding, and receptive. Their effective generation of character in him succeeds that of his physical life and frame. Through his active faith and reverence toward them, his imagination, his conscience, his eager affections, become, all, the sluices through which their impenetrating spiritual force streams upon and pervades him, till it tones him to their tint, and shapes him to their image. So that not unfrequently it is said of one afterward, 'He is just his father over again;' or, 'Not in the eye, the cheek, the form, the clustering curls, the symmetrical liteness and physical grace, but in the tenderness and dignity of temper, the artistic susceptibility, the enthusiasm or the sweet sobriety of the spirit, you see the mother repeated in the daughter.'

Their soul-life has prolonged itself, through these responsive representatives of it; while children who held a different moral relation to their parents, though resembling them in figure and face, are most unlike them in character; their parallels in person, but in spirit their opposites.

So it is that God puts a constant reward on a sweet and attractive magnanimity in the parent, on a generous, sympathetic, and winning temper; and makes the austereness, or the cynical harshness, which sometimes encrusts an even true piety, a bane to those who are brought up beneath it.

We see the same essential result—and still on the plane of mere natural law, and within the range of familiar experience—attending the long confidential intercourse of friend with friend; or the protracted exposure of the mind of the disciple to the higher mind, the more comprehensive and educating spirit, of him whom he reveres as a teacher. The moral force, as well as the intellectual belief, of the soul which is superior, is imparted to that which leans upon it with confiding love. And this mediation of character as of culture is that which gives his grandest opportunity to every teacher in the schools, and to each earnest minister in his pulpit.

What then if the Master be a Divine one? if toward Him there be wakened such an absolute faith as cannot exist toward any other? if while he stands upon our level, he shadows us with eternal supremacy? if while we grasp his hand in brotherhood, and look unabashed into his serene eye, we know that those muscles which ours touch are strung with Omnipotence; that the light in that eye into which ours look is the primal and unsearchable wisdom? And what if, by a special operation of that Divine Spirit by whom his work is now carried on, the supreme properties and traits of his soul, the very inmost life of his life, are in a method unique and transcendent imparted to those who accept and love him? How sure then, how swift, how pervasive and transforming, the reproduction of his life within them;—so that they at last may say with Paul, “I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.” Christ is properly formed in such, the light of life, the hope of glory. He is the root, and they the branches; their spiritual law, and force, and experience, transmitted from him; the very life of Jesus, according to the apostle, being manifested through them, and so prolonged and universalized in the world.

It is this indwelling of Christ in the heart which Paul specifies first, as the aim of the Gospel for every disciple. And when we bring distinctly before us what his life is—how gentle, stately, pure it was, when clothed in the flesh; what delicacy was mingled with its complete majesty; how patience, and heroism, and an immeasurable sympathy with mankind, were confederated in it; how it overtopped not the Pharisees only, but Roman dignity, Greek vivacity, the fervor of Psalmists, the preëminence of Patriarchs, and the utmost moral culture of the disciples; how it stood, and still stands, the supreme life in history, worshipped of angels, and dear unto God—we cannot but feel that to have this freshly propagated in us is a marvellous attainment, the vital source of every good. Whatsoever is virtuous, whatsoever is lovely, in the most entire masculine strength, combined with a fervor more than feminine, and a maidenly modesty—an inward glory that fills with grace the outward manner—a poise, and temperateness, and tenderness of temper that show themselves spontaneously through the noblest demeanor—a spirit so charming that children must love it, while so replete with grandest force that the world cannot conquer, nor death overcome it—all this must arise, in a florescence swift and sweet, from such an immediate indwelling of Christ!

But notice, also, the second part in the personal attainment outlined and expected by this analytic and practical apostle for those humble believers to whom he was writing: the basing all character and conduct upon—or rather, to adopt his more radical image, the rooting them in—a pure, impassioned, victorious Love, as their ground and condition. This follows naturally from what has preceded; since such love was the vital power of character in Christ, and must be in those in whom he dwells. Yet how clear and magnificent a conception it is, as applied to any personal soul! And, supposing it realized, what a glory intrinsic, surpassing all that of brilliant parts and rare attainments, shall it give to that soul!

Outside the gospel it is a conception not realized on earth, nor even consciously held in view, and worked toward. In most men, as all experience testifies, a certain real though tempered ambition is the basis of character; the thirst for success,

in society, politics, commerce, the professions. Philosophy even extols this principle, as nobler and more stimulating than an avaricious greed or a sensual thirst. And history shows characters admired through centuries, shows nations proudly dominant in her annals, in which this has been the prevalent spirit, subordinating to its service all occasions and powers. But in other men, as a various civilization is unfolded, an intellectual aspiration, a zeal for research, becomes the organic power in character; in others, the passion for a vivid and copious gratification; in others still, the sense of the governing authority of Right; while in yet many others, more amiable and benign, the whole personal experience is based and built on the social affections, and their sovereignty gives law to the other moral forces.

The aim of Christianity is diverse from either. It is to make LOVE, toward God and man—a love unselfish, ardent, comprehensive, that will prompt to all kindness, yet consist with all conscientious exactness, that will show itself in sympathy, generosity, forgiveness, and attain its consummation in a perfect self-sacrifice when that is needed, and yet that will never hide a sin from the sinner, or tolerate the postponement of righteousness for his pleasure,—to make this love, in one and all, the ground and germ of both character and conduct. What this is, essentially and forever, in God, it would make it to be in man his creature. What always resided supremely in Christ, it would bring to reside supremely in him in whom Christ's spirit is reproduced. "That ye may be rooted and grounded in love," says the apostle;—grounded on it, as the temple on the base from which with airy proportion it springs; rooted in it, as the tree in the soil, to which it is attached by myriad ties, and from which it drinks its nourishing life. Every pillar, and wall, and arch, and spire, in the personal attainment, will then manifest the permanence, and reveal the uplifting and moulding power, of this love which is beneath. Every branch, and bloom, and leaf, and fruit, in the complex character, will exhibit the beauty and throb with the life of this permeating force.

How essential and how immense the change which is thus prefigured as the anticipated fruit of the Gospel in each who

receives it! A change in the outward habit, not only, or in the intellectual views and beliefs, but in the sovereign passion of the heart; a change not transient, but enduring as life; not partial, but perfect; not limited in its influence, but extending in the force that radiates from it to all the powers, and even to each particular of the conduct; a change that will shed through the soul itself, and through the activity in which that is expressed, the inspiration of such a love as seraphs know; of such as breathed throughout the works and words of Christ, and was uttered with absolute energy in his cross; of such as reigns eternally in God, the source of his felicity, and the moral ground of his dominion.

And what a charm, and spiritual majesty, in any soul in which this change has been accomplished! What harmony, thenceforth, among the tastes that were discordant! What inmost liberty in the will which has come to this glad accord with the beings that are grandest, and the laws that are sovereign! What peace within, and sweet delight, giving supremacy over fortune! What a new awakening to each power, what widened sway over other intelligences, from this love which holds within itself the secret of might as well as of pureness!

There can be nothing brought into comparison with the intelligent personal soul in which this glory of a divine Love has been perfected, that shall not be mean as mud in the contrast. The earth, if crystalized into a chrysolite, were a dull trifle by its side. The lordliest intellect that ever has had sway on the earth, if multiplied to tenfold greatness, but associated with another spirit, were no more to be measured against it than is the mechanical power of looms against the affection that pulsates in poems and makes sacrifice sweet. It is not merely the fruit of ethical care and culture which is manifest in it, such as has been exhibited sometimes in men fortunately constituted and fortunately trained, outside of Christendom. It is not merely that overlaying of the natural character with graceful manners and costly accomplishments, which wins oftentimes a wide admiration. In this love-wrought character, though realized in the humblest, in the Bushman, in the slave, is shined a light, is embodied a force, that have come from God; and they who walk beside it daily have the influence on them of a

temper celestial, whose lustre and fragrance bring heaven more near.

No career can be conceived so noble and lovely, and morally so supreme, that it shall be difficult to a soul infused with such a spirit. Rather, the waving of angelic plumes shall not be easier, the song of seraphim more spontaneous. A life inspired by the passion which moves the praise of saints on high—its surroundings may be mean, and its incidents trifling; but the dullest details which its radiance touches shall be transfigured, like the raiment of the Lord in the glory of the mount. There shall breathe forth untroubled music through all the dissonance of its fortunes. It may not be like the artificial poem to which the life of some men has been likened, in whom melodious high-toned traits have been with voluntary effort expressed. But it shall be a sweet triumphant religious hymn; full of a quick and joyful love, that articulates itself in all the action; whose movement is modulated, and whose cadences supplied, by that same spirit which gives to anthems overhead their grandest grace. And he who takes anything else whatever, in the range of experience, any ambition, any passion, and sets it beside this as the sovereign and inspiriting temper in a man, will see that as the heavens are higher than the earth, so superior is the Gospel, in its spiritual aim, to all ethics, philosophies, and all other religions. Millennium is complete, the new Jerusalem has come to earth, when a Love, which holds its own bright law infolded in its ardent life, has been, by the power of an indwelling Christ, established in men! The absolute wisdom, grace, and might of our divine Author have now their demonstration, not when the suns have been set upon their poise, or the wondrous arch of the heavens hath been bended, but when *this* has been realized in the sinner!

We come then to the third element included by the apostle in his prayer for the Christians along the slopes of Western Asia, as another part of their personal attainment; and that is, the spiritual wisdom and insight, peculiar to believers, and common among them, whereby they comprehend the great system of Redemption, and are able to see it in its scope and height, as well as in its practical relations to themselves. This comes as the fruit of the temper of Love, perfected by an

indwelling Christ; and certainly we do not need argument to show us either its realness, or the rich supremacy it naturally gives to every thoughtful soul that gains it.

Love makes the mind always alert and eager, and quickens in it discerning power. It shoots a secret fervor through it, which all the forces share and show, and by which one gains new mastery over themes, and new facility in their exhibition. It is not the dry light, the 'lumen siccum,' but the light of enthusiasm, of a love for his study, through which the scientific *savant* searches most successfully for the truth he pursues. And the name of more than one poet will occur to us to remind us of the truth which Iago quoted so long ago, that 'even base men, being in love, have then a nobility in their natures more than is a nature to them.' But love to God lifts up the soul, as well as breeds in it a new enthusiasm; makes its attitude normal, as well as its spirit, toward the universe he has framed; brings it into immediate fellowship with himself, and assures it thus of an interpreting insight concerning his system, which others, without this, can no more attain than they can fly by swinging their arms, or can shut their eyes and reach the stars with their fingers.

And so how often has it been seen, as in Augustine or in Edwards—nay, we need not go so far from our times to find our examples—that they who have had the Christ within, and through the love thus wrought in their souls have had an intimate communion with God, have gained a comprehension of the system of Redemption, and of all other knowledge as related to that, which others of equivalent powers and parts, and an equal training in the exercise of the schools, have altogether failed to attain. With intuition and mastery they have walked amid the steps where scholarly skeptics blindly stumbled. With a marvellous perspicacity, derived from their spiritual sympathy with God, they have caught the meaning of his secret plans, and have read to the world the relations of history and of all human life to his sublime purposes. And others who followed them—lower in level, less in power, but kindred in spirit—have welcomed the truth which they unfolded, have found in it the grandest wisdom, and have felt the soul not enriched alone, but expanded by it.

For what a knowledge this is, when one has reached it! the summit of all knowledge; the inclusive round, amid which the sciences are separately set; the wisdom to which all arts are auxiliaries; the knowledge which spans and connects the eternities! More and more we are finding, as the race marches on, that the history of Redemption encompasses within it the history and the culture of the world; that all sciences, inventions, and learnings have their value, as subordinate to this, deriving from it their clearest lustre, and shedding in turn illustration upon it; that he who comprehends the great purpose of God, which was formed before the foundation of the world, to redeem and restore fallen man to himself by a still sublimer action on his part than even creation had given the room for; he who sees how all the inspiration of prophets, the rites of the temple, the tendencies of both Hebrew and Gentile society, the teachings, the works, and the death of the Lord, are harmonized in this purpose; how all local and fugitive national developments, Egyptian achievements, Assyrian invasions, Macedonian conquests, the Greek letters, the Roman imperialism, have been ranged around and limited by this central plan, and how far it stretches still onward into the future, of millennial glory and of heavenly rest;—he has the key to human progress, learning, life; to the wail of old poets, and their questioning aspiration; to the undertone of doubt, unsilenced by hope, that makes the ancient philosophy sad; to the arts whose beauty failed to preserve the idolatries they venerated; to the vast revolutions which ever and anon have underrun society, as the shattering earthquake heaps in piles the rended plain and splintered hills. He has the key to the present astonishing combinations of history, and the swift changes among the nations that are now going on. Yea, he has the key to the secrets of even the terrestrial constitution; to geologic changes, and microscopic formations; to the fire at the centre, and the verdure on the surface; to the shape of the continents, and their positions on the globe; and to those remote balancings of the stars in the heavens by which this whirling earth of ours is sustained in its equipoise, and is carried toward its glory.

The height and the depth, the length and the breadth, of that Divine plan to which all is subordinate, from relation to

which all cosmical movements take significance,—more largely than by any other they are mastered by him who through an appropriating faith in the Lord has Christ dwelling in him, whose whole experience is thus based upon love, and who knows, as far as man can know, that “love of Christ which passeth knowledge.” A wisdom so interpreting and wide-sighted as his, the schools cannot impart or rival. And it has the promise, beyond all other, of immortal completion. For when he reaches the very heavens, where his sympathy with the Highest will be perfect, and where the harmonious relations of the universe will all flash into discovery, the vision he attains will still parallel in kind, and only surpass in clearness and in measure, what here he had gained. He there will look from a point than which the archangel’s is not higher. But he will see, in grander extent, yet along the same levels, the reaches of that stupendous scheme which has the cross for its centre, the broken gates of death for its trophy, and eternity for its final theatre!

Whatsoever, then, is grandest in intellectual attainment, whatsoever most rich and sublime in true wisdom, more than the sciences ever have taught, more than the caskets of all literature contain, is included by Christianity in the aim it proposes to each intelligent soul that accepts it!

And then what shall we say of the fourth and the last part embraced in this outline of the apostle:—that “ye might be filled unto all the fulness of God himself;”—wherein is plainly signified to us, not only the transformation of the soul into the likeness of its author; not only the intimate union of its life with his from whom its being came; but the perfect transfusion of its individual sensibility and faculty with the experience which is eternal in him; the immediate and complete communication to it, by his power, and through his grace, of the pleasure and peace, the holiness and the light, and may we not add, of the essential prerogative and might, which are immanent in God;—so that however weak by nature, however stained and chained by sin, we may become, as Paul affirms, in these our bodies ‘the temples of the Holy Ghost;’ so that what was partly and dimly foreshadowed in the heathen apotheosis may be realized in us, and we become sharers in God’s pureness and joy; so that what was shown in incarnation itself may

be repeated in us, up to the measure of our diverse conditions, and we become also the sons of God—partakers of his fulness who filleth all in all!

How wonderful is this! surpassing speech; outrunning experience; and leading the very imagination to a height whereon it pauses awe-stricken and amazed. And yet how harmonious is it in its nature with that which has preceded! as the head is with the frame on which it is set; as the flower with the shoot from which it springs. And, supposing it realized—through the faith, the love, and the wisdom which it consummates—what a capital does it put, inwreathed with amazing volutes and helices, on the spotless shaft! What a more than fulfilment does it give to the wildest dreams of human nature! “Ye shall be as gods,” many heathenisms have said; but they have brought down the gods to man, not raised mankind toward the heavenly plane, in a vain and deceptive accomplishment of their boast. “Ye shall be as gods,” said the tempter in the garden; but even he, with his Satanic audacity, dared not promise to those who stood beneath the trees of life and knowledge that they should be filled, with wisdom, power, joy, and grace, unto the measure of God himself. That was reserved for the hunted apostle, writing beneath the gleam of the sword that was raised to destroy him, and writing to the scattered and scouted disciples whom the empire thought too mean and weak to be honoured with its contempt!

The Gospel which he was declaring to the world, sets the Infinite before us so as without it we could not have conceived him; boundless in being, in might, in knowledge, in a holiness immaculate, and a tenderness unmeasured, with the universe suspended on the word of his power, and the cross made the perfect representative of his spirit, having a joy ineffable in himself, and shedding this forth as the sun sheds his splendor, till the heavens are full of it; it shows him in creation, in redemption, and in judgment, upholding all, presiding over all, and simply articulating his infinite thoughts in sweeping systems, lucid Scriptures, and in the mighty order of Providence;—and then it says, to you and me, ‘and ye, if his Gospel hath done its work in you, shall be inhabited by his Spirit; shall be pervaded, in your lesser personality, with his Divine life; yea,

shall be filled with this, unto the very fulness of God! Surely, human nature had never elsewhere another promise so exalted as this! another recognition, so august, of that dignity, which belonged to its constitution, and which even sin has not wholly destroyed! And when this is realized, if realized it shall be, even philosophy must admit that the end of possible attainment hath been reached; that the utmost prophecies which lurk in our immortal being have been more than fulfilled! The will of the man being sweetly and inwardly harmonious with God's; the mind of the man, in its processes and beliefs, coinciding with his; and the finite heart being transfused and filled with the spirit of the Infinite; there is thenceforth secured to the humblest a plenary wisdom, a perennial delight, a perfect supremacy over chance and change, over time, temptation, sorrow, death! Inshpered thus in God, the soul cannot err, or faint, or fear, or die. And it shall have, beyond a doubt, what apostles had—shall have in fulness what they but partially and at intervals had—the mastery over the laws and limitations of sense and of matter which is the familiar prerogative of God!

No poet hath sung, nor art suggested, nor meditative mind caught in far prospect, an attainment like this; so personal, and so perfect; so wondrous high, so immortally continuous! All promises—of crowns, and palms, and thrones, of white robes, harps, mansions, and songs, of the river of life, the hidden manna, the white stone with a new name in it, the sceptre of sovereignty, the morning-star—they have their point of union here, they find in this their illustration—the accomplishment for believers of this unsearchable aim of the Gospel, that they be filled with all that is Divine, unto the fulness of God himself!

We cannot tell—thank God, as yet, in this infancy of our being, we *cannot* tell—what that shall be! But we know that when it is realized by us, realized in us, then the universe, in all the untrodden ways which science itself has not explored, becomes but our familiar home! Then that ascension of Christ our Lord, in which he paced the liquid air as if it were a sapphire floor, does but prophesy ours! And then the unshadowed effulgence of heaven is only the atmosphere for which we were through Him new-born! Immortality, then, is not for us

an outward boon. It is the native scene and sphere of our renewed and perfect life!

Oh, my Brethren, as we think of this—so vivid and vast, appealing so directly to our loftiest aspiration, and so immensely surpassing thought in the sweep of the future which it opens before us, and yet so clearly in the line of the influence of Christianity, portrayed so plainly by the apostle, and realized already in them that have ascended—how can we any of us help but feel how far beneath our privilege we live! How poor are our highest Christian ambitions, when matched against this grand attainment! How can we any of us help being quickened to new endeavours, put forth with a higher delight and enthusiasm, to gain that glory in ourselves which the great apostle represents in his words, for which he worked, and for which he prayed, as the chiefest of goods!

And what a view is opened before us, as we stand at this point, of the nature and scope of that Redemption of which the Gospel is the record; of the dignity of that Christian Theology whose office it is to interpret this Gospel, and to put its contents, by analysis and by synthesis, in logical forms, before mankind! What a view is presented of the nature and the necessity of the Faith, by which alone man can attain these blessings which are God's gift, through Christ; of the mischiefs which come with any Ritualism, which interposes superfluous forms between the Gospel and the soul; and of the hold which Christianity has, forevermore, by virtue of the aim it proposes to accomplish, upon the intelligent mind of the world!

Of course, I cannot do anything more than indicate the thoughts which thus crowd upon us at the point we have reached. But each may develop them for himself; and every one of them will reward our attention.

The supernatural character of Redemption:—men quarrel with this, deny it, decry it, assail it with wit, set science against it, and try with rash and hasty hands to eliminate from the Gospel whatever in it is most august! The incarnation of God in Jesus; the sacrificial death upon Calvary; even the realness of resurrection, and the visible ascension of the Lord into heaven; the mission of the Holy Ghost in the world;—with what elaborate and ever-repeated exertion men

attempt to reduce these to the level of nature; to bring them beneath the chains of sequence, in the ordinary law of cause and effect; to represent them as facts exaggerated; or wholly to transform them into fancies, myths, poetic legends, that gradually grew to the roundness of beliefs, and were hardened into the solidness of story. They are too grand, too mysterious and transcendent, to be real, it is affirmed. The earth is not vast enough to have such events transpire upon it. History is not noble enough to enfold such divine facts in its compass. The mind, which cannot measure them, repels them, and seeks to pull down the vast temple of faith to build from the fragments of the wreck it has made a temporary house of loose opinions, in which it may dwell. It admits the birth of a Jewish peasant; admits his pure and noble character, perhaps, even, his special genius for religion; admits his self-sacrificing and heroic death. But nothing else does it admit of the facts which the faith of sages and of centuries has discerned in the Lord, and in the work which he accomplished. And sometimes with rhetorical polish, and sometimes with poetic fancy, sometimes with scientific assertion, and sometimes with the slang of blasphemy, it affirms that this is substantially all that the Gospel amounts to.

But *one* answer to this, instant and peremptory, to the heart of the believer sufficient and final, comes rushing upon us at the point we have reached; the point from which we see the end that Christianity contemplates in those who receive it! It is not mental education alone, that it aims to secure; nor moral training, to habits of outward propriety and decorum. It is not even the exquisite culture of the social affections; or the illumination of the reason and the conscience with the prime and sovereign maxims of Right. If this *were* all that the Gospel proposes, then it might be accomplished, no doubt, on the plane of mere nature; by such an instruction and such an example as a true religious teacher and hero, conscious of a mission and glad to fulfil it, might well give.

But what Christianity proposes for man is something vastly beyond this; including it, but surpassing it, and adding to it elements not contemplated elsewhere. It is to take the humblest man—ignorant, weak, sinful, condemned, darkened in

mind, vitiated in heart, and inwardly severed from goodness and from God—to take the very idolater of Ephesus, bowing before the many-breasted Diana, to take the very slave of Corinth, soaked in each fibre of his nature in sin—and to make *him* that which Paul prefigured; which Paul now is; which Paul shall be, when God's great grace has done for him its utmost work! It is not merely to release him from outward danger and doom, though that is part of it. It is to make Christ dwell within him; to ground and root his character in love; to make him possessor of the spiritual insight which interprets God's plans; to fill him in spirit with all that is Divine, unto the fulness of God himself!

And nothing can be conceived, I submit, too great, too transcendent, for God to do, for the accomplishment of this result. You are troubled about miracles? But miracles become even probable beforehand, when we regard them in their moral relations, as the possible instruments of an end so august that the laws elsewhere maintained in nature may be properly suspended for its attainment. And that incarnation of God in Jesus, which is the chiefest and the central of miracles, and that descent of the Spirit to the world, by which the office of Incarnation is still further accomplished—they are no more difficult for me to believe, when I see the end they are to serve, than is the return of the spring after winter, making glade and forest vocal with song, and brightening with flower-flames all the sod.

I do not *want* the Incarnation made any less stupendous than it is, in the union it involves of perfect manhood, with its true body and reasonable soul, with the essential and eternal Divinity. Of course I cannot understand it. It is the more quickening to my hope that I cannot. The doctrine of a phantasmal body, like that which the Docetæ affirmed; the doctrine of a mere human soul, or of a super-angelic soul, at whatever point you try to stop on that slippery sliding-scale of theory which Ebionite and Arian have raised; even the Apollinarian doctrine, of the Divine soul displacing the human in the person of the Lord;—if the evidence for either were probable or plausible, no one of them is attractive or needful to me when I think of the work to be accomplished by Him who for us became incarnate. The more his nature transcends my thought the

more evidently it rises toward that Divine level of plan and operation which is here to be expected. It cannot be by mere natural means that an end so plainly supernatural as that which the Gospel sets before us shall be accomplished. Argument and precept are well in their place, and can do many things. But you might as well try to pull the suns up the steep of heaven with reindeer and with dogs as to try to fill the soul of man with the fulness of God by simply giving it correct notions of virtue, or opening to it new views of truth!

And if the facts involved in Redemption are so august, how grand, as I suggested, is the office of that Christian Theology which investigates these facts, discriminates and defines them, adjusts their relations, and puts them into appropriate expression and an orderly arrangement, the more deeply to impress them on the mind of the world!—Uninviting, do men find it? unpractical, do they hold it? unworthy the largest intellectual powers? It is in its nature the grandest of sciences; the most august of human studies; the most intimately connected with the highest culture; the most wide and fruitful in its practical influence! Dealing with the highest facts of the universe, so far as that universe is accessible to either the senses or the soul, it is the interpreter of all sciences beside:

“The fountain light of all our day,
A master light of all our seeing.”

Bringing to light possibilities in our nature which mere mental analysis could no more have discerned than the lancet of the surgeon can pick up the secret life-force upon its edge, it illuminates philosophy, and gives to the ethics, which else wander darkly on the plane of expediency, ‘a consecration and a gleam.’

The wonder-book of the world, it is the office of a Christian Theology to analyze and expound. The agencies which are sovereign in the universe it unfolds. The results toward which those agencies work, it seizes from far, and sets before us. And the moral ends for which all life and being are, it presents as in vision to the minds it employs, and to the minds which they affect. Any other learning, therefore, however rare, however rich, were profitably exchanged for this the noblest! Every

other is before it as earthly floors, columns, and roofs, beneath the golden architrave of stars. And when it shall fail to attract to itself the thoughtful attention of the educated minds which most instruct and quicken others, not only will the knowledge most needful to man have ceased to be put into clearest expression; not only will the governing mind of Christendom have ceased to absorb that highest stimulus which for eighteen centuries has been ministered to it; but the level of general intellectual culture will be at once and immensely reduced. History will then become commonplace. Philosophy will swing back to the vague hypotheses and uncertain speculations of its earliest time. The very Art of the world will lose the hiding of its power; and music cease to be inspired by highest themes,—the painting fade to fainter beauty.

How necessary Faith in the Divine Master, as the means by which the soul in man shall open to and appropriate these heavenly treasures, and make them all at last its own!—Not faith in teachers; faith in opinions; faith in a Church; we need for this that faith in CHRIST, which he demanded;—which apostles proclaimed the condition in each of the life everlasting; which is the element of victory on earth, of serenity in death, and of the vision that comes beyond!

Toward him in whom alone God reveals himself, coming into our nature to redeem us to himself; toward him through whom alone we have alliance with the King before whom seraphim bow, and are made sharers in his fulness; toward HIM this faith must be unfolded, being wrought in us of God's Spirit, until his birth, and work, and word, his cross, and passion, and resurrection, are all to us most real and near; until in him we find our rest, and from him derive ever-fresh inspiration! Whatever helps this, helps thereby toward our noblest attainment. Whatever prevents or hinders this, makes life more mean, the soul more dark, the destiny which the future holds impossible to be gained.

If any rites, then, help to faith, or any social forms of worship, or any esthetic grace of buildings, or any music, or other art,—all hail to them! Beyond their own intrinsic beauty they have then heavenly virtue on them from their relation to this result. If ancient, no matter; they still are good. If recent,

no matter; accept them gladly, apply them freely, so long as they make Christ more distinct, or lift the soul—through solemn hush, and joyful up-spring—nearer Him. For to the utmost point and limit, at which they thus continue to bless, they then have warrant not only, but eulogy, in the office they perform, the nurture of faith which they assist.

But the moment they cease to contribute to this, they are not superfluous only, but mischievous. Iconoclasm is then not the impulse of passion, but the soundest dictate of the soberest reason. Of windows gleaming in violet and gold, of lighted candles, splendid music, cruciform cathedrals, and all the pomp and pageant of worship, which fancy has fashioned and prerogative ordained, we then must say, "It is Nehushtan." Away with the brass which no more mirrors for me the Lord, but hides him from me! For a religion transacted for me, by no matter whom of priests or prelates, is not the religion that knits my soul through faith to God, and makes the boundless future mine! A religion whose ancient and venerable forms I am tempted simply to carry in my hand, clasped with silver, and bound with blue velvet—it may be charmingly handsome to look at, and handy to handle; but it is not by such a contact as that with things divine that I am to achieve that sovereign faith of which apostles testified before, in which the saints serenely suffered, and through which I gain the Christ within, the love victorious, the spiritual wisdom, and the fulness of God! He who on whatever pretence detains me from this, is the enemy of my soul. He who in any way helps me toward this, confers benefits on me which immortality only can reckon.

No man who preaches, in cathedral or cabin, to American, European, African, Malay, has any real or worthy success, except as he leads the souls he guides to the supreme experience of this. The very rhetoric of the pulpit has here its law; the architecture of churches the secret that should mould its forms; the entire mass of Christian letters the solvent that releases whatever in it was worth producing, is worth now treasuring for the future. Down with traditions, of Puritan or of Prelate—and up and on with all the means of Christian culture—which hinder on the one hand, or help on the other, this grandest gain!

And finally, my Brethren, as I suggested, what a hold has the Gospel forevermore on the mind of the world through this ideal which it proposes; which it proposes to accomplish for *each* who will accept it!

Other religions find their force in something extrinsic; in the statesmanships they control; in the arts they subordinate; in the military, political, or social operations with which theirs are inwoven; or in the elaborate and shrewd dialectics with which they both occupy and perplex their adherents. Christianity has an unwasting power—in perfect accordance with its Divine origin, and with the still active interventions of God for it—in the fact that it offers, and with evident reason, such a good to man as no other religion has dared to hint; a glory braided of four separate attainments, each supreme in itself, each harmonious with the rest; a glory as perfect, in the measure of our faculty, as that of God, and as immortal.

It is a civilizing power, as well; working out ameliorations in society as it spreads; shedding courtesies and culture, 'the fair humanitics,' the fine parts of learning, around it on its path; and blossoming forth, on every side, in philanthropic institutions, and a liberal enterprise. And this is a fruit and a mark of its Divinity. It must dispense such temporal blessings from its supreme height. It must scatter them from its infinite fulness. You might as well plant the cedars of Lebanon in the vase of etched Bohemian glass, and expect them not to crack the crystal in their growth, as to put the souls which the Gospel expands within the rings of a decorated despotism, and expect to keep those rings intact while the Christian development widens within.

But this is not its chiefest aim. The grandest purpose it has to serve is that which Paul saw bright before him, and for which he preached, in Nero's palace, as well as by the fountains of Philippi, or under the faultless doric of the Parthenon. This makes the Gospel more dear to mankind, as the general moral cultivation is advanced. It engages to Christianity the noblest convictions and hopes of the race. It assures it of a final universal supremacy.

I know there are multitudes of collateral indications which point the same way:—the historical progress of the Gospel in

the world; the leadership now maintained among the nations by those which hold it in most pureness; the readiness with which all invention assists it; the fact that its principles are sympathetic with the freedom which everywhere enlists desire. A Protestant power having immense dominion on the seas, carrying Christianity through India and Australia, and distributing its influence on that maritime commerce which is as the circulating blood of the world; a Protestant power suddenly supreme on the continent of Europe, flinging out to the ocean its flexible frontiers, and destined hereafter to make its influence radiate every-way for the furtherance of the Faith through which it is strong; Italy, united on the basis of universal religious liberty, and inflamed, from the lakes that overlook Lombardy down to Cape Spartivento, with an almost unanimous zeal against the Pope; our own country placed on the crest of the earth, and sweeping both oceans with the forces which in it from the first have been supreme;—these almost show the revolving wheels beneath the throne of Him who is to rule the earth.

But even these evidences become needless to me—I know without them, in the light of the promises which shine in God's word, that the Gospel, having once got a hearing in the world, will never hereafter cease to extend, that it is secure of an ultimate dominion—because it proposes and is fitted to raise men to such a height and splendor of experience as no transcendent human thought, aside from it, has ever foreshadowed! The race may part with many things. It has parted with poetries, philosophies, arts, and has afterward hardly missed them. It left the beauteous city of Minerva to be torn from its girdle, and to lie a trampled and fractured jewel beneath the shadows of Hymettus. It let the Roman Empire fall, though it seemed as if the very crust of the globe must have broken in the overthrow. It had left the kingdom of the Pharaohs before, a mere fossil on the Nile, with its splendid history sepulchred in the granite, and had still marched sea-ward, courageous as ever. It may leave our new and more humane civilizations to become effete, as have the older, and to finally pass away. But it *never* will lose the Gospel from it—the race will keep that, as it journeys toward the setting sun—until all men are idiots or insane. It cannot deny it, cannot even forget it, while conscious

still of its own Divine origin, and not wholly infidel to each greatest expectation. As surely as the words of Paul remain effulgent in the Scriptures—showing an attainment sublimer than thought, and still possible to man—the Gospel will at last have the nations for its subjects, and the earth for its arena!

And what a work, how honourable, how grand, becomes that of communicating this Gospel of grace to the minds of mankind! What great associations, what illustrious memories, gather thickly about it as we look back! What a cry rises for it from those domains, now dull as carbon, which it alone can turn to diamond! What an influence from it, if earnestly performed, striking on into the future, and outlasting the constellations! What responses shall come to it from the excellent glory! How all the economic and social relations which it also sustains—to good laws, and good government, to the wider expansion and the clearer enlightenment of the popular mind, to industrial progress and a copious commerce, to cheerful homes and a sound common-weal—how all these drop, into utter insignificance, beside that immense and immortal result which Paul expected and prayed might come from it, and which we his successors may with as sure a faith expect!

Young Gentlemen, now going forth from this Seminary—for so many years revered and useful—and expecting to accomplish in different spheres, and many of you in distant lands, your part in this work:—Fathers, and Brethren, already in it, and on whom sometimes its duties press with a weight beneath which nature alone would swiftly sink:—do we feel, as we ought, what a privilege is ours? and what an inspiring and incomparable duty? No wonder that angels delight to assist in this sublimest work of time! that for it the Lord became incarnate! that in it moves, with silent might and ceaseless patience, the Spirit who wrought the earth to form! Let us, with an unflagging zeal, derived from Him from whom alone a true zeal comes, accept till death the labours of it, and feel the service its own reward! And then, when, parting from an earth we have blessed, and from human societies which we have enriched, we have reached with those who by the Spirit have heard our words not only the instant vision of God, but the secrets of his

wisdom, and a share in his eternal fulness, it shall be with a rapture of soul which now we cannot tell or know—beneath whose thrills the very harps there waiting for us shall strain and throb—that we look backward, forward, up!

God grant this to us, for his Son's sake; and unto Him be all the praise!

ART. III.—*History of the Christian Church*. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D. Vols. II. and III. From Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great, A. D. 311—600. (Pp. xiv., viii., 1032.) New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

FOR fifteen years, "*grande mortalis ævi spatium*," we have been receiving with increasing interest and appreciation the successive instalments of Dr. Schaff's Church History. In October 1851, the "Apostolic Church," which had then recently appeared in the German edition, was reviewed. On the publication of the American edition, occasion was taken, in January 1854, to discuss more fully some ecclesiastical and theological topics to which, for various reasons, the work was drawing attention. The first volume of the History of Ancient Christianity continued the narrative of post-apostolic history through the era of conflict with dominant heathenism, of persecutions and apologies, to the year of our Lord 311, which witnessed the Edict of Toleration and the death of Galerius, the cruel instigator of Diocletian's ordinances against the Christians. This volume was issued from the press late in 1858, and elicited on all sides a hearty welcome and emphatic commendation. Manifold and engrossing occupations have delayed until near the end of last year the completion and publication of the next section of the author's work, which now lies before us. Yet this delay has not been without its advantages, in the growing breadth and soundness of the author's views, and the enlargement of all his resources. Not a valuable monograph has appeared while even the closing paragraphs were within reach of his pen, but has found an appreciative recognition. The

author has conscientiously availed himself of every newly discovered manuscript and every scholarly revision of old texts, of every new point of view opened by enlightened criticism, and of every honest and manly and Christian estimate of the events, institutions, systems and individual characters that lay within his broad and crowded field of investigation. And the practical Christian labours in which he has been engaged, if retarding for a time the work of composition, have, we are sure, added not a little to his qualifications to exhibit the institutions and the life of the early Christian centuries.

In the preparation of the American edition of these volumes, as in the case of the preceding, the author has had the valuable assistance of Rev. Dr. Yeomans. The continuance of these joint labours through so many years, and through the successive stages of the author's work, we regard as no slight advantage. The author writes with greater freedom and confidence, and the translator, becoming more familiar with the most delicate and characteristic turns of thought and shades of expression of the man whose *alter ego* he thus becomes in literary labour, is able to impart to his own work more of the freshness and independence of original composition.

Dr. Schaff's plan is so comprehensive that he is able to devote an entire volume or a pair of volumes to each of the great periods in the history of the church. Each of the three works thus far produced has, therefore, a completeness of its own. Yet it is so far conformed to the modern German type of ecclesiastical history as to appear rather a collection of monographs on church history than an organic, living work. This encyclopædic, or, as it has been called, "rubrical" treatment of history, has its convenience in text-books and manuals of reference. So would an alphabetic arrangement of similar monographs. But a work so constructed cannot possibly have the sweep and power which characterize the great masters of secular history. Neither writer nor reader can traverse ten times the period under examination, looking on each visit for a new class of facts and principles, without losing somewhat the impression of the grand onward march of events and agencies. It might not be orthodox to write the history of some Christian epoch, as Motley, for example, writes of a great secular period;

but we wish that some master would make the attempt. The variety would at least be refreshing. We should still have access to the works of Neander, and Gieseler, and Guericke, and Niedner, and Hase, and the other masters who, perhaps for reasons estimated more highly by them than by us, have chosen the more analytic method.

It may be said that the relations of theological science and of specific creeds, of church organizations and institutions, to the early Christian centuries, are such as have forced ecclesiastical historians into this divisive, monographic treatment of their subject. We admit the urgent necessity that some writers should discuss with most exact discrimination, the development of theology, and church organizations, and worship, and discipline and art. But we are not prepared to concede that the constraint is laid upon all to vie with those who have gone before them in the thoroughness with which they should unravel to the last thread the robe in which the church was arrayed.

The method being conceded, Dr. Schaff infuses into his work more of freshness and life than we have felt in any of his predecessors who can be compared with him in thoroughness and comprehensiveness. While he is less severely and conspicuously philosophical in the arrangement of his material, than Niedner, Neander, and some others, the principle which has guided him in his classification is for the most part easily recognized. He makes, it is true, ten divisions of his subject, apparently equal and coördinate, while Niedner in his extremely abstract and scientific work makes but three, and Neander, Guericke, Jacobi and others but four. The very fact that he is less hampered by a philosophic form authorizes a freer method and a more graphic style, adapted to the requirements of his successive topics.

At one point only do we find ourselves unable to justify to ourselves Dr. Schaff's grouping of his material. The subject of Monasticism is discussed with great fulness in his fourth chapter. The three chapters preceding are given to the exhibition of the external fortunes and relations of the church. The next succeeding topics are the development of the hierarchy, church polity, discipline, and schisms. Neander, Niedner, and others more justly conceive and exhibit monasticism as one of the

most characteristic developments of the Christian life of that period, and therefore assign it a later place under "Christian Life and Worship" (Neander, Guericke), or "Church Religion;" (Niedner).

In fixing the chronological bounds of the period which he proposes to discuss, Dr. Schaff corresponds very nearly with the majority of recent authors in his department. The Edict of Toleration issued by Galerius a few months before his death, A. D. 311, put Christianity into new relations to the ancient world, and may well be made the starting-point of a new era. Any such subdivision of historical periods must of necessity be somewhat arbitrary. This analysis is surely less unreasonable than some others that have been made. The *terminus ad quem* is less easily fixed. The accession of Gregory the Great to the pontificate in A. D. 590, marks, however, as fairly as any single event the consummation of a change long in progress, by which ancient gave place to mediæval Christianity. Gieseler's limitations of the second great period in the history of the Church (A. D. 324, Constantine's accession as sole emperor,—A. D. 726, the beginning of the image controversy) seems far less defensible. For the history of the period treated by Dr. Schaff we must follow Gieseler through two of the three subdivisions of his larger period, and in each of these traverse the ground six or eight times in order to find our facts and principles properly classified and labelled.

In respect to the fulness of discussion there is no great difference between Dr. Schaff and Neander. The second volume of the American edition of Neander covers the same ground as the two volumes of Dr. Schaff now before us, and with very nearly the same amount of matter. But in regard to the precision and transparency with which the material is exhibited, and the objective character of the communications made, there can be no comparison. The mint of Neander's mind did not strike and issue a coinage current with all minds at once and everywhere. The other common histories are, at least in their text, mere compends as compared with these two. Dr. Schaff, while referring to, and quoting from his authorities for individual statements, more than in his preceding volumes, contents himself with less citation than Gieseler. His general bibliography is

exceedingly rich and valuable, in connection not merely with the larger sections of his work, but also its important subdivisions. His concise and forcible characterization of the nature and value of the several works and the various editions which he cites as authorities, often adds much to the worth of these skeleton sections.

Dr. Schaff recognizes the existence and the value of an English and American literature within the limits of his department, much more than has been common with European Germans. For example, he refers to, quotes from, and occasionally criticises in their specific statements, such works as Cunningham's "Historical Theology," and Shedd's "History of Christian Doctrine." This is not merely intrinsically just, but is an important service to his American readers. And Dr. Schaff may aid scholars in the land of his birth, in coming to the perception that liberal attainments and valuable opinions are not confined to Teutonia. We are sure that he is stimulating and assisting American scholars to a profounder and richer learning. His residence in this country, and his observation of the developments of Christianity here, moreover, serve to liberalize and sometimes to correct his views of practical matters, such as the relations of church and state, and the Christian Sabbath. His own susceptibility, and candor, and practical earnestness, react upon the disposition of his readers, and largely increase his power among us. The American church, both in its direct tributes, and in its broader and more varied culture, will honour the accomplished Christian scholar, who, by pen and tongue, is doing so noble a work.

The period of church history covered by these volumes, is exceedingly rich, both in great movements and great men. The system at first despised, and then opposed in fierce persecution, is now tolerated, and soon after becomes the established religion of the state, acquiring the power, and too often manifesting the disposition to persecute in its turn. The missionary activity of the early church continues, and in each of the three continents a considerably wider extension is given to Christianity, beyond the limits of the Roman Empire. The church organization is rapidly modified, as the result partly of internal impulses, and partly of external influences. No longer compelled to apologize

for and justify its own existence, the church employs its pen mainly in defining, defending, and extending its system of doctrine, not neglecting, meanwhile, to write the history of its earlier experience, or to develop a rich and varied homiletical and liturgical literature. The great Ecumenical Councils belong to this epoch, and in connection with their decisions the voluntary or compulsory separation from the Catholic Church of one after another of the bodies pronounced heretical. The great ruling spirits of these centuries we find now upon thrones, then in episcopal chairs, and again in cloisters. The sceptre, the tongue, the pen, are the instrumentalities employed here in promoting the progress of truth, and the triumph of right, and there in the interest of base intrigue, angry passion, or pestilent error. Constantine, Julian, Theodosius, and Justinian,—Athanasius, the Gregories, Jerome, Ambrose, Leo, and Augustine, are among the great men who must be carefully studied in their individuality, and in their providential relations to the progress of the church during these centuries. Arius, Nestorius, and Pelagius too, are among the representative men, not merely in their generations, but in the religious history of the world. As our eye glances over the historian's inventory of material, not only that available for his possible use, but that indispensable to the structure which he is erecting, we cannot greatly wonder at the method which has been so often adopted. It is, doubtless, easier to write such a number of monographs as should render some measure of justice to the chief developments of an age so crowded with movements and prolific of results, than to bring all these details in their proper proportion and adjustment into one grand historic edifice.

It continues to be true during the earlier part of the period under review, that we stand upon ground which is the common heritage of all churches that have any title to the name Christian. Before we lay aside these volumes, we find that disruption had done a great work, but for a time the great events and the great names are the common property of Protestant, Roman, Greek, and Oriental believers. Were these disruptions a disaster or a blessing to church and world? While pronouncing them in the main a great blessing, we do by no means vindicate all the arguments used, the methods adopted, the

spirit manifested during the heat of these successive controversies in which the Orthodox Catholic Church was defining its faith. But we cannot conceive that without continuous miracles the church could have lived a healthy life under a creed, so vague in itself, or so loosely held, as to embrace in apparent unity all these discordant elements. Not indeed, in every particular of their action, yet beyond all question, in its general course, believers in casting out error bore powerful witness before the world in behalf of the truth as a sacred trust from their Head and Lord.

In his first three chapters Dr. Schaff describes as many phases of the external progress and triumph of Christianity, the political overthrow of heathenism, the literary triumph of Christianity, and the alliance of church and state. To Constantine, under whom this great revolution was substantially wrought, Dr. Schaff concedes not moral greatness, but a sagacious appreciation of events and tendencies, with judgment and energy in his administration. As a politician he judged it wise and no longer avoidable that Christianity should have a fair field by the side of other systems, and with an equal patronage, impartial or indifferent, from the state. Superstitious toward religions, especially toward successful religions, he had but a dim perception of the sacredness of true religion, and was inclined to use all systems when and so far as was useful to himself and his empire. His reception on his death-bed of the Christian ordinance of baptism can hardly be regarded as expressing more than the convictions of his intellect. The celebrated apparition of the cross just before his decisive battle with Maxentius, Dr. Schaff regards as subjective,—providential it may be, but in no higher sense miraculous. The cross had been making its way to this external position which it henceforth occupied as an emblem of power, through the growth and conflict and fiery trial of three centuries. The church, says Niedner, “became unconquerable in her outward position after she had made herself irresistible in her might.” Christians, “called to be saints,” were so far living a holy life,—bearing their Master’s name, they were so far actuated by his Spirit of active benevolence,—their faith in a doctrine which their own writers confessed to be “a stumbling-block” and “foolishness,”

had so often proved itself a very "power of God" to themselves and to others in the arena and at the stake,—the logic and learning, the ingenuity and malice of synagogue, and sanhedrim and philosophies of every name, had been so often baffled by the simple testimonies of the Scriptures and the apologies of the fathers, that the church only needed now a providential opportunity to take the place which was virtually hers already in the convictions of men as well as the decrees of God.

As early as A. D. 313, under the emperors' Milan edict, subjects might become Christians with impunity; in 324, Constantine, now sole emperor, exhorted his subjects to embrace the Christian faith; fifty years later, heathen writers became pleaders for toleration and champions of religious freedom; and as early as 385, not only was heathen worship made a capital offence, under Theodosius and his colleagues, but Christian heretics were put to the sword. Chrysostom and Augustine might remonstrate against force as an instrumentality of the truth, but the empire continued for the most part committed to this policy.

This alliance of church and state, and the ill-judged employment of secular agencies in the propagation of the faith, together with the relaxing of morals and discipline after Christianity had become the court religion, often complicated and embarrassed the work of Christian apologists. While the pen of the church was mainly employed in developing and defending true Christian doctrine as against distortions and perversions of the truth, changing circumstances called for an expansion of her apologetic literature. The brilliant but abortive efforts of the emperor Julian to restore heathenism, furnished one such occasion. And often during at least the first two centuries of this period it was needful for the church to watch against the quick and adroit assaults of her enemies. Not merely defensively, as when the high places of all lands were filled with the genius of hostile systems, but aggressively must the church present her paramount and exclusive claims. Heathenism and indifferentism must be argued out of being, so far as argument is in place, and Christ and his cross must be held up as challenging universal homage. The crowning glory of this literature is doubtless Augustine's "*de Civitate Dei*,"

the aim of which is at the same time defensive, didactic, and polemical.

The alliance of Christianity with the state did indeed give a new complexion to the religious activity of the state, but it introduced no new principle concerning the due relation of sacred and secular affairs. Jews and heathen were alike familiar with the idea of a state religion and a religious state. The dangers of the new connection were great and the evils manifold. If the state felt more promptly the modifying action of the church, was this influence as pure and spiritual? If the church received new supports, and enjoyed facilities in many ways multiplied and enlarged, did she not too often pay a sad and fatal price in the restriction or utter sacrifice of her independence? If her gospel was preached to some in high places who might not otherwise have heard it, was it not in many cases another gospel suited for courtly ears? As for the ameliorating influence of Christianity upon the jurisprudence and the social life of the empire, the statute book might not have been so soon reached by new enactments, but it may be that a purer and in the end a more effectual influence would have gone forth from a church less encumbered and secularized. One of the most natural and immediate, and at the same time most disastrous effects of the mutual dependence of church and state, was the elevation of secular rulers as such to the position of counsellors, umpires, and even dictators in the internal affairs of the church. Sometimes the high and exclusive prerogatives of the church were nobly vindicated against such encroachment. But in other instances, emperors and other secular rulers interfered, even in matters of doctrine, with their policies and intrigues, not sparing always the admonitory exhibition of the sceptre and the sword. There was quite enough of the spirit of lordship within the church, and here was the assumption and assertion, more or less guarded, of lordship over the church. The one might serve as a check upon the other. But in the collision between the two, truth and righteousness were not likely to be the interests first guarded. An Ambrose could indeed refuse the communion even to a Theodosius as a rebuke to his sin, and subject him to a public penance. And in general the Western Church was more faithful and independent than

the Eastern; but hierarchy and the primacy of Rome must sometimes furnish us the key to the interpretation of her conduct. We should honour her overmuch were we to imagine that she was merely guarding the Saviour's rights and honours. In the discussion of this whole topic, in his third chapter, Dr. Schaff writes as one who has breathed the free air of our American institutions.

The changing phases of this contest between emperors and bishops are full of interest and suggestion. The question related only to the boundary line between the two prerogatives. The church expected of the emperors protection, support, and a limited supervision. Emperors, not as mere civil authorities, but as possessors of priestly or episcopal rights, claimed with different degrees of distinctness, and exercised with varying energy, according to the temper of the men and the exigencies of the times, their ecclesiastical powers. Constantine, preaching to admiring courtiers, filling or vacating episcopal sees, according to his own pleasure, was nevertheless, more guarded than some of his successors in touching the doctrine of the church. In later days, now the orthodox faith, and again some heresy secured temporary triumphs through the direct and undisguised interference of emperors, acting in or upon councils, or independently of councils. Though we find and grant no scriptural warrant for the hierarchical system which was then rapidly developing, we may concede that providentially this system was made to serve as a strong bulwark against the encroachments of the state. "That age," says Dr. Schaff, "had only the alternative of imperial or episcopal despotism; and of these the latter was the less hurtful and the more profitable, because it represented the higher intellectual and moral interests." Again, a little later, speaking of the superior independence of the Western Church, he writes: "Here the hierarchical principle developed itself from the time of Leo the Great, even to the absolute papacy, which, however, after it fulfilled its mission for the world among the barbarian nations of the middle ages, degenerated into an insufferable tyranny over conscience, and thus exposed itself to destruction." We confess that we are not converts to that theory of historical development and providential government, which we understand Dr.

Schaff to hold. One abuse may be made to check another. One abnormal development in church or state may be employed as a providential limitation upon another. But we are not prepared to concede that this hierarchical structure was normal and right in a time and a place, and for a purpose, in any other sense than that in which Mohammedanism had a "mission," or Nestorianism, or the Arian and Pelagian heresies, which God has doubtless used for good. We cannot express our contentment with the papacy even before it "degenerated into an insufferable tyranny."

Throughout that hierarchical system the universal priesthood of believers was more and more repudiated. The voice of the people in the selection of their pastors was not consulted, and later was expressly excluded. The excesses and abuses which now and then appeared in the exercise of this prerogative were fully paralleled by misconduct of clergy, bishops, and secular authorities, where the nomination or appointment was vested in them. Clergy and laity were distinguished by new devices. Celibacy at first commended as expedient, was, after long striving and vigorous resistance, made obligatory, to the fullest extent in the Western Church. New offices were created between the priesthood and the laity. The episcopate gained in civil as well as ecclesiastical power. Metropolitans and patriarchs prepared the way for the final exaltation of the bishop of Rome to the primacy of the holy Catholic Church. Remonstrance and opposition became more feeble as they were found to be unavailing. The East indeed, while conceding to Rome the first patriarchate, claimed for Constantinople a second, hardly in name inferior. But Rome would brook no such approximation to her preëminence. And in Dr. Schaff's view, the successful assertion of these ambitious claims of the Roman See, "formed part of the necessary external outfit of the church for her disciplinary mission among the heathen barbarians." The motives of those who were engaged in building up this organism, were surely not at one with these gracious purposes of the Lord of the Church. He would have the papacy a schoolmaster to bring these barbarians to him; they were to be "trained by an awe-inspiring ecclesiastical authority, and a firm hierarchical organization to Christianity and free-

dom, till, having come of age, they should need the legal school-master no longer, and cast away his cords from them," (p. 289). The further exposition of this divine counsel is reserved for the history of Mediæval Christianity. We reserve our comments, expressing our sorrow that so large a proportion of the descendants of these barbarians are not yet come of age, and suggesting our fear that the hierarchy will not bring them out of their minority. We agree with Dr. Schaff most heartily in repudiating the arguments by which the papacy is based upon Divine right, especially as conferred in Mat. xvi. 18, (pp. 301—2. Cf. *Lange's Commentary on Matthew*, edited by Dr. Schaff, pp. 296—8).

The Ecumenical Councils are another interesting development of this age. In one view they were a growth kindred to the hierarchy; in another they serve as an important restraint upon all oligarchical and monarchical tendencies within the church. Their ecclesiastical precedent was the apostolic council at Jerusalem; within the confines of the Greek Church, they would be commended to favour by the political antecedents which could so readily be found in the congresses, called to meet special emergencies, or the stated meetings of Amphictyonic and Achæan leagues, and the Confederacy of Delos. The papistic theory, through which Rome sought to make these universal councils tributary to her supremacy, Dr. Schaff vigorously exposes and refutes. In the early centuries it was generally assumed and conceded, that in the doctrinal decisions of these councils, there was not merely a solemn expression of the unanimous conviction of the assembled church, (unanimity being ensured by whatever processes might be needful), but the voice of God. Accordingly, each successive utterance could be supplemented, but never rescinded. Of course, no appeal to the Scriptures against a decision of such a council was admissible, for the Holy Spirit would never contradict himself. On the question which Neander raises, and leaves open, as to Augustine's doctrine,—whether Augustine held that a council could express positive error, or simply, "that a later council should correct the decisions of the earlier, only so far as to define what the other had left undetermined, just as the more advanced development of the church might require in its opposition to new forms of

error," we understand Dr. Schaff to hold the latter view. He reconciles apparently conflicting expressions of Augustine, by conceiving that "Augustine presumed that all the transactions of a council were conducted in the spirit of Christian humility, harmony, and love," a presumption sadly opposed to facts. Was there in all councils called "Ecumenical," a characteristic and convincing manifestation of the presence and plenary power of the Holy Spirit, as inherited by or immanent in the Episcopate? Are the credentials of any as well attested as those of the Holy Scriptures? What these councils were to the state, what they were to the church of that day, and what they are to the later church, are three distinct questions. Protestantism peremptorily refuses, for want of evidence, to unite with the Greek and Roman Churches, in making them coördinate in doctrinal authority with the Scriptures, but is not quite agreed within itself, as to the amount of authority to be conceded to their deliverances.

The doctrine of the early church in respect to tradition, as distinguished from its Romish modifications, Dr. Schaff points out more distinctly when he takes up in his ninth chapter the special doctrinal history of these centuries. The Spirit of Christ it was believed still dwelt in the church, if not as a Spirit of revelation, at least as a Spirit of illumination and interpretation. By no means all of apostolic teaching had been embodied in the written Scriptures. Much had been orally transmitted, and was a precious possession of the church. And yet whatever use might have been made at an early day of this tradition as actually supplementing the Scriptures with other important facts and doctrines, the orthodox church soon found it needful to disclaim all such pretensions, but maintained the validity of tradition as an expositor of what had been written. The doctrine of an unwritten tradition in the church coördinate in authority with the Scriptures, was sure to be incessantly abused. Heresy could cite it with as much facility as orthodoxy; and criteria of the genuineness of alleged tradition became indispensable. "*Quod semper, et ubique et ab omnibus*" became the touchstone; "*universitas, antiquitas, consensus.*" It need not be said that very little that rests upon the basis of tradition will bear the honest application of this

test. The value of tradition evaporates with amazing rapidity. And some cardinal doctrines of the orthodox faith might be successfully challenged. The excrescences of Romanism would all be stripped away. Genuine Protestantism has very little place for the doctrine of tradition except in its museum of antiquities.

Says Dr. Schaff (p. 607), "The old catholic doctrine of Scripture and tradition" "makes the two identical as to substance, while the Roman Church rests upon tradition for many doctrines and usages, like the doctrines of the seven sacraments, of the mass, of purgatory, of the papacy, and of the immaculate conception, which have no foundation in Scripture. Against this the evangelical church protests, and asserts the perfection and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the record of Divine revelation; while it does not deny the value of tradition, or of the consciousness of the church, in the interpretation of Scripture, and regulates public teaching by symbolical books." Again (p. 616), "The catholic principle of tradition became more and more confirmed, as the authority of the fathers and councils increased, and the learned study of the Holy Scriptures declined; and tradition gradually set itself in practice on a level with Scripture and even above it. It fettered free investigation, and promoted a rigid, stationary, and intolerant orthodoxy, which condemned men like Origen and Tertullian as heretics. But on the other hand the principle of tradition unquestionably exerted a wholesome conservative power, and saved the substance of the ancient church doctrine from the obscuring and confusing influence of the Pagan barbarism which deluged Christendom."

While the elevation of Christianity to be the state religion gave the church new power for the maintenance of doctrine and discipline, the moral tone of the Christian community was seriously lowered. There was far more of insincere profession than in the lowlier days of the church. Noble instances of fidelity and of high courage attest the existence within the state-church of a piety and zeal of the apostolic type. But at the great metropolitan centres there was a pressure of one kind, and on the outskirts of the empire, among nominally converted barbarians, influences of another kind, under which the

standard of practical godliness was very generally forced downward. The church had not learned to multiply converts to righteousness by baptizing unconscious or indignant heathen with syringes through closed blinds. That has been the high attainment of a later day. Zeal, prudence, and sagacity, working together under auspicious circumstances, can effect wonders. A large part of a nation can be born in a day! For further particulars inquire of Romish priests in China. Unmitigated heathenism would hardly be countenanced even under the greatest laxity of the early church. But not merely within the sphere of practical life was the power of rude or refined paganism felt. Not a few church observances are unquestionably heathen in their origin and affinity. We have no space to illustrate this in a detailed examination of public worship and religious customs and ceremonies. These constitute the subject of Dr. Schaff's seventh chapter. Very naturally, in view of the development of Romanism in this direction, and with great clearness and fulness, beyond the measure of most church historians, he traces the growth of Mariology and Mariolatry. Other very interesting portions of this and the eighth chapters, amounting to forty or fifty pages, are devoted to the historical discussion and copious illustration of the liturgies and hymnology of the Nicene and next succeeding periods.

On the subject of the sacraments, Dr. Schaff confines himself quite closely to the exhibition with historical fidelity of the growth of doctrine and usage in the early church. Their general definition, and their conception of the nature, the operation, the necessity, and the number of sacraments, he concisely sketches. In the last-mentioned point, the mischievous working of the doctrine of tradition clearly appears, on the ground of which, five have been added to the two sacraments that rest on Christ's express command. The germs of the doctrine of the *real presence*, and the sacrificial as at first coördinate with but afterward superior to the sacramental nature of the Lord's Supper, are very clearly presented. In his incidental explanation of terms, Dr. Schaff says, of the Eucharist, (p. 503), "It is indeed, originally a sacrament, and the main thing in it, is that which we *receive* from God, not that which we give to God. The latter is only a consequence of the for-

mer: for we can give to God nothing which we have not first received from him. But the Eucharist is the *sacramentum* of a *sacrificium*, the thankful celebration of the sacrificial death of Christ upon the cross, and the believing participation or the renewed appropriation of the fruits of this sacrifice. In other words, it is a feast on a sacrifice. 'As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come.'" But is the Eucharist a *sacramentum* AND a *sacrificium*? The slip is easy from the strictly Protestant view, to the one on which the Romish mass is built up. What does the church sacrifice but herself, a living offering? This she does with confidence and joy, and quick experience of God's grace when she keeps in view *the* sacrifice which is wholly her Redeemer's. We quote again from Dr. Schaff, (p. 504): "In a deep symbolical and ethical sense, Christ is offered to God the Father in every believing prayer, and above all in the holy supper; *i. e.*, as the sole ground of our reconciliation and acceptance. This is the deep truth which lies at the bottom of the catholic mass, and gives it still such power over the religious mind."

On the question of the alleged miracles of the Nicene age, Dr. Schaff takes ground cautiously. He urges weighty considerations against their validity, "not warranting, indeed, the rejection of all, yet making us at least, very cautious and doubtful of receiving them in particular." He argues against Isaac Taylor's sweeping rejection of them, as determined by *a priori* and sectarian considerations, rather than by an impartial historical canvassing of their evidences.

Monasticism, which Dr. Schaff exhibits very fully in its more important phases in his fourth chapter, may be viewed under various aspects. In one view, it is a protest against the secularization of the church, and the deterioration of its discipline. In another, it is the culmination of "will-worship." Growing up at first outside the normal development of the life of the church, it passed into very intimate relations with it, externally and internally. Many of its ascetic exactions it forced the church to adopt in self-defence. And in its external organizations, it made itself in many ways an important auxiliary, if not an essential instrumentality. Light and shade are mingled in the sharpest contrasts in its developments, so widely spread

in space and time. We look with sadness and disgust upon its deformities; we accept with eagerness and gratitude many of its products, often incidental, and yet, in that age perhaps, unattainable, except by this or some similar institution. Nearly all that we prize, comes to us from the Monasticism of the West, which was far more seemly in its outward forms, less visionary and more practical in its aims and their results. To Jerome and Benedict, the church will not soon forget to pay a high and merited honour for the contributions of the one to sacred learning, and of the other to the cause of Christian philanthropy and civilization.

In his ninth chapter, which is naturally the most extended of the book, Dr. Schaff exhibits the developments of these three important centuries in Christian doctrine. The names of Arius and Athanasius, Nestorius and Cyril, Pelagius and Augustine, and others hardly less central and representative, will sufficiently indicate the magnitude of the issues then pending. In this chapter, and the tenth, which he adds as a supplementary picture-gallery of the Greek and Latin fathers of this era, Dr. Schaff displays to rare advantage his qualities as a church historian. The copiousness of his learning, his discriminating use of authorities, his lively individualization of men and movements, his judicial fairness in exhibiting the questions at issue, and the views of the contestants, nowhere appear to better advantage.

Both the great philosophical systems, the Platonic and the Aristotelian, exerted a powerful influence on Christian thought, and the forms chosen for its expression. Platonism was in the ascendancy during the greater part of the period under examination, but during the sixth century, as church-life passed on toward its mediæval type, Aristotle took the lead. It is noteworthy that the great thinkers of the church had so many of them received the best culture of the heathen schools. Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Lactantius, Jerome, and Augustine, are among the examples. With respect to the influence and value of the two leading philosophies, Niedner says, "On the one hand, the speculative nature of the Christian metaphysics, and on the other, the exactness of doctrinal definition needful to the church, demanded Platonic rea-

son and Aristotelian understanding." Says Dr. Schaff, "The influence of the two great philosophies upon theology was beneficial or injurious, according as the principle of Christianity was the governing or the governed factor." Within the church itself, the speculative and mystical character of the Alexandrian school, the more reflective and sometimes rationalistic tendency of the Antiochene theologians, and the more practical and experimental cast of Roman thought, all force themselves upon our notice in the discussion and decision of the great dogmatic problems that successively arose before the Christian mind.

The three great controversies of this period, fixing substantially the faith of the orthodox church, had reference to the Trinity, Incarnation, and the Nature and Relations of Sin and Grace. Of the five recognized Ecumenical Councils, the first two, that of Nicæa and the first Constantinopolitan, defined and announced the belief of the church concerning the Trinity. The next three were called to pronounce upon different phases of the doctrine of the Incarnation. No such authoritative announcement was ever made of the faith of the early church on the grave questions connected with Anthropology. Only local synods and councils gave utterance to their convictions, and these utterances were easily turned in favour now of one and again of another of the contending doctrines.

Some of the problems involved in the full and exact definition of the doctrine of the Trinity had been under discussion during the preceding Christian centuries. The nature of the God whom the church worshipped, and the Saviour in whom it trusted, could not long be left the sport of imagination, speculation, and caprice. In order to a true doctrine of the Trinity the proper and distinct deity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit must be successfully maintained. Arius brought the first of these points to a full issue. His doctrine, formed under the double influence of Origen's teaching and the rationalizing tendencies of Antioch, had been condemned by a provincial council at Alexandria in A. D. 321, but was still pressed to the distraction of the Eastern church. Constantine summoned the bishops of the Empire to Nicæa in 325;—and one-sixth are estimated to have accepted the invitation and availed them-

selves of the facilities offered by the Emperor. Their result was reached after six weeks earnest debate, all but two of the bishops present finally concurring. The deep conviction and earnest argument of a minority, led by Alexander, and Hosius, and Athanasius (not a bishop, and therefore not a voting member of the Council,) carried with them the less positive and discriminating majority, and finally all but two even of the adherents of Arius, in announcing their sublime faith in "one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God; who is begotten the only begotten of the Father; that is, of the essence of the Father, God of God, and Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father." The conflicting doctrines and the arguments by which they were supported, together with the far-reaching significance of the result, Dr. Schaff brings out in his most effective manner.

In the protracted and angry controversies of the next half century, Arianism gained a general ascendancy in the state and so over the church, and by casting off some of its most obnoxious expressions secured a stronger lodgment within the church. Athanasius died eight years before the second Ecumenical Council summoned by Theodosius to Constantinople in 381. The creed here developed, not receding in a single syllable from the Nicene, but supplementing it with some minor particulars in the doctrine of the Son, and bringing out for the first time with clearness and precision the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, had from the first the powerful support of the state, and was formally adopted seventy years later at Chalcedon. The so-called Athanasian creed, of unknown origin, and never adopted by a general council, is yet a remarkable product and exponent of the faith of the time. Says Dr. Schaff, (p. 697) this "closes the succession of ecumenical symbols; symbols which are acknowledged by the entire orthodox Christian world, except that evangelical Protestantism ascribes to them not an absolute, but only a relative authority, and reserves the right of freely investigating and further developing all church doctrines from the inexhaustible fountain of the infallible word of God."

No sooner had the church defined its conception of the eternal and essential relations of God the Son, than it became

necessary to conceive and express more clearly the doctrine of the Incarnation. What were these new relations of the Son of God? What did he cease to be, if there was any cessation? What did he become? What did he continue to be? When and because he came into the sphere of the visible, there were new complications introduced into the problem, new mysteries rising before the view of the thoughtful believer. Some of the elements to be weighed were abstract and metaphysical in the extreme,—*e. g.*, the relations of nature and person. What can the understanding grasp? What must the faith receive uncomprehended? What must both reason and faith reject, either as intrinsically absurd, or as contradicted by a sound exegesis of the Scriptures? Is Christ one, or is he two, or is he both two and one? To save oneness of person the Alexandrian school shrank from the admission of a twofold nature. To save reason the Antiochenes declined to admit completeness of nature without distinct personality. Had Christ a human spirit? was a question which Apollinaris answered in the negative. Can Mary be called the Mother of God? was the question which roused all the fierceness of the Nestorian controversy. Is it true that God was born, suffered, was crucified, died, in Christ? This Eutyches and the Monophysites maintained, and the church at Chalcedon condemned their heresy, and at Constantinople, seventy years after, re-affirmed its judgment. In these controversies the church displayed much less of that simple dignity, and moral earnestness, and that pure and majestic love of truth which had been so impressive in the former series of debates. Doctrine apart, our sympathies must often be with the defeated and heretical rather than the conquering and orthodox party. The Council at Ephesus (A. D. 431) exhibited but little of the spirit of Him for whose honours they professed to be so jealous. Nestorius, aside from the immediate ecclesiastical results, could well bear the censure of such a body, if that were all. At Chalcedon, however, twenty years later, the largest of all the Councils of the ancient church, under the spiritual presidency of the Roman legates, and adopting almost precisely Leo's language, declared Christ "as to his Godhead begotten of the Father before all worlds, but as to his manhood, in these last days born, for us men and

for our salvation, of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, known in (of) two natures, without confusion, without conversion, without severance, and without division; the distinction of the natures being in no wise abolished by their union, but the peculiarity of each nature being maintained, and both concurring in one person and hypostasis." The critical point in this Chalcedonian decision, which is still the subject of sharp debate, is the assumed impersonality of the human nature of Christ, without detriment to the completeness of that nature. Dr. Schaff suggests briefly but clearly the problems still lying before the church, "on the possibility, reality, and mode of the incarnation; on its relation to the revelation of God, and the development of man; on its relation to the immutability of God, and the trinity of essence and the trinity of revelation." "The great want in the present state of the Christological controversy is, on the one hand, a closer discussion of the Pauline idea of the *Kenosis*, the self-limitation, self-renunciation of the Logos, and on the other hand a truly human portrait of Jesus in his earthly development from childhood to the full maturity of manhood, without prejudice to his Deity, but rather showing forth his absolute uniqueness and sinless perfection as a proof of his Godhead." (Pp. 760—1.)

The scriptural doctrine concerning the person of Christ, as determined by the council of Chalcedon, cannot be more clearly and concisely expressed than it is done in the Westminster Catechism, in answer to the twenty-second question, "Christ, the Son of God, became man, by taking to himself a true body, and a reasonable soul," so that, as it is said in the Confession, "Two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion." This is a distinct denial of the Apollinarian, the Eutychian, and Nestorian, as well as of Docetic Christological heresies. This statement of the doctrine has been held by the church universal from that day to this. All departures from it have been confined to certain communions, as the Lutherans, or to individual writers. The modern speculations on the subject have, of necessity, taken the form of the reigning philosophy. And as that philo-

sophy is more or less avowedly pantheistic, and as Pantheism excludes all real, or substantial dualism—it of course precludes the admission of two natures, or substances, in the constitution of Christ's person. Instead of Christ having a rational human soul, the modern theory is, that the divine substance by a process of self-limitation, reduced itself to the dimensions of humanity, and that God himself, in his divine nature, passed through the process of human development, infancy, childhood, maturity, and return to complete Deity. This is what is understood by the *Kenosis* mentioned by Paul. God became man, not by taking to himself a true body and a rational soul, but by becoming finite, weak, ignorant, and in all respects limited as an ordinary man, though without sin. We cannot agree with Dr. Schaff in regarding these as open questions, still to be decided. They are decided in the Scriptures, and in the faith of the church universal, of which these modern speculations are neither an explanation nor a development, but a contradiction.

While the East was mainly instrumental in developing the faith of the church in these directions, the West, more intent upon the condition and necessities of man, the object of the redemptive work, was earnestly discussing human sin, guilt, and want, and the grace of God. Even more controlling than the influence of Athanasius in the Paulician and Christological debates, was that of Augustine in the anthropological controversies. Pelagius, Julian of Eclanum, and Cassian, were at different stages, and in different phases, and with diverse measures of ability and consistency, the opponents of Augustinianism.

Dr. Schaff brings out now in sharp and telling antitheses, and again in more fully developed and philosophical statements, the positions taken on both sides. There were in this controversy no such clear historical boundaries, no such close grapple and conclusive decision, as in various instances had characterized the eastern conflicts. Therefore, the dispute has stretched on, more as an open controversy, into the mediæval and modern church. Augustinianism can point to no Nicæa and Chalcedon.

In their original conception of human nature, and especially of human freedom, the systems differ. In Pelagianism, the

definition of man's primitive state, and more particularly his original endowment of freedom, is substantially the definition of his subsequent and present state. Under the Augustinian system, the primitive and the subsequent states define each other largely by contrast. According to Pelagius, as Dr. Schaff epitomizes his views, "Man is not a free self-determining moral subject, until good and evil, life and death, have been given into his hand." And his moral state, so far as concerns the will, is one of equilibrium, with increasing difficulties and strengthening presumptions in the way of right decision, it may be, but without external constraint or any essential commitment of the will, whether to good or evil. In Augustine's doctrine, Dr. Schaff recognizes a threefold use of the term "freedom," varying in kind or degree, which must be observed, to save him from self-contradiction. He means sometimes the spontaneity of the mind's voluntary action; again, a freedom of choice, limited to man's probation before the fall, in which man had the full double capacity of sinning and of not sinning, with a positive constitutional tendency to good; and in other instances, the free self-determination of the will to the good and the holy which belongs to the children of God. The *liberum arbitrium* in the second sense, Augustine concedes with qualifications even to fallen man, not admitting its existence any longer in man's direct moral choices, but in his choice "between individual actions within the sphere of sinfulness and *justitia civilis*."

The Fall is with Pelagianism very much a personal matter with Adam, subjecting his descendants to the influence of a bad example, setting a bad precedent, but hardly establishing a disagreeable presumption. To the school of Augustine it is a most momentous reality, the first man being viewed not merely as the progenitor, but as the representative of the whole race; so that not simply his moral integrity but theirs was lost; to them as well as to him was the highest and only perfect freedom sacrificed, the mind beclouded, the auxiliary grace of God needful to every man's continuance in good forfeited, paradise lost, the sensuous nature made predominant, physical death insured, and in their case original sin and hereditary guilt entailed. Dr. Schaff thus sums up the doctrine of Augustine

concerning sin: "This fearful power is universal; it rules the species as well as individuals; it has its seat in the moral character of the will, reaches thence to the particular actions, and from them reacts again upon the will; and it subjects every man, without exception, to the punitive justice of God." (P. 841.)

Grace is in the one system a useful external help, not indispensable; according to the other, a creative power, working from within man's renewal, removing fatal weights and hindrances, and implanting a new life. According to the one, it is intended for all—it being true that all can and should secure it, while they may fail of its more special manifestation; according to the other it is absolutely essential, not merited nor to be merited, bestowed according to God's sovereign pleasure, and irresistible, as it makes God's chosen willing, and infallibly secures its object.

The various shades of doctrine lying between the extremes, Dr. Schaff briefly sketches, so far as they belong to the centuries which are covered by his present work.

It has been refreshing, instructive, and stimulating to traverse again, in company with Dr. Schaff, this magnificent period. And if some glimpse has been given of the wealth of material contained in these volumes, and the masterly handling of such a variety of subjects, calling into exercise so many kinds of ability—if our own obligations to Dr. Schaff have been with any fitness expressed, and others induced to lay themselves under similar obligation, our end will have been attained.

ART. IV.—A Philosophical Confession of Faith.

WHAT is here designated as a confession of faith, will be arranged under several distinct heads; beginning with that which immediately follows.

The Three Primary Beliefs.

(1.) The three primary and practical beliefs of all men are—

First, the internal persuasion and full belief of every individual that he himself exists and thinks; the maxim, *Cogito, ergo sum*, as an expression of personal experience, having the order of its terms reversed and the whole combined, so as to become *Sum, et ergo cogito*. I am, and so it is that I think.

The *second* equally perfect persuasion and full belief of every individual is that, through the avenues of the senses, he also *feels*.

The *third* of the beliefs in question results by immediate inference from the other two, and, it is this; viz., that the thinking and feeling here described—reflection and sensation—are in *themselves, immensely different*.

These three are *practical* beliefs of the race—the beliefs under the influence of which men always act, however they may sometimes reason themselves out of the formal reception of one or more of them. They are veritable corner-stones of physics, as well as of metaphysics.* In the very respect of an immediate and simple faith, which accepts of the undistorted evidence of the senses, and also that which trusts in our mental processes rightly exercised, the philosopher and the little child are placed on the same level; inasmuch that we see verified, even in this, the noble aphorism of Bacon, that, with respect to the interpreta-

* A bald positive philosophy—as well as every form of materialism fully confessed—rejects or ignores the information which rests upon the *first* of these beliefs, and thus refuses to avail itself of the most intimate knowledge that we have; while the reasoner, who altogether refuses to believe in the existence of an external world, ignores, on his part, all the special information which sensation is fitted to give. And he and the materialist are, after all, so far alike, that each, in his own way, rejects the *third* of the primary beliefs, by confounding the ineffaceable distinction between reflection and sensation.

tion of nature, "it is a point fit and necessary in the front and beginning of this work, without hesitation or reservation to be professed, that it is no less true in this human kingdom of knowledge, than in God's kingdom of heaven, that no man shall enter into it, 'except he become first as a little child.'"*

Of the Personal Consciousness of Causation, and the distinguishing characteristic of a Cause—The Physical Cause.

(2.) Among our earliest experiences is that of the executive determination of the will, which prompts and brings with it the effort that evokes our muscular exertion. In this, there is "a distinct and immediate personal consciousness of causation," which has its special place in "that sequence of events, by which the volition of the mind is made to terminate in the motion of material objects." "I mean," says Sir J. Herschel, "the consciousness of *effort*, accompanied with *intention thereby* to accomplish an end, as a thing entirely distinct from *mere desire or volition* on the one hand, and mere spasmodic contraction of muscles on the other." "It is our own immediate consciousness of *effort*, when we exert force to put matter in motion, or to oppose and neutralize force, which gives this internal conviction of *power* and *causation*, so far as it refers to the material world." We recognize similar effects which we can refer to the exercise of similar efforts in our fellow-men; and the same are often largely exhibited by the inferior animals, and in such case too, are evidently under the control of at least an analogous determination of will. Our superior intelligence enables us to apply all this with a skill that the animals do not possess.

The power and causation are, in our own experience, understood to be evoked by a spiritual agency. The forces brought into action or put under constraint by the inferior animals, and the forces which are urgent in the material world are also so like that which we evoke for the action and application of our own muscular frame-work, that we can, by muscular effort, aid, oppose, or neutralize such forces; and we can also, otherwise, set any of these to influence, in a similar way, any of the

* Valerius Terminus of the Interpretation of Nature. Bacon's Works, Basil Montague's edition, vol. i. p. 267.

others. And force, in its efficiency or its urgency, in all these cases, being thus manifestly the same in *kind*, we are led to conclude (as not an unreasonable induction even) that, in every such case, the urgent or efficient force is itself evoked by an agency similar to our own, and “somehow exerted, though not accompanied with our own consciousness;* it being accepted as a sound maxim (illustrated and enforced by experience) that similar effects should as far as possible be referred to similar causes. And, inasmuch, withal, as many of the pre-arrangements and adaptations in nature are far superior to those which we can devise and execute ourselves, the efficient force must in the end be referred back to the agency of *a spirit enormously superior to ourselves*; far more so, than we ourselves are to the animals.

For, in all our experience of the force which we personally exert, and all that such a force encounters without us, we become satisfied that *that* which enters into the efficiency of causation, thus personally understood and tried—that which gives to the cause in question its cause-like character—is *energy*. And when, therefore, we discern efficiency of the same sort (or urgency, when efficiency is held in check) anywhere, though we cannot trace it back to our own will or consciousness; yet we conclude that the very existence of such an efficiency or urgency implies that of the appropriate determining energy. Nay more, we in effect apply this to the case of every efficiency; and not merely to that which is connected with physical force; insisting that urgency, or efficiency, or the traces of such, each and all, imply energy, either as being now, or else having been applied; for this is included in the statement that every effect must have a cause; which last must, of course, (as already indicated) be *energetic*, to be a cause at all.

It is to the energy in nature which we find to be thus efficient or urgent, though unable, directly, to trace it any further back—that we give the name of the (proximate) *physical cause*.

Energy immediately efficient—A Physical Cause not antecedent to its first effect.

(3.) The sun acts upon the most remote planet of the system,

* The quotations here are from Sir J. Herschel's *Outlines of Astronomy*, (439), and note to that article, first published in edition of 1833.

and that planet acts upon the sun; but this mutual gravitating force of the two is not like the outflow of conducted electricity, or the vibrations of light and of heat, or like sound; in all of which a progress from one elementary part to another is concerned, and this progressive transference occupies time. But the action of gravitation, though it indeed takes place in straight lines outspreading from a centre, like the radiations of light and heat, yet *takes no time*, or, at most, cannot be shown to take any; the nicest observations indicating that if any time at all be occupied in the transmission of gravitation, the velocity of its transmission must be full fifty million times that of light itself. We could not, even if this were accurately so, suppose gravitation to be due to any outflow or influx of a material substance, or even a vibration of the particles of such, without the introduction of the hypothesis of the existence of some such substance, diverse, it may be, from any others which seem to be recognized; and this, when we have no sufficient evidence that any time at all is occupied. The energetic action of gravitation must then be regarded as being immediately efficient at any distance however great.

The application of force through other agencies already specified, occupies time, because, as already indicated, of the motions involved. So also the transmission through a metallic or other bar, of the force due to pressure, occupies time, because the successive series of little particles which constitute the bar, must, one after the other, be set in vibration, being crowded toward, and again receding from one another. Experiments on the transmission of sound indicate, that a thrust upon one end of an iron bar extending the whole distance from the earth to the sun, would require a thousand days for its transmission to the other end. But the effect upon the *first* series of particles to which the thrust is applied, would, even then, be *immediate*; the time of transmission through the bar being as its length, and reduced to nothing for the first series of particles merely, with which the motion (that takes time) begins, the particles, at the first, being entirely obedient to force, and so *starting* as soon as force is applied. The like may also be inferred, because gravitation, which takes no time for its action,

is itself so like any force which may be employed to thrust the bar, that any such force may be made to aid, "oppose, or neutralize" gravitation. A physical cause then—so far from being "a mere stated antecedent"—is, at its first application, not antecedent to its effect at all. And, even when intervening motions and transfers of force occur, the physical cause is not a *mere* stated antecedent to its last effect, since, [see our number (2),] the cause must not only thus precede its last effect, but also be appropriately *energetic*.*

. *Mind and Matter immensely different in their Phenomena.*

(4.) In our article (2) "the sequence of events" is traced, which, beginning with the executive determination of the will, results in efficient action on material substances. A careful attention to this will indicate:

1st. That in the very case in question, the effort of the human agent does not *originate* the force which he applies, but only *evokes* that force; and how much muscular strength (and not how much mental power) he can thus apply, depends at once upon his bodily development and the state of his health; and no amount of mental reflection will evoke the force, until the will is made *executive*, in the application of *effort*, put forth through *muscular agency*.

2d. The reaction on ourselves, of excessive effort in the way either of thought or of muscular exertion, is well described as being fatigue. But the fatigue which incapacitates us, for the time, from the pursuit of accurate and well connected thought, can as immediately and perfectly be distinguished from that which makes us, at the time, incapable of a continuance of energetic bodily action, as sensation itself can be immediately distinguished from reflection; so different are being tired with walking, and being so tired with laborious and continued thought, as, temporarily, to be unable to think connectedly any longer. Even in the case in which certain forms of thought are accompanied with a sensation of "the racking of the brain," this last may itself be immediately and perfectly distinguished

* The crowing of a cock very often precedes the rising of the sun; but the agitation and the noise of the crowing do not bring about sunrise.

from the weariness and relaxation of mental energy, superinduced by that very process of thinking, and which prevents, just then, our thinking intensely any more. The very great difference between bodily and mental phenomena seems specially to be reflected by these so very different reactions, thus brought into juxtaposition and vivid contrast.

3d. "The intention to accomplish an end," and the executive determination of the will carrying out that intention, originate *within*; choice and the determination then to do, uniting in the putting forth of the effort which evokes lastly the efficient action on matter.

When, however, conversely, matter acts or reacts on us through the same sensational arrangements, *that* action or reaction begins *from without*, in accordance with a law or laws which exclude choice or will, for they exclude "disobedience," and this action or reaction, through the same sensational arrangements as before, is more or less distinctly made known in the end, to consciousness and the interpreting intelligence *within*; provided, that *attention* to the same (which attention is itself under the control of executive will and effort), be duly put forth, otherwise, (as in a case of abstraction of attention, in deep reverie), the connection of the sensational series with the conscious interpreting intelligence is so far severed, that we are no longer sensible of the material action from without. The *last link*, therefore, in the conveyance of information of an influence due to that which has neither consciousness nor will in itself—this last connecting link thus traceable, is one distinctly indicative of that of which matter (in its very action thus made known to us) is itself incapable; or the connection with the consciousness and intelligence *within* is effected by that which does what *the actions of matter itself cannot effect*;* so that the phenomena of matter and mind thus brought into juxtaposition by the very "sequence of events" which connects the two, are in contrast, again seen to be immensely different; even

* The conclusion with respect to the *last* connecting link in the conveyance of information from *without*, and the *first* of the series of arrangements by which matter is to be influenced from *within*, being both *mental*, is only the more cogent in view of the fact that the *one-half* of a nerve conveys *sensibility*, and the *other*, "*voluntary motion*;" so that we simultaneously *produce* pressure, and *feel* that we do it, without any interference of nervous action.

more so than, (1), are sensation and reflection themselves. We are not, then, in view of all here presented, *at liberty* to attribute to mind the properties or the phenomena of matter, nor yet to matter the properties or phenomena of mind; both the characteristics and the laws involved in the one case being so utterly different from the characteristics and the laws in the other.*

The Great Pre-existent.

(5.) That something always was, is what all will admit who reflect upon the matter at all; since, (2), there would be no energy in nothing to originate something.

This great pre-existent cannot, however, be mere matter, *i. e.*, matter apart from force. It would indeed be an assumption to suppose that matter could so exist; since we always find matter associated with force. But even if the contrary were supposable, matter alone could not be regarded as the great antecedent, since it must then be self-existent; and *self-existence itself*, must, (2), imply *the most indescribable energy*, the self-existent being eternally the sustainer of its own efficiency. Now matter shows itself to be utterly inert, and force is its *master*; the smallest force being adequate to influence the greatest mass; and this, though indeed *more* force is evoked, when the conditions due to a nearer approach, give a wider scope for that mutual action with which the efficiency of force is linked—of which more hereafter. But even if all these difficulties could be gotten over, matter does not now originate, nor could it be supposed to have originated its oërmastering force; and so force must either be supposed to have always co-existed with matter, or else force itself be pre-existent to matter.

But whether force thus pre-existed or else co-existed with matter, it cannot, under either aspect, be regarded as the great pre-existent to aught else.

For force is efficient in accordance with law; and the laws of nature, as by us ascertained and expressed, have, for us, the

* In the case of physical forces like those in question, it is only when something like consciousness and will develop themselves as evoking, in the way of choice, the forces which vital action has garnered up, that we recognize phenomena like those of thought. Apart from such, (when the favouring circumstances are all present), even in the vital actions, animal as well as vegetable, disobedience to law is *excluded*, and no choice appealed to.

character of rules prescribing both the mode and the measure of action under them. And (as heretofore insisted) these laws “are invariably obeyed; their transgression is not punished, it is excluded.”*

Now, it is not easy to see how force could thus be self-limiting and controlling. It would be still more difficult to conceive of force as developing the vital principle, which somehow modifies the action of forces within the living individual, making them work after a providential fashion, for the special benefit of every part of the plant or animal, and so of the whole. And still greater, (4), would be the difficulties in the way of supposing that force, even allied with matter, had developed itself into consciousness, associated with executive will. And most difficult of all, would it then be, to account on such an hypothesis of the progressive action of force, for the numerous and exquisite adaptations which we everywhere meet with in nature, and even in our very selves. For all this would give to force, at the outset, antecedent to consciousness, the characteristic attributes and arrangements of intelligence, and the subsequent development of intelligence itself, with an executive will; or this law-restricted, pre-arranging force, the originator of intelligence and will when all was ready, must, at least at the first, have been “an unconscious intelligence”—an unknowing knowingness—an intelligence which somehow provided for all things and all relations of things, ere it knew that it knew anything. But we are besides prohibited from attributing all this to force, or to force allied to matter, by what is exhibited in (2); viz., that force in its application to material objects even, is such as it would be, if evoked by an intelligent agency, not unlike, and yet vastly superior to our own, so that, whether, as here, the characteristic attributes of the cause be in question, and an assigned cause, in view of them, be put on trial to determine whether it be adequate to the effects; or the effects be compared with those which confessedly are due to an intelligent cause, the result of both comparisons is the same; and though the inductions in the one case, and in the other, may separately be regarded, as not being fully adequate, yet the *difficulties* which are everywhere presented as excluding the acceptance of

* Whewell—*Bridgewater Treatise*, chap. v.

any hypothesis *inferior* to that which they point to, are *real*; and the "consilience"* of the inductions in the same result is itself cogent in also requiring a far better hypothesis, untrammelled by the difficulties of any other inferior to itself, and withal fully adequate to account for the phenomena—an hypothesis, *no way less* than this; that the great efficient pre-existent, and, (2), Great First Cause, must, like ourselves, be intelligent and active, and yet be immeasurably superior to us, *i. e.*, must be the *Great Spirit*. This, presenting as it does, every aspect of an immensely adequate hypothesis—with every inferior one helplessly excluded—must, at the very least, be accepted until something else can be shown to meet the vast exigencies of the case at all.

But self-existence in itself implies an indescribable cause-like and even self-caused energy, eternally self-continued; and the Great Spiritual First Cause, therefore, can be nothing less than *almighty*.

The uncompromising laws "disobedience" to which is "excluded"—the providential working of the principle of vitality—the often closely arranged, but non-conflicting adaptations of all sorts; these and other arrangements, all indicate an aspect of intelligence and wonder-working skill in the Great Spiritual First Cause; who cannot, then, be characterized as being any thing less than *infinitely wise*. All this, moreover, will imply his *omniscience*, and that, in its special form of *prescience* to the largest extent; and in the special sense of the term (to be hereafter considered) would show Him to be *omnipresent*. The self-existent withal, in itself, "hath immortality." It is among the glorious perfections of such a being, that he *cannot die*.

The Great Spirit, moreover, can have about Him no taint of moral evil. For, the more widely extended our inductions are, the more plainly do they evince, not only the existence of sin, but also that destructiveness is as inseparable from sin, as is efficiency, or the tendency to it, from energy. Were then, the great administrator of the uncompromising laws, the pre-arrangements and adaptations of all nature, other than *perfectly*, and, of course, in his case, *infinitely good*, the occurrences of devastation and ruin everywhere, instead of being exceptional cases, would be exhibited with a frightful generality.

* Whewell.

Beyond this it is impossible for us to reason clearly with respect to the state of an infinitely great being, enormously sinful (if at all); were even the awful supposition admissible—being anything less than blasphemous; much less could we determine whether self-existence itself would be at all consistent with such a state. The existing dispositions of things indicate the contrary *now*; and a being infinitely perfect in all the attributes already indicated, must be *infinitely above all temptation* to evil. Then too, such a being must, *in himself* be, in every respect, “*without variableness or shadow of turning.*” Lastly in this connection—in so far as we can discern—the absolute infinite, in this case, must in the respect of its distinguishing attributes, be as truly exclusive of all other beings like itself, as, in a somewhat analogous way, boundless space is exclusive of all other space boundless like itself; though every limited space or volume is included within the infinity of absolute space: and so the Great Infinite First Cause—including within himself the infinity of all perfection—is *One*; there is no other.

To fulfil all that thus appears to be requisite in the Great First Cause of all; viz., that He should be *one*, and be *self-existent, almighty, infinitely wise, omniscient, discerning the end from the beginning, omnipresent, infinitely good*; and thus *absolutely unchangeable in himself*, and so *incapable of sin*, as well as *absolutely immortal*—for all this, nothing else is great enough, nothing else is wise enough, nothing else is powerful enough, nothing else is enduring enough, nothing else is good enough than the “*living God and everlasting King*”—all “*glorious in holiness*”—of a very old fashioned book.* This is the great, the final hypothesis—an hypothesis broad as the universe, which God sustains and pervades by his power, and lasting as the eternity, which he, “*the always ancient one,*”† “*inhabiteth;*” an

* In order to our acceptance, as such, of the infinitely adequate hypothesis which that old fashioned book affords to us, it is not requisite that we should even discuss the question whether the volume is indeed all that it claims to be. It is not necessary for us to settle the question whether Sir Isaac Newton was a good man, before we adopt the theory of gravitation. But that the only adequate hypothesis for science should itself be found in the Bible, is itself an argument in support of the Bible's claims.

† Pollock.

hypothesis withal, in conformity with which, the justly accepted formula of "the uniformity of causation," admits of this sublime paraphrase—Science is possible, because God is true.

Such a being, though exalted in his attributes above all limiting conditions, yet cannot well be described as "the unconditioned;" since existence itself has the very distinct aspect of a condition, and that, as being infinitely superior to non-existence, in the sense in which a finite quantity is infinite as measured by the zero of its own species.

The "absolute," and at the same time "unconditioned," is then an abstract idea which cannot be realized at all, and, besides, in no respect has it that, or can it fulfil that which is indispensable in the instance of a great Pre-existent, viz., (2) and (3), *infinite energy*; which is, in its own way, not a limited, but an all-embracing condition. To insist, then, at the outset, that the "unconditioned" must be God, or there is none, is to assume as true the converse proposition; viz. that God can exist *only* as the unconditioned: or to assume, without argument as to the fitness of the hypothesis, that atheism is of course true. But that does not prove it to be so; for God need not be no God, because, in order to be God, he must positively be self-existent, and in the possession of the infinite perfections which pertain to that, he must (in a negative aspect) be infinitely incapable of sin and death; being gloriously in all, *above* all limit or defect. That he should be so is essential to his being God. For, as in our estimate of the human being, *character* essentially enters as well as talent; so does a similar element enter into our estimate of what the Divine Being must (and *ought* to) be, with "a far more exceeding and eternal" appropriateness.

The ultimate reference of Necessary Truths.

(6.) The abstract truths which we call necessary, must all have been discerned by the prescience of Him whose self-existence, in all its perfection, is the *one absolutely necessary reality*. Such truths, then, to be truths, must be consistent with the perfect verity thus found in God himself; the necessity for them existing because they never can be other than

consistent with that unalterable verity. They are discerned by us to be what they are, because our reasoning faculties are, in their own measure, veritably adapted to the elaboration and discernment of such truths.

What we know of the Presence of Spirit.

(7.) We know that our own spirits are present, in an accepted sense of that term, in, or rather *to*, the region which we can take cognizance of, or within which our power extends. In its most intense sense, this is all true of the soul with respect to the body of its own indwelling; the two being so intimately connected, or rather united, as to form but one person. In so far as the general sensation of feeling is concerned, we seem to be conscious of the presence of the soul to every part of the body; especially is that true of that general feeling of buoyancy which belongs to extraordinary health, with its accompanying vivacity. But if—trying one of the senses by itself—the attempt be made, with one eye closed, to look, as far as may be, at that half of the body in which is the closed eye, the impression which accompanies the view, such as it is, will be that the percipient soul is confined to that half of the body in which is the open eye.

Again, during a great intellectual effort, the soul seems to be specially present to that part of the brain which, in an accepted sense, is sympathetically affected; and hence that “racking of the brain” which, (4), *accompanies* such intense thought; which yet can be *distinguished* from veritable mental weariness. We recognize very similar effects when we speak of the heart swelling with joy; and in other analogous expressions.

In cases, such as these, of a presence of the soul, seemingly restricted to a part only of the body; the experience of a more intense sensation there, would seem to render us partially insensible to feeling elsewhere; as in the presence of bright light, the eye becomes more or less insensible to lights of less intensity. This is more completely true when we make use of the sensibility of one eye, and that part of the nervous system immediately connected with it, to the exclusion of the other eye and its similar connections. When, however, *antecedent* to *any wearying thought*, we try to imagine a scene, a vivid descrip-

tion of which we are reading ; or to recall, in imagination, what we have seen ; or to suppose ourselves placed amid new scenes ; we shall, if we attempt it, find it difficult to say where the soul seems to be during the exercise : and it will be found to be as difficult to determine just where the soul seems to be, when it is engaged in the contemplation of the special characteristics of benevolence, or those of ingratitude, &c. We know, then, that the soul, in so far as its consciousness and activity of various sorts are concerned, is somehow present in all these cases, and in these, it seems above all, to be present *to* the body itself. The soul is present *to* the realities with which it has to do, and that which the imagination pictures is in some sense, also, present *to* the soul ; but will all that warrant us in saying that the soul is present *in* any of those realities even, or can we say that the soul occupies space at all, as matter does ? Can we say this without thereby asserting *more* than we *know* ? It ought not to oppose any bar to this conclusion that we should find it difficult to think of *how* the soul could occupy space, or quite as difficult to imagine that it *does not*. We do not after all understand how the executive determination of the will gives motion to the arm ; but the evidence that it does so, is among the best we have. But that, as before stated, the soul is, somehow, present *to* the realities with which it has to do ; and that its imaginings are, in their own way, present *to* it, we may safely assert ; anything beyond that being more than we know. We cannot, then, in view of all, be at liberty to assert of the alone Infinite One, that he occupies or fills, and in that way pervades all space ; though we could go nowhere and not find his presence there—as it were, to meet us ; taking cognizance of our very thoughts, and even of that personal character of our very selves, which would indicate beforehand something of what those thoughts would be.*

* The Scripture phraseology, though it may not *require* all that is here said, yet seems not to be inconsistent with it. “If I ascend into heaven, thou art there”—as if it were added, to meet me, &c., &c. “A great and strong wind rent the mountains and break in pieces the rocks before the Lord ; but the Lord was not *in* the wind ; and after the wind, an earthquake ; but the Lord was not *in* the earthquake ; and after the earthquake a fire ; but the Lord was not *in* the fire.” His presence was made known to the prophet by the “still small voice” that followed. “He *stood* and measured the earth ; he *beheld* and drove

The Practical Now, and the Eternal Now.

(8.) An *instant* is the limit between two portions of duration, or two portions of time, which is duration parcelled out, or measured. Such is midnight; when one day has ended and another is about to begin. It does not last or endure at all—not a small, but indefinite portion of time, as a *moment* is. The present is thus instantaneous;* and through the instantaneous present, in a metaphorical sense, the future incessantly passes over into the past. But it is otherwise as to duration, with the *practical now*. That endures while we have a momentary but distinct cognizance of what is passing. As, for example, now I am taking in the meaning of this sentence. And yet this our practical now, is an appreciable portion of the whole life of an ephemera, which lasts but for a day; and during that now, multitudes of sensations of that ephemera may have place; for there is time for numerous flutterings of the insect's wing. The practical-now of intelligences far more exalted than we are, might perhaps, in a similar but grander fashion, itself include a sensible portion of a *whole human life*. But in the view of the alone Infinite One, whose knowledge, in its perfection as well as its extent, has no limits, all this must exist to a degree which is perfect, and to extent which is infinite; and so all that has taken place in history, and all that even might be revealed in prophecy, must, in view of that alone Infinite One, all be included in one enormous, comprehensive, ever-during now. Such is His eternal now. And God has sometimes been described as himself being "the eternal now." The Scripture figure respecting him is, he "inhabiteth eternity."

Did Matter exist from all Eternity.

(9.) As already indicated in (5), we may not attribute to mere matter the energy implied in self-existence. If, then, matter

asunder the nations; and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow." A figure, such as that He pervades all space, seems never to be made use of Scripture; and this, though it *is* said that "He inhabiteth eternity." "In him we live and move and have our being," refers especially to his *sustaining power*, rather than to *where* he is.

* Some languages seem to recognize this; as their verbs have no present tense.

existed from all eternity, the Great Spirit and matter must from all eternity have co-existed. But, (4), as we are not at liberty to attribute to matter the phenomena or the properties of spirit, and it is by means of their phenomena and their properties that spirit and matter make themselves known to us; we are yet more severely restrained from attributing to matter the same essence as that of spirit; unless something else can be made evident which shall remove all these difficulties, and also sufficiently cogent to warrant our belief that the essence of matter and that of spirit, even that of the Great Spirit, is the same. If then, matter be not self-existent, and we may not accept the hypothesis, that the essence of matter is the same with that of the Great Spirit, then, if notwithstanding, the Great Spirit and matter did from all eternity co-exist, we must presume matter to have some such relation to, and connection with, the Great Spirit, as the body has with the soul. But if we are to be aided in our reasoning by what we know of that wonderful union in one person—our very selves—and consider withal how vastly superior we are to anything else which we find in other animals; we must, if nature be united to the Great Spirit, as body is to soul, look for an exquisite bodily organization of all nature, and *find some cogent proof of it*, ere we can admit that—

“All are but parts of the same general whole;
Whose body nature is, and God the soul.”

Of such an organization we find no proof.

Physical force we never find wholly dissociated from matter; and it need not, therefore, in this connection, be separately considered.

The existence from all eternity of life such as we know of or can find traces of, scarcely any one would contend for; nor does any proof of such an hypothesis appear: and that life could result from a progressive development of mere force, has (5) already been examined, and rejected.

Are all other Beings, and all things else Phenomenal of God.

(10.) Phenomena is the name for a class of associated facts, so closely associated, that we refer them very commonly to the same thing; the phenomena being indications to us of the pro-

perties of the thing. The analogy to this in the general disposition of all nature is not specially manifest.

Then, as regards ourselves, we have an abiding consciousness, and thus a full persuasion of our own personality, and our individual intelligence and will; the indications of which are phenomenal of us in view of our fellow-men; but this same complete personality and individual will, personally understood by us, forbid our supposing that we are mere phenomenal manifestations of another being.

And again, as regards ourselves—as, (5), *character* must be regarded as essential in our estimate of the Divine Being, we may not regard men as being phenomenal of God, for they are wicked, and he, (5), perfectly holy. And if we are not to be regarded as being phenomenal of God, then, whatever else may account for our origin and faculties, may be accepted as sufficient in the case of the lower animals; since, in respect of all that regards consciousness and will and their relations, we have all that they have, and more.

And as to matter, in all that by which it makes itself known to us, it is, (4), so different from spirit, that we may not in any appropriate sense regard our own bodies as being phenomenal of our souls; although the connection between them is so intimate that they constitute one person; and the soul, (4), by an executive determination of its own, acts through the bodily organization, and so evokes the physical action of matter. In this most intimate juxtaposition of the two, again, the one does not proclaim itself as being phenomenal of the other; and all that by which matter makes itself known to us, being, (4), irreconcilable with the distinguishing indications of spirit, we need again, *some far more cogent proof than appears*, ere we admit the hypothesis that matter is phenomenal of spirit, in the absence even, (9), of any personal bodily connection. But with regard to matter and spirit both, phenomena are to us most extensively indicative of *change*; and how then can nature in itself and all its relations be phenomenal of Him, who himself, (5), is without change. Can *sin*, as before, be phenomenal of *the perfectly holy*, and death—so extensively prevalent—be phenomenal of Him who, (5), *cannot die*.

Spirit a Substance and Matter also, though immensely different from Spirit.

(11.) As already indicated, (1), the first of our primitive beliefs immediately connected with our own consciousness and introspection, is that every individual himself is, and that so it is that he thinks; and the full and practical belief in his personal identity remains with him through all the vicissitudes of life, while reason lasts. Then too, (5), to this identical self belongs a personal character, which acts itself out through his faculties; and yet man, (9) and (10), cannot be regarded as being the same in essence, nor yet phenomenal only of the Great Spirit. All this is reconciled by the hypothesis that the human soul is not merely a bundle of will, memory, affections, and other human faculties, but that it is a spiritual substance, having its own personal character, and preserving through life's vicissitudes its personal identity; and of which substance and character both, the actions of intelligence, will, and affections, are so many manifestations; and the moral conformity, or otherwise of these, to that which is true and right, is indicative, in its own way, of the character of the man's very self.

Then, the atoms, or last elements of matter, must be regarded as having a substantial reality, and not as being "mere centres of force." For the property of impenetrability which is exhibited by all ponderable matter, offers, in the case of any atom, a forcible resistance somehow—and that, apparently, in all directions—to the occupying of its own place by any other atom; a state of things which does not well seem to be consistent with an equilibrium at the centre of force; or which will account withal for the atom's *reaction*. Then, the laws of motion do not seem to indicate that the forces at such a supposed centre are at all modified by the application of other force; but this extraneous and additional force is *absorbed* in producing a *transference* of the atom in space, the impenetrable forces at the supposed centre remaining unaltered; the inertia of matter being thus exhibited as a force-absorbent, and not as a mere negation. This and what immediately precedes, seem not to be satisfied if only centres of force make up matter, and no real atoms be present.

Lastly, although, (3), gravitation is not an outflowing, and its action at a distance takes no time, yet the *mutual* action of atom upon atom, is in the straight line which may be drawn connecting the two; and if each atom be a veritable indivisible, and not a mere centre of force, that share of the *solid-angular* outspreading from either atom, which falls upon the other, will be four times as great when the distance of the two is but one-half what it is the instance of any other two atoms; nine times as great when the distance is but one-third; &c., &c.; and thus, if there be always the *veritable indivisible* on which the lines indicative of the direction of the gravitating force may fall, the opportunity for the action of one atom on the other, and of the latter again on the former; that is the conditions of the *mutual* action of the two atoms, on which the exhibition of the force depends, will themselves be such, that the force will vary inversely as the square of the distance; in accordance with its ascertained law. The veritable existence of the indivisible element or atom seems, thus, again to be indicated.

Matter and spirit, then, being both regarded as substances, we yet, (4), (5), and (9), must regard those substances as being themselves immensely different.

What is Creation?

(12.) The question here asked becomes pertinent—other hypotheses, (5), (9), and (10), being excluded. In view, then, of what has already been exhibited, (5) and (11), creation consists in the great Creator causing to exist, a substance distinct from his blessed self, [see (7)], where nothing was before. This a little child will accept, when he is told that God Almighty did it; and in view of all that has been already indicated, the philosopher may accept the same with a like simple faith. To account for the origin of things, there is nothing better, nor even sufficient.*

All things Divinely Upheld, as well as Created.

(13.) To suppose that the Great Creator having given existence to other beings, as well as to things, then left them subject

* This is again an hypothesis found in the Bible—the question of its character as a revelation being still [note to (5)] in this discussion, held in abeyance.

to law, would seem to be scarcely less than to have rendered them, for the time being, self-existent, *i. e.*, (5), *deified* them; thus contradicting (9). "He upholdeth all things by the word of his power."

What is Force? and how did it Originate?

(14.) As, (12), the Great Creator gave to man an existence distinct from his own, but yet *endowed* with intelligence, will, and other faculties, not wholly unlike to his own attributes; so he would seem to have *endowed* matter with *force*, not wholly unlike in its effects to those of other powerful action; but yet *distinct from his own almightiness*: though continued, (13), and evoked, (1), by his own power.

The Characteristics of Force.

(15.) 1st. Force is found associated with matter, and it is in such a connection that it manifests its tendencies; *viz.*, to produce, to modify, or to prevent motion.

2d. Matter already associated with force may, as it were, absorb additional force; and the tendency of the force thus absorbed is to put the matter, thus associated with more force, in motion, and thereby render that matter the vehicle of energy—put it in a state of power. A cannon-ball propelled from the gun, without ceasing to be iron, or steel, &c., or veritably weighing any more, has become powerful to destroy.

3d. Force has about it a species of immortality—once applied it does not cease to act—the energy momentarily applied causing a body to go on with a uniform velocity; and though, in time, it may have successively moved various minute particles, and been extensively distributed among them, the *energy* which belongs to the force once applied will yet continue to act with characteristic efficiency, and that efficiency proportional to the force.

4th. Though force thus does not *die*, yet it sometimes *sleeps*. The force which has been made efficient in the breaking of a body, does not reappear until cohesion is restored. The dynamical action of force evoked by the hand in winding a clock will not reappear when the clock is stopped, nor while the clock is suffered to remain so. The force absorbed and accumulated during the growth of a tree, is rapidly set free when the wood of the tree is burned.

Of Vital Power, and its Characteristics.

(16.) Life, wherever manifested, shows itself, after the manner of an *individualizing dominant* principle, harnessing and controlling the physical *properties*, and making them work in the service of vital *functions*. The concatenation of sequences, withal, is longer than that involved in the influence of unorganized matter, and every thing works after a providential fashion, the parts in the living organism having their efficiency so regulated that, in the distribution of it, the several agencies are “alternately means and ends.”*

There are evidences of enormous effects of the physical forces in the past. But not in those vast agitations and upheavals whose last subsidence is now barely traceable; or experienced in miniature in the earthquake—not in those great aerial agitations, now imperfectly realized in the tornado—not in that overwhelming surge of melted material, of which the basaltic monuments yet remain—not in the whirlwind, nor the earthquake, nor the fire, whose effects were so enormous, was there such a display, and at the same time such a hiding of power, as when—with reference to organized material—the fiat went forth which conferred upon it an *additional* benediction, as it bade it LIVE. As such, life is, as already described, *individualizing* and *dominant*, making *properties* do their work, in the service of *functions*, and every part to work for the benefit of the whole, as also the whole for the benefit of every part. The concatenation of sequences is thus a long one, and the working after a providential fashion, extending even to the commencement and continuance of a new life beyond that of the individual already alive; yet, in a healthy state, and when the actions are unrestrained except by themselves, the laws of life are as uncompromising, and disobedience to them is as completely excluded, as in the case of those which regulate the properties and the changes of unorganized material. While thus arranged to work through a longer concatenation, after a providential fashion throughout, and toward results even in the distant future, the vital forces are *sustained*, *arranged to be evoked* and *continued*, and to act in accordance with laws as uncom-

* Kant.

promising, and with as little reference, in themselves, to will, in the subject of those laws, as in the case of the mere lifeless clod.

But wherever vital energy appears, it is *sovereign*—controlling all else with which it is connected; and it cannot, therefore, (5), be regarded as the development of mere progressive force; and much less can conscious life be regarded as a development of that which had no such superior endowment. To suppose so, is little better than to put the accuracy and sequence of law in place of the *new energy* which, in life, lies behind the law; and this consideration is no less stringent, though it is true that there are evidences of a wonderful *development of plan*, but yet no satisfactory ones of the actual development of the organized, and then again of the more exquisitely organized and endowed, *out of the inferior, or even lifeless, which preceded them; the lifeless and the unconscious working after a providential fashion to the development out of itself of that which would then be alive, or subsequently that which would even be conscious—working thus after the fashion of life, to introduce life, before the source of efficiency in the case, was itself alive; and so that life thus introduced should control and modify all that introduced it. That would seem to have, in itself, more than one element of self-confutation. We cannot dispense with the hypothesis here of the additional endowment of a new and dominant, individualizing energy. But this will not prevent great modifications, by special development, within far narrower limits, of that which is alive.*

Three Great Guiding Maxims.

(17.) Three great guiding maxims are consequent upon what has already been presented. These are:

I. "God always *first*;"* he being (5), (9), (6), and (14), the Creator of all other beings and all things else, in all their relations. "He is before all things, and by him all things *consist*." This is for science, (5), its great and final hypothesis;† and it

* For just this form of this great truth, the writer of this is indebted to the late Prof. John L. Ludlow, D. D., of New Brunswick, N. J.

† And in religion, God always *first*, is Calvinism; especially that practical Calvinism which Christians accept when they pray.

excludes atheism, and, with it, that special form of atheism, materialism.

II. God always *independent* of all that he has “created and made;” though all such, in all their relations, are dependent on him. [See (5), (6), (9), (13), and (14).]*

This excludes monism and pantheism.

III. God always infinitely good—“glorious in holiness.” It is essential to this perfection, (5), that God should be gloriously above all temptation to evil. In this he is above control by any extraneous motive. He is not governed by any external and immutable rule of right apart from his blessed self—that would be *fate*. Whatever there is either true, beautiful, or good that he has originated in other beings or in things, in these, (6), he exhibits so many illustrations of his perfections, but they are not actual developments of himself personally—that, (10), would be *pantheism*; but truth, beauty, and goodness, wherever found, have their origin in the *spontaneous* outflowing of his infinite perfection, of his supreme excellence.

Were it possible that the Divine Being could ever swerve from this his immortal rectitude, disorder and ruin, (5), must then everywhere prevail. The *cardinal* truth on which rests the welfare of the universe, is, *that God is good*. In it, withal, is found the last resort for the explanation of every moral difficulty. †

The Supra-natural.

(18.) Man, in numerous relations, is evidently a part of nature, though occupying the position of lord of this portion of the creation. He is then, thus, but *supra-natural*, not *super-natural*. ‡

* “Of old hast thou laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end.”

† “Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight,” is one most illustrious example.

‡ In the scriptural account, he appears as the last and highest work of the “six days”—a work *not finished*, until he was made.

ADDENDA.

The Extra-natural.

(19.) The *extra-natural* is not itself subject to natural laws; and yet may be incidentally introduced to the region of those laws. Angels are *extra-natural*; but their visits to earth are among the things revealed. The bringing about of such a visit must be described by another term, viz.

The Supernatural.

(20.) A law of nature is a precise relation pervading a whole class of facts, or it is a general fact with reference to the succession of phenomena. Its two conspicuous features are generality and precision; and the ultimate reference of the law of nature is indicated, when we say that it expresses the mode in which the Divine power ordinarily chooses to act; or while maintaining energy, evokes also its physical action.

It is among the unquestioned characteristics of the *supernatural*, that it involves the exercise of power not provided for by the laws of nature, in their ordinary action.

The renovation of the human soul by *Divine agency*, is thus preëminently supernatural. But the *laws of human activity* are not thereby *suspended*; though the whole moral character is renovated.

This may aid us to see that though miracles (in the accepted sense of that term) are also supernatural; we may not, therefore, assert that a miracle is a *suspension of the laws of nature*; since, even in the renovation of the human soul, there is, confessedly no suspension of the laws of human activity. To say, in view of all *that*, there is a suspension of natural law in the case of a miracle, is to assert *more* than we *know*; though, when that assertion is made, we have no right to contradict it; for that would, alike, involve the assumption of a greater knowledge than we possess.*

Similar reasons should restrain us from asserting that, in the

* Though the assertion itself might in some cases appear a little extraordinary; as when, for example, it should be stated that there was a suspension of the laws of nature when the multitude were sufficiently fed by a few "loaves and fishes." There might in such a case seem rather to have been an *extension* of the laws of nature.

case of miracles, the exercise of divine power is *immediate*; the accounts given to us of some of them, would rather seem to imply the *contrary*; as, for instance, when an *external application* was made to the eyes of the blind, which was caused to be *miraculously efficient*; and so the *gradual* restoration to sight in another instance, so *much* after the fashion of means placed in the train of being (miraculously) efficient.

In view of the whole then, it must be considered that we exceed the limits of our knowledge, when we undertake to assert *just how* a miracle is wrought; though we may always say, assuredly, that in such a case, a work is wrought in a *way not provided for in the ordinary laws of nature*. These latter, as already stated, are distinctly indicative of the mode in which the Divine power (maintaining and working) *ordinarily* chooses to act. In the case of miracles, the exercise of Divine power is after an *extraordinary* fashion; and neither the *mode* nor the measure of the effect of its action is exhibited by ordinary natural laws. As respects the *power* in question, *that* seems to be all that we may assert; while freely admitting that—in the orderings of Divine providence—miracles have been introduced only on appropriate occasions, and for the furtherance of high ends.

When the blessed Saviour walked upon the water, he was, somehow, miraculously upheld; but does it become us to assert that his body, for the time being, *ceased to weigh*?

In view of all that has been here stated;—then, moreover, when two entirely similar miracles—such as the miraculous feeding of the five thousand, and then that of the four thousand—have been wrought; may it not be that the efficiency was put forth after such a special and similar fashion in both cases, that, just in that respect, it may be said that miracles have their laws; though even in their *mode* of action, all inscrutable to us?

Lastly, that a *special revelation* of the divine will and purposes should itself be accompanied by *extraordinary phenomena* and effects, indicative of the Divine presence and power, is so far from being impossible, or even *incredible*, that under just such circumstances, such phenomena and effects are rather *to be looked for*; or that *miracles* should accompany a revelation is, for these reasons, to be regarded as among the *very*

likely events; insomuch, that the evidences of a revelation, though otherwise sufficient, would *appear to be incomplete*, and so far *seemingly questionable*, without the evidence of miracles: not questionable for *claiming* those which are well attested.

ART. V.—*The General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America met, according to adjournment, in the Central church, Cincinnati, Ohio, on the 16th day of May, 1867, and was opened with a sermon from the Rev. R. L. Stanton, D. D., Moderator of the last Assembly, from 1 Cor. ii. 2, "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified."

W. P. Breed, D. D., and John Crozier, *ministers*; and T. Newton Wilson, *elder*, were appointed a Committee on Elections, to whom the cases of persons present with informal commissions, or with no commissions, were referred.

The Stated Clerk announced that commissions in due form had been presented by persons claiming to represent the Presbyteries of Transylvania, West Lexington, Palmyra, and St. Louis, but that the Committee on Commissions were satisfied that the persons enrolled were the true and legal representatives of those Presbyteries. They recommended that these commissions be referred to the Committee on Elections, to give these claimants an opportunity of being heard.

On motion of Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, the report was laid on the table till after the appointment of the Standing Committees.

The Stated Clerk announced that he had been officially notified of the formation of the following new Presbyteries:—Presbytery of Rio Janeiro, Brazil, by the Presbytery of Baltimore, with six ministers and three churches; the Presbytery of Holston, East Tennessee; and the Presbytery of Catawba, in North Carolina. These Presbyteries and their commissioners were then ordered to be enrolled.

The Committee on Elections reported certain persons entitled to seats as commissioners, and they were accordingly enrolled.

The Stated Clerk presented a communication from the (non-adhering) Presbytery of Louisville, notifying the Assembly that it had elected no commissioners to this meeting of the Assembly, and protesting against the admission of any commissioners professing to represent the Presbytery of Louisville in this Assembly.

On motion of Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, the paper was laid upon the table till after the appointment of the Standing Committees.

The Assembly then resolved to proceed to the election of a Moderator.

Rev. Dr. P. D. Gurley, of Washington, and Rev. Dr. Howard, of Pittsburg, were nominated.

Dr. Gurley was elected by a vote of 169, to 55 for Dr. Howard.

Reunion of the Old and New-school Churches.

Rev. Dr. Gurley, (Moderator) from the Committee of Conference, with a similar committee from the other branch of the Presbyterian Church on the subject of a reunion of the two branches, presented the following report, embodying the terms of reunion agreed upon by the two committees:

The Joint Committee of the two General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church, appointed for the purpose of conferring on the desirableness and practicability of uniting these two bodies, deeply impressed with the responsibility of the work assigned us, and having earnestly sought Divine guidance, and patiently devoted themselves to the investigation of the questions involved, agree in presenting the following for the consideration, and, if they see fit, for the adoption of the two General Assemblies:

Believing that the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom would be promoted by healing our divisions; that practical union would greatly augment the efficiency of the whole Church for the accomplishment of its divinely appointed work; that the main causes producing division have either wholly passed away, or become, in a great degree, inoperative; and

that two bodies bearing the same name, adopting the same Constitution, and claiming the same corporate rights, cannot be justified by any but the most imperative reasons in maintaining separate, and, in some respects, rival organizations; and regarding it as both just and proper that a reunion should be effected by the two churches as independent bodies, and on equal terms, we propose the following terms and recommendations as suited to meet the demands of the case:

1. The reunion shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common standards; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures," and its fair, historical sense, as it is accepted by the two bodies, in opposition to Antinomianism and Fatalism on the one hand, and to Arminianism and Pelagianism on the other, shall be regarded as the sense in which it is received and adopted; and the Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall continue to be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity.

2. All the ministers and churches embraced in the two bodies shall be admitted to the same standing in the united body which they may hold in their respective connections up to the consummation of the union; and all the churches connected with the united body not thoroughly Presbyterian in their organization, shall be advised to perfect their organization as soon as is permitted by the highest interests to be consulted; no other such churches shall be received; and such persons alone shall be chosen commissioners to the General Assembly as are eligible according to the Constitution of the Church.

3. The boundaries of the several Presbyteries and Synods shall be adjusted by the General Assembly of the united Church.

The official records of the two branches of the Church for the period of separation shall be preserved, and held as making up the one history of the Church, and no rule or precedent, which does not stand approved by both the bodies, shall be of any authority until reëstablished in the united body.

5. The corporate rights now held by the two General Assemblies, and by their Boards and Committees, shall, as far as

practicable, be consolidated, and applied for their several objects, as defined by law.

6. There shall be one set of Committees or Boards for Home and Foreign Missions, and the other religious enterprises of the church, which the churches shall be encouraged to sustain, though left free to cast their contributions into other channels, if they desire to do so.

7. As soon as practicable after the union shall be effected, the General Assembly shall reconstruct and consolidate the several Permanent Committees and Boards which now belong to the two Assemblies, in such a manner as to represent, as far as possible, with impartiality the views and wishes of the two bodies constituting the united Church.

8. When it shall be ascertained that the requisite number of Presbyteries of the two bodies have approved the terms of union as hereinafter provided for, the two General Assemblies shall each appoint a committee of seven, none of them having an official relation to either the Committee or Board of Publication, who shall constitute a Joint Committee, whose duty it shall be to revise the catalogues of the existing publications of the two churches, and to make out a list from them of such books and tracts as shall be issued by the united Church, and any catalogue thus made out, in order to its adoption, shall be approved by at least five members of each committee.

9. If at any time after the union has been effected, any of the Theological Seminaries under the care and control of the General Assembly, shall desire to put themselves under Synodical control, they shall be permitted to do so at the request of their Boards of Direction; and those Seminaries which are independent in their organization, shall have the privilege of putting themselves under ecclesiastical control, to the end that, if practicable, a system of ecclesiastical supervision of such institutions may ultimately prevail through the entire united Church.

10. It shall be regarded as the duty of all our judicatories, ministers, and people in the united Church, to study the things which make for peace, and to guard against all needless and offensive reference to the causes that have divided us, and in order to avoid the revival of past issues, by the continuance of

any usage in either branch of the Church, that has grown out of our former conflicts, it is earnestly recommended to the lower judicatories of the Church that they conform their practice in relation to all such usages, as far as consistent with their convictions of duty, to the general custom of the Church prior to the controversies that resulted in the separation.

11. The terms of reunion shall be of binding force, if they shall be ratified by three-fourths of the Presbyteries connected with each branch of the Church, within one year after they shall have been submitted to them for approval.

12. The terms of the reunion shall be published by direction of the General Assemblies of 1867, for the deliberate examination of the churches, and the Joint Committee shall report to the General Assemblies of 1868, any modification of them they may deem desirable, in view of any new light that may have been received during the year.

13. It is recommended that the Hon. Daniel Haines and Hon. Henry W. Green, of New Jersey; Hon. George Sharswood and Hon. William Strong, of Philadelphia; and Daniel Lord, Esq., and Theodore Dwight, Esq., of New York, be appointed by the General Assemblies a committee to investigate all questions of property and of vested rights, as they may stand related to the matter of reunion, and this committee shall report to the Joint Committee as early as the 1st of January, 1868.

14. It is evident that in order to adapt our ecclesiastical system to the necessities and circumstances of the united Church, as a greatly enlarged and widely extended body, some changes in the Constitution will be required.

The Joint Committee, therefore, request the two General Assemblies to instruct them in regard to the preparation of an additional article to be reported to the Assemblies of 1868.

All which is respectfully submitted on behalf of the Joint Committee of the two General Assemblies.

C. C. BEATTY, *Chairman,*

E. F. HATFIELD, *Secretary.*

Leaving their report with the General Assemblies and the ministers and churches of our denomination through the land,

your Committee cannot disregard the providential auspices under which their recommendations await decision. The present is thought to be a favourable time, now that many questions of former controversy have lost their interest, for adopting a magnanimous policy, suitable to the necessities of our country and the world. The Presbyterian Church has a history of great renown. It has been intimately associated with civil and religious history in both hemispheres. Its republican and representative character, the parity of its clergy, the simplicity of its order, the equity of its administration, its sympathy with our institutions, its ardent patriotism in all stages of our history, its flexible adaptation to our heterogeneous population, its liberal support of colleges and seminaries designed for general education and theological culture, its firm and steadfast faith in the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, and this by means of revealed truth and the special effusions of the Holy Spirit, in distinction from all trust in human arts and devices, all unite to promise, if we are wise and faithful, a future for the Presbyterian Church in these United States greater and better than all the past. Amid all the changes that have occurred around us, we are confident that nothing true and good will ever recede or decay; and it becomes all those who love the same faith, order, and worship, abounding in love and hope, to pray that God would count them worthy of their calling, that they may fulfil all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power, that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in them, and they in him, according to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Signed by order of the Committee,

C. C. BEATTY, *Chairman*.

VILLEROY D. REED, *Secretary*.

On motion of Rev. Dr. Smith, the report was received, and referred to a Special Committee of Seven.

The Moderator announced the following as the special Committee to whom is referred the report of the Committee on Reunion. *Ministers*—J. T. Smith, D.D., W. P. Breed, D.D., George Marshall, D.D., D. D. McKee, A. T. Rankin. *Ruling Elders*—George C. Miller, E. A. More.

Declaration and Testimony.

The Moderator laid before the Assembly a communication from certain signers of the Declaration and Testimony, assigning their reasons for not appearing at this time in obedience to the citation of last year.

The paper was, on motion, referred to the Judicial Committee.

The Moderator also announced a communication from Rev. W. C. Handy, of Lewes Presbytery, who signed the Declaration and Testimony after the last meeting of the Assembly. His case having been referred by his Presbytery to this Assembly, he now notifies the Assembly that he is ready to answer.

Rev. Dr. Stanton moved to reconsider the reference to the Judicial Committee of the paper presented by certain signers of the Declaration and Testimony; and the matter was reconsidered.

Dr. Stanton then moved that these papers, those laid upon the table yesterday, and all others relating to the same general subject, be referred to a Special Committee of Seven, with instructions to report to-morrow morning.

Prof. Matthews opposed the reference. His seat was contested, and he wished a settlement of the question.

Prof. Duffield called for a division of the question.

Rev. Dr. Stanton remarked that, to use a common expression, the case is getting mixed; yet, after all, it is but one case having different heads. He could not see the propriety of a division of the question.

Dr. Duffield urged that these contestants have a chance to present their case according to the recommendation in the report of the Committee on Commissions.

The motion to refer to a Special Committee was adopted, and such a committee was subsequently appointed, consisting of *Ministers*—R. L. Stanton, D. D., Willis Lord, D. D., W. P. Breed, D. D., A. T. Rankin. *Ruling Elders*—S. Galloway, T. Newton Wilson, W. S. Gilman, Jr.

A communication from the Presbytery of Louisville (non-conforming) went to the same Committee.

The Stated Clerk, from the Committee on Commissions, laid

before the Assembly the commissions of Rev. James H. Brookes, D.D., and Rev. S. J. P. Anderson, D.D., who claim to be Commissioners from the Presbytery of St. Louis.

On motion, the papers were referred to the same Committee.

This Committee to which all these papers were referred, was directed to report on the morning of the following day. It was found impossible to prepare a report on such an extended and complicated affair on such short notice. The time, therefore, was prolonged and left to the discretion of the Committee. Although not intended by the Assembly, the effect of this course was virtually to decide against the claims of the contestants for seats in the Assembly; because the report involving their claims was not made until a late period of the session, and then their case was only one item among many, in a report, which was, on motion, adopted without division. The dispatch of business in a body of two hundred and eighty members, and limited, by usage and necessity, to a session of some ten or fifteen days, becomes an object of primary importance. It, however, not unfrequently works injustice or hardship in particular cases, as in the present instance.

The Moderator, in appointing this committee, acted on the principle of constituting it almost exclusively of members in sympathy with the majority of the house. The obvious principle of justice is that in all committees of importance the minority should be fairly represented. Such is the usage of the British Parliament, of the American Congress, and of all deliberative bodies. Dr. Staunton, recognizing the justice of this principle, moved that the committee be enlarged by the addition of three members, and Drs. Brownson and Duffield, and elder D. L. Collier, were added to the committee. Of these, however, only one (Dr. Duffield), belonged to the class of dissenters from the wisdom and constitutionality of the acts of the Assembly of 1866, which were the subjects in dispute. On a subsequent occasion, when a substitute for Dr. Krebs (disqualified by ill health) was to be appointed on the joint committee on Reunion, the name of Dr. Paxton, of New York, was presented and urged on the very ground that he was opposed to the proposed plan of uniting the New and Old-school bodies. To the astonishment, as we are informed, of all parties, the

Moderator appointed a gentleman known to sympathize with the majority of the committee. We refer to this subject not for the purpose of disparaging the Moderator, who acted on his own views of propriety, but because of the importance of the principle involved. In all governments where the majority rules, the rights of minorities should be sacredly guarded.

Unemployed Ministers.

Rev. Dr. Elliott, from the Special Committee appointed by the last Assembly, to which was referred an overture concerning unemployed ministers and vacant churches, and sundry memorials requesting the Assembly to devise measures for the more competent and uniform sustentation of those who are able and willing to engage in the work of the ministry, presented a report, which was read and accepted.

The report reviews, at some length, the evils complained of. It acknowledges their existence, and attributes them to the too frequent and easy dissolution of the pastoral relation, and the too early licensure of candidates for the ministry. It concludes by recommending the following action by the Assembly:

1. That it be enjoined upon all the Presbyteries to guard against the admission of men to the ministry of whose characters, habits, acquirements, prudence, and piety, they have not ample evidence to satisfy them of their fitness for the sacred office, and that it be earnestly urged upon all the Presbyteries not to grant license to their candidates, "except in extraordinary cases," until they have spent three whole sessions of study in the seminary. But unless all adopt the same rule, its adoption by a part only will be of no benefit, but injury, as has been found from experience.

2. In regard to applications for the translation or removing of a minister from one charge to another, or the resigning of a pastoral charge, the Presbyteries be required to adhere strictly to the forms of proceeding laid down in Chapters XVI. and XVII. of our Form of Government, and to discourage, by all proper means, those frequent changes which are unfavourable to the stability and growth of the Church, except in cases where the change would evidently tend to promote the best interests of the Redeemer's kingdom.

3. That, with a view to secure employment for our unemployed ministers and licentiates, it be enjoined upon each Presbytery and each Synod severally to appoint a committee—that of the Presbytery to be called the “Presbyterial Committee of Missions,” and that of the Synod the “Synodical Committee of Missions”—the chairman of each of these committees to be the Stated Clerk of the body appointing him.

4. That it be made the duty of the Presbyterial Committees to open a correspondence with each other, by which to ascertain the number of unemployed ministers and licentiates in each body; also the number of ministers and licentiates who are willing to be employed, and to submit to the direction of the committee in assigning them a field of labour.

5. That it be the duty of each Presbyterial Committee to see that every vacant church within their bounds be supplied with the preaching of the gospel; and also every station or neighbourhood where, in their judgment, churches may soon be collected and organized. For this purpose the committees shall be empowered to adopt a system of itinerancy wherever it may be done with the greatest advantage to the cause which it is their object to promote.

6. Where there are more vacancies than ministers to supply them, in any Presbytery, the committee of that Presbytery shall apply to the committee of any other adjacent Presbytery which has a surplus, and secure the number needed. On the contrary, if any Presbytery has a surplus of ministers, beyond what is needed to supply their own vacancies, the committee shall, upon application, send them where they are wanted; and the vacant churches shall receive the supplies thus sent according to the request of their own committee.

7. In all cases it shall be the duty of the Presbyterial Committee to see that the ministers thus appointed shall receive a competent support, and for this purpose the committee shall inquire into the condition of the vacant churches, and to what extent they are able to contribute to the supplies furnished them, and shall apportion to them the additional amount of supplementary aid which may be necessary to an adequate support for such supplies. But no church shall have ministerial supplies or assistance in funds granted it, which, in the judg-

ment of the committee, has not done all that it can, or ought to do, for the purpose of securing the stated preaching of the gospel, or which does not punctually redeem the pledges it has given.

8. It shall be the duty of the Presbyterial Committees to report to the Synodical Committees, so that if vacancies are found unsupplied within their bounds, and ministers or licentiates unemployed, it shall be the duty of the respective Synodical Committees to appoint to those vacancies such ministers as are without a field of labour; and it shall be the duty of those thus appointed to report themselves to the Presbyterial Committee within the bounds of the Presbytery in which they are appointed to labour, and to attach themselves to that Presbytery at as early a period as practicable.

9. The Presbyterial and Synodical Committees shall each report semi-annually to the Board of Domestic Missions, so that if there be still ministers who are not employed, the Board may appoint them to such vacant posts of labour as they shall judge to be productive of the greatest amount of good to the church; and in making their reports the committee shall state distinctly to the Board the amount of salary pledged by the several vacancies, and the additional sum required to be supplied by the Board.

10. No appointment shall be made for less than a year, and if a minister abandons the field to which he has been appointed before the completion of his time, or neglects to occupy it with constancy and fidelity, unless on account of special interposition of Providence, he shall forfeit his supplementary appropriation, besides subjecting himself to the censure of his Presbytery.

11. In no case shall the maximum amount of salary to be given to those who are thus sustained, exceed \$1000, including the estimated rent of a manse; nor less than \$600; nor shall the supplementary sum granted to each minister, beyond what the congregation pledges, exceed one-third of the whole amount of the salary thus to be raised, and to be proportionally less in cases where the whole amount can be raised to the sum required and agreed upon by the Presbyterial Committee.

12. The Board of Domestic Missions, as the organ of the General Assembly, shall have a general oversight of this whole

matter, acting in accordance with the foregoing arrangement, corresponding with the Synodical and Presbyterial Committees, recognizing and enrolling all ministers and licentiates reported by these committees, and paying over the supplementary portion of salary as assigned to them severally by their respective Presbyteries, and to enable the Board to act with greater efficiency upon the churches for the collection of an amount of funds sufficient to meet the demands which will be made upon it for the purposes indicated, its power, if not sufficiently ample, should be enlarged to an extent proportionate to the work to be performed. The exact sum necessary to meet the present exigency is not easy to ascertain definitely; but the Board should endeavour to raise at least \$300,000, at the earliest possible period, and ultimately increase it to \$500,000; and when the fund shall have reached an amount beyond that which is necessary to place all unemployed ministers in active service, let the same rule of distribution be applied in supplementing the salaries of all those ministers who are without an adequate support.

13. It is to be understood that nothing in the provisions of this plan shall be so interpreted as to prevent the Board of Domestic Missions from commissioning and sending out missionaries as heretofore, to labour in frontier and other destitute settlements, and granting them a liberal support, as indicated in the resolutions adopted by that Board at a meeting held November 13, 1866.

14. It shall, moreover, be the duty of the Board to make a full report annually to the General Assembly on this whole subject, and of the practical workings of the system of measures adopted, with such facts as experience may have shown to be beneficial for the removal of existing evils, and the enlargement and prosperity of the church.

In submitting to the General Assembly the foregoing plan, the Committee have, after full deliberation and a careful examination of other plans submitted to them, adopted this, as best suited to the existing wants of the church, and, at the same time, to preserve and bring into united and harmonious action the constitutional powers of our church courts. Holding as we do to the unity of the church, and yet recognizing different

ecclesiastical judicatories as constituent parts of this one church, it is important that each part, in its proper place and in the exercise of its legitimate powers, be brought in action for the benefit of the whole. These foundation principles have been kept in view by your Committee, and upon this constitutional basis they have endeavoured to present a plan which brings into harmonious action the powers of the various judicatories of the church, each acting in its own proper sphere, and all for the attainment of the same object. While the lower courts exercise their appropriate functions as indicated in our *Form of Government*, the General Assembly, as the supreme court of the whole church, having sanctioned the action of the lower judicatories in assigning unemployed ministers to posts of labour, is bound to make the "necessary provision for their support" beyond what the churches which they serve are able, and have voluntarily pledged themselves to contribute. This object, it is believed, the Assembly will most effectually accomplish by the agency of the Board of Domestic Missions, as her representative for that purpose. Just as the apostolic college, the highest authority in the primitive church, assigned the collection of funds for a particular object to the deacons, so our General Assembly may very properly appoint the Board of Domestic Missions over this business of collecting funds to meet the present necessities of the church; and to that Board we must look for its successful accomplishment.

Rev. Dr. Elliott remarked, after the report had been read, that the Committee had carefully considered several plans proposed, and others in actual operation, especially that of the Free Church of Scotland. In their opinion, the latter was not adapted to our circumstances, and could not be put into successful operation by us. It appeared to the Committee that the plan proposed by it was the best that could be adopted here.

Most of the churches in our country, our own among the number, are organized upon the principle that the gospel is not to be preached to any who are not willing and able to pay for it. This is the principle and the rule. All that is done for the wicked and the destitute is exceptional and temporary. Dr. C. C. Jones, when Secretary of the Board of Missions,

avowed, as we understand, the principle, that when a church, after a few years trial, failed to become self-supporting, it was to be abandoned. The scriptural rule is to preach the gospel to the poor, yea, to all men, whether they will bear, or whether they will forbear. We are persuaded that nothing effectual will be accomplished in the work of missions until the conviction is fastened upon the conscience of the church that it is its duty and high privilege to give an adequate support to every one whom the Holy Ghost has called to preach the gospel. If the Romanists and Methodists can do this, there is no good reason why Presbyterians should not do it. To accomplish this object, we need no new plans, and no complicated machinery. All that is required, is that the church should adopt, from a sense of duty, the principle above stated, and that the present Board of Missions should determine to act upon it. If that Board could be filled with the zeal, courage, and energy which characterized the Christian Commission during the war, the work would be accomplished.

The Board, however, can do nothing until the church is brought to recognize and acknowledge that Christ requires that all whom he calls to preach the gospel should live by the gospel.

Metropolitan church in Washington.

The Rev. Dr. Gurley, from the Special Committee of the last Assembly to which was referred the overture from the Committee of Church Extension within the bounds of the Presbytery of Potomac, asking the General Assembly to transfer the property of the proposed Metropolitan church, in the city of Washington, to the Presbytery of Potomac, to be by it applied to the purposes of church extension in that city, presented the following report:

The Committee report that, since the last Assembly they have laid all the material facts connected with the history of the Metropolitan church in Washington, before the Hon. Henry W. Green, of New Jersey, and solicited his opinion as to the propriety of the transfer proposed; and they further report that they have received from him a written opinion, herewith submitted, to the effect that such a change of appro-

priation as is contemplated in the overture, "would be a diversion of the fund from the purpose for which it was given, a defeat of the presumed intentions of the donors, and a departure from the recognized principles of equity." The Committee therefore recommend that the Assembly decline to sanction the transfer proposed in the overture.

This recommendation was adopted.

Church Extension.

Rev. Dr. Brownson, Chairman of the Committee on Church Extension, presented the following Report:

The Committee appointed to examine the Twelfth Annual Report of the Board of Church Extension, and also the records of that Board, beg leave to present the following for adoption by the Assembly.

Resolved, 1. That the records of the Board be approved, and that the Report be approved and published.

Resolved, 2. That the policy of the Board, in merely stimulating the liberality of the churches in their own behalf, by *supplementary* appropriations, under a rule of economy which secures the widest possible distribution, meets with the hearty sanction of the Assembly.

Resolved, 3. That the Assembly finds unhesitating gratification in the fact that through this Board, during the past year, notwithstanding its limited means, one hundred churches, located in fifty Presbyteries and eighteen States, have been efficiently aided in securing houses of worship; thus making an aggregate of 728 churches, which, since its organization twelve years ago, "have obtained church properties, free from debt, worth over two millions of dollars, and that will accommodate fully 150,000 worshippers."

Resolved, 4. That the appropriations made for the benefit of the freedmen in the Southern States during the last year, in connection with the Freedmen's Committee, are highly approved; and it is hereby recommended to the Board to extend such further help to the coloured people disposed to unite with our church in obtaining places of worship as circumstances may demand, and the state of the treasury may permit.

Resolved, 5. That whilst it is a matter for congratulation

that the contributing churches have increased in number, from 167 in the first year of the Board's operation, to 829 in the year now closed, and that the contributions have also increased four-fold during the same period, it is at the same time with great pain that the Assembly contemplates the fact that 1800 churches, or nearly two-thirds of the whole number, still give nothing to this important object.

Resolved, 6. That the Assembly, regarding the work of this Board as of vital moment to the stability and progress of the Presbyterian Church, and the advancement of the cause of Christ in this land, does most solemnly and earnestly appeal to all our churches and people, in the name of the "Great Shepherd of the sheep," to make regular and liberal contributions for the spread of the Saviour's kingdom through this approved channel.

Rev. H. I. Coe, the Secretary of the Board, upon invitation, addressed the Assembly as follows:

"*Mr. Moderator, Fathers, and Brethren*—Just twenty-three years ago, on this very day, the 18th of May, and at about this very hour of the day, the General Assembly entered upon the great work of systematic Church Extension. Let us, for our encouragement, briefly review the work that has been done during that period. The result is, that \$400,000 have been raised, and 1100 churches have been aided and enabled to build houses of worship. This work has been done under great and embarrassing difficulties, and though our progress has not been what we could have wished, there is great reason for encouragement. No important application has been refused, and the appropriations are gradually and steadily approximating to the demand. It is an important fact that, during the last six years, this Board has assisted more churches than have been organized in our bounds. It is also an encouraging fact in our work, that our contributions have been constantly increasing. During the first eleven years—embracing the period from 1844 to '55—the average number of churches contributing annually to the Church Extension Committee of the Board of Missions was only 55, and their average yearly contributions were less than \$3,500. In eleven years the old Committee received but \$68,544, of which only about \$21,000 were from churches. In the first

year of the new organization there were 167 contributing churches. During the last year we find 829 contributing churches, and our receipts were \$30,000. We have thus great reason to thank God and take courage. During the last five years the Board has given sanctuaries to about 300 churches, and it is probable that, during the present year, 100 more will be added to the number. The Freedmen will also need aid largely during the present year. It is the purpose of the Board to respond cheerfully to all the demands upon it, and if this great work is to go forward as it should, it will require not \$30,000, but \$300,000."

Board of Publication.

Rev. Dr. Rockwell, from the Standing Committee on the Board of Publication, presented a report which, as amended and adopted, is as follows:

Resolved, 1. That this Assembly has heard, with unaffected pleasure and devout gratitude to God, of the success which has attended the efforts of the church, through its Board of Publication, to preach the gospel by means of the printed page, both in the form of the religious paper and tract, and the more permanent volumes which have gone forth to make up the literature of the church.

Resolved, 2. That the Assembly highly approves the labours of the Board in supplying the youth of our churches with reading, which, in a popular and attractive form, presents the great features of the gospel, and the great duties of the Christian life.

Resolved, 3. That the Assembly has heard with pleasure of the large increase in the circulation of the *Sabbath-school Visitor*, and of the favour with which it is everywhere received, and cordially and earnestly commends it to our churches, as a most valuable auxiliary in the work of Sabbath-school instruction.

Resolved, 4. That the Assembly solemnly calls upon pastors and sessions carefully to supervise the reading introduced into Sabbath-schools under their care, and to see that no book, however attractive, be admitted that teaches for doctrine what is contrary to the standards of our Church, and the usages and order which we regard as in accordance with the word of God, and that in the selection of books precedence be always given

to the publications of the Board, and further that Presbyteries be enjoined to see that this resolution be carried out in the churches within their bounds, and to ascertain the extent to which the recommendation is adopted.

Resolved, 5. That while the Board is called upon to provide attractive reading for the young, it should also bear in mind that one of the objects of its organization was the furnishing of a sound and healthful Christian literature, adapted to the higher types of Christian culture and experience, and that diligent efforts should be made to circulate works of acknowledged merit, and which the church has ever received as faithful and instructive expositions of Christian doctrine and practice.

Resolved, 6. That the large and increasing distribution of the publications of the Board among the Freedmen and also among many churches of the South which have been impoverished by war, meets the cordial approval of the Assembly, and that our churches be urged to contribute the means fully to meet the calls which are coming up with increasing earnestness for aid in the supply of our Southern brethren with a sound evangelical literature.

Resolved, 7. That it be enjoined upon the Presbyteries under the care of this General Assembly, to recommend in the most earnest manner the introduction of the "*Home and Foreign Record*" into every congregation within their bounds, and that the sessions of churches subtract from the aggregate of their annual subscriptions a sufficient amount to place the "*Record*" in the hands of all our families and pewholders. And it is hereby further recommended that those who have in charge the "*Home and Foreign Record*," consider whether any modification is necessary to adapt it to more ordinary and general reading.

Resolved, 8. That the Board be directed to consider whether cheap editions of many of their publications may not be issued, to be used in gratuitous distribution and for sale in our railroad cars, and along our great thoroughfares of traffic and travel.

Resolved, 9. That the Committee have examined the Minutes of the Board and its Executive Committee, and recommend their approval and signature by the Moderator.

i The Rev. Dr. W. E. Schenck, Secretary of the Board, upon invitation, addressed the Assembly.

During the past year the work of the Board has been prospered in all its departments, for which we have reason gratefully to acknowledge God's hand. The distributions of the past year exceed those of the year before by nearly 20,000 volumes. More than 358,000 volumes and over 1,586,000 pages of tracts, have been distributed. These have gone into all parts of the world, and we have evidence that they have been accompanied by the Divine blessing in the conviction and conversion of sinners, not in single instances only, but in congregations. In all this we rejoice. We have now 332 different tracts upon our catalogue, and it has been, and still is a great wonder that our pastors do not avail themselves of this useful instrumentality.

A word as to our Sabbath-school books. To this important matter the Board has given great attention. There are great evils prevalent in relation to this matter. There are many books in Sabbath-school libraries which pastors would not allow there if they knew their character. I have known many instances where books of this character, published by other denominations, have been introduced into our schools. Sometimes these books are of a purely secular character, and unfit for Sabbath reading. In regard to our books, I would say that we publish none that do not contain "Christ and him crucified," though we often use the threads of parable and story upon which to string this great truth.

I would say, as to our *Sabbath-school Visitor*, that I am persuaded no cheaper or better paper of the kind is published. The circulation of the *Visitor* has increased 14,000 during the last year, and there has been an increase of 20,000 over its circulation two years ago. We desire it to be used in all our Sabbath-schools, as it is put forth for the use of our own children.

As to our distributions, I would say to you that we will give away books and tracts *just as fast as the churches furnish us with the means*. This is an important part of our work. We are now sending our books to all parts of the Church, and to the South.

During the last year our Colportage work, which during the war was mainly one of distribution, has been enlarged again.

We have had in commission 145 colporteurs, who have laboured in 25 of our States and of the British Provinces. Several have been labouring in Louisiana, North Carolina, and other parts of the South. We need more colporteurs, and we earnestly urge you to take up this matter in your Presbyteries, and see if something cannot be done towards furnishing suitable men. We will commission all such as come recommended by you, and who will go forth among your people and faithfully do colportage work there. But we ask you to recommend only good men, of some business capacity, and who will do their work, exhibiting piety, zeal, and prudence. Our receipts are increasing. Those for Colportage exceed by \$2000 the receipts of last year. In this great work we most earnestly wish your coöperation and your prayers. I have often felt that while all our other enterprises are prayed for, ours is almost neglected. Mighty as this engine is—perfect as is our machinery—all this will not avail, unless God blesses it and supplies the motive power. Pray, then, for it.

Foreign Correspondence.

Dr. Irving introduced the delegation from the Free Church of Scotland with a few appropriate remarks. The Rev. Principal Fairbairn then delivered an interesting address, expressing fraternal and catholic principles and feelings. This gentleman, so distinguished for his learning and abilities, is almost as well known in this country by his writings, as in Scotland itself. His visit to this country has been productive of great good. He has been everywhere received with the respect and affection due to his high reputation and excellence. In the course of his remarks he dwelt upon the success of their Sustentation Fund. "This fund," he said, was "the back-bone" of their Church. It originated with Dr. Chalmers. The minimum salary for a minister was fixed at \$750 and a manse. It is now proposed to make the minimum a \$1000. Dr. Buchanan's church contributes \$5000 to this fund, and draws \$750. Dr. Candlish's church contributes \$15,000, and draws \$750. We regret very much that the demands on our limited space forbids our inserting Dr. Fairbairn's interesting and

instructive address at length. It would enrich our pages, but we are obliged to forego this pleasure.

The Rev. Mr. Wells, the associate of Dr. Fairbairn, next addressed the Assembly. Mr. Wells, whose talents and attainments placed at his command some of the most attractive positions in the Free Church, consecrated himself to the self-denying labour of preaching the gospel to the most degraded population of Glasgow, and has been eminently blessed. To this subject his remarks were specially directed. He recognized Dr. Chalmers in this department as the governing spirit of his age and country. To evangelize Scotland was his purpose. "In 1833," said Mr. Wells, "he began his evangelistic work on a large scale. In one year thereafter he saw as many churches built as had been built in a century and a half before. In seven years, two hundred and twenty-two churches had been built in Scotland, at a cost of over one million five hundred thousand dollars. In 1843, the year of the disruption, all seemed lost, and we had not one single place of worship. Then our Church espoused the cause of Home Missions, and our membership was fitted for its work, and consecrated to it by a spirit of severe sacrifice. Nine hundred churches were soon added to those formerly built. It was fortunate for us that almost from the beginning we had, by common consent, a fixed plan. No time was frittered away and lost in experiments.

"Let me explain what is meant by our phrase, *territorial*. A congregation finds a neglected district, missionaries are appointed, Sabbath-schools organized, and the whole district is saturated and pervaded with Christian influences. I would call your attention to this fact. We are not satisfied with mission-schools, or with prayer-meetings, or with anything else that does not look to the establishment of a church in that locality. We find that this prospect is a stimulus to the missionary and to the people, calling forth affectionately and especially. No congregation with means is considered as having done its duty with us unless it has established one or more churches. Barrenness is esteemed the greatest of reproaches. That church is most honoured which is most truly a *mother* church. Signal success has attended this scheme. It has been wonderfully blessed of God. Outcasts are now the salt of the earth, and

those once sunk in the depths of degradation are now an honour to the church of Christ—the joy and crown of our churches. Some of these congregations increase with great rapidity, reporting one and two hundred additions to the church, within a year, on profession of their faith.

“The city of Edinburgh has a population of one hundred and forty thousand souls. It has thirty-four Free Church congregations. Of these, nine have been formed since the disruption. Had your work been prosecuted with the same success as ours, you would have had in Cincinnati sixteen self-sustaining congregations, and a membership drawn from among those ‘without God and without hope in the world.’

“Glasgow has fifty-eight Free Church congregations. Of these, fifteen have been formed in the way I have described. One of these has a membership of eleven hundred, and another has over fifteen hundred. Besides these, there are nine mission stations, which will soon become regular Home Mission churches.

“Two hundred new churches have been formed since the disruption. While some of our old congregations are decaying, you can hardly find one of these new congregations which is not flourishing. Many are nurseries and Christian institutes for the land in which they stand, provoking others to love and to good works. The world, under the circuit of God’s sun does not exhibit a spectacle more sublime. Further, these churches have had a great reflex influence in stimulating the spiritual life of our older churches. They have often been the channel through which gracious revivals have flowed forth to bless our land.”

This is a subject of such vital importance to our church and country, that the experience and efforts of our Scottish brethren are of special interest to all classes of our people.

On a subsequent day the delegation from the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, the Rev. Dr. Denham, of Londonderry, and Rev. Dr. Hall, of Dublin, were introduced to the Assembly. Both gentlemen made addresses, which were listened to with the deepest interest. That of Dr. Denham was distinguished for the tender and devout spirit which characterized all his utterances to American Christians; that of Dr. Hall was elo-

quent and stirring. The impression made by these distinguished men has done much to strengthen the bond of sympathy between our people and their brethren in Ireland. We must content ourselves with giving a few statistics of general interest from the speech of Dr. Hall, who said,

“Our country, Moderator, is a small one; you would be able to anchor it within one of your inland seas; but you have abundant evidence that it is very productive. The Protestants of Ireland are about 1,260,000, and the Presbyterians are rather more than half a million of these. Besides the General Assembly, there are several much smaller, but most respectable bodies of Presbyterians, such as Reformed, and others, who will not, we hope, wish to resist that tide of union feeling that has been happily setting in. The General Assembly has 600 ministers, and 560 congregations. It has 83,834 families, 126,207 communicants, 2,145 elders, 230,926 sittings in its churches, 372 young persons studying for the ministry, and its contributions last year for missionary objects were \$70,000, and for the support of its ministers, \$163,565. It has two Seminaries entirely under its control—Belfast and Derry—with a staff of fourteen professors, who are making a high place for themselves in the sacred literature of Europe, and for whom any church might well be thankful. We have, besides, the advantage of the admirable Queen’s College, of which many of our younger ministers are graduates, and our children take advantage of the national schools, on which, with a wise extravagance, the government is spending about \$2,000,000 annually in Ireland. We have sent recently over fifty ministers to the colonies, and we have six mission schemes at home, in India, and to the Jews, all receiving increased support from year to year, none of them quite without tokens of Divine blessing.”

Domestic Missions.

Rev. Dr. Stewart, Chairman of the Committee on Domestic Missions, presented the following report:

The Committee to whom was referred the Annual Report of the Board of Domestic Missions, would respectfully offer for the consideration and action of the General Assembly, as the

result of a careful examination of the document, the following minutes and recommendations:

It appears, from the Report of the Board, that the year which it represents has been, in many respects, a year of more than ordinary interest and activity on the part of the officers and missionaries of the Board. The amount of funds distributed has exceeded that of any former year by a very large per centage. The number of missionaries receiving support, in whole or in part, from the funds of the Board, is 626, an excess of 87 over the number aided the preceding year. By these missionaries the gospel has been preached in 32 States and Territories; 76 churches have been organized, and 6060 persons gathered into the fold of Christ. Of these, 3576 were received on profession of their faith, and 2484 on certificates from other churches.

The whole number of members connected with the churches aided by the funds of the Board exceed 27,000, and during the year more than 30,000 children have been taught in 481 Sabbath-schools.

The Committee notice further in their report, that more than one hundred and fifty of the missionaries of the Board had made no report, that the contributions from the churches for Domestic Missions had fallen off during the past year, and that a considerable number of our congregations had made no contributions at all. The report closes with a series of resolutions, which, as amended, is as follows:

1. *Resolved*, That the policy of the Board in its efforts to give to its missionaries a living salary, and to extend the field of its operations, is fully endorsed.

2. *Resolved*, That the General Assembly sanctions the course of the Board in the appointment of district missionaries; and that it be urged on all the Presbyteries to stir up the churches under their care to a greater degree of liberality in their contributions to this cause.

3. *Resolved*, That the special attention of the Board of Domestic Missions be called to the report of the Committee appointed by the Assembly of last year on ministerial sustentation, the supply of vacant churches and other kindred subjects, which has been adopted by this Assembly, and that the

Board be directed to coöperate, as far as possible, in the way prescribed in carrying out the plan therein set forth; and further, that the Board report to the next Assembly what enlargement of their powers, if any, may be necessary for that purpose.

4. *Resolved*, That the Board be directed to adopt some stringent rule, requiring all who are aided by its funds to make an annual statistical return of the labours of the year.

5. *Resolved*, That the Report of the Board be adopted and ordered to be published.

Dr. Janeway, Secretary of the Board, followed with an address, in which he referred to the rapidly increasing population of the country; the demand for increased exertion; the backwardness of the churches, and various difficulties with which the Board had to contend.

It is plain that this Board and its officers have a thankless and trying work. They cannot satisfy all demands, or meet the conflicting claims of different sections and interests. They are constantly exposed to the danger of having their best considered plans overthrown, on the spur of the moment, on the suggestion of any member of the Assembly. Constant complaint is made that the churches do not take hold of this work; the presbyteries pass resolutions, the pastors may or may not present the subject to their people; but the work is not carried on as it ought to be. The Board, to meet the emergency, with the advice and consent of the Assembly, appointed "district secretaries" to take charge of the work of Domestic Missions in special fields. The plan was to have one such secretary in every State. This plan, as far as adopted, worked admirably. Dr. Matthews, of Kentucky, said it gave unity to their operations, and they could not get on in their State without such an officer. Suspicion, however, was excited that these secretaries were agents in disguise. If their business was to raise funds, open opposition was threatened. The title was distasteful to some, and instead of secretaries, it was moved, and unfortunately carried, that they be called missionaries. This change, the Board regard as a serious mistake. 1. Because these officers are not missionaries in the ordinary usage of that term. They are "secretaries;" that is, they are men who are expected to do for a particular district what the Secretary of the Board

does for the whole church. 2. The men required for this work are not young men just entering on their ministerial labours, but men of experience, standing, and established influence. Such men are not to be classed with the general missionaries of the Board. And 3. As this title is established, being given by other organizations to similar officers, it operates to our disadvantage to refuse this designation to the honoured servants of our Board. So great and complex are the interests with which the Board of Missions has to deal, that a new effort is to be made to modify the system. The Assembly appointed a Committee to report next year to recommend such measures as they may deem necessary to promote the greater efficiency of the Board. This Committee consists of Dr. John C. Backus, Dr. W. M. Paxton, Dr. George Marshall, Dr. S. J. Niccolls, and Rev. A. M. Woods.

Foreign Missions.

The Rev. Dr. Lord, from the Committee to whom was referred the Report of the Board of Foreign Missions, stated that, with much care and interest they had examined this annual exhibit of the Board, touching its condition, means, and operations. From this it appears that we have about sixty different stations—or centres of evangelistic effort in the foreign field—scattered among our Indian tribes, in South America, in Africa, in India, in Spain, in China and among the Chinese in California, among the Jews, and in France, Belgium, and other portions of Papal Europe. In connection with these various stations, there are engaged in the great work of evangelization three hundred and forty-five missionaries and assistant missionaries. Of this whole number seventy are ordained American ministers, twelve are ordained native ministers, and eight are native licentiates, making altogether ninety employed in the distinctive work of preaching the gospel.

In view of the facts they condensed from the Report of the Board, the Committee on that Report would recommend for adoption by this General Assembly the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That the Report of the Board, so full of matter of deep interest to the church, be approved and published.

Resolved, 2. That the thanks of the General Assembly are due to the members of the Board, and especially to the members of the Executive Committee, for the zeal, wisdom, and Christian love and fidelity with which they have conducted this great work of Foreign Missions, so far as it has devolved upon them.

Resolved, 3. That we reverently and gratefully recognize the favour of the Great King and Head of the church to his cause and his people in the work of his Spirit in our Theological Seminaries; inciting the students in them to renewed inquiry as to their duty relative to the foreign field; stimulating a fuller consecration to Him who came to seek and save that which was lost; and enabling so many of them, when they hear the voice of the Lord, saying, "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" willingly to answer, "Here am I; send me." This General Assembly would affectionately press upon all our candidates for the ministry a loving and supreme devotion to Christ.

Resolved, 4. That we renewedly assure our brothers and sisters, working among the heathen, of our tender sympathy, our earnest prayers, and our cordial coöperation in every practicable and appropriate way. They are a part of the sacramental host, even as we; and as in their place they carry on the mighty conflict with Satan, in the deep recesses of his wide-spread and horrible dominion, we would send them words of cheer. The night is far spent; the day is at hand. Our glorious Emmanuel is coming, and to every consecrated one he graciously says, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."

Resolved, 5. That with all the earnestness demanded by the exigency, we would call upon God's people in the churches at home to rise to a truer conception of their duties and privileges as redeemed sinners, and as co-workers with that precious Saviour who redeemed them; to gain also a more adequate conception of the nature, the vastness, and the difficulties of the work to be done, before the kingdoms of this world can become the kingdom of our Lord; and by prayers of faith and labours of love, and gifts and sacrifices like those of Jesus, to furnish the material and the spiritual supplies needed to wipe out that debt; to send forth those waiting

young men; to replenish the treasury of the Board with liberal means for the present year; to enlarge along the future the sphere of our operations and the array of our aggressive forces, and to do our whole duty, on the one hand to a world lying in sin, and on the other to the King of kings and the Lord of lords. The spirit of missions is the spirit of Christ; and the spirit of Christ, pervading and energizing his whole mystical body, will be alike the salvation of the world and the power and glory of the church—of the church militant and of the church triumphant.

Dr. Irving, one of the secretaries of the Board, made an impressive address, in the course of which he said:

“The greatest difficulty under which the Board now labours is the debt of \$35,000. It has been occasioned not by extravagance, but by economy—economy during the whole war, and economy still. Four years before the war, and since that time, we have had an average of seventy-eight ordained ministers in the field, and in the last two years we have had besides, an average of fifty-four native assistants. During these two years we have been carrying on this work with the sum of \$23,000 less than the amount spent on an average during the three years preceding the war. For the last five years \$240,000 have been expended for exchange alone. The church has not recognized this, and we have been compelled to reduce the outlay by just that amount. Had the contributions been in gold, we would have had, during those five years, about \$240,000 more than we did have. During the last year we have spent about \$50,000 for exchange. It thus appears that we have received from the 240,000 communicants of the church, in the aggregate, the sum of \$186,000, and out of that \$80,000 were given by New York and the churches in its vicinity. The whole church, then, outside of that state, gave us during the last year a little over \$100,000. We begin this year not only with an empty treasury, but with a debt of \$35,000 hanging over us. How are we to carry on this expanding work unless there be a correspondence between the contributions of the church and these providential demands? We cannot go forward with an empty treasury. There are men here who have been labouring in China, and one from Brazil, and one just returned after

twenty years of labour at Lahor. It would be unnecessary to dwell further upon these subjects. They are spread out in the Report of the Board."

Mr. William Rankin, Treasurer, dwelt specially on their financial difficulties. As an encouraging fact he mentioned that Dr. Irving preached a sermon in Newark, and we took a collection of \$1700 for the cause. A day or two after, a Sabbath-school teacher said to me, "This is a great work in which you are engaged, But it is an easy thing for our Sabbath-school to support a missionary. Give us the name of one." So I gave them a name, that of the Rev. Mr. Wilson, of Siam, for whose support they agreed to raise \$800 a year. The first quarter, the school raised \$300. So we have \$1200 from this school, which will pay Mr. Wilson his salary, with exchange, and leave a small surplus. Now, if there are one hundred Sabbath-schools as able and willing as this, we will send out all the missionaries that are willing to go. Will not your Sabbath-schools take up this subject in earnest, and support not a child, whom they can send to school, and from whom they can get occasional letters, but a missionary whom I will name to them? Why very many Sabbath-schools could do it. The Sabbath-school of the Second Presbyterian Church, in St. Louis, has supported a missionary for years. It is a good way to excite an interest in this matter.

The Rev. J. K. Andrews, in view of this subject, as presented by Dr. Irving, offered the following resolutions:

In view of the appeal now made by the Board of Foreign Missions to this Assembly, and of the demand made, and the debt resting at present on it,

Resolved, 1. That the church should take efficient measures for liquidating this debt promptly.

Resolved, 2. That in order to do this, the Secretaries of the Board be instructed to make a direct appeal, by circular, through the pastors and sessions, to all our people, for a voluntary contribution, to be given outside and independent of their ordinary contributions, which shall be at once a thank-offering to the Lord for his great goodness to us in pouring out his Spirit on many portions of the church, and also a contribution to the Board of Foreign Missions, for paying this debt.

Resolved, 3. That to render this effort more prompt and efficient, each Presbytery be requested to hold, at its approaching meeting, a brief conference in reference to the present condition and demands of our foreign missionary operations; and that it shall be the duty of the Commissioners to this body to bring this action of the Assembly before their respective Presbyteries, in connection with their reports as Commissioners.

Mr. C. A. Spring presented the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That it is the deliberate and solemn sense of this General Assembly, that the children of the Presbyterian Church are her peculiar charge and care. That it is her especial duty, and one that has been too much neglected, to see that they are trained up in orderly and systematic habits of benevolence, to love the Boards of our church, and our church's great commission to preach the gospel to every creature.

Resolved, 2. That in view of the alarming condition, present and prospective, of the treasury of our Board of Foreign Missions, a committee of this Assembly, to be nominated by the Moderator, be appointed, whose duty it shall be to address a circular letter to all the Sabbath-schools, Bible-classes, children and youth in our connection—to all children who meet to talk of and sing about Jesus—and tell them of the immediate and pressing wants of this Board; that it is \$35,000 in debt—that the fathers turn to them because they are commanded to do so—and because they believe that there is power in prayer; power in littles; power in concerted action; power in the children and youth of the Presbyterian name, when properly directed, to pay off the whole debt in a single day.

Resolved, 3. That to this end, and in view of all the blessed influences that cluster around it, the General Assembly recommend to all pastors and superintendents to set apart the second Sabbath in July next, when, in all our Sabbath-schools and Bible-classes, after appropriate services, a collection be taken up to extinguish this debt.

Resolved, 4. That in their circular to the children, the Committee press upon them to begin at once to prepare for the great day of the children's free-offerings, by self-denial, and by

saving every penny, and by earning something every week for the great object.

All these resolutions were adopted. The interest manifested in the Assembly when the affairs of this Board were under discussion, is an omen for good. We have no fear that the funds required to relieve it of all embarrassment, and to carry on all its operations, will be withheld, if the people can only be reached. But such is the ignorance on the subject, and the pre-occupation of the public mind, that unless the demands of the Board can, by pastors, secretaries, or agents, be urged on the heart and conscience of the people, comparatively little will be done. We neglect the means for such direct appeals, and then complain that the agents of other societies stop it, and gather in the money which would naturally flow into our own treasury. The thing to be done, whether by systematic organization or by travelling agents, is personal application and appeal. All experience shows that this is necessary, and that this is effectual.

Board of Education.

The Rev. Dr. Williams presented the report on this Board, recommending the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Report of the Board of Education be approved, and that it be published under its direction, and that a copy be sent to all our ministers and church sessions.

Resolved, That the Assembly gratefully recognizes the gratuitous and faithful services of those members of the Board, and especially of the Executive Committee, who have devoted much of their time and attention to the business of this Board.

Resolved, That in view of the continued paucity of candidates for the ministry, it be earnestly recommended to all ministers, ruling elders, and Christian parents, to press frequently upon the attention of pious young men the duty of considering the question of personal consecration to the work of the gospel ministry.

Resolved, That the day of prayer for colleges, schools, and the youth of the church, on the last Thursday of February, be observed, so far as possible, in all our churches; and that the

first Sabbath of Mareh, immediately following, be improved by such instruction from the pulpit as may awaken in parents a deeper concern for the salvation of their children, and may lead the children and youth to consecrate themselves to Christ; also, that appeals be made at the same time for enlarged contributions to the ministerial fund of the Board.

Resolved, That the Assembly is much encouraged by the reports of the large number of young men who have been brought into the church by revivals, and by the knowledge that an unusually large proportion of the candidates under the care of the Board have the work of foreign missions in view, and they hail it as an indication of God's special favour toward this department of the church's work.

Resolved, That the Board be directed to continue its fostering care over the colleges, academies, and parochial schools already established, and to make such appropriations in their aid as the funds contributed for this purpose may warrant.

Resolved, That the missionary work of the Board, in the way of parochial and other schools for the benefit of our foreign population, which cannot be reached by our ministers, be vigorously prosecuted; and especially would the Assembly recommend to the patronage of our churches the German Theological School of the Rev. Professor Van Vliet, of Dubuque, as a much needed agency for the training of a German-speaking ministry for this rapidly increasing class of our population.

Resolved, In view of the extraordinary necessities of the coloured congregations in the South, and in order to afford aid to a number of pious, sensible, and experienced men, selected by our Presbyteries with a view of training them for preachers of the gospel, the Board of Education is permitted, at its discretion, in their case, temporarily to relax the rule (§ I. art. vi.), requiring that no person shall be received by the Board unless he shall "have spent at least three months in the study of the Latin language."

Resolved, That in view of the limited success of the efforts to secure the general introduction of the system of parochial schools, it be earnestly recommended to ministers and ruling elders to give more attention to the common schools in their neighbourhoods, frequently visiting them, and encouraging

both teachers and pupils; endeavouring to secure the appointment of teachers of moral and religious character, and the introduction of suitable books, and especially of the Bible, into the schools; and, in every way proper and prudent, labouring to elevate the standard of common school education in the regions where they dwell.

Resolved, That it be recommended to the Board to consider the expediency of preparing for publication a volume of permanent educational documents, in such a way that it may be brought within the reach of our churches generally; this volume to be composed of choice selections from the Annual Reports, in which are many valuable and elaborate discussions of important topics connected with the cause of education, but not now generally accessible; and also of such other documents as may seem most suitable.

Resolved, That in the case of those who, after having been educated in whole or in part by the Board, shall fail to enter the ministry in the Presbyterian Church, the Board be instructed to insist upon the obligation to refund, with interest, the money which they have received, according to section 3, article vi., of the Rules and Regulations of the Board.

Resolved, That the Board be instructed to withhold the appropriations, except in extraordinary cases, to schools and academies, in those Presbyteries, none of whose congregations have contributed to the funds of this Board.

Freedmen's Bureau.

Dr. Richardson presented the Report on Freedmen, recommending the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That the records of the Committee on Freedmen, for the past year, are hereby approved, and the Second Annual Report, now before the Assembly, is hereby ordered to be published and distributed through the churches.

Resolved, 2. That the Assembly expresses its approbation of the fidelity and wisdom with which the affairs of the Committee have been administered, and tenders its thanks to all who have contributed in any way to its success.

Resolved, 3. That the Committee on Freedmen be continued in the location and the work hitherto assigned to it, and that

the Boards of the Church be requested to coöperate with it, in their several departments, in such manner as may seem best fitted to promote its ends.

Resolved, 4. That the patient continuance in well-doing on the part of the ministers and teachers under the charge of the Committee, in the face of so much to discourage them—and especially in the face of so great social discredit and isolation, and even of ridicule, reproach, and persecution—is worthy of the commendation and sympathy of the church; and that the Assembly takes pleasure in the acknowledgment of this claim, and in the expression of its due appreciation thereof.

Resolved, 5. That in the constitutional character of the coloured people—their impulsiveness and readiness to receive impressions, both good and evil—and in the fact that various influences and agencies of evil are striving to gain the mastery over them, the Assembly find abundant reason not only to do, but to do at once, all that may be in its power, for their intellectual, moral, and religious enlightenment.

Resolved, 6. That the recent legislation of the national Congress, conferring upon the Freedmen of the South all the rights and privileges of citizenship, calls upon as patriots, not less than as Christians, to use our utmost endeavours so to educate and train them that they may be prepared judiciously and safely for all the interests involved, to enjoy the immunities and discharge the duties to which they are called.

Resolved, 7. That inasmuch as in the injury and injustice long inflicted upon this people, all sections of the country were more or less implicated, and for them all were more or less responsible, we recognize it as a righteous obligation, binding upon all, to repair and compensate for the wrong done them by the use of every means in our power to promote their social and spiritual welfare.

Resolved, 8. That in no way can we so properly express our gratitude for the providential answer to the prayers which for long and weary years went up from Christian and humane hearts for the deliverance of this people from servitude, as by continual prayer and persistent efforts for their rescue from the worse bondage of ignorance and sin, knowing that if the Son shall make them free, they shall be free indeed.

Resolved, 9. That the Assembly hereby expresses its approval of the measures taken by the Committee to establish schools and other institutions of learning among the Freedmen; and would especially commend to the interest and aid of the churches the Biddle Memorial Institute, established for the training of catechists and other religious teachers, that it may be enabled fully to meet the important purposes of its foundation, and to fulfil the designs of its generous founder.

Disabled Ministers' Fund.

Rev. Dr. Smith, Chairman of the Committee on the Disabled Ministers' Fund, submitted the following report:

The Committee to whom was referred the Twelfth Annual Report of the Trustees of the General Assembly, in relation to the Disabled Ministers' Fund, beg leave to report. Your Committee find reason for congratulation and devout thanksgiving to God in the fact that the cause is steadily growing in favour with the churches, as is manifest from their constantly increasing contributions to its funds. During the past year its receipts amounted to upwards of \$27,000, an increase of upwards of \$5000 on those of the preceding year. Fifty-four disabled ministers, and seventy widows, and eight families of orphans were relieved, an advance in each of these classes upon the numbers previously obtaining relief.

The Trustees have been enabled to meet fully every demand made upon them by the Presbyteries, and have a balance on hand sufficient, and perhaps not more than sufficient, to meet their accruing obligations until the annual collections in September shall replenish their treasury. Gratifying as this result is, the church, it is manifest, does not fully realize her obligations to those who have spent their strength in her service. Their claims for an adequate support address themselves not to our charity, or brotherly kindness alone, but to our sense of justice. They have a right to such support. In this the children of this world are wiser than the children of light. The state provides a pension for her disabled servants. Beneficial societies, which have multiplied so greatly among us, find their bond of union, their means of growth, their very life itself, in the provision they make for the relief of their disabled members and

their orphan families. And the church, whose glory it is that she was the herald of charity to the nations, in whose very organization the great principle was recognized that none of her members should suffer lack while others had a superfluity, cannot be behind them in this labour of love. What appeal speaks more eloquently to the hearts of God's people? Who can adequately realize all that is represented by the figures of this report? Fifty-four ministers, twenty-four of whom are above seventy years of age, worn out in the service of the Master, with no provision for their declining years, feeling daily the pinchings of poverty—who can tell the value of your benefactions to them? How touching is the story of each of these seventy widows, and each of these eight orphan families; and how many more, at this hour, are suffering want?

The Committee further recommend the following resolutions for adoption by the Assembly:

Resolved, That this Assembly approves of the diligence and fidelity of the Trustees and Secretary in the management of the important interests entrusted to their care.

Resolved, That this Assembly urges upon the churches continued and increased contributions to this fund, and upon all the individual members of our churches to whom God has given an abundance of this world's goods, the duty of making donations and bequests for the increase of its permanent fund.

Resolved, That this Assembly reiterates the instructions of the last;—that the Presbyteries be instructed to adopt such means as will bring this cause to the attention of all the churches; and they are also instructed to take especial pains to discover and present to the attention of the Committee on the fund the claims of all who are in need, and for whom the church designs this provision, not only that there may be no misappropriation of the funds, but that none who are entitled to aid may be neglected and allowed to suffer for want of it.

Resolved, That the Report of the Trustees on this subject be printed in the Appendix to the Minutes.

Theological Seminaries.

Rev. Dr. Breed, Chairman of the Committee on Theological Seminaries, presented the following report:

The Committee on Theological Seminaries report that there has been placed in their hands full reports from the Theological Seminaries at Princeton, Allegheny, and Danville.

The Directors of the Seminary at *Princeton* report the reception of fifty-three new students during the year, and the actual attendance of one hundred and thirty-five. Of these, fifty passed the usual examination and received the usual certificates. The uncommon degree of missionary spirit manifested in this Seminary during the year is exceedingly gratifying, nearly one-third of the senior class having signified their intention to engage in the work of foreign missions.

The Board of Trustees report the completion of the endowment, an addition of six scholarships, and generally encouraging condition of the finances.

The Directors of the *Western* Theological Seminary report that during the year twenty-one new students were admitted, the whole number on the roll being seventy-three. Of these, twenty-seven have completed their course and gone forth into the field. A full statement of the condition of the finances is made in the report of the Trustees.

The Report of the Directors of the Seminary at *Danville*, asks:

1. That the Seminary be re-opened at the earliest practicable period.
2. That the annual sessions begin on the first Thursday in May, and close on the first Thursday in November.
3. That the number of the Board of Directors be largely reduced.
4. That the vacant chairs be filled, and a fifth chair created.

The Trustees report a very satisfactory condition of the finances of the institution; and in view of this fact, as well as from other considerations, ask:

1. The early re-opening of the Seminary.
2. That a meeting be held during the sitting of this Assembly, within the State of Kentucky, to elect Professors, Directors, and Trustees.

Accompanying these reports is a paper from Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge, stating that in accordance with the order of the

last Assembly, he had taken charge of the interests and affairs of this Seminary during the year, and directing attention to various matters affecting its interests. This paper the Committee recommend to the attention of the Assembly.

The Committee further recommend:

1. That the chapter entitled "Of the Board of Directors," in the "Plan of the Danville Theological Seminary," shall be, and is hereby so amended, as that each of the three classes of Directors—one of which is chosen by every General Assembly—shall consist of five ministers and five ruling elders: and any six members present at any meeting of the Board shall be a quorum to transact business.

2. The Committee recommend that measures be taken for the re-opening of this Seminary at the earliest practicable day.

3. That the following be elected to fill the professorships now vacant, viz.,

Rev. E. P. Humphrey, D. D., Professor of Biblical and Ecclesiastical History; Rev. S. Yerkes, D. D., Professor of Oriental History and Literature; Rev. R. W. Landis, D. D., Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology.

4. That the change of time in opening and closing the sessions of the Seminary be referred to its Board of Directors.

5. That the fourth chapter of the Plan of the Seminary, entitled "the Professors—the Faculty," be and hereby is so amended as the Professors in said Seminary shall hereafter receive \$1750 a year instead of \$1500 as heretofore, the salary to be paid in half-yearly instalments.

6. That the Assembly during its present sessions proceed to fill the chairs now vacant in this Seminary.

7. That a fifth professorship be and hereby is established in said Seminary; the title of this professorship and its duties to be fixed by the Faculty as filled by this Assembly, and reported to a subsequent Assembly.

8. That the Reports of the several Seminaries, together with that of Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, D. D., be printed in the Appendix to the Minutes of the Assembly.

The gentlemen above nominated were duly elected to the several chairs designated in the Seminary at Danville, and on recommendation of the Committee, Dr. Willis Lord, of the

Seminary at Chicago, was transferred from the chair of Biblical and Ecclesiastical History to that of Polemic and Didactic Theology.

Systematic Benevolence.

The Rev. Mr. Fraser brought in the report on this subject, concluding with the recommendation of the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That we reiterate the injunction of the last General Assembly, making it the duty of pastors and stated supplies to instruct the people of their several charges in the principles of Christian liberality, as they are taught in the word of God, and interpreted in the standards of our church, and the deliverances of the General Assembly.

Resolved, 2. That all our Presbyteries be enjoined to require of all the churches under their care regular contributions to all the objects recommended by the General Assembly; and that ministers and sessions be especially inquired of as to their faithfulness in giving the people the opportunity to contribute.

Resolved, 3. That special pains should be taken to train up the children of the church in the principles and practice of Christian liberality.

Resolved, 4. That the Secretaries of all the Boards be appointed a committee, with the Rev. D. Irving, D. D., as Chairman, and that they be requested to take this whole subject into consideration, and report to the next Assembly such measures as they deem best for the more efficient working of the benevolent operations of the church.

The Committees to whom the reports of our several Boards are referred, have gradually, as it seems to us, adopted an erroneous view of the object for which they are appointed. That object is first, to see that the Boards are faithful in their several vocations; and secondly, to bring up any salient points which merit special attention or definite action on the part of the Assembly. Instead of being confined within these limits, their reports are becoming extended dissertations, discussing the various topics which the Reports of the several Boards bring to view, interspersed with moral and religious remarks. This is all very well, but it is out of place, and swells the

Minutes to an undue size, and accomplishes, we fear, very little good.

Death of the Rev. Thomas D. Hoover.

The following minute was adopted as a tribute to the memory of one of the members of the Assembly who died during its sessions :

Whereas, This Assembly has heard with profound grief of the death of the Rev. Thomas D. Hoover, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Cranberry, New Jersey, a commissioner to this body from the Presbytery of New Brunswick; therefore,

Resolved, That we devoutly recognize the providence of God in this solemn event, whereby one of our number has been suddenly removed from his place here to "the general assembly and church of the first-born which are written in heaven."

Resolved, That it is our earnest prayer that this solemn dispensation of Providence may be sanctified to ourselves personally, and to the entire church, of which the deceased was a useful and honoured member.

Resolved, That we express our heartfelt sympathy and condolence with the bereaved widow of our deceased brother, and pray that the same sustaining grace which was granted to him during his illness may be vouchsafed unto her in this hour of her sore bereavement.

Resolved, That this General Assembly record their grateful sense of the kind attentions so gratuitously rendered by Drs. Thornton and Carson, of this city, during the illness of our brother; that we also appreciate the spirit of liberality manifested by the proprietors of the Spencer House, in connection with this sad bereavement.

Resolved, That our Stated Clerk be directed to communicate a copy of these resolutions to the widow of the deceased, to the proprietors of the Spencer House, and to Drs. Thornton and Carson.

Mr. Hoover had for years been a great sufferer from asthma, which enfeebled his constitution, and rendered him less able to contend with the acute disease which was the immediate cause of his death. He was highly respected and loved by his

friends, his people, and his co-presbyters. The cheerfulness which he maintained under protracted bodily suffering, his mild and gentle spirit, his fidelity and energy in the discharge of his pastoral duties, will cause his memory to be affectionately cherished by all who knew him.

Overtures.

Among the numerous overtures presented to the Assembly there are some of general and permanent interest.

Overture No. 3.—The Committee report “an overture from the Presbytery of Saline, in favour of the enactment of a law requiring that, in the election of pastors, none be permitted to vote except communicants in good and regular standing;” also “that when any candidate is before a church, the church shall determine whether he shall be called to the pastorate before any other candidate shall be heard.”

The Committee recommend for answer, That in regard to the first point, the enactment of such a law would prohibit a usage quite extensive among the churches founded upon an interpretation of the present law, which has heretofore been sanctioned by the General Assembly.

It is therefore deemed inexpedient, upon the application of a single Presbytery, to recommend such alteration in the Form of Government. In regard to the second point, it need only be said that the authority asked for is now possessed by each congregation, and may be exercised or not, at its pleasure; while, to make such exercise binding, by positive law, would deprive all congregations of a present liberty, the use of which seems wisely left to their discretion. Adopted.

The idea that all church power should be confined to communicants rests on the Puritan or Independent notion of the church, as a company of regenerate men bound together by a voluntary covenant. The Protestant and Presbyterian doctrine is, that the visible church consists of those who profess the true religion, together with their children, and that baptized persons are members of the church (although not necessarily entitled to all its privileges), until in some regular way they are separated from it. On this principle our church has always acted in the election of pastors and other church officers. There is danger

also that the doctrine of the supreme power of the Assembly may be run into the ground. The rightful authority of the Assembly is limited in many ways; among others by the Constitution. And one of the stipulations of the Constitution is, that no acts of the Assembly shall be binding as permanent or constitutional rules, until submitted to the Presbyteries, and sanctioned by them. This calling on the Assembly to make laws permanently to bind the churches or church courts, is calling upon it to exercise a power which it does not possess. Suppose some one should overture the Assembly to enact that all our churches should stately use in public worship the Liturgy of the Church of England, what would we say? While resisting the doctrine that the Assembly is a body of delegated powers, having no authority not specifically granted, we must guard against the opposite extreme of ecclesiastical omnipotence.

Overture No. 13—Being the action of the Presbytery of California upon the subject of employing more efficiently the private members of the church as teachers, and catechists, and expounders of the word of God among the destitute portion of our population. The Committee recommend that this subject be referred to the Presbyteries and church sessions, and that the General Assembly urge upon pastors, and elders, and all private members of the church to coöperate in the use of all legitimate means to bring the gospel more extensively within the reach of the poor and spiritually destitute, especially among the population of our large cities.

The report was adopted.

Overture No. 18—Being the action of the Presbytery of Chicago upon the subject of infant baptism, viz.,

Whereas, The neglect of infant baptism is an evil growing to an alarming extent, and whereas our church is bound to do what it can to arrest it; therefore

Resolved, That we overture the General Assembly to enjoin upon all the Presbyteries within our bounds to ascertain the number of unbaptized children whose parents are members of our communion, and report to the next Assembly.

The Committee recommend that the injunction suggested in this action be sent down to the Presbyteries.

The report was adopted.

Overture No. 25—From the “Southern Relief Committee,” of Cincinnati, asking the coöperation of the Assembly’s churches.

The Committee recommend the adoption of the following:

Resolved, That it be urgently recommended to all our congregations to aid generously in the efforts now being made to relieve the destitution existing in the southern portions of our common country, by contributions in money, provisions, or in any other manner that may be most advisable; and that all pastors of churches under the care of the General Assembly, where contributions have not already been made, be requested to bring this subject before their congregations at the earliest day possible.

The report was adopted.

We rejoice that the General Assembly has acted upon this subject. If the reports in the public papers as to the present destitution at the South, and the disastrous effects of the recent floods, be correct, the largest liberality will be demanded to meet the wants of our suffering brethren.

Report of the Committee of Ten on the Declaration and Testimony.

The Rev. Dr. Stanton, Chairman of the Committee to whom was referred the papers relating to the contested seats from several Presbyteries, and sundry other papers relating to the Declaration and Testimony, presented the following Report:

The Committee to whom were referred sundry papers relating to the division of the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri, and of the Presbyteries under their care, which has resulted in two sets of Commissioners claiming seats in this General Assembly from several of these Presbyteries, and also sundry papers concerning the signers of a paper entitled a “Declaration and Testimony,” &c., together with the citation of the said signers who were summoned by the last General Assembly to appear before this present Assembly, beg leave to report:

That they have had the matters committed to them under consideration, and have had full personal conference with the several claimants for seats, and recommend to the General Assembly for adoption the following propositions:

I. The ecclesiastical judicatories hereinafter named, are the true and lawful judicatories in connection with and under the

care and authority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, namely:

The Synod of Kentucky, which met at Henderson, Kentucky, in October, 1866, and adjourned to meet and did meet in Lexington, Kentucky, in November, 1866, of which Synod the Rev. J. T. Lapsley is now the Moderator, and the Rev. S. S. McRoberts is the Stated Clerk; this Synod having under its care and authority, and within its ecclesiastical boundaries, the following Presbyteries, viz., the Presbytery of Louisville, of which the Rev. J. P. McMillan is now the Moderator, and the Rev. R. Valentine is the Stated Clerk; the Presbytery of Ebenezer, of which the Rev. J. F. Hendy is now the Moderator, and the Rev. R. F. Caldwell is the Stated Clerk; the Presbytery of West Lexington, of which the Rev. Stephen Yerkes, D. D., is now the Moderator, and the Rev. J. K. Lyle is the Stated Clerk; the Presbytery of Transylvania, of which the Rev. G. J. Read is now the Moderator, and the Rev. S. S. McRoberts is the Stated Clerk; the Presbytery of Muhlenburg, of which the Rev. A. D. Metcalf is now the Moderator, and the Rev. S. Y. Garrison is the Stated Clerk; and the Presbytery of Paducah, of which the Rev. J. P. Riddle is now the Moderator, and the Rev. James Hawthorn is the Stated Clerk; and these several Presbyteries having in their connection and under their care and authority and within their ecclesiastical boundaries, respectively, the ministers, churches, licentiates, and candidates belonging to and claiming to belong to, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

The foregoing described judicatories, namely, the Synod, Presbyteries, and church sessions, within their respective jurisdictions, are to be respected and obeyed as the true and only lawful judicatories possessing the names above recited, within the State of Kentucky, which are in connection with and under the care and authority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; and the Commissioners sent to and enrolled in this General Assembly from the above described Presbyteries, are true and lawful Commissioners.

The Synod of Missouri, which met at Boonville, Missouri, October 10th, 1866, of which Synod the Rev. J. P. Finley

was elected Moderator, and the Rev. J. A. Paige was elected the Stated Clerk, and which adjourned to meet in Kansas City on the second Wednesday in October, 1867; this Synod having under its care and authority and within its ecclesiastical boundaries, the following Presbyteries, viz., the Presbytery of St. Louis, of which the Rev. J. F. Fenton is now the Moderator, and the Rev. H. C. McCook is the Stated Clerk; the Presbytery of Palmyra, of which the Rev. A. Steed is now the Moderator, and the Rev. J. P. Finley is the Stated Clerk; the Presbytery of Potosi, of which the Rev. G. W. Harland is now the Moderator, and the Rev. A. Munson is the Stated Clerk; the Presbytery of Lafayette, of which the Rev. Charles Sturdevant is now the Moderator, and the Rev. George Fraser is the Stated Clerk; the Presbytery of South West Missouri, of which the Rev. William R. Fulton is now the Moderator, and the Rev. James A. Paige is the Stated Clerk; and the Presbytery of Upper Missouri, of which the Rev. Mr. Pinkerton is now the Moderator, and the Rev. W. C. McPheeters is the Stated Clerk; and these several Presbyteries having in their connection and under their care and authority and within their ecclesiastical boundaries, respectively, the ministers, churches, licentiates, and candidates belonging to and claiming to belong to the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The above described judicatories, namely, the Synod, Presbyteries, and church sessions within their respective jurisdictions, are to be respected and obeyed as the true and only lawful judicatories possessing the names above recited, within the State of Missouri, which are in connection with and under the care and authority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; and the Commissioners sent to and enrolled in this General Assembly, from the above described Presbyteries, are true and lawful Commissioners.

II. While this General Assembly herein declares, as above set forth, that certain Synods and Presbyteries, or bodies claiming to be such, within the States of Kentucky and Missouri, bearing the same names and claiming to exercise rightful jurisdiction over the same churches and people and within the same territory as those above recognized as lawful, are in no

sense true and lawful Synods and Presbyteries in connection with and under the care and authority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, these said unlawful Synods and Presbyteries having been dissolved by their own act under an order of the last General Assembly, and being now organized in open defiance or disregard of said order; yet, this General Assembly, acting in accordance with the decision of the last General Assembly, hereby asserts its jurisdiction and authority over the ministers and churches within and belonging to these unlawful ecclesiastical organizations; and the Presbyteries and Synods herein declared lawful, are directed to call, at their next stated meetings, their entire rolls as they existed before these divisions were made. This General Assembly, therefore, directs those ministers and churches belonging to any of the aforesaid unlawful organizations, who may desire to remain in connection with the Presbyterian Church under the care of the General Assembly, or who, having withdrawn, may desire to return, to report themselves to the Presbyteries respectively within whose bounds they are located; and the said Presbyteries are hereby directed to receive them in the manner and upon the conditions hereinafter stated, as follows:

1. Upon the appearance in person or on application by letter of any minister or ministers who have not signed the aforesaid "Declaration and Testimony," but who have acted with the said signers in the aforesaid unlawful organizations, the Presbyteries are directed to enroll them upon their simple expression of a desire to remain in, or to return to, as the case may be, the Presbyterian Church under the care of the General Assembly; and upon the application of any church or churches now embraced within any of these unlawful organizations, the Presbyteries are directed to receive them upon their expression of a similar desire.

2. Upon the application of any minister or ministers who signed the aforesaid "Declaration and Testimony," before, during, or since, the meeting of the last General Assembly, the Presbyteries shall require, as a condition of their enrolment, that they subscribe, upon the records of the respective Presby-

teries to which they make application, a declaration to the following effect, viz.

“I, *A. B.*, hereby declare my desire to adhere to the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and do now promise to render due obedience in the Lord to the authority of all its courts, embracing the Presbytery, the Synod, and the General Assembly; and, to this end, inasmuch as the last General Assembly pronounced the aforesaid ‘Declaration and Testimony’ to be ‘a slander against the Church, schismatical in its character and aims, and its adoption by any of our church courts an act of rebellion against the authority of the General Assembly’—I do hereby disclaim that I had any intention to rebel against or renounce the authority of the General Assembly in signing the ‘Declaration and Testimony,’ and I hereby withdraw all language deemed by the General Assembly offensive or disrespectful, in which its sentiments are expressed.”

In case any ruling elder who is a signer of the aforesaid “Declaration and Testimony,” shall express a desire to remain in or return to the Presbyterian Church, he shall be required to subscribe a declaration to the same effect, embracing the session as a court, upon the records of the session of the church where he may apply to be enrolled, whether or not he be an acting elder in that or any other church; and in case any ruling elder who is a signer, as aforesaid, should now belong to a church not embraced in any of the aforesaid unlawful organizations, whether an acting elder or not, he shall subscribe the same declaration upon the records of the church wherein he is enrolled, as a condition of his remaining in good and regular standing.

3. The same requirements shall be made, as last above specified, of any minister or elder who is a signer of the aforesaid “Declaration and Testimony,” now belonging to any other Presbytery or church in any other Synod than those of Kentucky and Missouri; that is to say, any such minister or ruling elder shall subscribe the declaration above recited, upon the records of the Presbytery or session, as the case may be, as a condition of his remaining in good and regular standing.

4. All the lower courts of the church, as sessions, Presbyteries, and Synods, are hereby enjoined to see that these direc-

tions of the General Assembly are faithfully observed; and if in any case or cases arising out of the conduct of the signers of the aforesaid "Declaration and Testimony," or out of the conduct of any of those, not signers, who have acted with them in organizing unlawful Presbyteries or Synods, any of the lower courts deem it their duty to institute process, they are hereby enjoined to exercise forbearance, and study the things that make for peace and harmony.

5. In case any person or persons belonging to any of the aforesaid classes, now embraced in any of the ecclesiastical organizations herein pronounced unlawful, shall not make application for membership in any of those judicatories herein pronounced lawful, or in any other judicatories under the care and recognizing the authority of the General Assembly, at or previous to the next spring stated meetings of the aforementioned lawful Presbyteries, the said Presbyteries shall thereupon drop the names of such ministers, and the said churches shall drop the names of such ruling elders from their respective rolls, as having voluntarily withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America under the care of the General Assembly, and they shall thenceforth be regarded as being no longer ministers in or members of the said Presbyterian Church; and in case any minister or ruling elder belonging to any other Presbytery or church now in our ecclesiastical connection, who is a signer as aforesaid, shall not subscribe the aforementioned declaration, at or previous to the next stated spring meeting of the Presbytery under whose care he is as a minister, or, if a ruling elder, under whose care his church is placed, his name shall be dropped in like manner and with like effect.

III. This General Assembly deems it proper, furthermore, to declare, authoritatively, the following principles, and to set forth the following statements, to the end that peace and harmony may be restored to the church at large under its care, and that all persons in its connection may be well and faithfully informed of their duty:

1. In the provisions hereinbefore announced, for the purpose of restoring to the church, under proper ecclesiastical relations, ministerial brethren, elders, and churches, whom we regard as having put themselves in antagonism to the just authority of the

church, and especially of the General Assembly, this supreme judicatory has endeavoured to do this in such a manner as, on the one hand, to recognize and maintain the just authority of the General Assembly, and, on the other, to extend the hand of fraternal kindness and welcome to brethren who have erred.

2. This present action severs no one from the church, but leaves the responsibility of final separation upon those who fail to give heed to the provisions now and herein made for their remaining in or return to the church of their fathers, whether they be ministers, ruling elders, churches, or any organizations claiming to be Presbyteries and Synods.

3. The plan now proposed, and recommended to this General Assembly for adoption, recognizes, on the one hand, the authority of the last General Assembly in citing the signers of the aforesaid "Declaration and Testimony" to appear before this present General Assembly, while, on the other hand, it remits their cases to the lower courts for final disposition in a way which every minister and member of the church must regard as regular, and with the simple requisition that the said signers comply with the terms above specified. This course does not even require the said signers to renounce the principles of church order which they affirm they conscientiously entertain, nor is it the wish of the General Assembly to interfere with their conscientious convictions; nor, furthermore, does this plan come in conflict with some good and wise brethren who have denied or seriously doubted, while fully adhering to the church, the competency of the last General Assembly to issue the summons to the signers of the aforesaid "Declaration and Testimony" to appear at the bar of the present General Assembly, "to answer for what they have done in this matter." This, however, is clear to the whole church: that the last and present General Assemblies stand in a very different relation to this whole matter. When the last Assembly issued its citation to these brethren, such was notoriously the condition of the lower courts, almost universally, in the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri, as subsequent events have but too well shown, that it would have been nothing less than vain trifling with sacred interests, which were greatly imperilled, for that General Assembly to have remanded the cases of these brethren to

those courts; but now, the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri, with the Presbyteries in their connection, as herein recognized, adhere to the Presbyterian Church through the General Assembly, and there is every reason to believe that the directions herein made will be faithfully executed by them.

4. This General Assembly regards the refusal of many of those cited by the last to appear before the present Assembly, as a grave violation of their duty, while, at the same time, it respects the conscientious, though, as it judges, the mistaken, conviction of duty, which has led them to decline obedience. It duly regards the declarations of some of these brethren, that, in signing the aforesaid "Declaration and Testimony," and in their declining to obey the aforesaid citation, they intend no disrespect to the General Assembly, but have taken this course because they deem the last and previous General Assemblies to have exceeded their constitutional authority. It ought, however, to be clear to these brethren, and to the whole church, that when a court of the highest grade and jurisdiction has made a decision or issued an order, it is the duty of all good and law-abiding men to yield it due respect and obedience, until it is repealed by the proper authority. This is a principle on which all good government rests, in civil as well as ecclesiastical affairs, and without its due recognition, anarchy would reign in church and state. In the present case, according to the principles of our system, no lower court or body of men is competent to set aside the acts of the General Assembly, for it is a court of last resort. If men, from conscientious scruples or otherwise, cannot abide its deliberate, well-considered, and solemn decisions, instead of persisting, during a series of years, in open defiance of its authority, they should, as Christian men and in the exercise of their Christian liberty, quietly withdraw from the church. From the present condition of things, however, this General Assembly is not disposed to take any further notice of the offence of the signers of the aforesaid "Declaration and Testimony," or of their refusal to obey the aforesaid citation of the last Assembly, than is provided for in the plan herein set forth for the restoration of peace and harmony and the return of these brethren to their proper relations in the church.

5. In regard to the two brethren who have obeyed the citation aforesaid—the Rev. J. A. Quarles, who signed the aforesaid “Declaration and Testimony” before the last General Assembly met, and the Rev. William C. Handy, who has signed it since, and who appears before the present General Assembly in obedience to a supposed “order of the Synod of Baltimore”—this General Assembly expresses its gratification at their manifest spirit of obedience, and feels called upon to take no further order in their respective cases than to enjoin them to repair to their respective Presbyteries and comply with the requisitions hereinbefore set forth, Mr. Quarles to appear before the nearest Presbytery which adheres to the General Assembly.

Finally. Your Committee have been animated, in the measures proposed in this report, simply by the desire to maintain the authority and restore peace and harmony to the church, and they are fully convinced that the same desire pervades the bosom of every member of this General Assembly. They only therefore, in addition, recommend the following resolution, as in their judgment conducive to this end, viz.

Resolved, That upon a motion to adopt this report, if such shall be made, the persons claiming seats upon the floor of this General Assembly, and those cited to appear here by the last General Assembly, shall be heard in discussion upon any part of this report.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

R. L. STANTON, *Chairman,*
 WILLIS LORD,
 W. P. BREED,
 A. T. RANKIN,
 JOHN T. DUFFIELD,
 JAMES I. BROWNSON,
 SAMUEL GALLOWAY,
 D. L. COLLIER,
 T. NEWTON WILLSON,
 W. S. GILMAN, JR.

On the motion to adopt the foregoing report, a protracted debate ensued. The leading speakers on the side of the dissentients from the acts of the Assembly of 1866, were Rev.

J. A. Quarles, Rev. Dr. Brookes, Rev. R. L. Breck, and Rev. Dr. Yantis; and on the side of the Assembly, Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, Prof. James Matthews, and Rev. S. J. Niccolls. These speeches were characterized by ability, research, courtesy, and a fraternal spirit. The report was ultimately adopted by a vote of ayes 261, nays 4. Excused from voting, 1. We do not dwell further on this subject, because the ground gone over was necessarily the same as that so strenuously contested in the last Assembly. The report was a compromise. It was to be taken as a whole, or not at all. Viewed in this light, it will, we doubt not, be regarded as eminently wise and conciliatory. It was evidently designed to heal the breach produced by the action of the last Assembly, and to render it consistent with the honour and conscientious convictions of those who dissented from that action to retain their connection with the church. In the first place, it requires the renunciation of no constitutional right. All concerned are allowed the right of protest and dissent. The signers of the Declaration and Testimony are not required to withdraw their names from that document, or to repudiate any principle which it contains. The report respects the conscientious convictions of all affected by its action. In the second place, it does not require to approve of the past acts of the Assembly. It calls for no assent to the wisdom, correctness, or constitutionality of any of those "deliverances" from 1861 downward, which have been the subject of so much discussion. And thirdly, it does not call for the recognition of the binding force of unconstitutional enactments. The principle that an unconstitutional law is no law, the Assembly neither itself denies, nor calls upon any man under its jurisdiction to deny. All that the report demands is, first, that the judicial decisions of the court of last resort, whether wise or unwise, constitutional or unconstitutional, must be submitted to. This is what is required of necessity in all well-organized societies. The decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States are final in all cases in which it adjudicates. No man is required to regard its decisions as wise, right, or according to law; but they must be submitted to. Such decisions do not bind other coördinate branches of the government in their future action, nor the court itself in deciding other cases of the like kind.

When that court decided in favour of the constitutionality of a national bank, and of internal improvements conducted by the general government within the limits of the States, no man was required to agree with the learned judges. Opposition to the bank continued, and it was finally overthrown. And when the same court decided that slavery was not an institution depending on the *lex loci*, and that therefore the Missouri compromise was unconstitutional, a decision which shocked the common sense and revolted the conscience of the whole north, no one resisted the judgment of the court, or refused to recognize Dred Scott, whose status was involved in the decision, as a slave. So these brethren are not required to approve of the acts of the Assembly of 1866, or to regard the assumption of jurisdiction which they involved, as constitutional. All that the report demands is, first, that these judicial acts, of dissolving and recognizing certain church courts, and citing certain individuals, be in those cases submitted to. Any one may oppose the passing of any similar act in the future, and do all he can to bring his brethren to agree with him in his construction of the constitution. But the decision of the highest court is of necessity final, in the particular case. These brethren say that the act of the Assembly declaring a Presbytery or Synod *ipso facto* dissolved, should such body admit any of the signers of the Declaration and Testimony to sit as members, is unconstitutional. They have a perfect right to their opinion. But if the Assembly so enact, there is no help for it. A man might believe the act of Congress creating a national bank unconstitutional, and therefore that the bank had no legal existence, and could not collect its debts. On this conviction he might refuse to pay his note to the bank. The case would then go to the courts, and if the Supreme Court decided that the bank could legally sue and be sued, there would be an end of that case. Any other man, or the same man, might try the experiment over again in hope that the court would reverse its decision; but until it is reversed, the decision, whether right or wrong, must stand. Submission involves no acknowledgment of legitimate authority, and therefore may be rendered with a good conscience.

And secondly, the report requires that disrespect to the Assembly and a schismatical intention should be disavowed by

the signers of the Declaration and Testimony. As they disclaim any intention to be disrespectful or to promote schism, there can be no difficulty so far as this requirement is concerned.

The adoption of this report throws the responsibility of preserving the unity and peace of the church on the dissentients. According to the universally recognized doctrine of schism, no man is justified in renouncing connection with a church to which he has avowed allegiance, unless he is required to profess what he does not believe; or to do what his conscience, as guided by the word of God, forbids. As neither of these requisitions are made of those who are concerned, in this report, we cannot see how they can escape the guilt of schism, should they renounce their allegiance to the church of their fathers. Should a transient majority of a church even apostatize from the truth or order of the gospel, that would be no excuse for the faithful to abandon it, unless they themselves were required to join in the apostacy. What would become of our country if every county should renounce its allegiance to the State, or every State to the Union, every time an unjust or unconstitutional law was passed. We would soon become a Mexico among the nations were this principle acted upon; and our church will become an ecclesiastical Mexico, if such anarchical principles control the action of its members.

Reunion.

Dr. Bred presented the report of the majority of the Committee, which is as follows:

The majority of the Committee to whom was referred the Report of the Committee on Reunion with the other branch of the church, would respectfully recommend to the General Assembly the following resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, That this Assembly has listened with grateful and profound satisfaction to the report of the Committee on Church Reunion, and recognizes in the unanimity of the Joint Committee the finger of God as pointing toward an early and cordial reunion of the two sister churches now so long separated.

2. *Resolved*, That said Committee be continued and directed

to coöperate with any similar Committee of the other branch in furtherance of this object, and to report thereon to the next General Assembly.

3. *Resolved*, That the Committee be empowered to fill all vacancies that may occur in their body during the coming year, whether by resignation, protracted sickness, or by death.

4. *Resolved*, That the necessary expenses incurred by this Committee in the discharge of the duties assigned them be paid from the profits on the sale of books by the Board of Publication.

5. *Resolved*, That the Report of the Committee be published in the Appendix to the Minutes, and in our religious newspapers, and commended to the careful consideration of our whole church, and that the Committee be directed to report to the next General Assembly any modification of the terms of reunion specified therein, which may appear desirable to the Joint Committee, in view of any further light that may have been received during the year.

6. *Resolved*, That the Hon. Daniel Haines, and the Hon. Henry W. Green, LL.D., of New Jersey, Daniel Lord, LL.D., and Theodore Dwight, LL.D., of New York, and the Hon. William Strong and the Hon. George Sharswood, LL.D., of Pennsylvania, be appointed a Committee to investigate all questions of property and of vested rights as they may stand related to the matter of reunion; and that this Committee be requested to report to the Joint Committee as early as January 1, 1868; and that our share of the necessary expenses incurred by this Committee be also paid by our Board of Publication from the profits on its book-sales.

Resolved, That the Joint Committee be requested to consider, and report to the next General Assembly, any specific amendments to our church constitution, which may be required in the government of a body so large as that of the re-united church.

W. P. BREED,
 GEORGE MARSHALL,
 C. D. MCKEE,
 A. T. RANKIN.

The resolution referring to a change in the constitution was stricken out.

Dr. Smith then read the following report:

The minority of the Committee to whom was referred the Report of the Committee appointed by the last General Assembly, to confer with a similar Committee of the other branch of the Presbyterian Church, on the subject of an organization between the two bodies, beg leave to report that they have heard, with great pleasure and gratitude to God, of the delightful spirit of harmony which pervaded the deliberations of the Joint Committee, and the gratifying degree of unanimity with which their conclusions were reached, and cannot but hail these auspicious occurrences as the harbingers of that ultimate union between the two bodies, which we all so earnestly desire. The time, we trust, may speedily come, when all branches of the Presbyterian Church in this land, holding the same standards, having the same ancestry, the same traditions, and the same glorious history, will be one in fact and in form, as well as in faith; and the action proposed here to be taken is not designed to prevent or hinder, but to hasten, in proper time, such a consummation.

The subject is one of great difficulty and delicacy. The almost uniform failure of all similar attempts at organization, the frequent exasperations and widening of the breach between the bodies attempted to be united, and the multiplication of the strifes and divisions among them, which have resulted from the best intentioned efforts at union when prematurely urged, warn us of the necessity of moving cautiously, and pondering every step. The reasons which should always inspire such caution, operate with peculiar force in the case before us. The generation which witnessed the disruption, and the men who were the chief actors in it, on both sides, are still among us. The feelings excited by it have not yet passed away.

The traditions of it are still fresh, and many, it is to be supposed, on both sides, still retain the convictions then avowed, and hold fast to the positions then assumed. Under such circumstances, the great danger is, lest by precipitate or unguarded action we kindle the embers of the old strife into a flame throughout our churches and Presbyteries, and so prejudice and procrastinate the result desired. Just emerging from

one sea of troubles, we ought surely to hesitate, lest we plunge into another.

In order that the union between the two bodies, when formed, may be real and permanent, there must be a thorough understanding and hearty agreement between them, as to the chief issues on which they are divided. Nothing should be left ambiguous or indeterminate, to become the occasion of future misunderstanding and strife. It has seemed to the minority of your Committee that the basis of union, as found in the report before us, is not sufficiently detailed and explicit, and they are unwilling that it should go down to the churches, with the implied sanction of this Assembly, to which all look for guidance and instruction as over them in the Lord. The basis of union is reported to you expressly and formally for your action upon it, and it is the prerogative, as it seems to us, the imperative duty of this body, the highest court of the church, to express its judgment clearly and unequivocally, for the guidance of the Committee, and of the church at large, in their future deliberations.

With these views, the minority of your Committee, with great reluctance, but under the stress of convictions they dare not resist, have felt constrained to differ with the majority upon a single point—that of instructing the Committee appointed by the last Assembly and to be continued by the action of this. They heartily concur with the majority in their entire report, and adopt it as their own, and propose to add to it the following instructions to the Committee of Fifteen:

1. That they endeavour, if practicable, to secure a more clear and definite statement of the doctrinal basis. It is well known that the two parties differed in their interpretation of our doctrinal standards upon points which both considered vital, while both professed to receive them as containing “the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.” There is nothing in the basis as proposed in the first article to show in what sense, or in the sense of which party, or in what higher sense, which is supposed to harmonize both, our standards are to be interpreted. What is their true historical sense, is the very question to be settled. Both parties disclaim all the

extremes from which they are formally distinguished: if accepted by the two bodies in the same sense, then either can define that sense for the other, and there can be no possible difficulty in the way of agreement upon a clear and definite statement as to the main points at issue, particularly the great decisive doctrines of imputation, and the atonement as to its nature and extent.

2. As on the basis proposed, committee-men, *i. e.*, unordained men, are allowed to sit in all church courts except the General Assembly, the Committee are further instructed to secure, if possible, such an amendment or modification of the second article as will insure the speedy and thorough presbyterial organization of all the churches, and the admission of none but ordained ministers or elders to a seat in any church court.

3. The Committee are still further instructed to obtain, if possible, a distinct and formal recognition of the right and obligation of every Presbytery to be satisfied as to the soundness of every minister it receives. With these instructions the minority concur in the recommendation, that the Committee of Fifteen be continued as provided for in the report of the majority.

JOSEPH T. SMITH,

E. ANSON MORE.

The report of Dr. Smith was finally laid on the table by a vote of *ayes*, 152; *nays*, 64. On motion of Dr. J. I. Brownson, an additional resolution was unanimously adopted, in the following words:

Resolved, That in submitting the Report of the Committee on Reunion to the consideration of the churches and Presbyteries, the Assembly is not called upon at this time to express either approbation or disapprobation of the terms of reunion presented by the Committee in its details, but only to afford the church a full opportunity to examine the subject in the light of all its advantages and difficulties, so that the Committee may have the benefit of any suggestions which may be offered, before making a final report for the action of the next Assembly.

On motion of Rev. P. D. Young, the Moderator was requested to appoint a member of the Reunion Committee of Fifteen to fill the virtual vacancy occasioned by the illness of the Rev.

John M. Krebs, D. D. In accordance with this request, the Moderator appointed the Rev. J. E. Rockwell, D. D., of the Synod of New York.

The vote in favour of laying Dr. Smith's resolution on the table is not to be taken as indicating the opinion of the Assembly as to the programme of the Committee. Many voted for that motion, not because they disapproved of Dr. Smith's report, but because they thought this Assembly was not called upon to do anything more than to send out the report of the joint committee for the consideration of the churches. The unanimous adoption of Dr. Brownson's resolution shows that the Old-school General Assembly was not prepared for the surrender at discretion which the report of the joint committee calls upon it to make. General Lee, at Appomatox Court House, might as reasonably have called on General Grant to lay down his arms, and concede everything to the Southern secessionists for which we had been so earnestly contending. The surrender, at any rate, has not yet, we are thankful to say, been effected, and we greatly mistake the character of Presbyterians if the plan of the joint committee, when it comes to be understood, be not nearly unanimously rejected by our branch of the church. We speak only of the programme of the Committee. The question of reunion, in proper terms, is a different matter.

The Rev. Dr. Smith, in advocating the adoption of his report, avowed himself in favour of union with our New-school brethren and with other branches of the Presbyterian Church, but was anxious that such union be on principles consistent with our doctrines and obligations, and on conditions, which would produce harmony and efficiency. Of the plan of the Committee, he affirmed that "this basis of union surrenders every principle for which we and our fathers have been contending these last thirty years." To prove this, he reviewed the several articles of the proposed plan. First, as to the doctrinal basis, he showed that it leaves the matter just as it was. The New-school before the disruption professed to adopt the system of doctrines contained in our Confession of Faith; and they are willing to make the same profession now. But it is to be adopted in the "sense in which it is accepted by the two

bodies." But all the world knows that it was accepted by the New-school on the "broad church" principle, which allowed of what the Old-school conscientiously believed was the rejection of that system. Then, secondly, as to the admission of churches not presbyterially organized, the plan provides that such churches may be represented in all our courts except the General Assembly. As to the latter, it proposes "that only such persons shall be chosen commissioners as are eligible according to the constitution of the church." That is, it is proposed that the constitution shall be violated in all our courts except the highest. Honest men, who have vowed to sustain that constitution, are asked to assent to its violation. This, to say the least, is a most extraordinary proposition. Well might Dr. Smith say, "Never, never, will the Old-school Presbyterian Church give their consent to abjure all its convictions, thus to roll back the whole tide of its history, thus to renounce everything which had distinguished it as a religious body."

Another article provides for the appointment of a committee of seven by each body to revise the catalogue of the books published by the two churches, and no book is to be retained on the catalogue of publications to be issued by the united church, which is not approved by at least five members of each committee. Our Board of Publication have a thousand books on their catalogue; the New-school Committee have thirty on theirs. We are asked to agree that they should revise our list, and strike out every book which five of their committee may object to. Dr. Smith regards this as saying, "Brethren, whatever is not acceptable to you; whatever is not in accordance with the New-school theology, cast away."

Another article provides that the theological seminaries belonging to the Old-school shall be allowed to put themselves under the care of the Synods; and those belonging to the New-school, may, should they prefer it, remain close corporations. We invite them to take part in the control of our institutions for theological training, and consent that we shall have no control over theirs.

Once more, the proposed programme declares that "all ministers and churches in the two bodies shall be admitted to the same standing in the united body which they hold in their

respective bodies up to the consummation of the union. This Dr. Smith argued, does away with the constitutional and natural right of the Presbyteries to judge of the qualifications of their own members. Every Old-school Presbytery will be bound to receive without questioning any minister of any New School Presbytery, who may present himself with clean papers.

The Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, as might be expected from his antecedents, was opposed to this whole scheme of reunion. He said he did not intend to argue the case. In his view any such union was impossible. We cannot absorb a church as a whole. The only method of union between the two bodies was that its members individually should come in through the Presbyteries, as all the rest of us had come. He insisted also, that such an union as that proposed would work the forfeiture of all our endowments.

The Hon. S. Galloway, a member of the joint committee, spoke earnestly in favour of the plan. He urged the obvious practical advantages of reunion, and made very light of the objections which had been urged against it. The New-school, he maintained, were as orthodox as the Old-school, at least in Ohio; and as to the admission of Congregationalists into our church courts, that he regarded as a trifle.

The Rev. Mr. Marshall avowed himself opposed to the programme of the joint committee, but regarded all discussion of its merits as premature. It was not yet before the house. It is here only to be published to the churches. In the next Assembly the plan would come up on its merits.

Mr. H. K. Clarke, who also was a member of the joint committee, made a long and forcible speech against the proposed plan. He said the Committee had transcended its powers. It was appointed to ascertain whether a union with the New-school could be effected on the basis of agreement "in doctrine, polity, and order." Instead of this, the Committee propose a new basis, which provides for diversity in doctrine and order. The Old-school Committee did all they could to induce the Committee of the New-school to agree to the basis which they proposed, which intended to provide for agreement in doctrine and order. Every effort to that end was opposed, and what he regarded as the broad-church principle was insisted upon, and

finally conceded. Our Committee urged that the Confession should be adopted in its "obvious, fair, historical sense." They insisted that it should be adopted "in the sense in which it was received in both churches." It is however notorious that the one church has been strict in its construction of the Confession of Faith, and the other satisfied with its being adopted as to substance of doctrine. The result of the whole discussion in the joint committee, according to Mr. Clarke, was the adoption of the broad-church principle.

Another proposition from the Old-school Committee was, that no church, not presbyterially organized, should be represented in our church courts. This, although admitted to be just and reasonable, was, on the grounds of expediency, stricken out. Mr. Clarke also dwelt on the unfairness of the article relating to the Board of Publication, and showed that it allowed any three men on the New-school Committee to strike from the list any book they pleased. The same inequality characterizes the proposed plan as it regards our seminaries. Our Committee proposed that seminaries which are close corporations should be *requested* to place themselves under ecclesiastical control. Even this was denied; and it is simply said, they shall have the privilege of so doing. Mr. Clarke expressed his firm conviction that if this plan were adopted it would lead to a division of the church, and increased contention instead of harmony.

Dr. Gurley, the Moderator, was requested to explain the action of the joint committee as to the points to which Mr. Clarke had referred. As to the doctrinal basis, he said that between the extremes of Antinomianism and Fatalism on the one hand, and Arminianism and Pelagianism on the other, there is a system of doctrine known as Calvinism, and on that system the plan proposes that the two churches should unite. Anything more definite than this, he said, was unattainable and undesirable. As to the representation of Congregational churches in our courts, he admitted it to be irregular, but regarded it as only a temporary arrangement to be tolerated in order to secure a great good. In reference to the Board of Publication, he said the great mass of our books were as acceptable to our New-school brethren as ourselves. He did not believe that one in a hundred would be stricken out. As

to the seminaries, their hands were tied; all they could do was to intimate a preference for ecclesiastical control. "On the subject of presbyterial examinations," he said, "we had a long conference. Many of the New-school Committee (Dr. Adams among others) acknowledged that this right is among the inherent and inalienable rights of Presbytery. The only question is as to the *expediency* of exercising it. And so we leave the matter with the Presbyteries. I have never felt that it was wise to enjoin this rule upon Presbyteries. In our Presbytery we examine simply because the rule requires it, and the matter is pretty much one of form. It seems to me the wisest and best basis is to leave the matter with Presbyteries, and let them examine, if they please—and that is just where it is left in these terms of union. It was the usage to receive brethren with clean papers, and we now propose to return to the old usage, unless convictions of duty prevent.

"The Committee is not authorized to propose changes in the Constitution. If we are coming together, the changes can be made by the united church. Some change in the basis of representation in the Assembly will be necessary—and this, I think, will ultimately be made."

It will be observed that Dr. Gurley did not advert to any one of the great principles involved in this question. What he said, however, virtually terminated the debate, and Dr. Smith's report was laid on the table by the vote above stated.

The importance of the question submitted to the churches by the action of the last Assembly cannot be overestimated. It concerns our very existence. Not the existence of a Presbyterian church, but the existence of a church professing and acting upon the principles which have always distinguished us as an ecclesiastical body. We are called upon to renounce that in which our special identity consists. It is not a mere change of name. The term "Old-school" is not simply to be dropped before the word Presbyterian in our designation; but the historical reality known and revered as the Old School Presbyterian Church will cease to exist. Another body with different principles, as well as with a different name, will take its place. With the opponents of the proposed union it is therefore a matter of conscience. With its advocates it cannot be a matter

of conscience. It is a matter of expediency, or at most of sentiment.

With regard to the great body of those who advocate the reunion of the two great branches of the Presbyterian Church in this country, the obviously controlling consideration is the advantages to be expected from the union. These are great. They are patent. They affect pressing interests in the pecuniary or business operations of the church. Weak congregations would be able to combine. Energies worse than wasted in mutual opposition might be directed to common ends. Instead of presenting a divided front to others, and, in our view, more or less erroneous bodies, we should form an unbroken phalanx. The strength of the united body for good would be far greater than of either portion separately, or even of the whole as it now is. A great weight would be lifted from our public, and especially from our giving men. The number of shoulders added to the wheels of our system would cause them to revolve easily and rapidly. We should indeed be, in the eyes of the world, glorious as an army with banners. These considerations have deservedly great weight. They ought to produce an effect. They are specially operative in the minds of our laymen, who cannot be expected to take into view the doctrinal and ecclesiastical principles involved in the question. They say, "The clergy made the quarrel. We have nothing to do with it. If they are ready to stop fighting, so much the better. We are for peace and coöperation."

Others are influenced by principles true in themselves, but which are not applicable to the question which we are called upon to decide. They insist that the visible church ought to be one organization, that the seamless robe of Christ ought not to be rent; that sects are a great evil and a great wrong. All this may be readily admitted. The division of the inhabitants of the earth into different and conflicting nationalities is a great evil. It would be far better, if all men would dwell together as one family, under one father God, obeying his laws and promoting each other's interests. But how worse than Utopian would be any practical attempt to carry this scheme into operation. Fourierism is beautiful as a social theory; but what is it in its application in the actual state of the world? If all Christians

were really one—one in faith, one in their intelligent knowledge of the Scriptures, one in spirit, then they might be, and should be, externally one. But if in order to external union, we must renounce the truth; cease to profess it, not only individually, but collectively; then we sacrifice the substance for the shadow; the reality for the semblance; a living man for a wooden image. We violate conscience for expediency. We serve man rather than God. This is a question not as to what would be right in an ideal state of the church, but as to what is right in the actual condition of things; some men acting on one set of principles and another upon the opposite; one believing that the church should be ruled by bishops, others that prelates are usurpers of an unscriptural authority, and that God has committed the government of his church to presbyters; and others again, that all power is of divine right in the brotherhood. It is plainly impossible that republicans and monarchists can live and act harmoniously together. It is far better in the state that those who agree should act together, and live peaceably with others. So it is plainly impossible that Papists and Protestants, Prelatists and Independents, should form one harmonious ecclesiastical organization. If Old and New-school Presbyterian bodies agree, they should be united, but if they differ in what both conscientiously believe and feel bound to carry out into practice, then they must either sacrifice their consciences, or remain asunder.

There is another false stand-point taken by the advocates of this union. They contemplate the matter as though there were no distinct Christian churches with their peculiar creeds and constitutional rules. They speak as though they were dealing with the subject *in thesi*; and discussing the question, On what principles should the disciples of Christ be externally organized? Should it be on a broad doctrinal platform, such, as the Apostles' Creed, which would allow all Christians to be merged in one ecclesiastical organization. This broadest of broad church principle is openly advocated even by some Old-school men. They would have the absolutely essential doctrines of Christianity, and nothing more, made the doctrinal basis of church-union.

Now, admitting that this would be scriptural and wise, it is

not the question we have to deal with. We are not called upon to decide what would have been the wisest course for the church in the first centuries. We may admit that it was narrow-minded bigotry to frame a stricter creed than that of the apostles—that the determinations of the Councils of Nice, Chalcedon, and Constantinople, were unnecessary theological niceties. Few indeed will be latitudinarian enough to take this ground, or will undertake to censure the church for repudiating the followers of Pelagius, who could with good conscience repeat the Creed, the Lord's prayer, and the Ten Commandments. But admitting that the church has ever been wrong in resisting heresy, still it is not now the question what would have been right centuries ago, but what is right under the existing state of things. How are churches professing distinct and opposite systems of doctrine and order to come together in one ecclesiastical organization? The only honest answer to this question is, Let them alter their creeds—let them strike from their confessions everything distinctive, retaining only what is common to all Christians, or at least to all Protestants. There would be honesty and fair dealing in this. But this is not what the advocates of union have ventured to propose. What is practically advocated is, that men believing one creed should profess another; or that those who do not adopt a certain system, should avow before God and man that they do adopt it. We have a distinctive system of doctrine presented in our standards, the proposal is that we should agree that all who adopt the Apostles' Creed should be allowed to say that they adopt the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession. Others do not go quite so far. They, however, insist that men should be allowed to say they adopt our system, who notoriously do not adopt it. It is not a new creed, but a latitudinarian principle of subscription which is now urged upon us. It is a revival of the doctrine of the famous Oxford Tract, No. 90, which asserted the propriety of signing a creed in a “non-natural sense.”

We would not knowingly or willingly do injustice to any of our brethren. But this is actually the doctrine advocated in some of our public papers, Old-school as well as New-school; and what is more to the point, this is the very principle which

constitutes the sum and substance of the Plan of Union proposed in the report of the Joint Committee of Fifteen. We are well aware that it is not so understood by many who signed that report; nor by many who advocate its adoption. Nevertheless it is its true import and spirit, and this we will endeavour as briefly as possible to demonstrate.

Every minister at his ordination is required to declare that he adopts the Westminster Confession and Catechism, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the sacred Scriptures. There are three ways in which these words have been, and still are, interpreted. First, some understand them to mean that every proposition contained in the Confession of Faith is included in the profession made at ordination. Secondly; others say that they mean just what the words import. What is adopted is the "system of doctrine." The system of the Reformed churches is a known and admitted scheme of doctrine, and that scheme, nothing more or less, we profess to adopt. The third view of the subject is, that by the system of doctrine contained in the Confession is meant the essential doctrines of Christianity and nothing more.

As to the first of these interpretations it is enough to say, 1. That it is not the meaning of the words. There are many propositions contained in the Westminster Confession which do not belong to the integrity of the Augustinian, or Reformed system. A man may be a true Augustinian or Calvinist, and not believe that the Pope is the Antichrist predicted by St. Paul; or that the 18th chapter of Leviticus is still binding. 2. Such a rule of interpretation can never be practically carried out, without dividing the church into innumerable fragments. It is impossible that a body of several thousand ministers and elders should think alike on all the topics embraced in such an extended and minute formula of belief. 3. Such has never been the rule adopted in our church. Individuals have held it, but the church as a body never has. No prosecution for doctrinal error has ever been attempted or sanctioned, except for errors which were regarded as involving the rejection, not of explanations of doctrines, but of the doctrines themselves. For example, our Confession teaches the doctrine of original sin. That doctrine is essential to the Reformed or Calvinistic

system. Any man who denies that doctrine, thereby rejects the system taught in our Confession, and cannot with a good conscience say that he adopts it. Original sin, however, is one thing; the way in which it is accounted for, is another. The doctrine is, that such is the relation between Adam and his posterity, that all mankind, descending from him by ordinary generation, are born in a state of sin and condemnation. Any man who admits this, holds the doctrine. But there are at least three ways of accounting for this fact. The scriptural explanation as given in our standards is, that the "covenant being made with Adam not only for himself, but also for his posterity, all mankind, descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him, in his first transgression." The fact that mankind fell into that estate of sin and misery in which they are born, is accounted for in the principle of representation. Adam was constituted our head and representative, so that his sin is the judicial ground of our condemnation and of the consequent loss of the Divine image, and of the state of spiritual death in which all men come into the world. This, as it is the scriptural, so it is the church view of the subject. It is the view held in the Latin and Lutheran, as well as in the Reformed Church, and therefore belongs to the church catholic. Still it is not essential to the doctrine. Realists admit the doctrine, but unsatisfied with the principle of representative responsibility, assume that humanity as a generic life acted and sinned in Adam, and, therefore, that his sin is the act, with its demerit and consequences, of every man in whom that generic life is individualized. Others, accepting neither of these solutions, assert that the fact of original sin (*i. e.*, the sinfulness and condemnation of man at birth) is to be accounted for in the general law of propagation. Like begets like. Adam became sinful, and hence all his posterity are born in a state of sin, or with a sinful nature. Although these views are not equally scriptural, or equally in harmony with our Confession, nevertheless they leave the doctrine intact, and do not work a rejection of the system of which it is an essential part.

So also of the doctrine of inability. That man is by the fall rendered utterly indisposed, opposite, and disabled to all spiritual good, is a doctrine of the Confession as well as of

Scripture. And it is essential to the system of doctrine embraced by all the Reformed church. Whether men have plenary power to regenerate themselves; or can coöperate in the work of their regeneration; or can effectually resist the converting grace of God, are questions which have separated Pelagians, the later Romanists, Semi-Pelagians, Lutherans, and Arminians, from Augustinians or Calvinists. The denial of the inability of fallen man, therefore, of necessity works the rejection of Calvinism. But if the fact be admitted, it is not essential whether the inability be called natural or moral; whether it be attributed solely to the perverseness of the will, or to the blindness of the understanding. These points of difference are not unimportant; but they do not affect the essence of the doctrine.

Our Confession teaches that God foreordains whatever comes to pass; that he executes his decrees in the works of creation and providence; that his providential government is holy, wise, and powerful, controlling all his creatures and all their actions; that from the fallen mass of men, he has from all eternity, of his mere good pleasure, elected some to everlasting life; that by the incarnation and mediatorial work of his eternal Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the effectual working of his Spirit, he has rendered the salvation of his people absolutely certain; that the reason why some are saved and others not, is not the foresight of their faith and repentance, but solely because he has elected some and not others, and that in execution of his purpose, in his own good time, he sends them the Holy Spirit, who so operates on them as to render their repentance, faith, and holy living absolutely certain. Now it is plain that men may differ as to the mode of God's providential government, or the operations of his grace, and retain the facts which constitute the essence of this doctrinal scheme. But if any one teaches that God cannot effectually control the acts of free agents without destroying their liberty; that he cannot render the repentance or faith of any man certain; that he does all he can to convert every man, it would be an insult to reason and conscience, to say that he held the system of doctrine which embraces the facts and principles above stated.

The same strain of remark might be made in reference to the

other great doctrines which constitute the Augustinian system. Enough, however, has been said to illustrate the principle of interpretation for which Old-school men contend. We do not expect that our ministers should adopt every proposition contained in our standards. This they are not required to do. But they are required to adopt the system; and that system consists of certain doctrines, no one of which can be omitted without destroying its identity. Those doctrines are, the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and the consequent infallibility of all their teachings;—the doctrine of the Trinity, that there is one God subsisting in three persons, the Father, Son, and Spirit, the same in substance and equal in power and glory; the doctrine of decrees and predestination as above stated; the doctrine of creation, viz., that the universe and all that it contains is not eternal, is not a necessary product of the life of God, is not an emanation from the divine substance, but owes its existence as to substance and form solely to his will;—and in reference to man that he was created in the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, and not *in puris naturalibus*, without any moral character;—the doctrine of providence, or that God effectually governs all his creatures and all their actions, so that nothing comes to pass which is not in accordance with his infinitely wise, holy, and benevolent purposes;—the doctrine of the covenants; the first, or covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience; and the second, or covenant of grace, wherein God freely offers unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him that they may be saved, and promising to give unto all who are ordained unto life, his Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe;—the doctrine concerning Christ our Mediator, ordained of God to be our prophet, priest, and king, the head and Saviour of his church, the heir of all things, and judge of the world, unto whom he did, from eternity give a people to be his seed, to be by him in time redeemed, called, justified, sanctified, and glorified, and that the eternal Son of God, of one substance with the Father, took upon him man's nature, so that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the

Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion; that this Lord Jesus Christ, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father; and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven for all those whom the Father hath given to him;—the doctrine of free will, viz., that man was created not only a free agent, but with full ability to choose good or evil, and by that choice determine his future character and destiny; that by the fall he has lost this ability to spiritual good; that in conversion God by his Spirit enables the sinner freely to repent and believe;—the doctrine of effectual calling, or regeneration, that those, and those only whom God has predestinated unto life, he effectually calls by his word and Spirit from a state of spiritual death to a state of spiritual life, renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining their wills, thus effectually drawing them to Christ; yet so that they come most freely;—and that this effectual calling is of God's free and special grace alone, not from any thing foreseen in man;—the doctrine of justification, that it is a free act, or act of grace on the part of God; that it does not consist in any subjective change of state, nor simply in pardon, but includes a declaring and accepting the sinner as righteous; that it is founded not on anything wrought in us or done by us; not on faith or evangelical obedience, but simply on what Christ has done for us, *i. e.*, in his obedience and sufferings unto death; this righteousness of Christ being a proper, real, and full satisfaction to the justice of God, his exact justice and rich grace are glorified in the justification of sinners;—the doctrine of adoption, that those who are justified are received into the family of God, and made partakers of the spirit and privileges of his children;—the doctrine of sanctification, that those once regenerated by the Spirit of God are, by his power and indwelling, in the use of the appointed means of grace, rendered more and more holy, which work, although always imperfect in this life, is perfected at death;—the doctrine of saving faith, that it is the gift of God, and work of the Holy Spirit, by which the Christian receives as true, on the authority of God, whatever is revealed in his word, the special

acts of which faith are the receiving and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life;—the doctrine of repentance, that the sinner out of the sight and sense, not only of the danger, but the odiousness of sin, and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, does with grief and hatred of his own sins, turn from them unto God, with full purpose and endeavour after new obedience;—the doctrine of good works, that they are such only as God has commanded; that they are the fruits of faith; such works, although not necessary as the ground of our justification, are indispensable, in the case of adults, as the uniform products of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers;—the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, that those once effectually called and sanctified by the Spirit, can never totally or finally fall from a state of grace, because the decree of election is immutable, because Christ's merit is infinite, and his intercession constant; because the Spirit abides with the people of God; and because the covenant of grace secures the salvation of all who believe;—the doctrine of assurance; that the assurance of salvation is desirable, possible, and obligatory, but is not of the essence of faith;—the doctrine of the law, that it is a revelation of the will of God, and a perfect rule of righteousness; that it is perpetually obligatory on justified persons as well as others, although believers are not under it as a covenant of works;—the doctrine of Christian liberty, that it includes freedom from the guilt of sin, the condemnation of the law, from a legal spirit, from the bondage of Satan and dominion of sin, from the world and ultimately from all evil, together with free access to God as his children. Since the advent of Christ, his people are freed also from the yoke of the ceremonial law. God alone is the Lord of the conscience, which he has set free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in anything contrary to his word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship;—the doctrines concerning worship and the Sabbath, concerning vows and oaths, of the civil magistrate, of marriage, contain nothing peculiar to our system, or which is matter of controversy among Presbyterians. The same is true as to what the Confession teaches concerning the church, of the communion of saints, of the sacraments, and of the future state,

and of the resurrection of the dead, and of the final judgment.

That such is the system of doctrine of the Reformed church is a matter of history. It is the system which, as the granite formation of the earth, underlies and sustains the whole scheme of truth as revealed in the Scriptures, and without which all the rest is as drifting sand. It has been from the beginning the life and soul of the church, taught explicitly by our Lord himself, and more fully by his inspired servants, and always professed by a cloud of witnesses in the church. It has moreover ever been the esoteric faith of true believers, adopted in their prayers and hymns, even when rejected from their creeds. It is this system which the Presbyterian Church is pledged to profess, to defend, and to teach; and it is a breach of faith to God and man if she fails to require a profession of this system by all those whom she receives or ordains as teachers and guides of her people. It is for the adoption of the Confession of Faith in this sense that the Old-school have always contended as a matter of conscience.

There has, however, always been a party in the church which adopted the third method of understanding the words "system of doctrine," in the ordination service, viz., that they mean nothing more than the essential doctrines of religion or of Christianity.

That such a party has existed is plain, 1. Because in our original Synod, President Dickinson and several other members openly took this ground. President Dickinson was opposed to all human creeds; he resisted the adoption of the Westminster Confession, and he succeeded in having it adopted with the ambiguous words, "as to all the essential principles of religion." This may mean the essential principles of Christianity, or the essential principles of the peculiar system taught in the Confession. 2. This mode of adopting the Confession gave rise to immediate and general complaint. 3. When President Davies was in England, the latitudinarian Presbyterians and other dissenters from the established church, from whom he expected encouragement and aid in his mission, objected that our Synod had adopted the Westminster Confession in its strict meaning. President Davies replied that the Synod required candidates to

to adopt it only as to "the articles essential to Christianity."* 4. The Rev. Mr. Creaghead, member of the original Synod, withdrew from it on the ground of this lax rule of adoption. 5. The Rev. Mr. Harkness, when suspended from the ministry by the Synod for doctrinal errors, complained of the injustice and inconsistency of such censure, on the ground that the Synod required the adoption only of the essential doctrines of the gospel, no one of which he had called in question.

While it is thus apparent that there was a party in the church who adopted this latitudinarian principle of subscription, the Synod itself never did adopt it. This is plain, 1. Because what we call the adopting act, and which includes the ambiguous language in question, the Synod call "their preliminary act," *i. e.*, an act preliminary to the actual adoption of the Westminster Confession. That adoption was effected in a subsequent meeting (on the afternoon of the same day), in which the Confession was adopted in all its articles, except what in the thirty-third chapter related to the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion. This is what the Synod itself called its adopting act. 2. In 1730 the Synod unanimously declared that they required all "intrants" to adopt the Confession as fully as they themselves had done. A similar declarative act of their meaning was passed in 1736. Again, in the reply to the complaints of Messrs. Creaghead and Harkness, it was asserted that the Synod never intended that the Confession should be adopted only in those articles essential to Christianity. 3. Over and over again at different periods—in the negotiations for the union of the Synod of Philadelphia and that of New York and New Jersey, both parties declared their adhesion to the whole system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession. The same thing was done in the correspondence of our Synod with that of the Dutch Reformed Church, and in their letter to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in which that body was assured that we had the same standard of doctrine as they had. 4. Finally, when in 1787 the General Assembly was organized, it was solemnly declared that the Westminster Confession of Faith, as then

* See Gillett's History of the Presbyterian Church, vol. i. p. 130.

revised and corrected, was part of the CONSTITUTION of this church. No man has ever yet maintained that in adopting a Republican constitution, it was accepted only as embracing the general principles of government, common to monarchies, aristocracies, and democracies.*

The Old-school have always protested against this broad-church principle, 1. Because in their view it is immoral. For a man to assert that he adopts a Calvinistic confession when he rejects the distinctive features of the Calvinistic system, and receives only the essential principles of Christianity, is to say what is not true in the legitimate and accepted meaning of the terms. It would be universally recognized as a falsehood should a Protestant declare that he adopted the canons of the Council of Trent, or the Romish Catechism, when he intended that he received them only so far as they contained the substance of the Apostles' Creed. If the church is prepared to make the Apostles' Creed the standard of ministerial communion, let the constitution be altered; but do not let us adopt the demoralizing principle of professing ourselves, and requiring others to profess, what we do not believe.

2. A second objection to the lax rule of interpretation is that it is contrary to the very principle on which our church was founded, and on which, as a church, it has always professed to act.

3. The Old-school has always believed that it was the duty of the church, as a witness for the truth, to hold fast that great system of truth which in all ages has been the faith of the great body of the people of God, and on which, as they believe, the best interests of the church and of the world depend.

4. This lax principle must work the relaxation of all discipline, destroy the purity of the church, and introduce either perpetual conflict or deathlike indifference.

5. There always has been, and still is, a body of men who feel it their duty to profess and teach the system of doctrine contained in our Confession in its integrity. These men never can consent to what they believe to be immoral and destructive, and therefore any attempt to establish this broad-church prin-

* On these subjects see the *Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church*, by Charles Hodge, vol. i. chap. 3.

ciple of subscription must tend to produce dissension and division. Either let our faith conform to our creed, or make our creed conform to our faith. Let those who are convinced that the Apostle's Creed is a broad enough basis for church organization, form a church on that principle; but do not let them attempt to persuade others to sacrifice their consciences, or advocate the adoption of a more extended formula of faith which is not to be sincerely embraced.

The next point to be established in this exposition is, That the New-school branch of the Presbyterian church in this country have practically adopted, and still hold, this lax principle against which the Old-school have always protested.

This is not a question concerning the faith of our New-school brethren as a class, but simply as to a rule of church action. We fully believe that a very large part, perhaps a great majority of those brethren, sincerely adopt the system of doctrine contained in our standards, and that they understood themselves to profess that faith at their ordination. But what we hold to be undeniably true as a matter of history, is that the New-school church do not, and never have required the adoption of that system as the condition of admission to their ministry. In proof of this position we appeal—1. To the fact already mentioned. It has been shown that a party existed in the original Synod who desired the doctrinal basis to be, as expressed in the adopting act (so called,) "essential and necessary articles;" "essential and necessary articles of faith." If a Presbytery deemed "the scruples or mistakes (of a candidate for reception into our ministry) to be about articles not essential and necessary in doctrine, worship, or government," he was to be admitted.

This was interpreted to mean "articles or doctrines essential to Christianity." This mode of adopting the Confession, is pronounced, by the Rev. E. H. Gillett, a compromise, in which the stricter Presbyterians yielded much to the New England, English, and Welsh members of the Synod. He says, further, that the Synod in 1736 endeavoured to put a construction on the Adopting Act which it would not bear." That construction, in the language of the Synod of 1736, is "that they adopted the Confession of Faith and Catechism to be the con-

fession of their faith, except only some clauses in the twentieth and twenty-third chapters," which relate to the civil magistrate. These are precisely the words used by the Synod in their real adopting act in 1729. The interpretation which the Synod repudiated was that put upon the language of their preliminary act, (commonly called the Adopting Act itself,) by Presidents Dickenson, Davies, and others, that by "essential and necessary doctrines" are to be understood doctrines "essential to Christianity," and not doctrines essential to the Calvinistic system. These were the two methods of interpretation about which the contention arose. The Synod gave the stricter construction, which, as we understand him, Mr. Gillett says the act will not bear. He further says that the Adopting Act, (as he interprets it,) in spite of this action of the Synod, "still stood as the fundamental and constitutional basis of the Synod, and no possible *interpretation* could supersede it." (*History of the Presbyterian Church*, vol. i. chap. 4.)* Of the two methods of adopting the Confession which disturbed the original Synod, this work of Mr. Gillett, published officially by the New-school Presbyterian Publication Committee, advocates the lax principle as the fundamental and constitutional basis of the church. The New-school as a church is thus committed to this broad-church principle.

2. It is well known by all familiar with the controversy attending the disruption in 1837, '38, that this was the grand point of difference between the New and Old-school parties. The one contending that the Confession was to be adopted as "to substance of doctrine" only; the other insisted upon its

* The Synod in 1736 say that they did at first adopt and still adhere to the Westminster Confession, Catechisms, and Directory, "without the least variation or alteration, and without any regard to said distinctions," *i. e.*, the distinctions which had been complained of. This Mr. Gillett says was not true. It certainly is not true that the Synod adopted the Confession literally without "the least variation;" for they distinctly excepted parts of the twentieth and twenty-third chapters. What the Synod, however, intended by their language is true—and that is, that they did not intend to distinguish between the articles essential to Christianity and those not essential to it. This was the distinction complained of. This they repudiated. That this is their true meaning, is plain from the cotemporary history of the controversy; from the explanation which they give of the Act of 1736, by quoting the Act of 1729; and from the whole subsequent history of the church.

strict adoption, as containing "the system of doctrine" held by the Reformed churches.

3. The decisive proof however, that the New-school, as a church, do adopt this lax principle, is to be found in the following facts. First, before the division of the church as a party, they uniformly and strenuously resisted the exercise of discipline in reference to doctrines notoriously inconsistent with the Calvinistic system. The Old-school, although averse to the modified Calvinism of New England, as represented by such men as the late Drs. Richards and Griffin, of Newark, New Jersey, and many others who agreed with them; and although still more averse to the hyper-Calvinism of the Hopkinsians, never desired that men adopting those views should be excluded from the ministry in our church. It was not until the rise of Taylorism, or, as it was called in New England, the New Divinity, that it was felt that fidelity to our standards demanded the intervention of church authority.

Every one knows that the fundamental principles of the New Divinity are, 1. That ability limits obligation, and therefore, as man has power only over deliberate acts of the will, all sin consists in the deliberate violation of known law. Hence, there can be no moral character before moral action, and no moral action until there is such a development of reason and conscience, as is the necessary condition of moral agency. If this be so, there can be no hereditary, sinful corruption of nature; and original sin, in the universally accepted meaning of that term, is an impossibility. Here we have, not an explanation of the doctrine that men are born in a state of sin and condemnation, but a bold denial of the doctrine itself. But the denial of that doctrine is the rejection, not only of the theology of the Reformed churches, but of that of the whole Christian church. 2. A second principle is, that a free agent can always act in opposition to any amount of influence which can be brought to bear upon him, short of that which destroys his freedom. In other words, absolute certainty is inconsistent with free agency. From this it follows, that God cannot control the acts of free agents in a moral system. If this be so, there can be no efficacious grace; and no purpose of election, because there is no power to carry that purpose into effect; regenera-

tion becomes, and is avowed to be, not an act of God, of which the soul is the subject, but an act of the sinner himself.

It is on the ground of the principle just mentioned the New Divinity vindicates God in the permission of sin. He cannot prevent its occurrence in a moral system. He does all he can to prevent all sin, to convert all men, to save every human being. It would be a waste of time to prove that these principles are inconsistent with Calvinism. Words must lose their meaning before there can be any dispute on this point. Unless Augustine was a Pelagian, no man holding the above principles can believe the system of doctrine taught in the Westminster Confession. 3. A third fundamental principle of the New Divinity is, that a regard to our own happiness is the ground of moral obligation. We are bound to do whatever gives us most enjoyment. Our whole allegiance is to ourselves. If serving the world, sin, or Satan, would make us happier than serving God, we should be bound to serve sin. This is the system which the eminently devoted Dr. Nettleton spent the later years of his life in denouncing and opposing.

It is an historical fact that the New-school as a party resisted the exercise of discipline in reference to these doctrines; that they not only refused to censure those charged with holding them, on the ground that the charge was not sustained, but they refused to allow the doctrines themselves to be condemned. It is further notorious, that they freely ordained or received into their Presbyteries men who did not hesitate to avow their adhesion to these principles. It was this more than anything else which roused the church to resist the encroachment of errors which threatened its existence; just as the Dred Scott decision and the attempt to force slavery on Kansas, roused the country to resist the encroachments of the slave power.

A second fact which proves the point in hand is, that since the separate organization of the New-school, the advocates of the New Divinity have been freely admitted and ordained. In no case has any censure been pronounced against their peculiar views, and in no case have their advocates been subjected to discipline. Yet it is undeniable, and we presume universally admitted, that these doctrines are publicly avowed and taught by not a few of their ministers.

A third fact is, as Mr. Hovey K. Clarke stated on the floor of the Assembly, the New-school Committee on Reunion strenuously resisted any such statement of the doctrinal basis as would exclude the teachers of these doctrines. Nothing would have been easier than to place this matter in a form which precluded honest misinterpretation. We know Dr. Bushnell has said that such is the chemistry of thought, that any form of words can be interpreted to mean anything; and that another distinguished man has said he could sign any creed any of his opponents could write. These, however, are moral idiosyncrasies. The great majority of good men at least act on the principles of common honesty. As it is known that the original and main dispute between the Old and New-school related to the principle of subscription, it would have been easy to stipulate, 1. Negatively, that the Confession was not to be adopted only as to the necessary or essential doctrines of religion; and 2. Affirmatively, that it was to be received in each and every article belonging to the Calvinistic or Augustinian system, as that system is set forth in the common standards of our church. What that system is, is just as certain as what Popery or Lutheranism is. Instead of anything thus definite, the programme, as submitted to the Assembly, proposes that the Confession should be adopted in the sense in which it is received in both branches of the church. This refusal to be definite, and this insisting on ambiguity, is proof enough that the parties are not agreed as to the terms of subscription; or rather, that it was agreed to concede to the New-school their lax principle of interpretation.

A fourth fact bearing on this point is, that whereas before the report of the committee, strong opposition to union was manifested in the New-school body, as soon as it was seen that the Old-school had surrendered every thing, the proposed plan was adopted by an unanimous vote in the New-school Assembly. What does this mean? Why it means they have sense enough to see that we have abandoned our principles and adopted theirs; and they are of course willing to receive us as repentant sinners. This has been openly proclaimed by their distinguished speakers; and one of their Presbyteries has formally resolved that it is, and must be understood that men

holding the doctrines of Dr. Taylor and Prof. Park are to be received in the united church as of undoubted orthodoxy.

We repeat what we have already said. We are not labouring to prove the prevalence of heresy in the New-school church. We know many of their ministers whom it would be an honour to any church to count among its members. We are willing to receive as true whatever can be even plausibly said as to the general orthodoxy of our New-school brethren. Let this be admitted. It does not touch the question. That question relates to a rule of church action, viz., the principle which is to govern the united church in receiving and ordaining ministers of the gospel. Shall every man who denies any one of the great constituent elements or doctrines of the Calvinistic system be excluded from the ministry in our church? Or, shall we admit men who deny the doctrine of original sin; of inability; of sovereign election to holiness and eternal life; the perseverance of the saints; the doctrine of the atonement as a true and proper expiation for the guilt of sin and a real satisfaction to the law and justice of God, and who represent it as merely didactic, moral, or symbolical in its design and influence? This is the question, and it is one which concerns our life.

We have no belief that any honest Old-school man can approve of the proposed plan of union, if he regarded it in the light in which we have presented it. And still further, we do not believe that there is any real difference among us, as to the principles set forth in the foregoing pages. The difference is not concerning principles, but simply a matter of fact. Those who have assented to this plan of union admit that the Old-school principle of subscription is right, and ought to be adopted in the united church, but they say the New-school have adopted it, and *therefore*, and on that understanding, they are in favour of the union. They have been led into this serious mistake because the New-school members of the committee assured them that as for themselves they did adopt the Confession as we do. This we doubt not is true as to them individually, but it is as clear as day that it is not true of the New-school as a church. This being the case, union with that church, on the proposed programme, would be the renunciation of a principle

to which the Old-school are pledged in honour, in conscience, and by solemn vows.

As to the other great point in controversy, the admission of Congregationalists to sit as members of our church courts, little need be said. It is admitted to be unconstitutional; but it is urged that it is a limited and temporary evil, and ought not to stand in the way of a union which promises such advantages. But the question is, Is it right? Is it right for a church deliberately to violate a constitution which it is solemnly pledged to support? In 1837 the Old-school abolished the old Plan of Union with Congregationalists, on the ground that it was unconstitutional. They justified the excising acts on the ground that it was against their conscience to allow Congregationalists to sit as members of Presbyterian judicatories. Are they now willing to disgrace themselves in their own eyes and in the eyes of all other men, by saying this was a false pretence? If conscience forbade it then, it forbids it now. And it ought not to be done. It is a great mistake to regard this as a small evil. Every moral wrong is a great evil. And that it is morally wrong for men deliberately to violate a constitution which they have vowed to support, admits of no dispute. Suppose it were proposed to allow a British peer to sit as a member of the United States Senate. It might be said it was a small matter, only one member out of sixty-four, and that his presence could do no harm. In one sense this may be true. He might be the wisest and most useful member of the body; nevertheless his admission would shake the very foundations of the government. We cannot believe that our church will ever be brought to assent to a plan of union which involves the surrender of the great principles which we have conscientiously adopted, and to which we stand pledged before God and man.

If the view of this subject given above be correct, it necessarily follows that the Old-school would be guilty not only of a great moral wrong should it accept of the proposed plan of union, but would forfeit the moral right to all endowments, whether of churches, or boards, or seminaries. Those endowments were given to a church professing certain principles, and pledged to support them. If those principles be abandoned, the

moral right to the endowments ceases to exist. We say nothing of the legal question. That is beyond our province. But if property be given to a body pledged to require of its ministers sincere faith in the grand old scriptural Augustinian theology, which has ever been the fountain of life and strength, all moral right to the property is gone, if that body becomes latitudinarian, admitting to its ministry men to whom that theology is a jest or an offence.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Poetical Books of the Holy Scriptures, with a Critical and Explanatory Commentary, by the Rev. A. R. Fausset, A. M., Rector, St. Cuthbert's, York, England, and Rev. B. M. Smith, D. D., Professor of Oriental Literature and Biblical Instruction, in Union Theological Seminary, Va. Philadelphia. 1867.

This brief commentary is marvellously compact and is often almost epigrammatic in its terseness. It is suggestive rather than exhaustive, yet it contains more than might have been imagined from its diminutive size. The plan upon which it is constructed, of giving a page of commentary opposite to each page of text, has embarrassed its preparation without promoting the convenience of its readers, for the proposed correspondence has not in actual fact been preserved, and could not be without a detriment far greater than the advantage to be gained. Nevertheless, with this drawback, which is chiefly one of mechanical arrangement, it will serve a valuable purpose and meet the wants of a large class of readers who have not leisure nor inclination to consult more extended commentaries, and who wish to arrive at the meaning of the sacred writers by as direct a route as possible. The exposition of the Psalms in particular is admirably executed. That of Job would probably have been improved, if the writer had consulted some of the later continental commentaries, as those of Hahn, Schlottmann, and others.

The whole is evangelical and spiritual, and a fair measure of attention is paid to whatever is typical and Messianic. In the Song of Solomon, confessedly, one of the most difficult books in the Bible to expound satisfactorily, the Messianic interpreta-

tion is pushed to an extreme. It is divided into five canticles, which are supposed to relate successively to as many distinct periods in chronological order, from the times of the Old Testament to the end of the world. The first canticle, i. 2—ii. 7, is referred to the period preceding the advent, it is the bride searching for, and finding her king; the second, ii. 8—iii. 5, to John the Baptist's ministry; the third, iii. 6—v. 1, to the ministry of Christ on earth, the bridegroom with the bride; the fourth, v. 2—viii. 4, extends from the agony of Gethsemane to the conversion of Samaria; the fifth, viii. 5, 14, from the calling of the Gentiles to the close of revelation. The Song begins with longing for Christ's first coming, and ends with praying for his second coming.

The Fatherhood of God, being the first course of the Cunningham Lectures delivered before the New College, Edinburgh, in March, 1864. By Robt. S. Candlish, D.D., with a Reply to Professor Crawford's Strictures, and a notice of other objections. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. 1867. Pp. 389.

The Fatherhood of God considered in its general aspects, and particularly in relation to the Atonement, with a review of recent speculations on the subject. By Thomas J. Crawford, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. Second edition, revised and enlarged, with a Reply to the Strictures of Dr. Candlish. William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1867.

These are two of the most important theological works which Scotland has recently produced. Their authors are eminent men—the subjects discussed are of vital interest, and the ability with which the discussion is conducted is worthy of the high standing of the parties engaged in it. As Dr. Crawford's book has just come into our hands, we are in no position to express the opinion, which, with our measure of light, we should be led to entertain of the points in dispute. We can, however, confidently commend both volumes to our readers, as replete with instruction.

Cyclopædium of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by Rev. John McClintock, D.D., and James Strong, LL.D., Vol. I. A, B. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1867. 8vo. Pp. 740.

This is a comprehensive work. Besides the topics directly indicated by the title-page, it is archæological and biographical. As it is to be completed in six volumes, with every effort at condensing, it cannot be so thorough as the more extended work of Hertzog, which is in nineteen volumes. It is, however, not only comprehensive, but learned. It evinces a wide research, and familiarity with the latest and best authorities. It is well arranged, and the matter is compressed into the smallest possible compass. Abundant references to the best sources of infor-

mation are given at the conclusion of every article. It is also candid and impartial in the discussion of controverted subjects. This is a great merit. Being written by Wesleyan Methodists, it bears, of necessity, the impress of its origin; but if prepared by Augustinians it would not be freer from the impress of their characteristic principles. We regard the work, therefore, as giving promise of meeting a very widely extended and pressing demand. It is an honour to its compilers and to the church to which they belong.

The First Epistle of John expounded in a Series of Lectures. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D., Principal of the New College, and Minister of Free St. George's Church. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. 1866. Pp. 526.

This is not a merely practical and exegetical exposition of this epistle. It is as well a profound theological work, in which some of the deepest themes of religion are discussed. The natural relation between man and God, the relation as determined by redemption, and the relations of the subjects of this redemption to each other, are severally considered. Such subjects discussed by such a writer as Dr. Candlish must be an attraction of unusual interest to all the students of the Scriptures.

An Exposition of the Epistle of James, in a Series of Discourses. By Rev. John Adam, Free Church, Aberdeen. New York: Scribner, Welford & Co., 654 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 440.

The character of the Epistle of the apostle James determines the character of these lectures. As the apostle deals specially with the practical duties of the Christian, so these lectures are practical, rather than theological. This, however, is by no means a disparagement of their value.

The Progress of Development of Doctrine in the New Testament, considered in a course of eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford, on the Bampton Foundation. By Thomas Dehany Bernard, M. A., of Exeter College, and Rector of Walcot. From the second London edition, with improvements. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard & Co. 1867. Pp. 258.

By development in this volume is meant, not the unfolding of the germs of truth by a process of human speculation, but the progressive revelation of divine truth as contained in the writings of the New Testament. That there is such a progressive revelation in the Scriptures, taken as a whole, no one has ever doubted. And that this is true of the New Testament is made abundantly evident by the author of this work, if indeed it had ever been questioned. The exhibition of this subject, in a reverent spirit, is a matter of no small importance. The volume before us has been received with the very highest commendation.

The Doctrine of Justification. An Outline of its History in the Church, and its Exposition from Scripture. With special reference to recent attacks on the Theology of the Reformation. The second series of the "Cunningham Lectures." By James Buchanan, D. D., LL.D., Divinity Professor in New College, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. London: Hamilton & Co. Dublin: John Robertson & Co. 1867. Pp. 514.

The Scottish theological press has been unusually prolific during the past five and twenty years. Principals Cunningham, Fairbairn, Candlish, Drs. Crawford, Buchanan, the Rev. Henry Wallace, and others, have furnished contributions to sound theology which challenge competition with those furnished by any other portion of the Christian church. German research and speculation have roused the energies of the British mind, and we have abundant evidence that it is not the purpose of God to allow his truth to lack defenders able to cope with its most skilful opponents. The work of Dr. Buchanan on Justification takes its place among the foremost of these defences of sound doctrine, and as such we commend it to the attention of our readers.

Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. By Franz Delitsch, D. D., Professor of Theology. Translated from the German. By Rev. James Martin, B. A. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. London: Hamilton & Co. Dublin: John Robertson & Co. 1867. Pp. 461.

A System of Biblical Psychology. By Franz Delitsch, D. D. Translated from the German. Second edition, thoroughly revised and enlarged. By Rev. Robert Ernest Wallis, Phil. Dr., Senior Priest-Vicar of Wells Cathedral, &c. New York: Scribner, Welford & Co., 654 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 569.

Delitsch is a Hebrew by descent, a Christian by profession and conviction, among the first, if not the very first, of living Hebrew and Rabbinical scholars, thoroughly German in spirit and culture. No man can be more simple and scriptural in his defence of Christian doctrine, and no one indulge in more mystical speculative discursions. In the latter of the above works the reader will find illustration of the correctness of the above remark in both its parts. These volumes form a part of the valuable series of T. & T. Clark's valuable Foreign Theological Library.

Presbyterian Historical Almanac and Annual Remembrancer of the Church, for 1866. By Joseph M. Wilson. Vol. VIII. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson, No. 111 South Tenth St. 1866. Pp. 450.

We have frequently spoken of this Almanac of Mr. Wilson. Every volume is an improvement on those which precede it. It is becoming more and more important to the ministers and members of our church.

The Reign of Law. By the Duke of Argyle. Fifth Edition. Alexander Strahan, publisher, 56 Ludgate Hill, London. 1867.

The high themes treated in this series of essays, some of which had been previously given to the public in leading reviews, are: 1. The Supernatural. 2. Law; its Definitions. 3. Contrivance a Necessity arising out of the Reign of Law. 4. Apparent Exceptions to the Supremacy of Purpose. 5. Creation by Law. 6. Law in the Realm of Mind. 7. Law in Politics. They are handled in a style well worthy of a nobleman, who in this domain shows himself quite without a peer, at least among the nobility. The duke's style has that classic precision, force, and beauty, which result from a thorough mastery of the topics treated, combined with genuine literary and scientific culture, and especially, a clear apprehension of the issues arising between scientific scepticism and evangelical faith.

The first pages of the work betray the author's insight into one of the great subjects which has been much obscured by the crude definitions of brilliant, but uninformed and superficial writers. He sharply criticises Dr. Bushnell's definition of the supernatural as including all the changes brought about by "God, angels, or men" in the use and guidance of the laws of nature for the production of results, which these laws, without such use and guidance, could not of themselves produce. This makes the ordinary agency of the human will supernatural, and, of course, vacates this term of all significance in the great controversies relative to faith in a revealed and supernatural religion. The duke justly and forcibly says: "In all ordinary senses of the term, Man and his doings belong to the Natural, as distinguished from the Supernatural." This means not only what is above the powers of physical nature, but of man in any use he can make of these powers.

From this subject the transition to miracles is easy. The author is quite strenuous in maintaining that it is not of the essence of a miracle, that it be wrought in violation of, or antagonism to the laws of Nature. It is only essential that a use be made of, and results achieved through, these laws, which wholly transcend all human power, and evince a supernatural interposition. If with or without any use of the laws of nature, works be wrought in attestation of a divine message or messenger, clearly transcending human power, such works, he claims, are miracles. This is a region of no little difficulty. On the one hand, the supernatural, whether in miracles or the gracious operations of the Spirit on the soul, involves the immediate agency of God, over and above the mere forces of nature.

We have been accustomed to regard God's agency in Nature and Providence, as confined to upholding and guiding the forces and laws of Nature: in grace, as working above yet concurrently with them: in miracles, as not only above, but counter to them. We are aware that this distinction is not without its difficulties. No other theory, however, has so few. And there is a sense in which the laws of nature may be so set against each other as to counteract their natural working, and prevent their normal effects.

This volume is especially rich in its unfoldings and illustrations of the "reign of law" in the intricate and complex processes of nature. The third chapter, showing the necessity of contrivance arising out of the very dominion of law, in order to adjust different laws in those mutual relations and proportions requisite to the accomplishment of the great ongoings and results in nature, is one of the gems of the book. The marvellous illustrations discovered by our author in "the machinery of flight," as shown in a vast variety of birds, are most beautiful and convincing.

He deals some heavy blows at the development theories of Darwin, Huxley, and others, in the chapter on "Creation by Law," in which he maintains that creation no less than other procedures of God, however free, may nevertheless proceed according to fixed laws, and, in this sense, the universal reign of law is not inconsistent with the free creation of a personal God. He also proves that no mere evolution by natural laws and forces, could ever evolve new species, and otherwise exposes Darwin's fallacies.

Not the least interesting and weighty chapter is that relating to "Law in the realm of Mind." But it is liable to grave criticism. He has evidently been too greatly influenced by the late speculations of certain physicists in regard to the mutual correlation, convertibility, and essential identity of all forces, material and psychical. He asks: "Are we sure that the Forces which we call material are not, after all, but manifestations of mental energy or Will?...The more we know of Nature the more certain it appears that a multiplicity of separate forces does not exist, but that all her forces pass into each other, and are but modifications of some One Force which is the source and centre of the rest." This view, otherwise objectionable, we think leads the author to exaggerate the mind's dependence on the body and subjection to its laws, as also, at times, to confound in some measure the causality of the mind or will, with the nature of cause and effect in the physical world. It is true no less of mind than of matter, that

all events must have a cause. But each effect must have a cause suitable to its own kind. Moral effects are due to moral causes, to moral agents endowed with freedom and a moral faculty, as influenced by motives acting in a manner congruous with such freedom. The author seems to us to recognize the moral faculty more distinctly than freedom. But he nevertheless gives many fine proofs and illustrations of the great truth, that the only freedom possessed by mortals consists with certainty of actions, the prevalence of the strongest internal and external motives, and the potent influence of our physical, not less than our moral constitutions and surroundings, upon our actions, character, and destiny.

History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.
By John Anthony Froude, M. A. Vols. IX. X.; Reign of Elizabeth
Vols. III. IV. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

The successive volumes of this sterling work fully sustain the interest awakened by the first. For original and exhausting research, graphic delineation, and judicial accuracy and fairness, it has gained a foremost rank, while it sheds important light upon the country and period to which it relates.

The Tripartite Nature of Man, Spirit, Soul and Body, applied to illustrate and explain the Doctrines of Original Sin, the New Birth, the Disembodied State, and the Spiritual Body. By Rev. J. B. Heard, M. A.
Perpetual Curate of Bilton Harrogate. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1866.

This title-page sufficiently discloses the high range of topics discussed in the book before us. It not only runs into the profoundest topics in theology, but of metaphysics and psychology, as related to theology. The fundamental doctrine of the book, aside from its applications by our author, is among the most controverted and unsettled alike in philosophy and theology.

The author not only maintains the dualism of man's nature as composed of body and soul. He also maintains an equally broad distinction between soul and spirit, bringing to the support of this distinction some passages of Scripture, in which they appear to be used, if not in contrast, yet as mutually complementary—especially the *πνευμα*, *ψυχη*, and *σωμα* of the Apostle, 1 Thess. v. 23. While the author displays learning and acumen in the valuable contribution he has here made towards the elucidation of this subject, yet the very cursory glance we have been able to give to portions of his book, assures us that it will not answer to take his opinions upon trust, or without independent and searching examination. The following language seems to teach the doctrine of annihilation. "In that case, which we believe to be the case of the second death referred to in Revelation, *all consciousness and being must cease*

with the disruption of the tie which unites the higher and lower natures together." P. 107.

While the author teaches a trichotomy in human nature, he does not hold to three substances, but to three manifestations of one substance. "The only trichotomy which will stand the test of our advanced school of physiologists is this, that the bodily organism, the intellectual faculties, and that higher spiritual consciousness by which we know and serve God, are not separable natures, but separate manifestations of the one nature. That relation of the Persons of the Trinity which is called Sabellianism, is the best expression of that which we hold in regard to the nature of man." P. 110.

The author however, is no Sabellian with regard to the Trinity. The great doctrine of his book, aside of questionable applications and auxiliary theories, is, that man over and above the mere animal or psychical consciousness (*ψυχή*) common to him with the brute, has what he styles a "God consciousness" (*πνεύμα*), whereby he is capable of morality and religion. To this we do not object, if only it be understood, 1. That *ψυχή* and *πνεύμα* are often used interchangeably in Scripture to denote the whole immaterial conscious nature in man, [see Matt. xvi. 26, 1 Cor. vi. 20], and that therefore, in man they are not two substances, but diverse manifestations of one substance, the indivisible mind or rational soul of man, wherefore each is at times employed to denote that soul. 2. That body and spirit are two different substances and not merely different manifestations of the same substance, which, although, mysteriously united in man, are nevertheless not confounded or identified. Here then there is a real dichotomy in man, of soul and body. A trichotomy we only recognize to this extent, that the one immaterial soul in man has a rational, moral, and accountable nature which brutes have not.

Homespun: or Five and Twenty Years ago. By Thomas Lackland. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867. Princeton, for sale by Wm. S. Smith.

Twenty-five years ago is too recent a date for the age of "Homespun." We grew up amid the whirl and buzz of the hand-wheel in our parental home. But it was displaced by the spinning-jenny forty years ago. And the same may be said of the usages, manners, and ideas which the author undertakes to depict as peculiar to that age. They were becoming obsolete under the influence of machinery and steam, before the beginning of the last quarter of a century. As to the descriptions themselves, some of them are fair, and others are very indifferent representations of the habits, customs, and personages of the times to which they refer.

Representative Responsibility, a Law of the Divine Proceedure in Providence and Redemption. By the Rev. Henry Wallace, Londonderry. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1867.

In this able work a real and valuable service is rendered to the cause of sound doctrine and evangelical truth, at a point in which they are most widely misapprehended and bitterly impugned. It is shown by proofs most manifold and unanswerable, that the principle of representation runs through the entire constitution of human society, so that man can be a social being only as he acts for others, or is acted for by them. This great principle, therefore, is not peculiar to the two great heads of the race, the first and second Adam. It is not a device got up to explain the fall and recovery of man. It exists independently of, and anterior to, revelation, and pervades the constitution of nature and the administration of Providence. It is no more peculiar to scripture, no more the invention of theologians, than the depravity and debasement of our race, which are facts recognized, but not first revealed, in the Bible. Out of this principle flows the probation of our race in Adam, and the imputation of his sin to his posterity as represented in him; together with the imputation of the righteousness of the Second Adam to his people, and of their sins to him—doctrines clearly enunciated in the word, and underlying the gospel of God, yet by multitudes amazingly misconceived and hated.

These views are presented with great force by our author in this volume, which is well worthy of careful study.

We notice two points in which he varies from the accepted phraseology of Reformed theologians, and as it seems to us, without advantage to his cause. He objects to saying that sin entered by God's permission, as if this implied some Divine sanction or connivance. We do not see how this can be, or how we can escape this view, unless it be conceded that God was unable to prevent the entrance of sin. If he could prevent it, and did not, then he chose to permit it, not in the sense of approving or conniving at it, but of not preventing it for wise and holy reasons. "Even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight." In close affinity to this, he argues, as if the Divine prevention of Adam's sin when on trial would have involved some interference or coercion incompatible with free-agency. But if the effectual preventive of sin by Divine agency militates against free-agency, what becomes of efficacious grace, the perseverance of the saints, and the perpetual fealty and stability of the saints in heaven? We may well refrain from dogmatism here.

It is, however, but little that we except to in this timely volume. The representative characters of Adam and Christ, Original Sin, the Priesthood of Christ, Atonement, and the Witness of the Spirit, are admirably treated. This last topic is the subject of the concluding chapter. It well deserves to be struck off in a separate tract, not so much as a contribution to dogmatic theology, as for its practical utility, in removing injurious misconceptions in regard to the nature of religious experience.

Dictionary of the Bible. Parts II. and III. By Dr. William Smith. American edition. New York: Hurd & Houghton.

An examination of these numbers more than confirms the favourable opinion we expressed in our last issue as to the merit of this foremost of the Bible dictionaries. The American editors-in-chief, Prof. Hackett and Mr. Abbot, display everywhere their admirable qualifications for the work committed to them. The occasional contributions of their co-labourers are also of a high order.

The Christ of the Apostles' Creed: the Voice of the Church against Arianism, Strauss, and Renan. With an Appendix. By Rev. W. A. Scott, D.D. 8vo., pp. 432. New York: J. D. F. Randolph. 1867.

We have recently read with interest a volume entitled "The Church: its Origin, its History, its Present Position," by Drs. Luthardt, Kahnis, and Brückner, of the University of Leipzig—the work being found among the valuable translations made accessible to the English and American public by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, of Edinburgh. Dr. Brückner in his first lecture thus sketches in one particular the present problem before the Protestant church. He quotes the saying of Strauss, "They who would clear the church of popes must first clear religion of miracles," and then adds, "Now miracles are of two kinds, physical and mental. Naturalism chiefly attacks the former, because it knows no higher laws than the laws of nature. Rationalism chiefly attacks the latter, because it knows no higher source of knowledge than human reason." "The highest of natural miracles is the incarnation of the Son of God; and the highest of mental miracles, the Divine inspiration of Scripture. We see then that it is at these points chiefly that opposing views and tendencies encounter each other."

In the volume before us, Dr. Scott discusses, in a series of seventeen discourses, the successive phrases of the Apostles' Creed that set forth its doctrine of Christ. The work is designed not for scholars, but for intelligent Christian readers, most of the philosophical and polemical discussion being reserved

for the appendix. The author prepares himself for his work by a special and extended study of the standard English theologians of the present and preceding centuries, and fortifies his positions by frequent references and copious citations. The work is well adapted to revive and confirm the faith of practical Christian men and women, and to deliver from error such others as, having been misled by the subtle and treacherous dealing of modern skepticism, will candidly ask themselves, What is the faith which the church of all ages has drawn from God's word, and by which it has lived? What has it held and found its Saviour to be, and what does it with sure warrant anticipate? We can readily believe that these discourses were useful to those who heard them, and pray that others may be reclaimed, won, and edified by reading them.

The Life of the Rev. William Marsh, D. D. By his Daughter, the author of "Memorials of Captain Hedley Vicars." 2 vols., 12mo., pp. 580. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

Whatever may come from the pen of this favourite and accomplished author is sure of a hearty welcome. We have here a daughter's loving and graceful tribute to a father, who was eminently worthy of such a biographer. Connected by birth and by marriage with the gentry and nobility of England, Dr. Marsh early became an earnest, evangelical Christian, and was for sixty-four years an honoured and useful minister in the established church. He died a little less than three years since, in the ninetieth year of his age. In each of the important stations which he successively occupied, he wrought a good work for his Master. Loving ardently his own church, he recognized his Master's image wherever it appeared. Writing to one of the Gurney family, he says of the well-known philanthropist, "Joseph John was a scholar—Joseph John was a philosopher—Joseph John was a Christian—Joseph John was an honour to the community of which he was a member. And what made him such, but the Word and the Spirit of God? When Bishop Bedell, an ardent Protestant, but a most loving and benevolent man, died, a zealous Roman Catholic exclaimed, 'May my soul be with Bishop Bedell's!' Joseph John was a Friend, and I am a Churchman, but—may my soul be with Joseph John's!" One of the highest tributes ever paid to Dr. Marsh himself, and one very touching to him when he was about leaving his great parish of sixteen thousand souls in Birmingham, was paid him by Joseph Sturges, the Friend and Radical: "Friend Marsh, if thee leavest Birmingham, the Friends will put on crape." He was a strong opponent of Ritualism and Rationalism, a friend of Simeon, and Legh

Richmond, and Wilberforce, an earnest and valued co-labourer in all good causes, a man whose blessing at his dying-bed the Archbishop of Canterbury was honoured in asking.

We could easily fill pages with characteristic utterances and incidents from the life of this good man, but we choose to refer our readers to the memoir itself. A beautiful Christian home is laid open to our view, and we can the more readily understand the spirit and the power of the author of "Hedley Vicars." Said a friend who opened to the beautiful likeness of the good old man in the first volume, "That is worth the price of the book." We agreed with her.

Aunt Margaret's Trouble. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Brothers.

A story, reputed to be from the pen of a daughter of Dickens, which may at least claim to be simple and natural; our readers who crave the sensational will pronounce it tame.

Ritter Bell, the Cripple. By Fairleigh Owen. Philadelphia: J. P. Skelly & Co.

A well written and spirited temperance story for children.

The Sunday Question. A Reply to the Rev. Dr. George Junkin's Treatise entitled "Sabbatismos." By Justin Martyr. 12mo., pp. 143. Philadelphia: T. Elwood Zell. 1867.

The title of this little volume sufficiently explains its aims. The question of Sunday cars furnishes the occasion for the discussion. The specific object of the book is to show that the fourth commandment is not now morally binding. We have not discovered anything specially new or convincing in the author's argument. He writes with vehemence, with an extensive knowledge and adroit use of the literature of his subject, (especially where he can array evangelical men against each other on any point,) and is not always sparing of the charge of bigotry and intolerance, and an unreasoning adherence to orthodoxy, on the part of those who differently read the Scriptures and the moral history of the church and world. Such reasonings as those of this author should be well pondered, for the issues are living, practical, immediate, constant, vital.

The Book of Proverbs in an Amended Version, with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes. By Joseph Münscher, D. D. 12mo., pp. iii. 265. Gambier, Ohio. 1866.

This volume should have fared better at the hands of the printer and binder. It hardly holds together while we are examining it. It is a clear, concise, scholarly, and practical commentary, and supplies a want in our exegetical literature.

The English version is followed with such corrections as are necessary to bring out the meaning more fully and exactly. The notes are not so learned as to repel or be unintelligible to our intelligent laity, and yet, will attract scholars by their discussions of the original text, and their citation and canvassing of different interpretations. We are confident that the book will win its way to a place in many libraries as the best commentary of its kind that is now easily accessible.

William Farel, and the Story of the Swiss Reform. By the Rev. W. M. Blackburn.

Anthropos. By the Rev. W. P. Blood, D D.

These volumes, issued by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, escaped notice at the time of their appearing. They are characteristic, and worthy of both authors and publishers.

Studies in the Gospels. By Richard Chevenix Trench, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo., pp. 326. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

We have here a collection of sixteen expository articles from the pen of the learned Archbishop. This is a welcome addition to the series of works with which he has already enriched our literature. The articles vary in length from nine to more than sixty pages, but are all, so far as we have had time for their examination, fresh, interesting, and instructive. The most extended and minute discussions are on the Temptation, (pp. 1—65,) Christ and the Samaritan Woman, (pp. 83—138,) and the Transfiguration, (pp. 184—215.)

The volume is brought out in the superior style so characteristic of the publishers.

Yesterday, To-day, and Forever. A Poem, in twelve books. By Edward Henry Bickersteth, M. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

This honoured son of an honoured father is not unknown to our readers as an author. As a poet, he is now for the first time introduced to the American public, in a reprint, if we remember rightly. Three successive years at the University of Cambridge, he received the Chancellor's Prize, and again the Seatonian Prize for a poem. The remarkable poem now before us is by far his most elaborate and ambitious production. Although the composition is recent, the theme has been in mind for twenty years gathering form and proportions. The grandest and most awful revelations of the historical and prophetic Scriptures supply the author's subject. The work has been in our hands too short a time to warrant a judgment to

which we should wish to be held; but passages of great beauty and power have arrested our attention as we have turned to one book after another. The author writes as one anticipating the near and rapid approach of the great events described in the latter part of his poem.

The Culture demanded by Modern Life; a Series of Addresses and Arguments on the Claims of Scientific Education. By Professors Tyndall, Huxley, Paget, Whewell, Faraday, Liebig, Draper, De Morgan; Drs. Barnard, Hodgson, Carpenter, Hooker, Acland, Forbes, Herbert Spencer, Sir John Herschel, Sir Charles Lyell, Dr. Seguin, Mr. Mill, etc. With an introduction on Mental Discipline in Education. By E. L. Youmans. New York: D Appleton & Co. 1867.

We propose nothing more now than to note the appearance of this book, whose title sufficiently indicates its aim and range. We shall doubtless have occasion to refer to it in subsequent discussions of educational questions.

Hieroglyphic and Demotic Dictionary, containing in methodical order the words and groups most frequently used of the Sacred and Popular Language and Writings of the ancient Egyptians—with definitions in French, German, and Arabic, and statement of affinities with corresponding words of the Coptic language, and with Semitic Idioms. By Henry Brugsch. Leipsic. 1867. J. C. Hinrichs, Publisher. Pp. 96.

This is the first instalment of a Hieroglyphical Dictionary by Brugsch, the fruit, as he says, of twenty years' toil, and designed to exhibit the results of all the labours of Egyptologists in deciphering and translating groups of Hieroglyphics up to the present time; thus revealing the existing state of knowledge on the subject, what is certain, what doubtful, and what remains to be unriddled. The vast step forward implied in the possibility of such a work, will make this of great interest to scholars. It is to be completed in twelve parts, at intervals of one or two months.

Bible Prayers, arranged by Jonas King, D. D., Missionary at Athens, Greece. American Tract Society, New York. W. S. Smith, Princeton.

The Bible Reader's Help. From the Religious Tract Society, London. Revised and enlarged. American Tract Society, New York. W. S. Smith, Princeton.

The Syrian Leper; or the Sinner's Malady and the Sinner's Cure. By Rev. E. P. Rogers, D. D., Pastor of the South Dutch Church, New York City. American Tract Society, New York. W. S. Smith, Princeton.

A Mother's Legacy; or Sabbath Evening Counsels to her Sons and Daughters. By Mrs. Nancy Sproat, late of Taunton, Mass. Author of Poetic Works for the Young, &c. American Tract Society, New York. W. S. Smith, Princeton.

The above issues of the American Tract Society have substantial value, and do not belong to the trash which enters too largely into popular religious literature.

"*Out of Harness,*" *Sketches, Narrative and Descriptive.* By Thomas Guthrie, D. D. Editor of "The Sunday Magazine." New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

Our Father's Business. By Thomas Guthrie, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

It is enough to say of these volumes that they consist of sketches, essays, and homilies, in that peculiarly rich, fervid, evangelical strain, which characterize all Dr. Guthrie's writings and discourses, and have won for him his great celebrity as a Christian preacher and author. Those who buy and read these volumes will not regret their outlay.

A Week with Jesus, or Lessons learned in his Company. By John M. Lowrie, D. D. Author of "Esther and her Times," "Adam and his Times," and the "Hebrew Lawgiver," and Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Fort Wayne, Indiana. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

Dr. Lowrie in the previous volumes published by him has established his reputation as a writer on Scripture teachings and religious experiences, who is sound and instructive, without being dry and dull. The present volume has these characteristics, and is therefore, a valuable addition to our stock of fresh religious reading.

Bible Pictures, or Life-sketches of Life-truths. By George B. Ide, D. D., author of "Battle Echoes," &c., &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1867.

A perusal of some of the chapters in this book has satisfied us that it has decided merit as a fresh and vivid, yet sound and solid presentation of important scriptural truths. It will rank very well with the book of Dr. Lowrie, just noticed.

Hints and Thoughts for Christians. By Rev. John Todd, D. D. American Tract Society, New York. W. S. Smith, Princeton.

A volume beautifully printed, of short, racy articles on various points of practical religion, in Dr. Todd's usual vein, which renders them at once readable and profitable.

When were our Gospels Written? An Argument by Constantine Tischendorf. With a Narrative of the Discovery of the Sinaitic Manuscript. Translated and published by the Religious Tract Society in London, under an arrangement with the Author. American Tract Society, New York. W. S. Smith, Princeton.

We are indebted to the Tract Society for placing this important little volume within easy reach of all.

Toils and Triumphs of Union Missionary Colportage for Twenty-Five Years. By one of the Secretaries of the American Tract Society. American Tract Society, New York. W. S. Smith, Princeton.

We are glad that Dr. Stevenson has prepared and published this summary of the methods and results of Colportage; thus enabling those who are in doubt to form an intelligent opinion regarding its merits and efficacy.

