THE

BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW

FOR THE YEAR

1868.

EDITED BY

CHARLES HODGE, D. D.

VOL. XL.

PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED BY

PETER WALKER, 821 CHESTNUT STREET:

AND SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED BY

R. CARTER & BROTHERS, New York; Rev. A. KENNEDY, London, C. W.

Rev. WILLIAM ELDER, St. John, New Brunswick;

Rev. ROBERT MURRAY, Halifax, N. S.;

AND TRÜBNER & CO., London.

Printed by Alfred Martien.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XL.

No. I.

No. II.

No. III.

No. IV.

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1868.

No. I.

Art. I.—*The English Language.**

Linguistics is gradually acquiring the consistency of a science. If not so definite as mathematics and other pure sciences, it has yet made good its claim to be regarded as a science, both by the character of its methods and the wide generalizations which it has reached. Languages have long, almost always indeed, been a subject of study. But one may be an accomplished linguist, reading and speaking many tongues, without being an adept in the science of language. This science, in its more recent and exact form, differs perceptibly even from philology. The material, or subject matter of the science, is not one language, or any one class of languages, ancient or modern, living or dead, but language itself, in its entirety. Its methods are to observe, arrange, and classify all the forms of speech that are, or ever have been, in use, and from them to deduce the necessary laws of speech for a race constituted as the human race is. It aims to show how language originated, that is, to show why we speak at all, and why we speak as we do, to show what is the inner life of language,

* Language and the Study of Language. By William Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanskrit in Yale College. Charles Scribner & Co. New York. 8vo.

how its changes are effected, to trace the relations between language and thought, and finally, as the geologist is able from existing phenomena to read the history of the globe far back anterior to human records, so from the existing forms of speech to travel back into the prehistoric annals of the race, and to trace the doings and the character of races of whom there is no other record.

The science of language, as thus understood, is the youngest of the sciences, younger even than geology, being yet hardly half a century old. Among its cultivators are two particularly noticeable by those of the English speaking race, both as being on the foremost wave of the advancing science, and as using our language in their investigations, and being therefore the more accessible to English and American students. These are Prof. Max Müller, of the University of Oxford, and Prof. Whitney, of Yale College. Prof. Whitney's book has for some time been known to be in preparation, and has been expected with the liveliest interest. The Professor has not as yet made much noise in this country, but he is familiarly recognized, by those eminent in linguistic science abroad, as the highest living authority in America on the subject of which he treats. His book, the result of long years of silent investigation and research, cannot fail to place him in a position of most honourable distinction before the eyes of his countrymen. If not so brilliant and fascinating in style as are the volumes of Max Müller, the work is equally learned, and is decidedly more sober and trustworthy in its conclusions.

The recent contributions to the study of English by Prof. Marsh* and Prof. Schele de Vere, of the University of Virginia,† and by Trench, Alford, and Moon, in England, as well as the elaborate reviews which have appeared in nearly all the leading periodicals in both countries, show that the subject has awakened public attention. All the works referred to have been received with marked favour, and they have done much towards making the genius and resources of our language better understood by those who use it. But the works

* Lectures on the English Language, 8vo.; Origin and History of the English Language, 8vo.

† Studies in English, 8vo.

of Prof. Müller and Prof. Whitney, while necessarily dealing largely with English, and while of great interest and value to the mere student of English, yet take a much wider range than those of the other writers who have been named. The difference between them is like the difference between a work on geology and a work on trilobites or on the carboniferous era. As a matter of course, a work which professes to be the exponent of a science in its totality, cannot be original in the same manner as a work which gives only a special study of some particular point. Prof. Whitney's volume, crowded as it is with matter, is and claims to be only a compend of a vast science, giving in briefest outline the results of many workers and thinkers, living and dead. And yet it is rare to find, in a work which is professedly and in its nature a compend, so much that is original. The method of evolving the subject from the simple inquiry, Why do we speak as we do? is entirely his own, and a large proportion of the facts and observations employed by him in the development of his theories are of the nature of original contributions to the science. His work, in short, is not only a masterly exhibit of the science, but it has actually placed the science perceptibly forward. It is at once the ablest exposition, and the largest addition, that the science has yet received from any single contributor among those who use our English tongue.

One feature of the work that will make it particularly acceptable to the ordinary reader, is that, in establishing the general laws of language, the author draws his illustrations very largely from the mother tongue. It is evident indeed, from every chapter of his book, that he has been an attentive student of his own language, and we could not recommend a better course to one who wished to make himself thoroughly master of whatever is difficult and recondite in English Grammar than to read Prof. Whitney's book, which does not profess to treat of the subject at all. His remarks, for instance, upon the production of form-words, in Chapter III., ought to settle for ever the logomachies of the schoolmaster-grammarians about most of the disputed questions respecting the conjugation of the English verb. The perfect freedom with which Prof. Whitney walks among all the intricacies of English

idiom, makes it evident that he has given to this department of science very special attention, and we cannot but express the wish that he will favour the public from time to time with further illustrations of the subject drawn from the same rich storehouse. Special studies in English from one who has shown himself such a master of the general subject, could not fail to be valuable.

The publication of Prof. Whitney's volume seems to afford a fitting occasion for stating briefly the accepted theory in regard to the origin and character of the English language, and of its relation to the other languages of the earth. In doing this, it will be necessary first to take the reader to regions apparently remote from the topic named. But in many things, a comprehensive survey of a whole subject is the shortest way of getting at a precise knowledge of a particular division of it. Some idea of the general grouping of the languages of the earth is necessary to a proper understanding of the place which English holds, both in history and in general philology. This is the more necessary, because the whole science of language has been revolutionized, or rather it has been created, in times within the memory of persons still living. The old theory, which until lately nobody even questioned, was, that the Hebrew was the original language of the earth, and that all other languages in some way sprung from it. "All antiquity," says Jerome, "affirms that Hebrew, in which the Old Testament is written, was the beginning of all speech." When, therefore, attempts began to be made at a scientific classification of languages, the problem which presented itself to scholars was, "Hebrew being undoubtedly the mother of all languages, how can we explain the process by which it became split into so many dialects, and how can we trace back the words in all the various languages of the world to their original Hebrew roots? The amount of learning and ingenuity bestowed upon the solution of this problem was prodigious, and has well been compared to that bestowed by the earlier astronomers in undertaking to explain the movement of the heavenly bodies on the assumption that the earth was the centre of the universe. The foundations of the old theory of language began to be shaken as far back as the time of Leibnitz

in 1710, and primarily by Leibnitz himself. But no great and certain advance was made in the way of establishing a true theory, until near the close of the last century. The steps which then led to the discovery and the establishment of the science of language, as now understood, originated in undertakings not by any means scientific in their aim. The English East India Company, in the government of their Indian empire, have always had in their employ a number of eminent jurists, to act as judges in the civil administration. These judges early found that the jurisprudence which they were called upon to administer, was interwoven with a vast body of national traditions of unknown, but certainly most venerable antiquity, and that to interpret these traditions rightly, it would be necessary to become acquainted with the old original language, in which they were contained. The English and American missionaries in that country made a similar discovery. The people of India were found to be in this respect very much in the condition of the nations of southern Europe, which have survived the disintegration of the Roman empire. As France, Spain, and Italy look to ancient Rome for the basis both of their several languages and their system of jurisprudence, so in modern India many nations and tribes were found with languages distinct indeed but closely affiliated, and having a common basis in a tongue which ceased to be spoken more than two thousand years ago. This dead language, existing in India as the Latin does among the nations of southern Europe, is known by the name of the Sanskrit.

The jurists and civilians of the East India Company found, that in order to acquire the necessary authority as interpreters of Indian law, they must acquaint themselves with the Sanskrit language. The missionaries were obliged to study it for a like reason. It was the only way in which they could obtain a hearing as instructors of the people, or in which they could, satisfactorily to themselves, explain and confute the system of theology and philosophy on which the vast superstructure of Indian religion was based. These two classes of Europeans, therefore, addressed themselves with zeal to the study of this ancient tongue. Their labours in this line first took shape in the formation of the Asiatic Society at Calcutta, in 1784, from

which event indeed the history of Sanskrit Philology as a European study may be dated. As the results of their studies were transmitted from time to time to the learned of western Europe, it became gradually apparent that the facts disclosed were likely to have an important bearing upon the entire science of philology. A surprising coincidence, for instance, was found between this ancient language at the foot of the Himmalayas, which had been a dead language for more than two thousand years, and the languages of western Europe. More surprising still, this language was found even more like to the Latin and Greek. This coincidence included not only a vast number of words of like meaning, but most wonderful similarities in declensions, conjugations, and syntax. Grammatical forms and constructions in Latin and Greek, which had become anomalous and unexplainable before the time of Julius Cæsar and the grammarians of Alexandria, were found to be explained by corresponding forms in Sanskrit, where they existed in a state less impaired, or more fully developed.

Such results as these necessarily led to a careful re-examination of the whole theory of the affiliation of languages. It would not comport with the object of the present article to enter into a history of the investigations and discussions which followed, nor to state the discrepancies of opinion which still exist among philologists, as to the general classification and the geographical distribution of the languages of the earth. The examination of the subject has led, however, to some well ascertained results, in regard to which the learned are pretty much agreed. All the leading languages, from the Himmalaya mountains in Asia, on the east, to the Atlantic shore of Europe, on the west, are found to have numerous affinities and points of resemblance too strong to be accounted for in any other way than by supposing an historical and ethnical connection. The ethnographical theory, by which these extraordinary analogies and identities are explained, we will proceed to state in the briefest manner possible. It will be understood to be the merest outline.

The principal nations embraced in the immense space of longitude that has been named, are supposed to have all sprung originally from the same central hive in Asia, the precise loca-

tion of which it is not necessary to the theory either to establish or assume, and to have proceeded thence, in very early times, in successive swarms, to the several countries where they are found within the historic periods. These tides of population are supposed to have followed each other at distant intervals, and to have proceeded, as migratory nomads usually do, in the direction of their original impulse, until the impulse was spent, or until it met with some obstacle sufficient to arrest its further progress. The earliest wave rolling westwardly would necessarily be arrested by the Atlantic, and would eventually become stationary in the regions along the coast and in the adjacent islands. The next succeeding wave in the same direction would be compelled to pause on reaching the range of countries occupied by its predecessor. The earliest easterly wave seems to have been arrested by the formidable obstacle presented by the Himmalaya mountains, and to have settled at its feet among the plains of Hindustan. So on with the several emigrations, east and west, and more or less remote, until we imagine the whole area occupied between our two extreme points.

Taking this general idea, which is admitted to be in the main purely theoretical, we find the following distinct groups of languages, marked off and yet connected by well-defined characters, and by well-known and indisputable facts.

I. The INDIC, or the languages of India. The ancient original language of India is the Sanskrit. It ceased to be a spoken language at least 300 B. C. Its earliest form is to be found in the Vedas, the most ancient of the sacred books of the Hindus. Between the Sanskrit and the present living languages of India, are two successive stages, or dialects (both however dead), namely, the Pali, containing sacred books less ancient than the Vedas; and the Prakrit, containing various remains, both literary and religious, and approaching to more modern times. The chief modern dialects sprung from the above, but largely mixed with the languages of the successive conquerors of the country, are such as the Hindi, Hindustani, Bengali, Mahratti, &c.

II. The IRANIC, the language of Iran, or Persia. The ancient language of the Zoroasters, or Fire-worshippers, the

inhabitants of Persia, which was originally called Iran, is the Zend. Its earliest form is in the Zend-Avesta, the most ancient of the sacred books of the Persians. Two stages of this also are found, the Pehlvi, some centuries after the Christian era, and the Parsi, or old Persian, about 1000 A. D. The chief living representatives of the Zend are the Persian and the Armenian.

III. The CELTIC. The tribes found by the Romans in Spain, Gaul, Britain, and Ireland, and in the smaller islands along the Atlantic coast, had certain remarkable points of coincidence, showing them all to belong to the same race. They are called Kelts or Celts, and they have been divided into two branches, the Cymric and the Gælic. From the Cymric branch are derived the Welsh, (the lineal descendants of the old Britons,) the Cornish (inhabiting Cornwall), and the Armorican, in the province of Brittany or Armorica on the coast of France. From the Gælic branch came the Erse or Irish, the Highland Scotch, and the Manx, on the Isle of Man.

IV. The ITALIC. With the ancient language of this family, the Latin, we are all familiar. The Roman power and civilization carried their language into all those provinces which were thoroughly subdued. The chief modern Latin languages, or Romance languages, as they are generally called, are six, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, French, Wallachian, (spoken in Wallachia, Moldavia, and parts of Hungary, Transylvania, and Bessarabia,) and the Romanese (spoken among the Grisons of Switzerland.)

V. The HELLENIC. This is represented by the ancient Greek, the modern Greek usually called Romaic, and perhaps the Albanian.

VI. The TEUTONIC. The oldest of the languages belonging to this class is the Gothic. It became extinct in the ninth century. Ulfilas, a bishop of the Mœso-Goths, about A. D. 350, translated the whole of the Scriptures, except Kings, into the Gothic. Of this translation a considerable portion of the New Testament and a small portion of the Old, have survived, and constitute a most important relic of this ancient tongue. The modern Teutonic languages may be divided into two dis-

tinct groups, the Scandinavian and the Germanic. The Scandinavian includes the tribes north of the Baltic, and is represented by the Danish, the Swedish, the Norwegian, and the Icelandic. The Germanic includes the tribes in central Europe south of the Baltic, and is subdivided into two branches, the High German and the Low German. From this latter has sprung the Hollandish or Dutch, and the Anglo-Saxon, the parent of English.

It has been conjectured that the Italic and Hellenic races entered Europe south of the Euxine, following the coast of the Mediterranean. In like manner the Teutonic tribes are supposed to have passed north of the Euxine, and in the course of their wanderings westerly to have become gradually separated into two streams, part verging north, to and beyond the Baltic, forming the Scandinavian nations, and part going more centrally, pressing upon the Romans on the south, and upon the Celtic nations on the west. This at all events is the position in which we find them in the times of Livy, Cæsar, and Tacitus.

VII. The Slavonic. The last of the great waves of population that we shall notice, the last perhaps in point of time in its western exodus, is the Slavonic. It is found in the northeastern parts of Europe and the conterminous regions of Asia, pressing westerly upon the Germanic and Scandinavian peoples, and southerly upon the Greco-Roman. The languages of this group are very numerous. The principal are the Russian, Bulgarian, Illyrian, Polish, Bohemian, Lusatian, Lettish, Lithuanian, and Old Prussian.

The seven groups of languages, that have been thus briefly described, form one of several great Families of Languages, into which the numerous varieties of human speech have been divided. This family has been variously named. It has been called the Japetic, because the nations included in it are supposed to have descended from Japhet, one of the sons of Noah. Another name is the Indo-European, which is a purely geographical name, and has been given purposely to avoid mixing up the philological question with the ethnical one. Of the linguistic affinities, there is no doubt. The ethnical connection has not been so clearly established. Still another name has

been given to the family, and has been much insisted on by those eminent scholars who have pushed their inquiries into the subject farthest. This name is the Aryan. It is so named from an ancient country in central Asia, called Arya in the Sanskrit-books, and known by this title among the Greeks and Romans, and supposed to be the starting point from which these various nations migrated.

Besides this family, there are two or three others, which we need not describe, as they are not connected, except in a most remote degree, with our present subject. One of these is the Semitic family, so called because the nations embraced in it are descended from Shem, the oldest son of Noah. The principal languages included in this family are the Hebrew, Samaritan, Syriac, Chaldee, Arabic, and Ethiopic. The other families of languages are not as yet sufficiently defined, and therefore need not be named in this extremely cursory review.

The English language, it will be seen, bears intimate relations to two of the groups of the great Indo-European or Aryan family, namely, the Teutonic and the Latin. More than nine-tenths of English words are derived from one or the other of these sources. At the same time, there are numerous words in English that cannot be claimed as being exclusively either Teutonic or Latin, but are common to both sources. Some words, indeed, are found running through all the seven groups of the Indo-European family, showing that they existed before the great dispersion. A few words are found even common both to the Indo-European and the Semitic families, bearing in this fact a history that carries us back to the ark itself.

It would be impossible, in such a review as this, to give the induction of particulars that are proper in the way of illustrations even, much less of proof, of these generalizations. A very few familiar examples will be quoted.

THREE.

1. Sans.; *tri.*
2. Zend; *thri.*
3. Celt.: Erse, *tri;* Welsh, *tri.*
4. Ital.: Lat., *tres, tria;* Fr., *trois;* It., *tres;* Sp., *tre.*
5. Hell.: Gr., *τρεις, τρια.*

6. Teut.: Goth., *thri;* Ger., *drei;* Sw., *tre;* Dan., *tre;* Sax., *threo, thri;* Eng., *three.*
7. Slav.: Russ., *tri;* Let., *tri.*

SEVEN.

1. Sans.: *saptan.*
2. Zend: *haptan;* Per., *heft.*
3. Celt.: Welsh, *saith.*
4. Ital.: Lat., *septem;* It., *sette;* Sp., *siete;* Fr., *sept.*
5. Hell.: Greek, ἑπτα.
6. Teut.: Goth., *sibun;* Ger., *sieben;* Du., *zeeven;* Dan., *syv;* Sax., *seofen;* Eng., *seven.*
7. Slav.: Rus., *sem;* Let., *septyni.*

FATHER.

1. Sans.: *pitri.*
2. Zend: *paitar;* Per., *pader.*
3. Celt.: Ers., *athair* (initial consonant elided).
4. Ital.: Lat., *pater;* It., *padre;* Sp., *padre;* Fr., *pêre.*
5. Hell.: Gr., πατηρ.
6. Teut.: Goth., *vatar;* Ger., *vater;* Du. *fader;* Dan., *fader;* Sw., *fader;* Sax., *faeder;* Eng., *father.*
7. Slav. (doubtful).

MOTHER.

1. Sans.: *matri.*
2. Zend: Per., *mader.*
3. Celt.: Ers., *mathair.*
4. Ital.: Lat., *mater;* It., *madre;* Sp., *madre;* Fr., *mêre.*
5. Hell.: Gr., μητηρ.
6. Teut.: Ger., *mutter;* Du., *moeder;* Sw., *moder;* Dan., *moder;* Sax., *moder;* Eng., *mother.*
7. Slav.: Rus., *mat.*

TO BEAR.

1. Sans.: *bri, bhar-adi.*
2. Zend: *bairan;* Pers., *ber.*
3. Celt.: Ers., *bear-adh.*
4. Ital.: Lat., *fero, pario, porto;* It., *portare;* Sp., *portar;* Fr., *porter.*

5. Hell.: Gr., *φερω, φορεω, βαρος* (a thing borne, a burden), *βαρυς*.

6. Teut.: Goth., *bairan;* Ger., *fëhren;* Du., *beuren;* Sw., *bœra;* Dan., *bœre;* Sax., *bœran;* Eng., *bear.*

7. Slav.: Rus., *beru.*

Some words, it is to be observed, not only run through the entire Indo-European or Japhetic group, but likewise appear in the Shemitic. Thus the numeral "seven," already quoted, is evidently connected with the *sheba* of the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Ethiopic, and the *sabata* of the Arabic and Hebrew. In like manner, "bear," seems to have an etymological connection with the Hebrew *parah*, which means to "bear," and perhaps with the Hebrew *bara*, meaning "to create," "to produce," "to bring forth," (comp. English *bairn*, that which is born or brought forth.)

This word "bear," both in its generic meaning of bearing a burden, and its specific meaning of bringing forth (as of animals, trees, earth, &c.) is probably more widely diffused than any other word to be found in the world. There is no word of which we would feel it safer to guess that it was used by Noah himself, and that it is verily older than the flood.

Let us look at a few of its forms in the English alone.

Here we have it both as a Teutonic word, coming directly from the Saxon *baeran*, and as a Latin word, in its three several forms of *fero, pario*, and *porto*.

First, let us enumerate some of the forms of Teutonic origin.

Bear, bearing, bearer, bearable, bearably, bier; forbear, forbearing, forbearingly, for-bearance; over-bear, over-bearing, over-bearingly; bore, over-bore, for-bore; borne, over-borne, for-borne; born, bairn, birth; burden, burdening, burdened, burdensome, burdensomely, burdensomeness; over-burden, over-burdening, over-burdened, unburden, unburdening, &c.

From the Latin *fero*, we have fertile (bearing freely, productive) fertility, fertilize, fertilization, fertilizer, fertilizing, fertilized. *Fors* (forts) comes from *fero*, as the Greek *φορτιον* from *φερο*, *τροπος* from *τρεπω*. *Fors, fortis* (whatever bears or brings itself along, *chance*) gives us fortune, fortuning, fortuned, fortunate, fortunately, fortuneless; unfortunate, unfor-

tunately; misfortune; fortuitous, fortuitously, fortuity. *Fortis* (that which bears everything before it, *strong*, *brave*,) gives us forte; fort, fortlet, fortalice, fortress; fortitude, fortify, fortifying, fortified; force, forcing, forced, forcer, forceless, forceful, forcefully, forcible, forcibly; enforce, enforcing, enforced, enforcement; reinforce, reinforcing, reinforced, reinforcement. There is some connection evidently between *fero*, to bear, and *ferry*, to bear across a stream; hence we have ferry, ferrying, ferried, ferriage, ferryman, &c. *Fer* as an adjective termination, in conjunction with *ous*, is compounded with many hundreds of Latin nouns, giving rise to such words as somniferous, noctiferous, odoriferous, pestiferous, vociferous, &c., some of which again originate a new progeny, as vociferous, vociferously, vociferate, vociferating, vociferated, vociferation, &c., &c.

Fero, in composition with the Latin prepositions, gives a still more prolific progeny of words; as,

Circum-*fer*-ence, circumferential, circumferentor.

Con-*fer*, conferring, conferred, conference, conferrer, conferee.

De-*fer*, deferring, deferred, deference, deferential, deferentially.

Dif-*fer*, differing, differed, different, indifferent, differently, indifferently, difference, indifference, differentiate, differentiating, differentiated.

In-*fer*, inferring, inferred, inferrible, inference, inferential, inferrentially.

Of-*fer*, offering, offered, offerer, offertory.

Pre-*fer*, preferring, preferred, preferrer, preferment, preference, preferable, preferably, preferableness.

Prof-*fer*, proffering, proffered, profferer.

Re-*fer*, referring, referred, referee, referrible, reference.

Suf-*fer*, suffering, suffered, sufferer, sufferance, sufferable, sufferably, insufferably.

Trans-*fer*, transferring, transferred, transferrer, transferee, transference, transferrible, intransferrible.

The connection between *fer*-o, and *par*-io, to bring forth or bear, may not be obvious at first sight; but the words are not more removed than are *βάρος* and *φέρω* in the Greek, in which case the connection is generally admitted. As the identity

of the stem depends upon its consonantal elements, the substitution of *p* for *f* is the only material change in passing from *fer* to the stem *par*, or *per* (*par*-io, pe-*per*-it,) and no etymological law is better established than the interchangeability of the labials *p*, *b*, *f*, and *v*. The same applies to *por*-to, to carry, to bear.

If these two words be admitted to belong to the group, we have from *par*-io, parent, parentage, parental, parentally, parentless, parturient, parturition, and very numerous compounds, such vivi*par*ous, ovi*par*ous, &c. From *por*-to, to carry, we have port, porte, portico, porch, porter, portly, portal, portage, portliness, portable, portableness, besides the compounds portmanteau, portfolio, &c., &c. Besides these, we have also the various prepositional compounds, com-port, de-port, ex-port, im-port, re-port, sup-port, trans-port, each of which gives birth to a numerous family, which need not be enumerated, as they are formed in the same manner as the derivatives of con-fer, de-fer, &c., already given.

It is not necessary to pursue the illustration further. From a careful count, we suppose there are in the English language alone, not less than four hundred and fifty words, dependent upon this one stem, in no one of which is the meaning of the primary root entirely lost.

What the count might be, if carried through each of the languages of the Indo-European family, to say nothing of the numerous traces of it in the Shemitic family, we are unable to say. It certainly reaches many tens of thousands.

One other remark before we leave this subject. In treating of such a class of words, it is obviously proper to say, first, that fertile, confer, defer, &c., are derived from the Latin *fero;* secondly, that bear, burden, borne, born, birth, &c., are derived from the Sax. *baer*an. But it is not proper to say that baeran and its derivatives come from fero, or that fero and its derivatives come from baeran. The two (fero and baeran) are independent of each other, and yet they are mutually related. The generic stem, which pervades them all, is not strictly a Teutonic word, or a Latin word, but an Indo-European word.

Having thus given a general outline, showing what is meant

by the Indo-European family of languages, with a few examples in illustration of the theory, we will pass briefly in review some of those historical facts, which show more particularly the exact place of the English language in this family.

According to the theory, then, the first of the great waves of population that rolled westward from central Asia, was the Celtic race. At what particular time this great emigration took place, we know not. We only know that it was many centuries before the Christian era. The Celts, or Kelts, appear to have been originally nomadic in their character, and to have journeyed westerly, or to have been driven westerly by the Teutons or some succeeding race, through central Europe, until their further progress was arrested by the Atlantic ocean. We find remains of this race all along the Atlantic coast of Europe, though they were chiefly congregated in Spain, Gaul, Britain, and the adjacent islands.

The Latin or Roman race, shortly before the Christian era, extended their dominion northward from Italy, until they had subdued nearly all the countries occupied by the Celtic race. In Spain, and in Gaul (or France), this dominion was so complete, that those countries became integral parts of the Roman empire. Not only Roman laws and customs were introduced, but a Roman population extended itself into those provinces, and intermingled largely with the original population, so that finally the Roman or Latin language was substituted for the original Celtic throughout the provinces of Gaul and Spain.

We have a modern instance very analogous to this, with which we are familiar. The state of Louisiana was originally settled by the French. The principal inhabitants were of that race, and the French language was the one mainly spoken in the settlement. But since the acquisition of the territory by the United States, the Americans have spread themselves through the country, have mingled their race with that of the original inhabitants, and finally the English language has, to a great extent, displaced the French.

In the year 55, B. C., the Romans, under Julius Cæsar, passed from Gaul into Great Britain. From that time until

426, A. D., a period of nearly five centuries, the Romans continued to regard Great Britain as a part of their empire.

At length, in the fifth century of the Christian era, the Teutonic or Germanic race, then occupying eastern and central Europe, under various names, as Goths, Vandals, Franks, &c., began to be agitated by a great and steady impulse southward and westward. These fierce northern barbarians precipitated themselves with fearful violence upon the now corrupt and imbecile Roman provinces. The Roman empire, tottering to its fall under these repeated assaults, was obliged to withdraw its forces from the distant provinces for the defence of the imperial city itself. The Roman legions were finally withdrawn from Great Britain in the year 426, A. D., just 481 years after the invasion of Cæsar, and the native Britons were left thenceforth to defend themselves, as they best might, from the barbarians that on all sides threatened them.

The Roman occupation of Great Britain differed materially from their occupation of Gaul and Spain. These latter countries were thoroughly subdued and made part of the great Roman commonwealth, almost as much so as was Italy itself. They were Romanized or Latinized almost as thoroughly as Louisiana is now Americanized. But in Britain the case was different. The Romans there held at best only a military occupation. They maintained one or more legions in the island. They constructed roads, they fortified camps, and had, of course, considerable commerce with the natives. But the Roman people themselves never settled in great numbers in the island.

The connection between the Romans and the Britons was somewhat similar to that between the present English and the natives of India. There was a state of military subjugation, and, to some extent, of civil administration and government; but there was no general intermixing and fusion of races. There was no extension of the language of the conquerors over the region of the conquered. On the final withdrawal of the Roman legions, in the fifth century, the original Britons are found to have retained hardly any traces of the Roman or Latin language. It is asserted that less than a dozen words altogether remain upon the island, as the result

of these five centuries of military occupation, and these few words are so much corrupted as to be with difficulty recognized.

Among the Latin words left in Great Britain by the Romans, may be mentioned, by way of illustration, the proper name Chester, both as occurring by itself, and as a part of many compounds, such as West-Chester, Win-Chester, Chi-Chester, Col-Chester, &c. Chester is a corruption of the Latin word *castra*, a fortified camp. These fortified camps of the Romans, in the distant provinces, were often permanent establishments, remaining in the same place for a series of years. Of course, the natives resorted to these camps for the purpose of traffic, bringing for sale provisions, clothing, and whatever else was needed for the support of the soldiery. Booths were erected, then huts, and finally more settled habitations, arranged in rows, or streets, and so each camp, "castra," or "chester," became the nucleus of a town, giving us Westchester, Manchester, Grantchester, and all the other Chesters.

The Latin words, however, that were left in Great Britain by the Romans, during their early occupation of the island, are very few in comparison with the whole number of Latin words that now exist in English. We know not how many Latin words we now have in English, certainly not less than thirty thousand. But this vast number was not introduced by the Roman conquest. Not a hundred altogether are found that came in as the result of that event, and those few are, like the word Chester, so much altered as scarcely to be recognized. The large ingredient of Latin words now existing in English, is to be attributed to causes of much later date, some of them indeed coming down to the present day. Of these we shall speak more fully a few pages further on.

The year 451, A. D., is generally assigned as the date of an event that has affected, more than all other causes, the destiny of Great Britain. This was the coming of the Saxons under the two brothers Hengist and Horsa.

The Saxons were a branch of the great Teutonic race. They lived along the southern shores of the Baltic, in the countries now known as Holland, Jutland, Hanover, Sleswick,

Holstein, &c., extending from the Rhine to the Vistula. Their position along the coast of the North Sea and the Baltic, and the numerous bays, creeks, and rivers with which that coast is indented, determined in a great measure their occupation, and separated them perceptibly, both in character and destiny, from their Teutonic brethren of the forests of central Germany. They were the navigators of their age. They spent their lives almost entirely upon the waves. Bold, buccaneering, and piratical, they were the terror equally of the Roman and the Celt.

The various tribes of this race were known by different names. Those with which history is most familiar are the Jutes, the Angles, and the Saxons. That part of Britain which was settled by the Angles, was called Angle-land, changed afterward into "Engle-land," and then into England. This name, applied primarily to a single province, was ultimately extended to the whole country. The compound term, "Anglo-Saxons," taken from the two most notorious of the piratical tribes, is used by historians to distinguish those of the race that settled in England, from those that remained on the continent. "Anglo-Saxons" are English Saxons, while the term alone, without prefix, usually means continental Saxons.

The Saxons did not come into England all at one time, or in one body. Their first arrival was under Hengist and Horsa, A. D. 451. One part of the race having obtained a secure foothold in the island, other swarms followed from time to time, for several hundred years. In the year 827, nearly four centuries after the first settlement, seven independent Saxon kingdoms had been established in the island, which were then united under one government, known as the Saxon Heptarchy.

The policy of the Saxons in Britain differed entirely from that of the Romans. The Romans had merely a military occupation of the island. They held it in subjection by their legions, and when those legions were withdrawn, the native Britons remained on the same soil where Cæsar found them, improved and civilized indeed by contact with the Romans, but still unmixed as to race, and uncorrupted as to language. The Saxons came with a far different purpose, and in a far different manner. The Saxons took, not military, but popular

occupation of the island. They came, not as an army merely, but as a people. They came, not to conquer merely, but to settle. They made England their headquarters, their home. Their policy, therefore, was one of extermination. The Romans held the Britons in subjection. The Saxons butchered them, or drove them out. The Roman soldiery and the Britons covered the same area of territory, mingling freely together. The Saxons wanted, not subjects, but soil. The conflict, therefore, between these two races was one of the bloodiest upon record. The result was the expulsion, almost the extermination, of the feebler race. When the Saxon Heptarchy was fully established, the great mass of the native Britons had been literally butchered. Of those that survived this fate, some few had settled in Armorica or Brittany, on the coast of France, but the great majority had taken refuge in the secluded and inaccessible mountain fastnesses of Wales, where they remain as a distinct race to this day. The Welsh of the present day are the lineal descendants of the ancient Britons.

The most striking evidence of the extent to which this exterminating policy of the Saxons was carried, is to be found in the language. Had the Saxons come into the island as the Romans did, and mingled with the natives, even though it had been as conquerors, the original British or Celtic language would have remained substantially unchanged, or at most, there would have been a mixture of the two languages—the British or Celtic, and the Saxon. So far is this, however, from the fact, that after the Saxon conquest was completed, there remained upon the soil scarcely a vestige of the original language of the island. According to Latham, the only common names retained in current use from the original Celtic of Great Britain are the following, basket, barrow, button, bran, clout, crock, crook, cock, gusset, kiln, dainty, darn, tenter, fleam, flaw, funnel, gyve, grid (in gridiron), gruel, welt, wicket, gown, wire, mesh, mattock, mop, rail, rasher, rug, solder, size, tackle.

We know of but one instance in history of an extermination so complete, and that is, of the Indian race who originally occupied this country, and whose fate presents a curious parallel to that of the ancient Britons. As there now linger

among our hills and valleys a few Indian words which we have adopted and Anglicized, such as tomato, potato, tobacco, calumet, wigwam, tomahawk, hominy, mush, samp, mocasson, &c., so among the Saxons, after their bloody work was over, there remained a few of the words of the old Britons. As the remains of the Indian tribes are now gathered into a body in the west, where they retain and keep alive their native dialects, so the remnants of the miserable Britons were collected into the western part of England, in what is now the Principality of Wales, where they retain with great tenacity their ancient language and many of their ancient customs.

The original language of Britain, then, the old British or Celtic language, that which was spoken by the half-naked savages that Cæsar saw, still exists. It is a living, spoken language. But it is not our language. Though spoken in parts of England, it is not the English language. It is not that with which we are materially concerned in our present inquiry. We, Englishmen and Americans, are lineal descendants of the Anglo-Saxons, and our language is the Saxon language. The English language, whose history we are now sketching, though it has received large admixtures from various sources, is in the main the same that was spoken by Hengist and Horsa, and by their countrymen along the southern shores of the Baltic, before their arrival in England in the fifth century.

During the ninth and tenth centuries, the Saxons in their turn were invaded by the Danes. The Danish invasion, however, does not assume much importance in giving the history of the language, because the Danes, although for a time victorious, were finally expelled, leaving the Saxons in possession of the country. The Danes, moreover, were of a race cognate to the Saxons, and their language belonged to the same group of languages. A considerable number of Danish words were retained in the island, and have been incorporated into the language. They are not, however, so numerous, nor do they differ so much from the Saxon words, as to make any special consideration of them necessary.

The first historical event which impaired seriously the integrity of the language, was the Norman conquest. Wil-

liam, Duke of Normandy, generally known as William the Conqueror, invaded England, A. D. 1066, and by the decisive battle of Hastings, routed the Saxons, and gained the English throne. By this event the Normans became, and continued to be, the governing race in England. Let us trace briefly the influence of this event upon the language.

The policy of the Normans differed both from that of the Romans and that of the Saxons, and it was this difference of policy that caused such a difference in the effect upon the language. The Normans did not, like the Romans, merely send over an army to subjugate, but came over as a people to occupy. On the other hand, they did not, like the Saxons, exterminate the conquered, but sought to keep them on the soil as a subject and servile race. William divided the island among his followers, giving to each a portion of territory, and of the Saxon population which was upon it. In this manner, two races were diffused side by side, over the surface of the island, and kept in constant juxtaposition. The effect of this continued contact between the two races, soon became apparent.

The Normans were superior to the conquered race in military skill, but were greatly inferior in numbers. They sought, therefore, to perpetuate their authority by depressing the social and political condition of the Saxons. They introduced Norman laws and customs. None but Normans were appointed to any important office, either in church or state. Above all, a strenuous attempt was made to spread the Norman language throughout the island. No other language was spoken at court, or in camp, in parliament, in the baronial hall, or in the lady's boudoir. In this language the laws were written, and judicial proceedings were conducted. No civil contract was binding, no man could sue or be sued, no right could be enforced, and no favour won, except in the language of the governing race. The first step to every Saxon serf, who wished to rise from his state of inferiority and servitude, was to forget his native language, and train his tongue to the accents of his foreign masters.

But the laws of nature are stronger than the laws of man. The Normans attempted an impossibility. It is impossible for

two races to maintain permanently a separate existence, when kept in constant contact and juxtaposition, as were the Normans and the Saxons. A mingling of race is sooner or later the uniform and inevitable result. So it was here. The Saxons gradually intermarried with the Normans, and rose to an equality of legal rights and social position. With the elevation of the race, the Saxon language resumed its rightful position. It had always been the language of the masses, while the Norman had been spoken only by the governing few. When two races become thus blended into one people, they cannot long continue to speak different languages. In this case, the Saxon, as being the language of the many, displaced the Norman, which was the language of the few, notwithstanding all the weight of authority and fashion that had been exerted in favour of the latter.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that no changes in the language occurred during this fiery ordeal. As there was a mingling of race, so there was to some extent a mingling of language. If we take a survey of the authors that wrote two or three centuries after the conquest, we find, not the pure Saxon of Alfred and Cædmon, nor yet the Norman parlance of William and his barons, but a mixed language, like the race, predominantly indeed Saxon, but with a large foreign ingredient. This mixed language is our modern English. Its main element is Saxon. But it has another element, amounting now to nearly one-third of the whole, the first introduction of which is to be attributed to the Norman conquest.

But who were the Normans, and what was their language? The word "Norman," is a corruption of Northman. The "Northmen" were the inhabitants of the ancient Scandinavia, that is, of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. They were, in the ninth and tenth centuries, precisely what the Saxons had been in the fifth century. The Saxons, after their establishment in Great Britain, had been converted to Christianity, had acquired the arts of peace, and become comparatively civilized. The Northmen were still unlettered pagans, whose home was in their ships, and whose whole life was warfare. For the greater part of two centuries, they ravaged all the more civilized countries of Europe, bordering upon the coast, until

their very name was a terror. Rollo, a leader of one of those adventurous bands, penetrated into the very heart of France, and finally obliged the king to cede to him and his followers an entire province, amounting to no inconsiderable part of the kingdom. This province, thus ceded A. D. 912 to the victorious Northmen, or Normans, was thenceforward called Normandy.

Rollo and his followers were comparatively few in numbers. They gradually intermarried with their subjects in the province which had been assigned them, and adopted their manners, religion, and language. In less than a century after the advent of Rollo, his descendants in Normandy were, as to language, scarcely distinguishable from other Frenchmen. But the French language, as we have seen, is in the main that introduced into the province of Gaul by the Romans. It is in short a corrupt form of the Latin language. And the Norman French is the same as other French, only with the addition of some northern or Scandinavian words, which the descendants of Rollo retained after their settlement in Normandy.

The Norman French, therefore, which William the Conqueror tried to introduce into England, was mainly a Latin language. The Normans did not eventually succeed in displacing our native Saxon. But they did succeed in introducing into it a large number of Norman-French words, and these Norman-French words, introduced into English after the Conquest, are generally words of Latin origin. These Latin words, thus introduced through the Norman-French, constitute the first important item in the Latin element of the language.

The importance of the Norman conquest, in its influence upon the language, is not to be estimated by the actual number of words then introduced. In point of fact, much the larger number of Latin words have been brought into the language since that time, and by other causes. The chief effect of the conquest in this respect was, first, that it broke down the old grammatical inflections, which constituted a dividing wall between the two languages, and, secondly, that it created the tendency to adopt foreign words. There is in all nations naturally a strong aversion to the adoption of foreign terms. The natural and spontaneous disposition, when a new word is

wanted, is to make it out of roots or stems already existing in the language, and by modes of combination with which the popular ear is familiar. The terrible shock of the Conquest, and the wholesale use of foreign words to which the people thereby became accustomed, overcame this natural dislike, and opened a wide door through succeeding centuries for a continued influx of Latin words from a great variety of sources.

The extent of this influx may be estimated, if we call to mind that England, both from its position and from its natural policy, has always maintained the closest commercial relations with the nations of southern Europe, and that those nations, the French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian, all speak languages that have descended directly from the Latin, and that have consequently the closest affinity with each other. The Norman conquest having brought a large number of Latin words into the language, and having opened permanently the door for the introduction of others, by overcoming the national prejudice on the subject, and by making such foreign importations fashionable and popular, there has been ever since an uninterrupted stream of Latin words setting in upon us, like a tide that knows no ebb. Whenever, in the progress of commerce or of the arts, it has become necessary to have new words for the expression of new wants, or new ideas, instead of making these new words by a process of home manufacture, we have resorted to the easy credit system of borrowing them from our neighbours. Almost every musical term in the language has been taken from the Italian, most of our terms of etiquette and punctilio from the Spanish, and the entire nomenclature of cookery, dress, and fashion from the French. Italian singers and fiddlers, and Parisian cooks and milliners have levied a tax upon our tongues no less than upon our purses. These foreign words, when first introduced, usually appear in a foreign dress. They are printed in italics, or with quotation marks, or in some way to indicate that they are foreigners, and not yet entitled to the full rights of citizenship. But in a few years, the popular ear gets accustomed to the lingo, the popular lip learns to sound it trippingly, it becomes a part of staple English.

But there is another source, from which Latin words have

been brought into the language, even more prolific than those from mixture of race and from national intercourse. We refer to learning and education. From an early period in English history, long indeed before the time of the Conquest, all ecclesiastics were instructed in the Latin tongue, because in that tongue all the church services were conducted. Besides this, the Latin language then was, and indeed until comparatively modern times it continued to be, the general language of scientific and literary intercourse throughout Europe. Every treatise intended for general dissemination was written as a matter of course in Latin. Latin was the only medium by which an author could make himself known to those for whom alone books were intended, namely, the learned few. In addition to this, it has been, for more than a thousand years, and it still is, the settled practice, that the study of the Latin shall form a leading part in every course of liberal education. All educated men, of whatever profession, have been, as a matter of course, Latin scholars. The language of Cicero and Virgil has been as familiar to Englishmen of education, as that of Chaucer and Spenser. Indeed, as to a critical knowledge either of authors or of language, Englishmen have been far more proficient in the Latin than in their native English. The mother tongue has been left to take its chance in the nursery and the playground, while Latin has been interwoven with every element of their intellectual cultivation.

The effect of such a system must be obvious. The wall of partition between native words and foreign having been broken down by the rude shock of the Conquest, scholars have completed what warriors, teachers, and artists began. Hence the strange anomaly, that with us learned men have been the chief corrupters of the language. The Germans, and other Teutonic nations, have been as much addicted to the cultivation of classical scholarship as we have. But with them the national instinct has never been rudely blunted, and it has resisted with a great measure of success the Latinizing tendency which has so marked all classical studies with us. Our scholars have found, not only no resistance, but every facility which the established habits of the people could afford, for the introduction of Latin words. Out of this abundance of their hearts, therefore,

they have freely spoken. Steeped from boyhood in the diction of the most polished nations of antiquity, they have but followed a natural impulse, when they have used "dictionary" for "word-book," "science" for "knowledge," "fraternal" for "brotherly," "maternal" for "motherly," "paternal" for "fatherly," "felicity" for "happiness," and so on, to an extent which may be already counted by tens of thousands, and which is constantly increasing.

If now, from a review of the whole subject, the question be asked, What are the main elements of the English language? the answer will be obvious. There are, indeed, as we have seen, a few old Celtic words, which have come down to us directly from the ancient Britons. Among the thousands of words, also, that have come to us from France, Spain, and perhaps Italy, there are doubtless some few of Celtic origin, because the original population of all those countries was Celtic, before they were overrun by the Romans. We have also a few Scandinavian words, introduced by the Danes during their invasions of England in the ninth and tenth centuries, such as, bait, brag, dish, dock, doze, dwell, flimsey, fling, gust, ransack, rap, whim, &c. There are too, without doubt, not a few Scandinavian words brought by the Northmen into France, and thence by their descendants, the Normans, into England, after the Conquest. We have also, as every nation has, occasional words, derived from every country, no matter how remote, with which we have commercial intercourse, or with whose literature our scholars have been conversant. Thus, we have tariff from Tarifa, a town on the Mediterranean, where import duties were once levied; tamarind, from Heb. tamar and *ind*-us; damask, damascene, and damson, from Damascus; spaniel, from Hispaniola; ratan, bantam, and sago, Malay words; taboo, Hawaiian; algebra, almanac, alchemy, chemistry, talisman, zero, zenith, coffee, sugar, syrup, sofa, mattress, from the Arabic; caravan, dervish, scarlet, azure, lilac, from the Persian; gong, nankin, from China; muslin, chintz, and calico, from India.

But all these together are few and inconsiderable, in comparison with the whole number of our words, and they do not affect the organic character of the language. The overwhelm-

ing majority of our words are still of two classes. They are either Saxon or Latin. These are the two main elements which constitute the language.

No mention has been made thus far of Greek words, of which we have a large number in the language. The omission has been intentional, and for the purpose of simplifying the historical survey of the subject. The Greek language is so nearly allied to the Latin, that in a discussion like this, they may be considered as one. It is only necessary to remark, that very few Greek words have been introduced by mixture of race, or by commercial intercourse. The Greek words which we have, were introduced almost entirely by scholars and books. Nearly all of them are scientific terms. Indeed, nine-tenths of all the scientific terms that we have, are Greek.

Of the relative numbers of these two classes of words, Saxon and Latin, it is impossible to speak with certainty. If we exclude all compound and obsolete words, and all purely scientific and technical words, the ratio of Anglo-Saxon words to the whole body of words in the language, would probably be about six-tenths, or 60 per cent. If we examine, however, the page of any ordinary English book, the Saxon words will be found to bear a much larger preponderance than this. One reason is, that all the small connecting words, the articles, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, and most of the adverbs, are Saxon. These small words occur at least ten times as often as any other class of words in the language. For example, "wickedness," which is Saxon, may not occur more frequently perhaps, than "malice," which is Latin. But "the," "and," "but," "if," &c., will be found a hundred times, where either "wickedness" or "malice" will be found once. Again, some writers are noted for their partiality to the Latin vocables, others for their partiality to the Saxon. But, taking the average of different writers, and excluding works of science, in which sometimes the words are almost entirely Latin and Greek, we suppose that the Saxon words on any page of ordinary English will be found to be nearly nine-tenths of the whole number.

The Latin words that have found their way into the Eng-

lish may be again subdivided into two well-defined classes, viz., those that have come to us by national intercourse and admixture, and those that have come through learned men and education. The former have come to us indirectly, from languages that are not pure Latin, but are the modern representatives and descendants of that tongue, viz., the French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian. The others have come directly from the fountain head, the Latin itself. Words of the former class are all more or less corrupted, either in those modern languages in which the English found them, or in the transition from those languages into the English. Words of the latter class, taken from the Latin directly, are changed very little, or not at all.

The difference between these two classes can be best illustrated by a few examples. It exists mainly in the stem, or root of the word. Both classes are obliged to conform to the English idiom as to the termination. But in the stem, while those coming from the Latin directly are almost without change, those from the other languages, particularly those from the French, are almost invariably changed in the spelling. Thus:

Latin Stems.	Words coming from the Latin directly.	Words coming from the French, or some other modern descendant of the Latin.
Curs-us,	curs-ive,	course.
Cur(r)o,	cur(r)ent,	cour-ier.
Reg-is,	reg-al,	roy-al.
Fruct-us,	fruct-ify,	fruit.
Fragil-is,	fragil-e,	frail.
Pung-ens,	pung-ent,	poignant.
Punct-um,	punct-ual,	point.
Recept-um,	recept-acle,	receipt.
Decept-um,	decept-ion,	deceit.
Diurn-us,	diurn-al,	journ-al.

It is a common opinion, that the language has deteriorated in consequence of this multitude of foreign admixtures. Some purists have gone so far as to recommend an entire disuse of words of Latin origin,—to put upon them the ban of public odium, to stigmatize them as foreigners and intruders. It

cannot be doubted, indeed, that many writers have been beguiled into an excess in their partiality for the Latin vocables.

Dr. Johnson was a great sinner in this line. "Our Father, who art in heaven," translated into Johnsonese, would read on this wise, "Parent Divine, who existed in the celestial regions"! "If a body kiss a body, need a body cry," is a piece of as good English as was ever written. Turned into Johnsonese, it would run somewhat on this wise: "On the supposition that an individual salutes an individual, does an individual lie under an obligation to exclaim in a vehement and plaintive voice"? A boy in an English charity-school was once asked, "what king David did, when the servants told him that his child was dead?" "Please, sir, he cleaned himself and took to his victuals." The admirers of the high-polite style would be quite shocked at such home-spun talk, and would array the matter thus: "What course of action did king David pursue when he received intelligence of the demise of the infant? Answer, He performed his ablutions, and immediately proceeded to partake of refreshments."

Perhaps the happiest hit upon this style, is the imitation of Dr. Johnson in the Rejected Addresses. A single paragraph will give an idea of the performance.

"Professions lavishly effused and parsimoniously verified are alike inconsistent with the precepts of innate rectitude and the practice of internal policy; let it not then be conjectured, that because we are unassuming, we are imbecile; that forbearance is any indication of despondency, or humility of demerit. He that is the most assured of success will make the fewest appeals to favour, and where nothing is claimed that is undue, nothing that is due will be withheld. A swelling opening is too often succeeded by an insignificant conclusion. Parturient mountains have ere now produced muscipular abortions; and the auditor who compares incipient grandeur with final vulgarity is reminded of the pious hawkers of Constantinople, who solemnly perambulate her streets, exclaiming, 'In the name of the Prophet,—figs!'"

But among our great authors Dr. Johnson is not the only sinner in this respect. Gibbon, for instance, is quite his

equal. No book in the language is more free from this Latinism, or is in purer English in all respects, than the English Bible. The writers who come nearest to the Bible, in the purity of their English, are Shakespeare and Bunyan. Next to these, we suppose, is Addison. Poetry uniformly is freer from Latinism than prose is.

That part of the domain of English letters in which words of classical origin most abound, is in the field of science. With the exception of a few Arabic terms, almost our entire scientific nomenclature is derived from the Latin and Greek, particularly the latter. Not less than nine-tenths of our scientific terms are Greek. Medicine, geology, mineralogy, grammar, logic, mathematics, physics, and metaphysics, are all in a state of utter dependence upon languages with which none but the learned are familiar. This has been undoubtedly a hindrance to the communication of knowledge. To any one acquainted with the Greek and Latin, the terms used in the different sciences almost of themselves describe the objects to which they are applied, without further study. If now these terms, instead of being taken from a dead language, had been drawn from the resources of the mother tongue, the very structure of the word would show its meaning even to the unlettered, and with the meaning of the word would be conveyed a knowledge of the thing.

When, for instance, the anatomist speaks of the "systole" and "diastole" of the heart, he talks Greek. He must consequently explain himself. He must give in different words a description of the thing meant, and after you have learned from these other sources the nature of the subject, you infer vaguely what must be the meaning of the words. Now, suppose the anatomist had been called to explain the same point to a native Greek. The words themselves would have conveyed the idea which is meant, and nothing more would have been necessary to convey this idea, even to an unlettered man, than a mere enunciation of the terms. To a native Greek, systole and diastole, apogee and perigee, hydraulics, hydronamics, clepsydra, creosote, isomeric, isomorphic, metamorphic, and all the other thousands upon thousands of scientific terms, which so puzzle the mere English student, are just as intelligible

and expressive in themselves, as to the native Englishmen are our homespun compounds, inkstand, penhandle, moonlight, notebook, sunrise, woodland, hilltop, cornfield, snowflake, pitchfork, daylight, forenoon, afternoon, and so on, to any extent. We cannot doubt, therefore, that if the terms of science had been, from the first, and throughout, carefully elaborated out of our own native materials, the difficulties in the communication of science would have been much lessened.

The actual number of foreign words in the language, great as this may be, is not the worst feature of the case. A still greater evil is the national tendency to adopt others as fast as they are wanted, without reluctance, and apparently without limit, instead of producing them by a process of home-manufacture. In some languages there appears to be a perfect reliance upon their own resources for the expression of new ideas. Whenever, in the progress of the arts, or in the wide ranges of human thought, it becomes necessary to employ some new words for the expression of some new shade of meaning, it is always done in such languages by some new combination or fresh moulding of the materials already existing. Such a process begets a habit, and with the habit a facility, in the formation of compound and derivative words, that in the end render a language in the highest degree flexible and expressive. Such is the truly infinite power of combination in a language so formed, that it is impossible to conceive an idea which the language does not furnish within itself the means of completely expressing. But, how different is this from the condition of the English. Every new fashion from the French milliners, every new dish from the French cooks, every new dancing woman from the French stage, every new singer or fiddler from the Italian opera, every discovery in science, every invention in art, even too often the arts, and wants, and inventions that spring up indigenously among ourselves, have to be made known to the public under some foreign term. Such is the fashion, and fashion in language, as in most things, is supreme. Even Morse must needs call his far-off-writer a telegraph, and Webster himself, our great lexicographer, with all his temerity, had not the courage to call his Dictionary a Word-Book.

How different have been the fortunes of the English from those of the German. These two languages, in the beginning of the race, started even. They were both of the same common stock. Their parents, the old Saxon, and the old German, have a common ancestor in the venerable Gothic. Cradled in the impenetrable forests of the elder Europe, they were, in the fifth century, in the same incipient formative condition. The German, hemmed in on all sides, but not invaded, was led by circumstances to draw upon its own resources for the invention of new terms to express the new ideas which became evolved in the onward progress of civilization. Hence has resulted a language capable of expressing, by combinations of its own native words, every shade of meaning required even by the teeming brains of that nation of students—a language uniting infinite diversity of forms with entire simplicity of materials. How different the English!—a conglomerate of materials from a dozen different sources; affluent, indeed, almost beyond comparison, in its multiplicity of words, but wanting in that noble simplicity which might have been the result of a different course of political events.

But let us not be among the croakers. Bad as the case is, it is not entirely hopeless. There are in various quarters, symptoms of a growing partiality for words of native stock. Besides this, the very evil complained of is not without compensating advantages. One advantage of this facility with which we borrow foreign words, is that we have thereby become, beyond all nations, rich in synonyms. For the same idea, in almost numberless instances, we have two, and sometimes even three terms, exactly equivalent and equally legitimate. This is a decided advantage, saving oftentimes tiresome and inelegant repetitions. The writer who has tired his readers with the term "native language," may take refuge, as in this article we have had frequent occasion to do, in the "mother tongue." The idea is kept up, but the tautology is spared. Moreover, it frequently happens in these cases, that of two words of different origin, used to express the same general idea, the one has acquired by usage a slight shade of meaning different from the other, so delicate and evanescent as scarcely to be defined, and yet perceptible to a cultivated taste,

and beautiful in proportion to its delicacy. How logically the same, for instance, and yet how different to the loving heart, are the words "maternal" and "motherly." It was his skill in availing himself of this peculiarity of the language, that among other things enabled our own Washington Irving to express with such marvellous exactness the endlessly varying shades of human thought and feeling—that enabled him to pass from the grave to the gay, from the didactic to the playful, from the humorous to the sublime, with an ease that seems only equalled by the movements of the mind itself.

Far be it from us then to join the ranks of those who would dismiss with a rude rebuff these Latin-English intruders. They are now here. They form a large and valuable element of our language. They are a part of our national wealth, and they should be cherished and protected accordingly. All we would ask, is to protest against the unnecessary introduction of more, and to insist upon making the native element of the language a subject of more distinct attention than it has hitherto received in our schemes of education.

ART. II.—*Report on the Prisons and Reformatories of the United States and Canada*, made to the Legislature of New York, January, 1867. By E. C. WINES, D. D., LL.D., and THEODORE W. DWIGHT, LL.D., Commissioners of the Prison Association of New York.

THE administration of penal justice is a department in social science, attractive to the jurist, the statesman, the philanthropist, and the Christian. The science of punishment opens a field as broad as the domains of virtue and vice, for it affects the whole human race. It affects the right of property, the sacredness of human life, public tranquillity and public morals. The supreme aim of public punishment being the prevention of crime, it is apparent that the well-being of society—the peace and order of states and nations—indeed the moral and political character of the world, are intimately connected with the sys-

tem upon which it is administered. And as this object can only be accomplished by measures which are both penal and reformatory, it will be conceded that the philosophy which investigates the principles upon which coercion and reformation should be wisely blended, is a study worthy of the careful attention of law-makers, educators, and all right-minded people.

Anciently punishment was of an exemplary, if not vindictive character, inflicted with a view of deterring and repressing the repetition of offences. The convict was placed under the ban of society—treated as an outcast, as if forsaken of God and man—not only confined in prison, but tortured there, by having superadded to his banishment from society, the deprivation of wholesome air, light, and food, and a denial of human sympathy, of kind words, of instruction secular and divine, of the offer of salvation—of everything which perchance might excite within him a godly sorrow and a purpose to reform. The sentence of the law excluding him from society, dreadful and crushing to his manhood as it might be, was made doubly cruel and maddening by the enforcement of a code of arbitrary and barbarous prison rules, calculated to drive him to despair and make him curse the day of his birth.

Why is it that in all ages past there has been something connected with prisons revolting to the moral sense of enlightened Christians? Why has the sighing of the prisoner gained the sympathy of good people, and the expression of that sympathy become, in some measure, a test of Christian discipleship? *"I was in prison, and ye came unto me." "Sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not."* The solution is not to be found in a supposed mawkish philanthropy which would screen the perpetrator of crime from deserved punishment; for the most distinguished philanthropists who have taken their lives in their hand, and visited the foulest prison-dens that ever disgraced humanity, and devoted their energies in effecting marvellous reformations in prison systems, have been the staunchest defenders of legal punishment, and the most reliable advocates of a judicious penal code. The execution of the murderer, who has shed the blood of his fellow-man, and thereby incurred the penalty of that high universal law which

demands blood for blood that the land may not be defiled, dreadful as it is, does not distress the friends of prison reform with a sense of outraged justice. On the contrary, those persons who rank highest for their Christian culture, with a sense of greater security to the peace of society, and with relieved anxiety when justice is executed, unite in a loud Amen to the tragic vindication of the law. Apt illustrations of the truth of this statement will occur to the reader in any community. We can refer to the case of Bridget Durgan, recently executed in New Jersey for the murder of Mrs. Dr. Coryell, in which there was positive demonstration by large numbers of her own sex, of real satisfaction in the enforcement of the law. And so the conviction and execution of Charles Lewis for the brutal murder of James Rowand, in Princeton, a few years ago, met with the universal approbation of the kindest and most benevolent people in that community. His imprisonment in the notorious Mercer county jail excited more sympathy for him while in heavy irons, in a loathsome and insecure cell, than his proud expiation of his crime on the gallows.

There is some defect in prison systems, some want of just discrimination, it may be, in the adjustment of the punishment to the crime, some cruel enforcement of discipline, some cold, inhuman neglect of the inmates, and doubtless sometimes there are instances of the confinement of the innocent, all which lead us to associate in our minds, injustice and inhumanity with all prisons. They all receive the instinctive condemnation of kind-hearted people; whereas they ought to be of such a character as to assure the public mind that they are just the right places for those who are within them. We are more accustomed to hear of the evil than of the good in such institutions—of the injustice than of the justice associated with them. Our minds are early impressed with the story of unjust imprisonments, as those of the young man Joseph in the prison of Pharaoh in Egypt; and of the cruel imprisonment of the prophet Jeremiah, who was thrust into a deep, dark, miry dungeon in the court of the prison of king Zedekiah, in which he would have died had not a kind-hearted negro man in the king's house obtained from the king a commission to take thirty men and draw him out, with cords and old rags let down to him to protect him

from injury. Then we read of the apostle Peter chained in prison between two soldiers, until God delivered him; and of a great company of apostles and John Bunyans, who through many centuries suffered imprisonment for religion and liberty. Then we read the harrowing details of John Howard, the prince of philanthropists, who visited the jails and prisons of all Europe, and exposed their horrors; and later, those of Mrs. Fry and Sir Fowell Buxton; all these followed by the affecting reports of various Prison Reform Associations in Europe and in the United States, which have brought home to the people a knowledge of the true character and history of prisons in general, showing that notwithstanding the modern reforms introduced into them, which have been like transformations from darkness to light, there is to-day a call for a new and improved system for general adoption.

Within the last half century the noble work of prison reform has been making steady progress, and accomplished immeasurable good. We cannot estimate too highly the important services rendered in the good cause by the sisterhood of Prison Discipline Societies. These have been sustained by the best men and women of the times, and their humane and benevolent work sparkles like a gem in modern civilization. We would not make invidious comparisons, but the London Prison Discipline Society, the Royal Society of Paris, the Netherlands Society for the Improvement of Prisons, and others in Prussia and Russia, having royal sanction, were prominent in Europe. While in the United States the Philadelphia Prison Society, and the Boston Prison Discipline Society were the earliest and most efficient organizations; but these were soon followed by similar ones in the several states. The Boston Society, which originated in 1825, has within the last three or four years been succeeded by a state institution called a "Board of Charities." An association recently organized under the name of the American Association for the Promotion of Social Science, having for its object among other things, "the prevention and repression of crime, and the reformation of criminals," promises to be a useful co-labourer in the field. The New York Prison Association, under whose auspices the Special Report to the New York Legislature, above mentioned, was made, was incor-

porated in 1846, with the object,—1. Of ameliorating the condition of prisoners. 2. Improvement of prison discipline. 3. The support and encouragement of reformed convicts after their discharge. Its membership embraces some of the most influential and worthy men of New York. This Association, in view of preparing a scheme for an improved prison system for that state, appointed a large and learned committee to prepare one, and commissioned the Rev. Dr. Wines, their Corresponding Secretary, and Professor Dwight of Columbia College Law School, Chairman of their Executive Committee, to visit the prisons and jails of all the states and of Canada, with a view of learning their present state and the reforms needed. These commissioners were admirably qualified for such a work—being men of extensive and accurate learning, of large humanity and experience in human affairs, and enthusiastic in prosecuting the work entrusted to them. Their visits extended to but eighteen of the states, and to Canada,—the war having prevented their visit to the Southern States. In addition to their personal observations, they propounded a series of interrogatories in writing, to certain officers of the several states, on the several branches of their commission, the replies to which, with some sixty volumes of reports, laws, and documents relating to the subject before them, enabled them to present an elaborate report of 547 pages, embodying material facts, and containing a highly interesting and philosophical discussion of the principles involved in the subject matter. In this valuable contribution of experience, observation, and philosophical discussion, these distinguished gentlemen have placed the whole civilized world under renewed obligations to them and to their association. This report, more elaborate than any previous one, must result in pushing the prison standard a little higher, in order that it may keep abreast with advancing civilization.

The Modern Reformatory System of Prison Discipline recognizes the spirit of a true Christianity as the most potent element of reform. It is based upon scriptural doctrine. Moses regarded the design of punishment to be the protection of society, and the vindication of law and justice—inflicted to amend the transgressor, and to deter others, that they "may hear and fear, and commit no more any such evil among you."

It seeks improvement in the construction and furniture of prison buildings, with a view of promoting the security, the health, the order, and the cleanliness of the inmates; the abolishment of needless rules in prison government; the disuse of punishments and practices which unnecessarily subject the convicts to a sense of degradation; religious services with Sunday-school and secular instruction; pastoral labour by chaplains; prison libraries; the Bible and religious papers; rewards to influence hope; regular labour, and a knowledge of trades; kind and humane treatment, and encouragement and aid to the reformed when discharged from prison. This is seeking no more than what Christianity is required to do for prisoners. Nor is it wresting "the sword" which was divinely appointed as "a terror to evil doers." It is only adopting the principle upon which God's moral government is administered; "*reformation through kindness.*" Punishment inflicted for this end will enable a transgressor to say with the prophet, "Wherefore doth a living man complain,—a man for the punishment of his sins? Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord."

Some persons regard all convicts in prison as beyond hope; as given up to a reprobate mind, and intending to persist in a career of crime, despite all the pains and penalties of the law, and the moral influence of friends. They adopt the false idea, too much encouraged we admit, by the debasing and demoralizing character of too many of our state prisons, that a man's infamy is sealed for ever when he puts on the prison uniform; that he can never recover from it. Now it cannot be denied that there are incorrigible and utterly abandoned men in prison, as there are out of it; men who scoff at all reformatory efforts, and curse those who seek to do them good. But even such hardened criminals, while left in the stern clutches of the law, are not to be left without offers of mercy. If our blessed Saviour admitted the dying thief into Paradise, should not prison reform societies and the legal keepers of prisons, permit all classes of felons to come into the atmosphere of the subduing and reforming agencies of Christianity? The statistical tables show that about one-half of the thousands of convicts who are crowding our prisons, are under thirty years of age, a

period hardly beyond the "wild oats" season. And then as to the circumstances of their offences. Under the influence of strong drink, the temptations of pride and poverty, ignorance of the criminal nature of their offences, without parental counsel and restraint, or other mitigating circumstances, these youthful offenders have committed assaults, or obtained money or goods by false pretences, or taken property that did not belong to them, or given undue liberty to their youthful passions—the most of them for the first and only time in their lives. Some of them have respectable relatives, and were accustomed to associate with respectable church-going people. Their imprisonment overwhelms them with shame. Their hearts are broken. They mourn bitterly over their folly and their transgression, and seek some friendly sympathizing one to receive their pledge to amend their lives, and be restored to the confidence of society. Shall such be left in the solitary and silent cell without hearing the voice of sympathy, and without receiving the counsels and encouragement of religion? be left to themselves to work out a term of years, undiminished in any degree by that good conduct which distinguishes them from the unrelenting and unreformed veterans in crime in adjoining cells? It is the object of this new system to win the prisoner back to the path of virtue. It is not a hopeless work. The late Dr. Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia, before the Society for Promoting Political Inquiries, convened at the house of Benjamin Franklin in 1787, in speaking of the effects of public punishment, said, "I have no more doubt of every crime having its cure in moral and physical influence, than I have of the efficacy of the Peruvian bark in curing the intermittent fever. The only difficulty is, to find out the proper remedy or remedies for particular vices." And again, in the same essay, he remarked, "The virtues are all parts of a circle. Whatever is humane, is wise—whatever is wise, is just—and whatever is wise, just, and humane, will be found to be the true interest of states, whether criminals or foreign enemies are the objects of their legislation."

The old prison system in use fifty years ago, which was chargeable with being a school of vice, because of the promiscuous intercourse of the prisoners without respect to age, sex,

or criminality, which it tolerated, gave way under the combined assaults of the Prison Reform Associations, and an aroused public sentiment, the fruit thereof. And like most reforms, the advance went from one extreme to another. Because there was corruption in promiscuous and unregulated intercourse of the prisoners, the theory was adopted that there should be no intercourse whatever. Solitary confinement at hard labour—prisoners never to be allowed to speak or be spoken to; silence, eternal silence, as the only security against moral contamination and mischief; these were the cardinal principles of the new system proposed and established at that day. Doubtless it was a reform, a great reform over the old system. But what a multitude, numbered by thousands and tens of thousands, of human hearts have been for ever crushed and driven, in the unnatural silence of perpetual solitude, to madness and despair!

At first there was a disposition to adopt the separate silent system, known as the Pennsylvania system, because the best, and now the only representative institution of this order was located in Philadelphia. The new prison at Trenton, in New Jersey, which superseded the old one at Lamberton, was, after the Pennsylvania order, placed on a separate silent plan. And so was the Rhode Island State Prison, and others. In 1840 the Inspectors of the New Jersey State Prison began to doubt the reformatory power of this system. Its physician, Dr. James B. Coleman, a gentleman of ability and character, still residing in Trenton, assailed the solitary plan as injurious to health of body and mind. He persisted in this opinion for several years, writing with much force against the system, as tending to produce insanity rather than reformation, and reporting many and increasing cases in the prison, arguing that it stood in the way of personal reform and economical labour. In 1859, the legislature, perhaps more for economical reasons, as more rooms were needed, than for its effect on the health and mind of the prisoners, abandoned that system, and adopted the congregate one. The Rhode Island prison shared the same fate. The warden, Dr. Cleaveland, condemned the solitary plan as a "slow corroding process, carrying its subjects to the derangement or destruction both of body and mind." And at the

present time, the separate system in its strictness exists nowhere in the United States, except in the State Prison in Philadelphia.

The other system, which is generally known as the New York system, from the fact that its original and best representative institution of this order is at Auburn, in that state, is the congregate system. It adopts the separate system at night, and though by day it allows the prisoners to work together, they are required to be silent. This plan requires more rules for the maintenance of order, but admits more of the reformatory agencies. Of course each of these systems has its advocates, and each has some advantages over the other. As now conducted, under the present administration of the criminal law in the states, we think the New York system is altogether preferable, though it needs modification, chiefly however in its administration. The commissioners, Dr. Wines and Professor Dwight, whose report is under review, do not utterly condemn separate imprisonment as worthless, but, as we think, with much judgment and nice discrimination, say that "the utility of the separate system lies, as we conceive, not in employing it as a complete system in itself, but as the initial part of a system, which beginning in a species of confinement intensely penal in its character, ends in a form of restriction so slightly penal that it is but one remove from entire freedom."

Our readers will be pleased to hear further how these gentlemen analyze these two systems, and we quote again:

"The separate and silent systems have, notwithstanding their diversity, a common basis. Isolation and labour lie at the foundation. . . In one the isolation is effected by an absolute bodily separation by day as well as by night, and the labour is performed in the cell of each individual convict. In the other, the labour is performed in common workshops, and the isolation at night is secured by the confinement of the prisoners in separate cells, but during the day is of a moral species, being effected by the enforcement, so far as such a thing is possible, of an absolute silence. The bodies of the prisoners are together, but their souls are apart, and while there is a masterly society, there is a mental solitude. Such is the theory upon which the respective systems are founded, but

in neither do the facts ever fully correspond to the ideal. . . . Sociability is one of the strongest of human instincts, and the social principles and relations are the great springs of improvement. It is by these that the heart is kindled and warmth and energy imparted to the character. Man droops and pines in solitude, whether that solitude be created by a physical or moral separation—by walls of granite or a wall of absolute and eternal silence. No sound excites him like the voice of his fellow-man. This imparts strength to dare, to do, and to suffer: and these three words express the sum of human duty."

The Commissioners declare themselves not satisfied with the system of New York prisons, as it now exists, but say, that if it is to be retained, it should be reformed, and they suggest: a complete separation of the government of the prisons from party politics; permanence in the executive administration by permanent tenure of office; a higher grade of qualifications in the officers; authority of wardens to appoint and remove the police officers of the prisons; total abolishment of the contract system; making the labour of convicts not only to support the prisons, but to use it so as to aid in restoring the prisoners to society, with a knowledge of some business which will ensure a livelihood; greater breadth and efficiency given to both secular and religious instruction; introduction of a system of rewards as encouragement to good conduct and industry, so that the principle of hope shall act with greater vigour than that of fear; and making the reformation the real, as it is admitted to be, the proper object of the discipline. But they prefer to see it replaced with a better one, and would adopt the Irish system as the best model known, it having stood the test of experience, in yielding the most abundant and best fruits. In defining this system they say:

"It is, in one word, an adult reformatory, where the object is to teach and train the prisoner in such a manner that on his discharge he may be able to resist temptation, and inclined to lead an upright, worthy life. Reformation, in other words, is made the actual as well as the declared object. This is done by placing the prisoner's fate, as far as possible, in his own hands, by enabling him through industry and good conduct to raise himself, step by step, to a position of less restraint; while

idleness and bad conduct, on the other hand, keep him in a state of coercion and restraint. There are four distinct stages in the prisoner's progress under this system—the first, intensely penal; the second, less so; the third, but slightly penal; and the fourth, losing the penal aspect entirely, except being subject to police supervision."

Here, it is said, the advocates of the separate and congregate systems of imprisonment may meet on common ground. It is a system, based upon the principles of this Irish system, that these Commissioners recommend, to be put in force cautiously and gradually, and to be developed as experience and public sentiment would sanction.

But it is said with great force, that the state has not done its whole duty when it has punished the prisoner, nor when it has reformed him; that unless after his discharge, he is supplied with work or means of support, he will relapse into the clutches of his old associates; and that this provision for him should be made by the state, and not be left, as now, in some cases, to be made by voluntary Reform Associations. There is no good reason why this provision should not be engrafted on the prison system of every state. It is done in Ireland, where there is a legal agent to look after such cases, and where there are two refuges, one Roman Catholic and one Protestant, to receive such discharged prisoners, when first discharged. In France this special work is done by the Association of St. Vincent de Paul, and is cherished as its noblest field of labour. In Bavaria there is an extensive national organization for this purpose, and the governor gives six weeks notice of the discharge of the prisoner, with a full account of his character. In the United States, Massachusetts, which seems always to be in the advance, is the only state, so far as we can learn, which has made provision by law for such assistance, which is rendered through a state agent, and two voluntary female refuges.

To Massachusetts is accorded the most complete system of prisons and reformatories, of all the states visited. She has one state prison, at Charlestown, it is called the banner prison, a jail in each county for temporary detention, a house of correction in each county, four houses of industry, three state

reform schools, six female refuges, a state agency for aiding discharged male prisoners, truant schools, and guard-houses or lock-ups. Other states are following closely after her, and are fast multiplying their reformatories.

As preventive of crime, two institutions are demanded for children: 1st. *Public nurseries* for children from two to five years of age, of pauper parents, that they may be gathered from the street, where a majority of criminals originally come from. 2d. *Industrial schools* for truant, ragged children, whose parents abandon them through vice or indifference. A few such have been established. And we understand the Commissioners in their report to advocate *making the education of all children compulsory*—holding that it is better to force education upon the people, than to force them into prisons to expiate crimes occasioned by neglect or ignorance. Next in the ascending step is the *Juvenile Reformatory*, which is indispensable, and is being introduced into the several states. In connection with this, it is asked that the principle of holding the parent responsible for the conduct and maintenance of his child till he arrives at years of discretion, and that the expense of maintaining the child when at the reformatory, be paid by the parent, should be introduced and adopted here, as it is in Ireland, where it is said to work well. There it has been adopted for about two years; and within that time $1500 have been recovered from parents under the provisions of the law. The limitation of this principle to the age prior to the age of discretion, removes what otherwise would be good ground of objection to it. But how such a law can be enforced by a pecuniary exaction, in cases where the parent is irresponsible, we do not perceive. And it is generally where the parents are very poor, that such cases arise.

County jails, which come next in order, are the most defective of all our penal institutions. They are, as at present maintained in almost every state, schools of vice, of the worst form. They retain the objectionable features of the old state prison system. There is neither separation nor silence. Youth and aged persons of both sexes, without classification, are thrown more or less together, without employment at labour, and without reforming agencies. The cells are often insecure

unhealthy, dark, and dirty. Some persons are detained in them to await trial; some are sentenced by justices for small offences; some are sentenced by the higher courts for felonies, and some are detained as witnesses. There is but little discrimination in the mode of treating them. Their penal character should be taken from them, and they should be made places for detention only. This will involve the necessity of *prisons intermediate* between county jails and prisons proper, called in Canada *central prisons*, and in Massachusetts *houses of correction*, and which the Commissioners would call district prisons. They should be eminently reformatory. Jails cannot be so. Prisons for women should always be separate from those for men.

Touching the general administration of prisons, there is a felt want of a Bureau, or a central authority in each state, having general powers of control and direction over all the departments of the preventive, reformatory, and punitive institutions, "under which the nursery of the infant, the school of the juvenile, the jail of the adult, the local penitentiary, and the state prison, can be moulded into one harmonious and effective system," the whole animated by the same spirit, and aiming at the same objects.

This report contains an important chapter on *Prison Premises and Buildings*. We are pleased to see in it an expression of opposition to a disposition, increasing of late years, to lavish expenditure in material and ornamentation in erecting prisons, claiming that they should be decent, substantial, and tasteful, but holding that a stately and imposing exterior tends to give dignity to crime. A general defect, universal in all prisons, is that "the cells are too small for sanitary or moral purposes," giving no additional security, being at war with cleanliness, and proving a perpetual hindrance to the mental, moral, and physical welfare of the inmates. So, too, the windows, with one or two exceptions, are too small. They should be large and secured by iron bars. The deficiency of sun-light contributes to the ill-health of prisoners, just as plants are injured when kept in dark cellars. They also obstruct the entrance of pure air. In this respect, as in others, the Massachusetts prison stands without a peer on this continent.

Another excellent suggestion is, that if prisons were of less dimensions, they would facilitate the classification of convicts in prisons, which is very desirable. There should be "separate prisons for females—separate prisons for the young—separate prisons for different occupations, and separate prisons for the worst class of offenders."

Undoubtedly much of the success of attempted reform will depend on prison officers, who are trusted to carry out prescribed regulations. It is truly said, "Few men have greater temptations to fraud. Few men are more open to the assaults of bribery. Few men have greater trials of temper. Few become abusive and injurious with greater impunity." With few exceptions the higher officers who have the management of our prisons, are sadly disqualified for the varied and singularly difficult duties of their position. Unless the chief executive officer be a man of strict sobriety, of mild temper, gentle manners, benevolent feelings, energy, enthusiasm for his work, high moral principle, knowledge of human nature in its various aspects, sterling honesty, and be duly impressed with religious principles, he will not be able to discharge his solemn official obligations in a manner that will commend him to the prisoners whose reformation is, in great measure, in his hands, or to the benevolent reformers of prisons who watch without. While the tenure of the office is short, and as fickle as politics, and the office is a reward for political services, and the salary is too small to support a man of high qualifications, these important institutions will be shamefully neglected and mismanaged.

We hail the progress of reform in the rules of *Discipline* with unfeigned joy. The chapter of the report on this subject is one of thrilling interest, and unanswerable argument. Let it be made known, to the honour of our blessed Christian religion, which is a religion of love, that in the discipline of prisons, "the law of force is giving way to the law of love." The best prison officers in this country, those who have been most successful, and the longest time in office, and who are imbued with a noble Christian spirit, and whose opinions are most worthy of regard, agree that the humane system is the most effective in securing good discipline. We can only extract from the report a few brief sentences from the testimony.

Mr. Haynes of Massachusetts says, "Kindness is the principal means of discipline employed here. It is believed that this renders the prisoners more confiding and obedient, and that it is better adapted than a more strictly coercive discipline, to promote their reformation. I have never known an instance where I thought that a man would be made better by the infliction of blows, nor have I ever yet, as I think, met the person, however low and degraded, however hardened and steeped in crime, who had not a spot in his heart that could be touched by kindness."

Mr. Cordier of Wisconsin says, "Every convict in this prison is treated like a human being, and not as an outcast from society. .... We find that kindness thus employed always has the most salutary effect."

Mr. Miller, late warden of the Missouri State Penitentiary, says, "Kindness is the great central idea in a true theory of prison discipline; kindness in tone, look, and utterance, as opposed to a coarse, rude, and stern manner of treatment. Kindness is a means of discipline which I have always found effective..... In many instances when different kinds of punishment had failed to make any lasting impression, I have known kindness to work a thorough revolution in the man. Indeed its effect is never lost."

We remember an anecdote related of Mr. Pillsbury, formerly warden in the State Prison of Connecticut, and a giant prisoner, who had betrayed the kindness and confidence of his keeper, who had done everything he could to make him happy. After reasoning kindly with him, he said, when about to lock him in a cell, "And yet I cannot bear to lock you up. If I had the least sign that you cared for me"—The man burst into tears. "Sir," said he, "I have been a very devil these seventeen years; but you treat me like a man." "Come, let us go back," said the warden. The convict had free range of the prison as before: and from this hour he began to open his heart to the warden, and cheerfully fulfilled his whole term of imprisonment.

The policy of giving rewards in order to excite hope in the prisoner—an element of great power in the Irish system, and one used with great success by Captain Mochonochie on Norfolk

Island, but very rarely adopted in American prisons, will soon be incorporated, we doubt not, into all our prison systems. The principle is a sound one in any system of reform. The commutation laws, allowing prisoners to earn by industry, obedience, and good conduct, a certain diminution of their terms of sentence, already adopted in the states of Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Ohio, and Wisconsin, constitute a very good foundation for a more general system of rewards. The effect of such a law in the Massachusetts prison has been good, and in the opinion of Mr. Haynes, "the most important step taken in this country in the last forty years." The warden of the Wisconsin prison regards the law of commutation in that state as "a more powerful agency to promote good conduct among convicts than any thing else that could have been devised for that end." The testimony from the warden of Ohio is: "No law ever passed by the legislature has been so marked in its influence for good, since Ohio has been a state, as that which enables prisoners to earn the remission of part of their sentence by good conduct." Similar testimony is borne from the states of Connecticut and Michigan. In Illinois and Wisconsin the law allows every convict who passes the whole time of his sentence, without a violation of the rules recorded against him, to receive a certificate to that effect, for which the governor will give him a certificate restoring him to citizenship, which had been forfeited by his conviction.

The report suggests, respecting the punishment employed in enforcing the rules of the prison, some changes. Its language is: "We say, then, let the lash go, with the shower bath, the crucifix, the buck, and all other punishments that are either cruel or degrading, into utter and perpetual disuse as an instrument of discipline in our prisons." The prison at Charlestown, the best disciplined institution on the American continent, where the convicts do as much work as any equal number of men outside, is cited as having but "one punishment, and that seldom resorted to—simple confinement in a dark cell on a ration of bread and water." Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Ohio, and Rhode Island, employ no other punishment than solitary confinement in a dark cell.

In all the state prisons of the United States, and of Canada, except four, absolute and unbroken silence is the rule; in some more rigorously enforced than in others. The theory of the congregate system is a rigid prohibition of intercommunication between prisoners—a total separation of prisoners by night, and vigilance of the officers by day. We concur with the opinion expressed in the report, that "unbroken silence should be exacted of convicts when shut up in their cells, but more than doubt the wisdom or utility of such exaction at all other times. To a limited extent, and under judicious restrictions, conversation should be permitted among prisoners in certain stages of their imprisonment." We feel prepared to demand more, rather than less, than this.

Some of the states have made provision by law for the *secular instruction* of prisoners. New York was the first to make such provision for all her prisons. Similar provision exists in other states. As a large proportion of the convicts are ignorant and unable to read, it is important that they should be taught; and time should be allowed to them to read while alone at night in their cells. The English practice of giving to each cell a gas-burner for this purpose, is a humane one. To be alone in a dark cell for fifteen hours in a day, is enough to make a cheerful man melancholy. Prison libraries, now quite generally provided for prisons, are regarded with much favour by convicts who can read. There are several thousand volumes in some of them. Kentucky at an early day took the first step in the direction of this measure.

No part of this report has afforded us more pleasure, nor inspired us with more hope for the improvement of prison discipline, than the chapter which exhibits the progress and power of the *moral and religious agencies*, as they are employed in many of our prisons and reformatories, and are beginning to be incorporated by law into the prison system of several of the states. Prior to the time of John Howard, penal establishments contained, it is said, no chaplains or chapels. Latimer is reported to have denounced the heathenism of the London prisons, in the presence of the King; and in the reign of Elizabeth, ministers imprisoned for nonconformity took the occasion to preach to their fellow-prisoners. Whitefield and

the Wesleys "prayed and preached in all the jails, bridewells, and bedlams," until they were shut out of them. In 1773, Parliament authorized the sessions to appoint chaplains to their jails at a salary of £50 a year. This was regarded as the first governmental recognition that prisoners were within the pale of salvation; and at the present day all the English prisons are supplied with chaplains. It is within the last forty years that these have been employed in some of our American prisons; at first they were paid by voluntary associations. Auburn claims to have been the first to introduce a resident chaplain and regular religious services, and a Sabbath-school among the convicts. The theological students of that place aided the chaplain in sustaining the Sabbath-school. Sing Sing followed. The theological students of the Princeton Seminary in 1827 organized a Prison Discipline Society, and by a committee visited the old state prison at Lamberton, New Jersey, every Sabbath, and conducted religious exercises in the prison and visited the prisoners in their cells, and distributed tracts among them. This was under the old system. The legislature approved it, and directed a large room to be prepared for such religious use. By 1828, several of the states had made provision by law to pay chaplains. Since then there has been great progress made in the use of such means. The states of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and Wisconsin, have resident chaplains, while several other states have preaching in their prisons on the Sabbath by resident pastors. Sabbath-schools are maintained in the prisons of Connecticut, northern Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Michigan, Ohio, Rhode Island, and New York; and in Vermont a Bible-class is held on a week day. In the female prisons of Indiana and at Sing Sing, N. Y., the whole body of convicts attend the school together. It is estimated that from 1500 to 2000 convicts in our various state penitentiaries are receiving from two hundred teachers, instruction in Sabbath-schools. The testimony is unanimous and positive, that the prisoners are deeply interested in them; and that a growing knowledge and interest in the Scriptures is the result. Affecting accounts are given of some prison prayer

meetings, and revivals of religion in them. A copy of the Bible is now in most of the prisons supplied to every convict who will receive it, and in some cases, as in New Jersey, the law requires this to be done. The penitentiary at Kingston in Canada has a full supply of religious agencies; chaplains, Bibles, prayers, preaching, and Sabbath-schools.

There can be no doubt of the effect that the self-denying labours of Mrs. Elizabeth Fry, of England, who from 1813 to 1844 devoted a large portion of her time and means, though she had ten children of her own, to visiting and reforming the prisons of England and those of other nations in Europe, exerted in our country. Especially interested in the condition of convicts of her own sex, she did not confine her labours to them, but she became Howard's successor, whose angel voice announced deliverance to prisoners from many cruel and inhuman burdens. She exposed their wrongs, and touched the conscience of Christian men and women, and enlisted them in her noble work of reform. Her influence was felt here, and her example inspired a kindred zeal among our American philanthropists. A reverend poet, who appreciated her services, thus alluded to her:

> "Once I beheld a wife, a mother go
> To gloomy scenes of wickedness and woe;
> She sought her way through all things vile and base,
> And made a *prison a religious place:*
> Fighting her way—the way that angels fight
> With powers of darkness—to let in the light."

We have in Miss Dix, the blessed friend of the insane, whose efforts in their behalf are made perpetual in the magnificent asylums erected all over our land for lunatics, an illustration of what one woman can do in arousing the public conscience, and reforming legislation.

We see in all these efforts to secure the reform of convicts, and to prevent crime, a beautiful tribute of respect to the Christian religion and the Divine oracles. Our state governments dare not withstand the appeal of a Christian people to send into our prisons and reformatories the word of God, and the living teacher. There is no system of personal reform outside of the Bible. This is now acknowledged by a state when

it gives the Bible and the chaplain, the Sunday-school and the prayer-meeting, to its imprisoned citizens. Why should there be such reluctance ofttimes by legislatures to admit the higher law of the Scriptures? The Bible asserts its claim to be fearlessly and frankly recognized in courts and legislatures, as well as in schools and in prisons.

We are compelled to pass over the subjects of finances, hygiene, and prison industries. The subject of criminal administration, which concerns the penal code—the arrest, trial, conviction, sentence, and pardon of offenders, has a vital relation to prisons and reformatories. To notice the principles which have been discussed and suggested by criminal lawyers and state officials, as furnished in the Appendix to this Report, would require the space of another article. We have written enough to suggest the importance of this Report, and the strong claims which prison reform has upon the good men and women of our day. We hope that our judges, governors, lawyers, physicians, and ministers, will reëxamine this subject, and attain to a higher sense of the wrongs and the remedies connected with our penal institutions.

ART. III.—*Presbyterian Reunion.* By the Rev. HENRY B. SMITH, D. D. Reprinted from the "American Presbyterian and Theological Review," October, 1867.

THERE are two principles on which denomination churches may be organized. According to the one, the essential bond of union is the form of government; according to the other, it is the form of doctrine.

In the Romish Church, the principle of unity is submission to the pope, and to the authority of the church of which he is the head. If this be yielded, great latitude of opinion is allowed to its members and its priesthood. In all ages in that church its theologians have been Augustinians, Semipelagians, Mystics, and Rationalists. The Thomists and Scotists, Dominicans and Franciscans, Jesuits and Jansenists, have all been embraced, not indeed in peaceful fellowship, but in the bonds of external union.

In the Church of England the bond of union is submission to the reigning sovereign as head of the church; and the adoption of the same form of government and mode of worship. In that church all forms of Christian doctrine have ever been tolerated, from Romanism as a theology, down to the lowest Pelagianism. This has been regarded as the greatest glory of that church, and the essential condition of its prosperity and peace.

The same principle is almost of necessity adopted in all established churches. Submission to external authorities and forms, with great latitude in tolerating doctrinal differences, characterize all such churches, because in them the ministry is a state office.

There are churches, however, where the greatest stress is laid upon doctrine. The truth is held paramount to all forms of order or worship. Conformity to the standard of faith is exacted, and professed by every one who enters the ministry of such a church. Such being the understanding, it is dis-

honest in any man to profess to adopt those standards, who does not really believe the doctrines which they teach. We do not say that it is dishonest for a church to adopt the lax principle above stated, provided it be avowed and recognized by all parties to the engagement, but it is undeniably dishonest to profess to believe what we regard as false.

Now it is evident that if a union be proposed between two churches, one of which adopts the strict, and the other the lax principle of subscription, such union must result in constant conflict, unless one of the parties agrees to renounce its own principle, and to adopt that of the other. It is also obvious that wisdom and conscience alike dictate that such union should not be consummated, unless there be a distinct understanding upon this point. Any misconception of each other's views; any misapprehension as to the rule of action to be adopted in the united body, must issue in evil. In a matter in which such great interests are at stake, frankness and openness are imperatively demanded.

All are agreed that union without unity is an evil and not a good. Of what avail would be organic union between us and Baptists, when every celebration of either sacrament would be the occasion or the scene of alienation and conflict. How can Presbyterians and Episcopalians be united in the same church, if one party affirms, and the other denies, the validity of Presbyterial ordination? How can two churches unite with a good conscience, or with any hope of harmonious action, if the one be strict, and the other lax in adoption of the standards of doctrine? Stated *in thesi*, these questions admit of but one answer. All such incongruous unions would be wrong and of evil consequences. In the last case supposed, it is plain that the strict church must agree to become lax, or the lax must agree to become strict, or the union between them would be an offence and evil. So far we take it for granted there can be no diversity of opinion among intelligent and conscientious men.

These are the simple principles which we have to apply to the proposed union between the two great branches of the Presbyterian Church in this country. That this union is desirable is almost universally admitted. That it is in fact

earnestly desired by the great majority of the ministers and members of both bodies, recent events have rendered undeniable. With regard to the New-school this has been evident from the beginning; and as to the Old-school, the action of our Presbyteries has rendered it plain that they are of the same mind. Although the great majority of the Presbyteries, so far as reported, has decided against the adoption of the terms proposed by the joint committee of the two Assemblies, they have, almost without exception, expressed in the strongest language their desire that the union may be effected upon a satisfactory basis. In the recent Presbyterian Convention held in Philadelphia, scarcely a voice was raised against organic union. This is a fact therefore to be acknowledged. The reunion of the Old and New-school churches is by the great majority of both bodies earnestly desired. To this fact no man can shut his eyes; and no one can wisely refuse to give that fact its due weight.

Nevertheless it must be admitted that this union cannot be righteously or advantageously effected unless the two bodies are really one; one in principle and one in practice. If the Old-school be strict in the adoption of the Confession of Faith, and if the New-school be lax or liberal in that matter, either in theory or practice, then the one must adopt the theory and practice of the other, or the union between them would be not only undesirable, but morally wrong.

That our church from the beginning adopted the strict rule of subscription is plain, 1. Because all the members of the original Synod (except one), adopted in 1729 every doctrine of the Confession as expressing his own faith, save certain clauses relating to the power of civil magistrates in matters of religion. 2. Because the Synod in 1730 declared that they required all "intrants" to receive the standards as strictly as the existing members had done the year before. 3. Because in 1736, the same declaration was made in still stronger terms. 4. Because when the two Synods were united in 1758, after the schism, it was on the following basis as to doctrine—"I. Both Synods having always approved and received the Westminster Confession and Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as an orthodox and excellent system of Christian doctrine, founded on the word of

God, we do still receive the same as the confession of our faith; and also adhere to the plan of worship, government, and discipline, contained in the Westminster Directory, strictly enjoining it on all our ministers and probationers for the ministry, that they preach and teach according to the form of sound words in the said Confession and Catechisms, and avoid and oppose all errors contrary thereto."

"VI. That no Presbytery license or ordain to the work of the ministry, any candidate, until he give them competent satisfaction as to his learning, and experimental acquaintance with religion, and skill in divinity and cases of conscience; and declare his acceptance of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms as the confession of his faith, and promise subjection to the Presbyterian form of government in the Westminster Directory."

In 1788, when the present constitution was adopted, the same ground was taken. The Confession of Faith and Catechisms were declared to be the confession of the faith of the church, and pronounced unalterable, except at the suggestion of two-thirds of the Presbyteries. From that time to the disruption in 1837, all the prosecutions for false doctrines were made and sustained by those now constituting the Old-school. Those prosecutions were not made against mere explanations; nor against denials of particular propositions contained in the Confession, unessential to the system of doctrine therein taught. They were made against what the Old-school regarded as errors involving a rejection of the system; errors touching our relation to Adam; to original sin; to efficacious grace; regeneration; the satisfaction of Christ; justification; predestination and election. The Old-school church stands out before the world as a body pledged to maintain, on the part of its ministry, a strict adoption of the Reformed system of doctrine in its integrity. This is its character. This it cannot renounce without being false to its professions and engagements; without condemning all its past history; and, as we said in our July number, and say again with all seriousness, without forfeiting all moral right to its property and endowments. This, therefore, cannot be done. It is this which three-fourths of our Presbyteries, so far as reported, have declared must not be

allowed for the sake of any external advantages, or in obedience to any amount of external pressure. Such is the character and position of the Old-school body.

How is it with the New-school? It also as a party within the church, and as a separate organization since the disruption, has acquired a character and status in the presence of the Christian world. That character in many aspects is high and commanding; perhaps in some respects superior to our own. But the question is as to its distinctive character; the peculiarity by which it is distinguished from the Old-school. That peculiarity, as given and avowed by themselves, is liberality. They are a liberal body. They admit of a latitude in matters of doctrine and order, which the Old-school have conscientiously resisted. In saying this we make no derogatory imputation. We ascribe to our brethren nothing dishonourable or immoral. What is dishonourable and immoral is to profess to adopt a system in its strictness, and then to allow of a latitude of interpretation which destroys its integrity. But every church has a right to assume a broad doctrinal basis, for external ministerial communion, if this be understood and avowed. Presidents Dickinson and Davies were two of the greatest ornaments of our church, and they openly advocated this latitude of interpretation of the Confession of Faith. We do not see that any one has cause to resent as an injury the assertion that he adopts, either theoretically or practically, a principle, which those men publicly avowed. As our earnest desire is to avoid all personalities, and everything adapted to excite unpleasant feeling, we wish to disclaim any intention of impugning the sincerity or honour of any individual, or of any organization. But it is worse than infatuation for any two churches to come into organic union, unless they understand each other, and are agreed as to the true meaning of the terms on which they propose to unite.

We say therefore that the New-school, as distinguished from the Old, is a liberal body; it has hitherto admitted of a latitude in matters of doctrine to which the Old-school on conscientious grounds cannot consent. That this is true we suppose to be as clear and as generally admitted as that of the two great

English parties, the Tory and the Whig, the one is conservative and the other progressive.

The proof that the New-school has hitherto acted on the principle of a greater latitude of construction in adopting the Confession than the Old-school, is found partly in official declarations, and partly in the uniform practice of that body. As to the first class of proof, we find in the pastoral letter of the New-school Assembly in 1838, and in the declaration published by the following Assembly of 1839, such statements as these: 1. They refer the origin of the Presbyterian Church in America to the London Union formed in 1691, between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, which adopted certain general "Heads of Agreement," under which they were to act. 2. That body, we are told, sent one of their number, the Rev. Mr. McKemie, to this country, who established here "a modified form of Presbyterianism." 3. That in the year 1729 the Presbyterian Church in America adopted the Westminster Confession in "the articles essential or necessary in doctrine, worship, or discipline." 4. That "the rash departure from the tolerant and fraternal principles" of 1729, led to the schism of 1741. 5. That that schism was healed in 1758 by a return to those liberal principles, the terms of reunion being "a subscription to the Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, notwithstanding any such scruples with respect to any article or articles of said Confession, as the Presbytery or Synod shall judge not essential, in doctrine, worship, or discipline." 6. That the Church continued peaceful and prosperous until the union with the Associate Reformed church in 1821; but soon after that event, the difference of views on doctrinal points, which had been previously tolerated, "became the occasions of alarm, and whisperings, and accusations, and at length of ecclesiastical trials for heresy." 7. "That the result of these efforts to change the terms of subscription and union" was the separation effected in 1837.*

.* Our object is not to comment on the historical correctness of the above statements. In our opinion, however, it is not true that the Presbyterian Church in this country owes its origin to the London Union of Congregationalists and Presbyterians formed in 1691. It is certainly not true that the Synod

It thus appears from these official documents that the New-school as a party and as a church has avowedly contended for a greater latitude in the adoption of the Confession of Faith than the Old-school was willing to concede. The prominent distinction between the two bodies has ever been that the one is strict, and the other "liberal" in its requirements as to matters of doctrine.

The same liberal principle is avowed in other official publications, and by the representative men of the New-school church. In 1850, the Synod of New York and New Jersey appointed a committee, consisting of five ministers and five elders, "to prepare and publish a brief history of the causes which produced" the division of the church in 1837. This distinguished committee accomplished the work assigned to them in 1852. Their history recites, from the official documents referred to above, the same statements respecting the origin and early character of our church; as to the qualified adoption of the Westminster Confession; as to the liberal principles on which the schism of 1741 was healed; and as to the attempts of the Old-school to alter the terms of subscription. It says that the preliminary act of 1729, which distinguishes between essential and nonessential doctrines, "does immortal honour to its authors and to those who received it as a bond of Christian union and fellowship." P. 87. In the eleventh chapter, in which the Committee state their position as a church, it is said, "In respect to doctrine, our position is between latitudinaranism, which tolerates error subversive of the gospel, on the one hand; and uniformity, which precludes all diversity of views on points not essential, on the other." P. 215. Again, "Our position in respect of doctrine, is that of agreement in things *fundamental*, and toleration and forbearance in things *not essential*, 'endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace.'" P. 216.

of 1729 adopted the Westminster Confession only as to the articles deemed "essential or necessary in doctrine, worship, or discipline." It is certainly incorrect to say that the schism of 1741 was occasioned by an attempt to alter the terms of subscription. That schism had nothing to do with matters of doctrine or terms of subscription. It is not true that when the schism was healed in 1758, there was any reference whatever to essential and nonessential articles. And it is not true that the disruption of the church in 1837 was occasioned by any attempt "to change the terms of subscription."

In the *Independent* for April 9, 1863, there is an article entitled, "The Presbyterian Church in the United States (New-school). By Prof. Henry B. Smith, D. D. New York." In the second paragraph of that article, it is said, "New England accepted the Confession and Catechisms in 1648, and the Presbyterian Church, by its adopting act of 1729, declared that they were, 'in all essential and necessary articles, good forms, and sound words, and systems of Christian doctrine,' allowing, however, differences of opinion, provided they were, 'only about articles not essential or necessary.' This adjustment had respect to the fact that two tendencies, the New England and the Scotch-Irish, then nearly equal in numbers, united in the new organization. This is the basis of the American Presbyterian Church."

This documentary evidence proves, beyond reasonable contradiction, that the characteristic difference between the Old and New-school is, that the one is strict, and the other liberal in the adoption of our common standards.

The other source of proof is that the New-school admit men into its ministry, whom the Old-school consider unsound in doctrine to the extent of the rejecting some of the essential elements of the Reformed or Calvinistic system. It is a matter of painful surprise to us that our brethren will not distinguish between a rule of church action and the personal belief of its ministers. When we say that the Church of England admits Pelagians into its ministry, we do not say that the body of its clergy, or the church itself, is Pelagian. We only say that it allows great latitude in the interpretation of its standards. When we say that the New-school admits Taylorites into its ministry, we do not say that the mass of its ministers are Taylorites, or that the church itself professes the New Haven divinity. Nine-tenths, or ninety-nine-hundreths, of the New-school ministers may be perfectly orthodox, and yet they may think it right to give this latitude of opinion to those who choose to avail themselves of it. The men in our old Synod, as we remarked above, who were in favour of this liberality, were among the most orthodox, excellent, and distinguished ministers in the country.

The proof that the New-school are liberal to the extent of

admitting into its ministry men who deny some of the essential doctrines of our system, is found in the fact, that it receives avowed advocates of the New Haven divinity.

We trust no one will be so uncandid as to say that a man does not adopt the New Haven theology, because he may not agree with Dr. Taylor in all his opinions. Dr. Smith calls himself a Calvinist; but does he adopt all Calvin's opinions? We all call ourselves Augustinians, but there are many doctrines of Augustin, which we with one voice reject. Augustinianism or Calvinism is a known historical system of doctrine; and those who adopt that system in its distinctive features have a right to call themselves Augustinians or Calvinists, and to be so regarded by others. We trust therefore that our brethren will not consider that we impute sentiments to them which they distinctly disavow, when we say that the church to which they belong practically adopts this liberal construction of our common standards.

A presumptive evidence of this fact may be found in the ready admission which the graduates of the New Haven and Andover Theological Seminaries find in the New-school churches. As a general rule, students attend those seminaries where the theology taught suits their own views. With many exceptions doubtless, the students of such institutions imbibe the doctrines therein inculcated. We have never heard that students from Andover, trained under Prof. Park, who has a peculiar talent for making Old-school doctrines appear ridiculous and odious, find any more difficulty in being received into the New-school body than into the Congregational churches of Massachusetts. A slight inspection of the Andover triennial catalogue will show how many of those students are acting as ministers in good standing in New-school Presbyteries.

For direct proof on this subject we need at present to refer only to the article of Dr. Duffield, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, reviewed in our last number; and to the resolution of the Tioga Presbytery. As to the former, although the author assumes to speak in the name of his church, we do not believe that he fairly represents the views of one-tenth of its ministers. We do not refer to his article as evidence of the general pre-

valence in the New-school body of the doctrines which he avows, but simply as evidence that those doctrines are tolerated by the New-school. Dr. Duffield goes over the whole ground, saying, as to each point, the Old-school teach so, and the New-school teach so. The two systems are contrasted. The one is denied and the other is affirmed. That which is affirmed is, in all important points, the New Haven system; which not the Old-school only, but the great body of New England divines, pronounce entirely incompatible with the system taught in the Westminster Confession. This is the judgment of such men as the late Dr. Woods of Andover, of Dr. Porter, Dr. Humphrey, Dr. Griffin, Dr. Tyler, Dr. Nettelton, as well as of the late Dr. Richards, Dr. Fisher, Dr. Hillyer, and others of the New-school Presbyterians.*

The Tioga Presbytery resolved that ministers holding the views of Dr. Taylor and Dr. Park are to be regarded as of unquestioned orthodoxy in the united church, provided the Old and New-school should be united on the plan proposed by the joint committee of the two Assemblies. The gentlemen named in the above resolution are men of great distinction. They have written abundantly for the press. Their views are universally known. The judgment not of Old-school men only, but also, as we have seen, of the larger part of the most eminent of the New England divines, has been pronounced, viz., that they are incompatible with the Reformed or Calvinistic faith. Any attempt to reverse this judgment must fail. The endeavour to show that Dr. Duffield's article is consistent with the system of doctrine contained in our Confession, does ten times more harm than good.

Any competent and candid reader can be convinced of the correctness of the judgment which pronounces the New Haven divinity inconsistent with Calvinism, by a very brief exhibition of the leading features of that system.

Every student of history knows that the Pelagian controversy had its origin in the offence which Pelagius took to a prayer of Augustin, *Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis.* This

* See Letters on the Origin and Progress of the New Haven Theology. By a New England minister to one in the South. P. 109.

Pelagius said was absurd, as it assumed that God could righteously command, what we of ourselves were not able to perform. His argument runs thus, Quærendum est, peccatum voluntatis an necessitatis est? Si necessitatis est, peccatum non est; si voluntatis, vitari potest. Iterum quærendum est, utrumne debeat homo sine peccato esse? Procul dubio debet. Si debet potest; si non potest, ergo non debeat. This intimate conviction that men can be responsible for nothing which is not in their power, led, in the first place, to the Pelagian doctrine of free will. It was not enough to constitute free agency, that the agent should be self-determined, or that his volitions should be determined by his own inward states. It is necessary that he should have power over those states. Liberty of will, according to this theory, is plenary power at all times, and at every moment, of choosing between good and evil; and of being either good or bad, sinful or holy. Whatever does not fall within this imperative power of the will, can have no moral character. Omne bonum ac malum, quo vel laudabiles vel vituperabiles sumus, non nobis oritur, sed agitur a nobis. (*Apud Augustin. de Peccato Orig.* 14.)

These views of the nature of free agency and ability, Dr. Taylor and the other New Haven divines constantly avow. "Moral agency," says Dr. Taylor, (*Lectures*, vol. i., p. 307,) "implies free agency—the power of choice—the power to choose morally wrong as well as morally right, under every possible influence to prevent such choice or action." Again, in the *Christian Spectator* for 1831, p. 632, "Men are free agents; by which we mean, not simply that they have the power to do as they please, or have command over the muscles of the body, but the power of choice itself; a power to place their hearts on idols, the objects of mere personal gratification, or to place their hearts on God—to choose either, as their supreme portion." It is here as distinctly asserted that free agency implies plenary ability, as that doctrine was ever stated by Pelagius himself. Dr. Taylor was fully aware of his agreement with Pelagius on this fundamental principle. In vol. ii. p. 132, he says, "Here I am constrained to ask, whether in all this theology, both Catholic and Protestant, theologians in maintaining the doctrines of grace, have not extensively main-

tained opinions—philosophical dogmas, unscriptural principles, and held them as essential doctrines of the word of God, which are palpably inconsistent with, and utterly subversive of, God's authority as a lawgiver? Without referring to more remote incongruities on this subject, may it not be said to be a prevalent doctrine of the Christian church from the time of Augustin, and emphatically in the two great divisions of the Reformed church, known as the Calvinistic and Arminian, that 'God commands what man *cannot* perform,' 'that man by the fall lost all ability of will to anything spiritually good;' 'that God did not lose his right to command though man lost his power to obey?' The error of Pelagius is, not that he maintained man's ability without grace, but that man does *actually* obey God without grace." It is a mistake to say that Pelagius held that "men do actually obey God without grace." So that this shadowy difference between him and Dr. Taylor on this point vanishes. Dr. Taylor here consciously places himself in avowed opposition to the whole Christian world, Catholic and Protestant.

As Dr. Taylor and Pelagius agreed in this fundamental principle as to free agency and ability, so they agreed in the conclusions which they drew from it. These conclusions follow by a logical necessity.

1. The first of these is, that all sin consists in the voluntary transgression of known law. In the quotation above given, Pelagius says, that sin "is something done by us," and his associate, Julian, says, "Nihil est peccati in homine, si nihil est propriæ voluntatis vel assentionis." (*Aug. Op. Imp.* i. 60.) Or, as is often expressed, "Quod nihil habet rationem peccati nisi fiat a volente et sciente." That such is the doctrine of the New Haven divines is universally admitted. To prove this was the great object of Dr. Taylor's celebrated *Concio ad Clerum.* It is so often reiterated by him and his disciples, that proof passages can hardly be required. The first position which that discourse endeavoured to establish is, that "there is no sin except such as consists in man's voluntary act." Moral depravity he defines, "A man's own act, consisting in the free choice of some object rather than God as his chief good." *The Christian Spectator*, 1831, p. 632, says, Men's sin

"consists wholly in their own voluntary act." The uniform tenor of Dr. Taylor's discourse is said by the *Christian Spectator*, 1829, p. 347, to be, "The agent is guilty for acting contrary to the demands of known duty."

2. A second inference from these premises is, that there can be no original, or hereditary sin, no sin derived by descent from our first parent. Pelagius said, as all sin in us is something done by ourselves, it follows, ut sine virtute, ita sine vitio procreamur, atque ante actionem propriæ voluntatis id solum in homine est, quod Deus condidit. So Julian argued, Tu autem concedis nihil fuisse in parvulis propriæ voluntatis; non ego, sed ratio concludit nihil igitur in eis esse peccati. Dr. Taylor in his *Concio* says, by mankind being depraved by nature, "I do not mean that their nature itself is sinful, nor that their nature is the physical or efficient cause of their sinning; but I mean that their nature is the occasion of their sinning; that such is their nature, that in all the appropriate circumstances of their being, they will, and only sin." In the *Christian Spectator*, 1829, for June, we find such statements as the following: A moral being "can be regarded only in two points of view—the substance of the soul with its essential attributes on the one hand, and its actions on the other. If there is sin in the mind previous to and independent of those actions, the substance of the soul itself must be sinful." P. 347. "By a moral nature we mean the power of choosing and refusing, in view of motives, and with a knowledge of right and wrong." "In accounting for this abuse (of our moral nature), we are not to say that a man's nature is itself sinful; for no man, we think, can say this at the present day, without charging his sinful nature directly upon God, as its author." P. 349. It is vain, says the *Spectator*, to appeal to the laws of propagation, for God established those laws. "Every soul, then, which becomes united to a human body, has either existed from eternity, or has been brought into existence by God. And every thing pertaining to such a soul, which is not its own act, must of necessity result from the act of God." P. 348. When Mr. Harvey, says the reviewer, in order to account for the universality of sin, "talks of 'a native depravity,' which 'was voluntary in the transgression of Adam, who acted as the represen-

tative of his race,' he carries us back, at once, to the most revolting statements of the doctrine of imputation." P. 352. In page 373, he examines Mr. Harvey's arguments for original sin. 1. "Infants die. The answer has been given a thousand times, brutes also die. But Mr. Harvey replies, 'animals are not the subjects of the moral government of God.' Neither are infants previous to moral agency, for what has moral government to do with those who are not moral agents." . . . "Animals, and infants previous to moral agency, do therefore stand on precisely the same ground in reference to this subject." 2. A second argument, "Why are infants baptized? Because God has permitted believing parents to put upon their offspring 'the seal and token of the covenant.' This seal is the pledge and assurance that of those to whom it is applied God will raise up children unto Abraham. But is there no significance in the use of the purifying element of water in this ordinance? Certainly. It indicates that the being to whom it is applied will need the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit, from the earliest moment that such influences from the nature of the case can take effect."* Far as the Romish church has departed from Augustinianism, its symbols pronounce this view of baptism a solemn mockery. They condemn all those who say that infants are not baptized for the remission of their own sin, *peccatum unicuique proprium.* All Christian churches hold that infants are in such a state as to need the application of the blood and Spirit of Christ for the removal of guilt and pollution. Dr. Taylor's views on this subject, therefore, are not only in conflict with the doctrine of the Reformed churches, but

* Several years before the delivery of Dr. Taylor's sermon on the Nature of Sin, the writer of this article, then just out of the Seminary, spent a few days in his family, and found him one of the most frank, cordial, and delightful men, whom, in a long life, he has ever met. It was the Doctor's habit, it would seem, to talk freely of his opinions, even to the young. At any rate, he condescended to expound his views to the writer, as to the freedom of infants from guilt and moral pollution. In answer to the question, What he made of infant baptism? he playfully snapped his fingers, and said, "There you've got me. I havn't got an answer to that yet; but I'll get one before long." The answer given in the text is doubtless the one found. Those who were most earnest in their protest against Dr. Taylor's doctrine, retained, universally, we believe, the highest regard for him personally.

of the whole Christian world; that is, of all the organized, historical churches of Christendom. 3. A third argument for the doctrine of original sin was drawn from the acknowledged fact that infants need redemption. All of the human family who are saved, are saved through the sprinkling of the blood of Christ and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. Infants, therefore, must be in a state of guilt and moral corruption. This argument is thus met by New Haven divines: "By salvation, in reference to those who are not moral agents, is meant deliverance from the future existence and consequent punishment of sin, and a title to eternal life."

These citations are sufficient for our purpose. They prove decisively that the New Haven theology involves the denial of original sin, as that doctrine has been held by the whole Christian world. It is true that Dr. Taylor admits that men are depraved by nature; that is, that such is their nature that they will certainly sin. But this was admitted by Pelagius, except in a case here and there among millions. What is meant by this depravity by nature we are clearly taught. "A child enters the world," says the *Spectator*, "with a variety of appetites and desires, which are generally acknowledged to be neither sinful nor holy. Committed in a state of utter helplessness to the assiduity of parental fondness, it commences its existence, the object of unceasing care, watchfulness, and concession, to those around it. Under such circumstances it is, that the natural appetites are first developed; and each advancing month brings them new objects of gratification. The obvious consequence is, that self-indulgence becomes the master principle in the soul of every child, long before it can understand that this self-indulgence will ever interfere with the rights, or entrench on the happiness of others. Thus by repetition is the force of constitutional propensities accumulating a bias towards self-gratification, which becomes incredibly strong before a knowledge of duty, or a sense of right or wrong, can possibly have entered the mind. That moment, the commencement of moral agency, at length arrives. Does the child now come in a state of perfect neutrality, to the question, whether it will obey or disobey the command which cuts it off from some favourite gratification? If the temptation presented

to constitutional propensities, could be so strong in the case of Adam, as to overpower the force of established habits of virtue in the maturity of his reason, how absolute is the certainty that every child will yield to the urgency of those propensities, under the redoubled impulse of long-cherished self-gratification, and in the dawn of intellectual existence?" *Christian Spectator*, 1829, p. 366, 367. The child, according to this, comes into the world, as Pelagius said, *sine virtute et sine vitio*. As he certainly stumbles in walking, and errs in reason, so also he certainly fails in the exercise of his moral agency. This is the probation for eternity on which the Heavenly Father places his infant children! It is not our business, however, to discuss these points. It is enough to say that the doctrine above stated was condemned in œcumenical councils, and has remained under the condemnation of the church universal from that day to this.

The New Haven divines are also willing to admit what they say may be called, although improperly, "a sinful bias," or propensity to sin in infants. This propensity to self-indulgence is called sinful, not in itself, but because it leads to sin. "There are those who," say these divines, "on the ground of this certainty alone, are accustomed to speak of human nature as itself sinful. By the term 'sinful,' they do not mean deserving of punishment, but certainly resulting in sin. And we believe that multitudes who imagine themselves to mean more than this, will find on examining closely, that this is the whole amount of their real and practical faith." P. 375. "Those who fancy themselves to believe in its existence, are, in our opinion, either misled by ambiguous language, or deluded precisely as Hume, Berkeley, and Edwards were in their speculations. The testimony of their consciences, their habits of prayer, and their modes of striving against sin, will furnish a complete demonstration, we think, that they truly and practically believe 'there is no sin except such as consists in a man's own voluntary acts.' As to the figurative use of the terms 'sin,' 'sinful,' and 'guilty,' &c., to denote certainty of sin, and not 'desert of punishment,' we think it unhappy in a high degree." P. 376. All the Romish, all the Lutheran, all the Reformed, all the Wesleyans or Evangelical Arminian symbols, teach that since

the fall all men are born with sin, *nascantur cum peccato;* that innate, hereditary corruption is truly sin. The Augsburg Confession, for example, says, "Hic vitium originis vere sit peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque mortem his, qui non renascantur per Baptismum et Sanctum Spiritum." The Form of Concord says that this *hæreditarum morbum* is to be regarded "pro horibili peccato." This is precisely what the Pelagians, the extreme Remonstrants, and the New Haven theology, denies. The denial and affirmation of the same thing cannot be regarded as different forms of one and the same truth. It is not enough to save the universal church doctrine of original sin, to admit the existence of "a sinful bias" or propensity. This was admitted by those who regarded themselves, and were regarded by the church universal, as rejecting the doctrine of original sin. Thus the Remonstrant theologian, Limborch, (*Theol. Christ.* iii. 4, 1,) says, "Inclinatio illa (ad peccandum) proprie dictum peccatum non est, aut peccati habitus ab Adamo in illos propagatus, sed naturalis tantum inclinatio habendi id, quod carni gratum est."

We do not see, therefore, how it can be denied that the New Haven theology rejects the doctrine of original sin as it enters into the faith of the whole Christian church.*

* As long since as 1828, Dr. Beecher distinctly recognized the fact that the principle that all sin consists in voluntary action, involved a rejection of the Reformed doctrine of original sin. In the *Spirit of the Pilgrims* for that year he writes: "The Reformers with one accord taught that the sin of Adam was imputed to all his posterity, and that a corrupt nature descends from him to every one of his posterity, in consequence of which infants are unholy, unfit for heaven, and justly exposed to future punishment." "Our Puritan fathers adhered to the doctrine of original sin as consisting in the imputation of Adam's sin, and in a hereditary depravity; and this continued to be the received doctrine of the churches of New England, until after the time of Edwards. He adopted the views of the Reformers on the subject of original sin and a depraved nature transmitted by descent. But after him this mode of stating the subject was gradually changed until long since, the prevailing doctrine in New England is, that men are not guilty of Adam's sin, that depravity is not of the substance of the soul, nor an inherent physical quality, but is wholly voluntary, and consists in a transgression of the law in such circumstances as constitute responsibility and desert of punishment." None of the Reformers and no Christian church ever held that "depravity was of the substance of the soul." But Dr. Beecher assumed with Dr. Taylor that there is nothing "in the soul but its essence and its acts;" and therefore if depravity

3. A third inference which Pelagians drew from their views of free agency, is that God of necessity limits himself in the creation of free agents. They are from their nature beyond his absolute control. If free agency involves the ability to choose and act contrary to any amount of influence which can be brought to bear upon free agents, without destroying their freedom, then God cannot control them. He cannot prevent sin, or the present amount of sin, in a moral system. Neither can he convert whom he pleases. He can persuade and argue; but man may, and multitudes do, resist his utmost efforts to bring them to repentance. These inferences the New Haven divines adopt and avow. "Moral agency," says Dr. Taylor, "implies free agency—the power of choice—the power to choose morally wrong as well as morally right, under every possible influence to prevent such an action." *Lect.* vol. i. p. 307. "Moral beings, under this best moral system, must have power to sin, in despite of all that God can do under this system to prevent them; and to suppose that they should do what they under this system, viz., sin, and that God should prevent their sinning, is a contradiction and an impossibility. It may be true that such beings in this respect, will do what they can do—that is, will sin—when of course it would be impossible that God, other things remaining the same, should prevent their sinning without destroying their moral agency." Vol. i. p. 321, 322. In his sermon on sin, he says: "The error lies in the gratuitous assumption, that God could have adopted a moral system, and prevented all sin, or at least the present degree of sin." Again, "Would not a benevolent God, had it been possible to him in the nature of things, have secured the existence of universal holiness in his moral kingdom?" Again, "Who does most reverence to God, he who supposes that God would have prevented all sin in his moral universe, but could not; or he who affirms that he could have prevented it, but would not?" The doctrine held by all Christendom, that God can

was not an act, it must be of the substance of the soul. This is interpreting the doctrines of others by one's own philosophy. If the above principle be correct, there is no difference between a good man and a bad man, but in their acts; and there is no such thing as a character.

effectually control free agents, without destroying their nature, is regarded by the New Haven divines as a most dangerous error. *Spect.* 1832, p. 482.

God according to their theory prevents all the sin he can; he brings all the influence he can to secure the conversion of every man. If he fails, it is because men effectually resist his utmost exertions for their salvation consistent with their free agency. Let it be remembered that we are not giving our inferences from Dr. Taylor's principles; but simply stating the inferences which he and his associates draw for themselves and present as Christian doctrine.

Of course it also follows from this theory of free agency that there can be no such thing as "effectual calling" in the Augustinian sense of those words. By effectual calling is meant such an exercise of the power of the Holy Spirit on the soul of a sinner as effectually, or inevitably, secures its regeneration and conversion unto God. It is, as all Augustinians maintain, from its nature "irresistible," although its effect is not to coerce but to render the sinner willing in the day of God's power. The New Haven divines explicitly deny this. Regeneration is defined to be, not an act of God, but an act of the sinner himself. It is the act of choosing God as a portion, or source of happiness. But the fundamental principle of the system, repeated over and over, is that a free agent can and may act contrary to any amount of influence which can be brought to bear upon him, short of destroying his freedom. He can, therefore, and multitudes do, effectually resist the utmost efforts of the Spirit of God to secure their salvation. "In all cases," it is said, "it (the grace of God) may be resisted by man as a free moral agent, and it never becomes effectual to salvation until it is unresisted." "God offers the same necesary conditions of acceptance to all men; desires from the heart that all men, as free agents, would comply with them and live; brings no positive influence upon any mind against compliance; but, on the contrary, brings all those kinds, and all that degree of influence in favour of it upon each individual, which a system of measures best arranged for the success of grace in a world of rebellion allows, and finally, saves, without respect of kindred, rank, or country; whether Scythian, Greek, or Jew,

all who, under this influence, work out their own salvation, and reprobates alike all who refuse." *Spect.* 1831, p. 635. Again, "The means of reclaiming grace, which meet him in the word and Spirit of God, are those by which the Father draws, induces just such sinners as himself voluntarily to submit to Christ; and these means all favour the act of his immediate submission. To this influence he can yield, and thus be drawn of the Father. This influence he can resist, and thus harden his heart against God. Election involves nothing more, as respects his individual case, except one fact—the certainty of the Divine mind, whether the sinner will yield to the means of grace, and voluntarily turn to God, or whether he will continue to harden his heart till the means of grace are withdrawn." *Id.* p. 637. The Arminian doctrine of sufficient grace has never been stated in clearer terms than in the above quotation.

This New Haven doctrine makes infant regeneration, in which the whole Christian world believes, an impossibility. According to that doctrine regeneration is the choice of God as a portion. But of such choice the infant mind is confessedly incapable. It is no less incapable of being the subject of any such process as that described in the immediately preceding quotations, by which the Spirit "induces" sinners to make choice of God. Accordingly, when speaking of infant baptism, these divines say, that it is intended to indicate that children "will need the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit, from the earliest moment that such influences in the nature of the case can take effect." They do not need them while infants, because, from the nature of the case, they can take effect only on moral agents.

4. Once more, it follows the New Haven theory of moral agency and ability, that there can be no such thing as predestination and sovereign election in the ordinary and accepted sense of those terms. To foreordain is not simply to submit to the occurrence of what we cannot prevent. If God "out of his mere good pleasure" elects some to everlasting life, he does not elect them because he foresees they can be persuaded to repent and believe. In the latter case, he elects some and not others, because he foresees that some, and not others, will submit to

be persuaded. Every theologian knows that Augustinians when treating of the objects of God's knowledge, so far as things out of himself are concerned, divide them into the two classes of things possible, and things actual. In the exercise of simple intelligence, God knows whatever can be; in other words, all that omnipotence can effect. By the knowledge of vision he sees all that according to his purpose ever actually occurs. Under these two heads, all events are comprehended. The Jesuit theologians, in their controversy with the Jansenists, introduced a third category, intermediate between the knowledge of simple intelligence and the knowledge of vision. This they called *scientia media.* The objects of this form of knowledge are the acts of free agents. God foresees how such agents will act under given circumstances. This distinction was introduced with the conscious and avowed intention of getting rid of the Augustinian doctrine, held by the Jansenists, of predestination and sovereign election. God foresees who will, and who will not submit to the plan of salvation. Those whom he foresees will submit, he elects to eternal life; those whom he foresees will not submit, he predestinates to eternal death. The New Haven divines adopt the same distinction, and apply it to the same purpose. In the *Christian Spectator*, 1831, p. 628, it is said, speaking of the vessels of mercy, "These are the very persons who, God foreknew, (when he resolved on his works of mercy,) would be induced to believe, and whom in carrying forward those works, he prepares for glory. It was to *be* believers, and not *as* believers, that he chose them, under the guidance of his [*scientia media*] foreknowledge." The words "scientia media" included in brackets are not inserted by us, they belong to the text.

Again on page 618, it is said, "The quotation which Dr. Fisk gives from the Articles of Faith, is incomplete, and in the sense given to it, unfair. The framers of that article did not intend to affirm (as we suppose) that the foreknowledge of God has nothing to do with election. The qualifying phrase, which they have annexed, should have been added, 'without any foresight of faith and good works as conditions or causes moving him thereunto.' They did not mean to assert, that the faith and good works of none are foreseen, as the certain result

of God's work of grace. They meant only (we conceive) that the works of the elect (though foreseen) were not regarded as meritorious conditions, deserving those interpositions in their behalf, which secured their faith, and thus secured their acceptance in Christ, as children of an everlasting adoption. But, surely, the faith and subsequent adoption in Christ of certain individuals among the lost, were foreseen by God as the certain results of his own works of grace."

We are not aware that any Lutheran or Wesleyan, however opposed to the Augustinian doctrine, or however strenuous in asserting that election is founded on the foresight of faith and repentance, ever dreamed of regarding such faith and repentance as "the meritorious conditions" of election. Lutherans and Wesleyans refer all that is meritorious in the salvation of men to the person and work of Christ. We cannot see, therefore, that there is the slightest difference between their doctrine and that of the New Haven divines, as to this particular point. In any other aspect we regard the New Haven doctrine much the lower of the two. It teaches that God does all he can to convert every man, and elects those whom he succeeds in inducing to repent. Thus on page 634 of the same volume of the *Spectator*, it is urged that their theory "presents a fairer view of God's wisdom and goodness" than the Arminian, in that "without doing anything to procure the sin of men, or hinder their return to him, he does, on the contrary, in his works of grace, do everything to encourage and persuade them to return to him and secure their salvation, which he can do amid the obstacles opposed by their sins to the triumph of his law and grace."

The reader will not be surprised to learn that Dr. Fisk, in his reply to this review of his sermon, makes such remarks as the following: "If I understand the reviewer he is in principle an Arminian. The reviewer's whole ground of defence is this Arminian explanation of the doctrine of predestination." "The sermon was never written to oppose the decrees of God in an Arminian sense. Why, then, does the reviewer complain of the sermon? It seems that Calvinism, in its proper character, is as obnoxious to the reviewer as to the author of the sermon. If it is safer to attack Calvinism in this indirect way, I will

not object. But I cannot see that it would be safer. An open, bold front always ends best. As I understand the reviewer, from the days of John Calvin down to the present hour, there is, on this point, between the great body of Calvinists and himself, almost no likeness except in the use of words. Theirs is one doctrine, his another." Dr. Fisk was not alone in this judgment. "The late Dr. Griffin, after quoting the foregoing passages in his Treatise on the Divine Efficiency, makes the following observation: 'These remarks of the President of the Wesleyan University of Connecticut, appear to me to be candid and judicious, and go far towards exposing the unhappy incongruity between the language and sentiments of this review.'" *Letters on New Haven Theology*, p. 112.

The same doctrine concerning election is taught by Dr. Duffield, as shown in our last number. "The divine decree of election embraces all whom God foresaw that he could, by the blood and Spirit of Christ, bring to faith and repentance."

We say nothing of the New Haven doctrines concerning the atonement and justification, because they are not connected with the system. A man may agree with Dr. Taylor on those subjects, and yet reject his system; or, he may embrace his peculiar system and yet reject his views on those particular doctrines. The system contemplates God specially in his character as a Moral Governor, ruling over moral agents. Moral agents are free agents. Free agency implies plenary ability to do and to be whatever law or duty demands. Free agents must have the power to act contrary to any kind or degree of influence which can be brought to bear upon them. From this it follows that sin consists wholly in the voluntary transgression of known law. All mankind, therefore, did not sin in Adam and fall with him in his first transgression. Every man stands his probation for himself. He is neither under condemnation nor the subject of anything of the nature of sin, until he arrives at the stage in which moral agency begins, and deliberately transgresses the law of God. There can be no innate hereditary sin or sinfulness. As free agents can act contrary to any amount of influence which is not destructive of their freedom, they are beyond the absolute control of God. He can neither prevent all sin, nor the present amount of sin

in his moral kingdom. He cannot secure universal holiness, or a greater amount of holiness in that kingdom. He does all he can to convert every sinner, consistent with his moral agency. Those whom he foresees he can induce to repent and believe, he elects to eternal life. Regeneration is the choice of God as the portion of the soul; a choice which every moral agent can refuse to make in despite of all God can do, short of destroying his free agency. Of the choice which constitutes regeneration, infants are incapable.

Of this system we say, 1. That it is not Calvinism, in any fair or true sense of the term; but in all points directly antagonistic to it, so that the acceptance of the one is the rejection of the other.

2. We say, in the second place, that this system is not only inconsistent with the doctrines of the Reformed church, but with those of the church universal. It has never been embraced in the symbols of any organized, historical Christian church on the face of the earth. Even the Greek church, which takes the lowest position on all questions concerning sin and grace, maintains that infants are in a state of condemnation and sin, and need the remission of sin and regeneration, as signified, or, effected, (as the Greeks say), in baptism. The New Haven system is much below the Semi-Pelagian doctrine. It is still further removed from the doctrines of the Romish church as determined in the Council of Trent. It is below not only the Lutheran views on these points, but below the Arminian system as held by all Wesleyans.

3. In the third place, we say that system, although condemned by the church universal, has hitherto been tolerated in the ministry of the New-school body. On this point we beg to be understood. We therefore repeat *ad taedium*, that we do not say that the mass of our New-school brethren hold the New Haven system. We do not say that one in ten of their Presbyteries would license or ordain a candidate who professed that system, or receive a minister who avowed it. We only say that the New-school as a body, as an organized church, has up to the present time, tolerated in its ministry men who openly proclaim themselves its adherents. The proof of this has already been adduced. This is the system, which

the Tioga Presbytery says must be regarded as orthodox, and of which the New-school General Assembly of 1838 spoke of as a matter of little moment. In its Narrative on the State of Religion for that year, the hope is expressed "that shades of difference in prevailing theological views" may soon be forgotten. This is said of the difference between East Windsor and New Haven, between Dr. Tyler and Dr. Taylor.

4. A fourth remark is, that for the Old-school church deliberately, and with its eyes open, to bind itself to regard the New Haven divinity as consistent with our standards, would be simple apostacy. It would be to condemn all our past record. It would be to repudiate our solemn, and often reiterated declarations. It would be to violate our pledge; to be unfaithful to our trust, and completely to destroy our identity. And for our church to be led into such a compact without understanding what it was doing, would be to the last degree disastrous.

5. The reason why our Presbyteries have, with such unanimity, protested against the terms of union proposed by the joint committee is, that those terms do bind us to receive the Confession of Faith with the same latitude of construction with which it had been hitherto adopted by the New-school body. Our life-long friend, Dr. Beatty, the chairman of that committee, than whom there is not a man in our church more respected, loved, or trusted, thinks that we did him and the committee injustice in putting such an interpretation on their plan. He says that we materially alter its sense by inserting a comma after the clause, "as it is accepted by the two bodies," in the first article of the terms of union. It should read that the Confession of Faith shall continue to be adopted, "in its fair historical sense, as it is accepted by the two bodies in opposition to Antinomianism and Fatalism on the one hand, &c." We have to confess, with regret, that we are careless in matters of punctuation. Whether that comma was in the newspaper report from which we copied; or, whether the printer inserted it; or, whether we put it there ourselves, we cannot say. All we know is, that we did not insert it with any intention of altering the sense. And we do not see that it does affect the meaning in any material matter. Whether the comma be

there or not, the article binds the contracting parties to adopt the Confession of Faith, as it has been hitherto received by the two bodies. The one consents to be no stricter than the other. Besides, the second article of the proposed plan provides that every minister of good standing in either church shall be regarded as of good standing in the united church. That is, we cannot deem heterodox any minister whom any New-school Presbytery has pronounced orthodox. As the Tioga Presbytery declares the views of Drs. Taylor and Park to be orthodox, we should be bound to acquiesce in that judgment. In our July number we explicitly stated that we exonerated our committee of any intention to give up our principle of subscription. They understood the terms in which they acquiesced as securing that point. In this matter we are forced to differ from them. But whether we were right or wrong in this matter, is of subordinate importance. The action of our Presbyteries has rendered it clear, first, that they cannot conscientiously consent to any plan of union which shall involve the surrender of our principle of construction; and secondly, that they are satisfied that the New-school, as a body, has hitherto practically adopted a different, and much more liberal principle of construction.

It was to make this latter point apparent; to bring it home to the intelligence and conscience, especially of the younger portion of our ministry, that the preceding pages were written. We have no desire to renew old controversies; or to provoke any unkind feelings; or to operate against the reunion of the Old and New branches of the Presbyterian church. Our simple purpose is that we should understand each other. We have hitherto differed. We have so differed as to render reunion, on any terms satisfactory to the conscience of both parties, apparently impossible.

This was the posture of affairs up to the publication of the article on reunion by Dr. Henry B. Smith of New York. That article has changed the aspect of the case. Dr. Smith tells us that the New-school body is not now what it once was. "It gives in a more unreserved adhesion to our symbols, with entire unanimity, than it could then have done," *i. e.*, thirty years ago. P. 639. He assures us that it is perfectly willing to accede to the principle of subscription for which the Old-

school contend. That principle is, and is understood by Dr. Smith to be, 1. That the Confession of Faith is to be adopted as containing "the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." 2. That by the system thus taught is to be understood the Reformed or Calvinistic system. 3. That this system is to be sincerely adopted in its integrity. 4. That to secure the integrity of the system, "the individual doctrines," and not one doctrine here and another there, but the several doctrines in their historical sense, must be adopted. See pp. 641, 642, 643. The Old-school have never demanded more than this. And they have no right to demand more. Dr. Smith, indeed, cannot bind his church. But no objection has been made to his statements, and his pamphlet, we understand, has been sent to all our ministers, to let them know what the New-school are willing to do.

The late Philadelphia Convention has placed the present status of the New-school church in a still clearer light. That Convention bids fair to be an epoch-making event. It consisted of over three hundred members, representatives of five Presbyterian denominational churches. It was pervaded by one spirit. We never saw the same degree of unanimity manifested in any similar assembly. As far as man can judge, the Spirit of God was present, controlling the action of the Convention in a manner truly remarkable. The conclusions arrived at were unexpected; yet they were wise, Christian, and catholic; such as will bear the test of cool examination and reflection. One of the most important results of that Convention was to bring the bodies there represented not only into closer Christian fellowship, but to a better understanding of the position which they were willing to assume. This is specially true with regard the Old and New-school Presbyterians. With regard to the former, the impression was, we hope, removed, that Old-school men are dissatisfied with our standards as they are; that they require that their own explanations, their philosophy, or speculations, interpreting and supplementing the language of our symbols, should be adopted. It was made apparent to all, that the Old-school is now, and always has been, ready to accept the standards with-

out note or comment; and that they desire nothing more of others.

With regard to the New-school, it was made to appear, that they are willing not only to adopt the Confession as containing the system of doctrine taught in the sacred Scriptures; but to take that system in its Reformed or Calvinistic sense. Such is the ambiguity of language however that even those statements are susceptible of very different interpretations. Dr. Tyler of East Windsor and Dr. Taylor of New Haven adopted the Saybrook Confession (which is, on all points in dispute, identical with our own). They considered themselves as adopting it in its historical sense. They both called themselves Calvinists. Yet their systems were diametrically opposed. Dr. Tyler declared that Dr. Taylor denied the essential principles of the Reformed faith. And Dr. Taylor said that Dr. Tyler's doctrines led by logical necessity to Universalism, Infidelity, and Atheism. It is a matter of gratitude therefore, that the Convention carried us two steps further. First, it was made apparent as a conceded point, that by the word "system" was to be understood, the concatenated series of doctrines contained in our standards. And secondly, that by "doctrines" is to be understood, not this or that view of certain truths, but the doctrinal statements given in our symbols. For example, it was conceded that if a man said he believed in the doctrine of the Trinity as one of the system of doctrines contained in the Confession of Faith, it was not enough that he should believe in a philosophical, or modal Trinity; but in that doctrine as stated in our standards. Again, with regard to the original state of man, it is not enough that one should hold that man was in some sense created in the image of God, but, if he adopts our standards, he professes to believe that man "was created in the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness." With regard to our relation to Adam, the man does not adopt "the system of doctrine" contained in our Confession, who simply says that the sin of our first parent affected injuriously in some way the circumstances or physical or moral condition of his descendants. This, Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians, and Remonstrants, are willing to admit. He only adopts that system, who is able to say that all those descending

from Adam, by ordinary generation, "sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression." They do not adopt our system, who simply say that the state, or circumstances of man, since the fall, results in the universality of sin; nor those who only acknowledge a bias, or propensity to sin, which may be called sinful because it tends to lead men into sin. This, those who avowedly reject the Reformed doctrine have ever been willing to say. Those only fairly receive the doctrine of our Confession on this subject, who are able to say, that our first parents "being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin (viz. their first transgression) was imputed, and the same death in sin, and corrupted nature, conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation;" and this corruption of nature, "both itself, and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin."

This doctrine, that all mankind since the fall are born in a state of sin and condemnation, (which involves the idea of imputation in some form), is not peculiar to the Reformed church. It is held by the Greeks, the Latins, the Lutherans, and even by evangelical Arminians, as well as by all the branches of the Reformed church in Switzerland, in France, in Germany, in Holland, England, Scotland, and America. We are contending for no confined sectarian dogma, when we contend for a doctrine thus universally received, and the denial of which, President Edwards says, renders redemption either unnecessary or impossible.

Again, our standards teach, that "from this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions." This inability men may explain as they please; but to deny the fact, and to assert that men, since the fall, have plenary power to be and to do all that the law of God requires, is to reject an essential element of the Reformed doctrine.

It is moreover clear that no one accepts the Reformed system, who does not hold that "God out of his mere good pleasure hath elected some to everlasting life." It is not enough, again, that a man should admit that we are saved "by the blood of Christ;" for this even Unitarians are accustomed to say. If

he adopts our system, he must be able to say that Christ, "by his obedience and death, did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to the Father's justice."

Justification, according to our system, is "an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by faith alone." Those, therefore, who teach that it is mere pardon; or, that it is a subjective change effected by the Spirit in us; or a participation of the theanthropic nature of Christ, do not hold the doctrine as taught in our standards. So of the other doctrines which make up the Reformed system.

To the adoption of the Confession of Faith in this sense and in this way, the New-school delegates in the Convention, in the most unmistakable manner, gave in their adherence. This was done, not only by the explicit declaration of Dr. Fisher, their representative on the committee to prepare a basis of union, but by the undeniable approbation and acquiescence of the whole Convention, when it was stated in their presence. Against this statement of the proper principle of subscription, no voice was raised then, nor has been raised since, so far as we know and believe. It would seem therefore that, in the good providence of God, the Convention has enabled us to understand each other on this important point. There is no doubt that the Old-school ask this and nothing more than this. And if the New-school Assembly and Presbyteries will sanction what their representatives did on the floor of the Convention, the doctrinal basis of union may be considered as satisfactorily adjusted. Should the effort at reunion fail because the New-school authorities decline to ratify what was done by their delegates in this matter, the responsibility for the failure will rest on them, and not upon the Old-school.

There is another important end which we hope may be accomplished by the meeting in Philadelphia. Why may not the negotiation for union between the Old and New-school bodies be merged into the more comprehensive union proposed by the Convention? Many of our ministers and members, who, on different grounds, might be indisposed to the union of the Old and New-school branches alone, would cheerfully

acquiesce in a union which should comprehend the United and Reformed, and (if such a thing may be hoped for) the Dutch, Presbyterian churches. There is also an obvious incongruity in conducting a twofold negotiation for the same object at the same time. Our next General Assembly will be called upon to appoint a committee of five, to confer with a like committee from the New-school Assembly to negotiate a basis of reunion. We shall thus have two committees, one of five, and another of fifteen, members, negotiating at the same time. The reunion might be somewhat delayed, if it contemplated a more general union, but it would probably be accomplished in a way more satisfactory, and more likely to be permanently harmonious.

Art. IV.—*Homiletics and Pastoral Theology.* By Wm. G. T. Shedd, D. D., Baldwin Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1867.

Lectures on Pastoral Theology. By Enoch Pond, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Bangor. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1866.

Pulpit Talent. An Address before the Porter Rhetorical Society of Andover, at their late Anniversary. "Hours at Home," October, 1866.

It is a fact just coming to be duly recognized, that in every great forward step in human progress there is a "fulness of the times" as truly as there was for the advent of Christ. The providence of God makes the nation or the race ready for each great event, so that, when it comes, it finds men everywhere thinking and longing and toiling for it. So it results that, in the sphere of physical research and invention, two men, separated by vast distances, can at once announce to the world the possibility of the Magnetic Telegraph, the discovery of the planet Neptune, or the demonstration of the Doctrines of the Conser-

vation and Correlation of Forces. The same thing holds true in all our moral and spiritual progress; Providence prepares men for what is coming, and brings them to think and long and toil for it. The thought of God, which led to the formation of the American Board, was simultaneously put into the hearts of Mills, Newell, and Nott, while they were yet pursuing their preparatory studies in widely-separated colleges. Reversing the order and reasoning backward, when we find the world so astir touching any great practical question, there is always reason to conclude that the time is at hand for some decisive step, either by way of return to old truth or old method which has been departed from, or by way of advance to new truth, or new method which has not before been clearly recognized or duly regarded.

Now to apply this. It cannot have escaped any observant mind, that the present is a time in which the attention and thought of men are turned, in an extraordinary degree, to the questions involved in the reaching of men by the gospel. District, State, and National Conventions, both simply Christian and formally ecclesiastical, are engaged in earnest discussion of church work and Sunday-school work, and mission work, in all their aspects and relations. Evidently there is a great and felt need somewhere. Either the church has departed from right ways, to which she must return; or there are ways hitherto unrecognized, to which she must go forward.

The minister, in his twofold character of preacher and pastor, and as the divinely appointed leader in the work of the church, has an intense and abiding interest in the discussion and solution of this whole problem. The question of the efficiency of the subject, in its part in this work, has already been discussed in the pages of this *Review*, (in the October number for 1866, in the article entitled "The Preaching for the Times.") The object of the present article is to discuss the question of the efficiency of the pastorate in its relations to the circumstances and wants of the times. In treating of this subject we shall consider the work of the pastorate as embracing all the duties of the minister resulting from his office, except those which have to do directly with the pulpit and preparation for it, and shall take it for granted that, under God, the efficiency

of the work of the church depends very much upon it, the two involving each other. We may say at the outset, that our discussion has nothing to do with finding some new method of doing God's work, which shall be better than the ordained method; for we hold that in the workings of grace, no less than of creation, the rule laid down by God for our guidance is always broad enough to meet the wants of all ages, so that the gospel and the essential law of the pastorate can as little need to be changed, improved, or supplemented, as can the law of gravitation. In short, the highest that the church can hope to do is to hold fast by God's method, and to adjust that method to the wants of the times in which we live.

Before we consider either the Divine law of the pastorate or the required adjustment to present wants, it is necessary that we should take account of some of the altered circumstances which have materially modified the conditions of pastoral work, and then endeavour to ascertain what has been done toward clearly defining the law of the pastorate and adapting it to meet the existing wants.

In taking a survey of the state of things in our own land as bearing upon this subject, it becomes clear that a great revolution has been going forward in the business, the character, the social usages, and the methods of Christian work; and that this revolution has materially changed the elements that are to be taken into account in solving the problem of bringing the gospel to bear more effectively upon the masses through the pastorate, while it has also enhanced the difficulty of doing it.

We note first the *revolution in business.* The modern advance in the arts, which has brought and bound all nations together, has extended the arena on which the daily strife of business is waged, from the narrow limits of the single town to the confines of the civilized world. Out of this transaction of business for the world, rather than for the village, has come an activity proportionally increased, and therefore by so much the more intense and engrossing. And besides this immense expansion there has taken place an entire change in its controlling principle. Speculation has become the order of the day in everything. The road to wealth is no longer by the old and slow way of waiting for the legitimate increase of demand,

or of adding to value by actual change of place or form, but rather by forcing a fictitious demand, by taking advantage of the pressing necessities of men. In Wall Street and "on change," in the gold and stock trade, and in all other trade, a grand game is being played, involving as the stake every staple article of food and clothing, every necessary and every luxury of life. From the sudden and extraordinary changes brought about by these speculative operations, there results a risk in the transactions of the smaller tradesmen which was formerly unknown. There is no escape from these risks, for, in bringing about the ends of speculation, combinations are daily formed which command their millions and control the price of everything, including "greenbacks" even, and which are equally ready to take the proceeds of the broker's gambling, and to snatch the hard-earned bread from the mouth of the starving poor. In this anxious whirl men have little time for religious intercourse or thought, and are almost inaccessible to a pastor.

A *revolution in character and social usages* has followed upon this change in trade. Sentiment is fast outgrowing principle. The merchant or tradesman, worried by the business of the world and absorbed in it, has neither time nor disposition to lay a solid basis of principle in himself or in the members of his household, or his business establishment. It is neither easy nor comfortable to think closely of principles when the life is so abnormal. This has been superficially designated a day of *introspection;* but it is this only as to feelings, not as to principles. Principles do not trouble the mass of men much. They have been in many cases deeply overlaid by the increase of imposing religious forms and ceremonies, or forgotten in the hurry of work carried even into the church. Rogers, in the "Greyson Letters," suggests to his novel-reading niece that to save herself from imbecility, she keep a debtor and creditor account of sentimental indulgence and practical benevolence, with occasional memoranda running thus: "For the sweet tears I shed over the romantic sorrows of Charlotte Devereaux; sent three basins of gruel and a flannel petticoat to poor old Molly Brown." The suggestion might be happily applied to much of our life, to bring it back to reality and truth again. A

pastor now too seldom finds in the basis of character the earnestness of the stern old Puritan, by which to lay hold of men and mould them.

At the same time the *rapid changes in social position*, resulting from the false modes of business, have given rise to a mass of conventionalities—chiefly as a fashion in the uncultivated rising families, and partly as a defence in those already occupying the high places of society—which clog the whole interior and better life; and have induced a disrelish for honest work, which tends to the destruction of strength and manliness. The old-fashioned home of half a century ago, with all the family gathered around our hearth-stone, is less and less seen in the mansions of the opulent, while the closet is at the same time crowded out by the fashion and the constant round of excitement. In many of these families, all worthy aims in life is taken from the young; idleness begets imbecility, worthlessness and positive vice, and, with the increased temptations of the day, the tendency of much of the wealthy society is veering rapidly away from religion and downward. Many things conspire to make the home and the every-day life almost inaccessible to the pastor.

There has been a corresponding *change in the methods of Christian works.* We have a vivid recollection of the impression made upon us several years since by that admirable little book of Dr. Fish, "Primitive Piety Revived," in connection with this very subject of the work of the church. The want of "Individualism" was set forth as one of the great wants of the piety of the age. But if that could have been written then, how much more now, when our labour-saving machinery in the church has become as perfect as that in the factory or on the farm! The conversion of the world is rightly our great work. But how often, alas! is the little work of the individual lost in this. Organizations have an indispensable place. It is not however to supersede, but to evoke and systematize the Christian work of individual men; not as a substitute for personal effort, but as the instruments for insuring it and rendering it effective. It is too much the case that everything can be done by proxy now. There is some way by which every one can give his money and withhold his personal presence and

effort, while securing a substitute to carry on the work of every department of moral reform and Christian philanthropy and religious instruction. The children of the family are to be taught. They can be turned over to the Sunday-school. The masses outside of the church are to be looked after and saved. That can be given over to the mission-school and hired missionary. The church of God is to be built up. That work is safe in the hands of the pastor. The tide of vice in the community is to be stayed. Instead of having the trouble of going to the victims, and by personal Christian kindliness lifting them up and saving them, and then by personal influence and example elevating the tone of society till it shall be an efficient aid in this work, the power of legislation is rather relied upon, and the whole matter turned over to the civil government, to legislate the moral evil out of existence, and the individual Christian conscience into quiet sleep. All this change in the method of the work has put the individual further from the reach of pastoral effort.

While all these changes have been taking place, there has arisen an *increased demand upon the pulpit.* Perhaps this may not be owing to greater intelligence and culture in some of the hearers, but to the general diffusion of the Bible and religious literature, and of information on all subjects. When the Pilgrim Fathers came to this country, the first English translation of the Bible (Coverdale's) had been read only eighty-five years, and King James's version had been published but nine years, and had not been much used as yet. Every child had not a Bible then, as now. What was acceptable and edifying to them, as dispensed from the pulpit, may be common-place and unimportant now, even to the child. This increased demand upon the preacher has rendered it more difficult to meet the requirements made of the pastor, by so much abridging the time at his command.

With this glance at some of the altered circumstances of the age which most affect the pastoral work, we turn to inquire briefly what has been done toward getting at the Divine law which must rule in that work, and setting it clearly before men; also what toward the adjustment of the energies of the

pastorate in accordance with that law to these changed conditions.

What has been done toward unfolding clearly *the Divine law of the pastorate?* What has been done, in other words, toward bringing distinctly before men the relation of the church, in its entire membership and in its organized capacity, to the doing and directing, under God, of the human and instrumental work which has in view the conversion of the world, and what toward defining and fixing in the minds of men the divinely constituted relation which the ministry bears to both the church and the work? We cannot divest ourselves of the conviction that much remains to be done in this direction. In the twofold work of the minister, as Preacher and Pastor, we have our "Homiletics" and "Pastoral Theology" as embracing the rules for our guidance, but in the treatment of the subjects involved in them, while the sphere of the pulpit is plainly and adequately defined, the scope of the pastorate is not so clearly determined. There are certain duties somehow connected with this twofold work—and all-important duties they are in this day—which the authors seem not to know exactly how to deal with, or to which part to assign them, even though conscious of their existence. Dr. Bushnell in his address on "Pulpit Talent," published in "*Hours at Home*," brings forward and emphasizes one of these duties, that of *administration*, in making "administrative or organizing capacity" one of his preaching talents. He evidently does it with hesitation, although he says not. In the ordinary schemes there is no place assigned for any such talent; perhaps the ordinary definitions exclude it. Dr. Shedd, while showing in his new work —from his point of view so admirable—that he is conscious of the existence of such a side to pastoral work, is content to say in his definition, that the office of a pastor "is to give private and personal advice from house to house, and to make his influence felt in the social and domestic life of his congregation;" and then, in his further development of the subject, to recognize the negative and subjective side of this work of administration by making "*decision*" one of the necessary qualities of the pastor's character in his relation to the church. Now we do not, either in Christian doctrine or in the law of the pastorate,

believe in any change by way of *improvement* upon God's word, but we do believe in change by way of development and growth in knowledge, and by way of adaptation to the varying wants and characters of men; and were we to venture a criticism upon Dr. Shedd's general view of this subject, we should say that it fails to take into account the necessity and fact of change by way of adaptation to the changing circumstances of living men, so that he sends his pastor to the oversight of an abstract man (perhaps we ought to say a student), just as he sends his preacher to preach to an abstract sinner. Dr. Pond in his book has several valuable lectures (beginning with lecture fifteen) on the *administrative side* of the pastorate, in which he at once recognizes its importance and gives it its place as a constituent element of the work of the pastor, as distinguished from that of the preacher. Taking a general survey, we must conclude that but little has been done by the authors in this department toward fixing the exact sphere of the pastorate, and enforcing the great Divine principles which must regulate the pastoral work of the day; little toward bringing out any old truth to which we are to go back, or any new truth to which we are to go forward.

Turning now to the practical side, we ask—What has been done in the church toward the *adjustment* of the work of the pastorate to the needs of the times, in order to make it at once efficient and adequate? It is obvious that in some quarters the changed condition of things, to which we have called attention, *has not been noted at all.* When we are told, for example, that the additions in membership to one large branch of the church among us, for a certain year, were all in one half the churches in that denomination, the information is sadly significant. In other quarters the revolution spoken of has been marked and taken into account, and has led to various experiments by way of remedy, and sometimes in the apparent ignorance or neglect of the great Divine principles which should govern all Christian work. It falls in with our purpose briefly to notice some of these experiments.

One class of men have sought to increase the efficiency of the pastorate by *grasping after larger personal influence*, through letting themselves down to the level of the world and

its demands. We do not refer now to men of the stripe of "Rev. Joseph Bellamy Stoker" of Holmes, or "Parson Stiggins" of Dickens, for we believe such rarely exist, save in the imagination of men who know but little of the character of an evangelic ministry, or who have learned to despise all that was noble in their ancestry. But there is, among the younger clergy, in some instances, a reckless grasping after popularity, at the expense of Christian character and influence, that is truly alarming. In the pulpit or out among the people, they are ready to bring to market just the wares for which there is the most ready sale,—extravagant story and theatrical gesture for the Sabbath and the sacred desk; vulgar familiarity and shameless jest for the week-day and the home. We have known the same man to startle an audience by shouting from the pulpit on the Sabbath—"The motto of the world is—every man for himself and the devil take the hindermost;" and then on the week-day to confirm his right to the character thus won, by securing the setting up of a billiard table in the rooms of a Christian organization. Now, putting the best construction possible upon such conduct, we must pronounce the course a ruinous blunder; for, in attaining the notoriety which such a method brings, the man casts away all religious power among the people, by forfeiting all claim to their respect.

Another class have attempted to bring *the whirl of the world with its spirit*, into the church, and to restore the power of the church over the world by making concessions to the world and conforming to it. The amusement question, which has been under discussion in some quarters of late, had its origin with the time-serving, world-serving spirit of this class of men. The leaven is to be put into the lump, card-playing and billiard-playing are to be sanctified, Paul's rule of refraining from eating meat when it makes his brother to stumble is to give way to Christian freedom, so called. We have heard men in high places favour the establishment of Religious Club Rooms, with all the approved appliances of a Club Room, for reclaiming the young men of our cities and furnishing them society! We have seen articles running in this wise, which had not even the poor merit of ability to atone for their error,

admitted to places in leading religious journals. Be it recorded to the honour of the Christian young men of the country, that when the matter came to be pressed upon their attention at the last National Convention, held at Montreal, they emphatically pronounced against all complicity with such time-serving schemes. This is but one of the ways in which men of this spirit, which we deprecate, have set about their work of secularizing the church. It is evident that all such schemes must be futile, as they can only result in worldliness, or in worldly power, if in any power at all.

Still another class have sought to devise some *new methods of Christian work* to meet the obvious wants of the day. These have been put in the place of the simple and divinely ordained method of the church. In some regions the aim has been to introduce some popular service in the place of the second preaching service. New England especially seems to have been threatened with a revolution in this way. Organization upon organization has been added to the church to make it equal to its mission. We have heard of one pastor who organized the young members of his congregation into what a good mother in Israel called his "singing gang," and sent them out to spend the Sabbath afternoon in singing to the sick people of the parish. It seems to have been forgotten that all God's methods given to the church are none the less perfect and adequate for their simplicity, so that nothing needs to be added to them.

But the innumerable conventions and conferences, and the much discussion, show that the church at large is conscious of not having reached the right method of adjustment, while at the same time it has come to realize in some degree the increased difficulty in reaching men, and the real want of efficiency and adequacy in the work of the pastorate, as it is now understood and wrought. It sees that things are going wrong, but it has not yet seized upon a remedy; hence the protracted discussion grows in interest and earnestness. And it must be noted by the way that such discussion, while it is the harbinger of coming progress, is at the same time an indispensable condition to such progress. Every generation—we might with truth say, every man—must discuss and solve each practical,

moral, and social problem for itself, before the truth involved in it can find a place of power in the consciousness and hearts of men. The ministry should therefore hail it as an ally in the work of God. Meanwhile, for the pastor to go on his course, in the way the fathers went, ignoring or giving no heed to all such recurring agitation growing out of changing circumstances, were as unwise as for the military man to cling to his old-fashioned guns and his wooden ships, regardless of the revolution wrought by earth-works and iron-clads. And hence, by just so much as any one interested in the results of such movement delays to enter into it and make the requisite investigation of principles and adjustment of forces, he loses. What needs to be done should be done at the earliest feasible moment. The ministry, the church, must meet the situation fairly, and if we find ourselves, our principles, or our methods at fault, in directing the forces ordained of God for the work of the church, neither pride of consistency nor love of conservatism must prevent us from righting whatever is found wrong.

This preliminary discussion has prepared the way for the treatment of the practical question, *What is to be done to bring the pastorate, in efficiency, up to the wants of the times?* Its shortcomings in efficiency or adequacy may result either from the departure of the church from the Divine law laid down for the guidance of the work, or from failure, on the part of the one who holds the office, to come up to the demands of his position. Our subject at this point therefore naturally falls into two parts; first, *the Divine law of the pastorate*, and then, *the pastor for the place and age.*

The place must be considered first to prepare for ascertaining the man for the place. The *law of the pastorate* must be clearly defined and asserted. In order to this it is a first necessity to return to the true divine idea of the church, and its organization and work, as the body of Christ, for on this wise only can we ascertain the place of the pastorate. The only right mode of procedure is, to ascertain first what the office is, and then make the definition to suit; not, as is so often done, to construct first the definition and then warp or dwarf the thing to suit it. We shall seek to follow this method, leaving our nearer definition of the pastoral work and office until we

reach the proper point. There are three propositions in this connection which we hold to be fundamental: (1.) In the church of God, and its entire membership, are to be found the human energies that are to be directed to the accomplishment of God's work in the world. (2.) The prerogative of duty of directing these energies inheres in that church in its organized capacity. (3.) The pastorate holds under Christ the chief place in that work of direction. These three propositions, while they define most clearly the sphere and authority of the pastorate, furnish, we believe at the same time, the logical and scriptural basis on which the church is to build. We shall consider them in their order.

In the church of God, in its entire membership, are to be found the human energies which are to be directed to the accomplishment of God's work in the world.

At the outset, we would carefully guard the place of the Spirit of God. The preaching of the word of Christ and work for Christ, both attended by the Holy Ghost, are the two great instrumentalities in the extension of Christ's kingdom, and without the Holy Ghost the work is as worthless as the preaching is ineffectual. But, under the Spirit, the working element is to be found in the church of God in the entirety of its membership. And by this we mean to include the two aspects of the truth;—that each member of the church is a worker sent of God on a special mission, and that all the members in their united capacity are co-workers with God. *Individual effort and combined effort* are the two sides of the law which govern all the work of the universe. The illimitable forests which cover the hills like the shadow of God, have been built by the combined work of the single leaves; the mighty tides that gird the globe are but the sum of the flow of the single drops; the tempests which sweep over the earth with resistless force, only combine the momentum of single particles of the viewless air; the force of gravitation which hurls the innumerable starry train along with such fearful velocity, only sums up the power of the single atoms each of which pulls for itself. In precisely the same way, the vast work of the church in bringing the world back to God, is only the sum of single efforts, the combined work of single Christians. The whole frame-work of

Christianity presupposes this threefold principle. The mission and structure of the church embodies it. The history of the early Christian converts exhibits its practical working. Paul, in his Epistles, takes special pains to present and enforce both its aspects. A "manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man for the profit" of the church and the world. This is one aspect. It contemplates man as an individual. As each man is to repent for himself, believe for himself, live for himself, and die and give account for himself, so the Holy Ghost gives each man a gift peculiar to himself, and assigns to him a place and work peculiar to himself, in carrying on the great work for the good of a lost world. Paul presents, by the relation of the parts of the body to the whole, the relation of the work of each man to the whole work of the church. This is the other aspect. God has so arranged the parts of the human body as to constitute one living organic whole in which harmonious coöperation is added to the action of the individual parts. If any one part refuses to perform its office,—if the eye refuses to see, or the ear to hear, or the hand to work at the bidding of the soul,—the power and completeness of the body are destroyed and its mission proves a failure. Just so He has fixed the position and gifts of every member of Christ's body, the church,—the endowments being as various as the places,—and the harmonious coöperation of all in their places is as essential in the church as the united working of the eye, the ear, and the hand, in their places in the human frame. The church is thus to be regarded as a great working institution, in which each member is to be a workman for God with the ability given him in his own appointed place, and all together are to be regarded in carrying out of the one plan of God. This is the Divine law of the work of the church, and we find here, in the individual members and gifts from God, the energies which are to be directed to the accomplishment of his designs in the world.

Believing that this needs little more than to be stated fully and clearly, to gain admission, we pass on to our second proposition; that *the prerogative and duty of directing its own energies in its work inheres in the church in its organized capacity.* All forms of church government imply this. All churches assume it as fundamental. God has organized and endowed

the church for this mission. It has this right in virtue of Christ indwelling.

There are three conceivable ways of proceeding in all our Christian work: first, that by independent individual effort; secondly, that by voluntary organized effort; thirdly, that by organized church effort.

The *first method*—that by *independent individual effort*—has the advantage of simplicity. Its doctrine is, "Let every man work with his might in his own sphere. God deals with men not in the mass, but as single souls. They are regenerated, sanctified, and saved as individuals. Every man whom God saves, he saves and sends forth to work for him in the world. All power must in the last analysis be resolved into individual power—the power of gravitation into the pull of the single atom—the power of the church into the energies of its separate members. Let every man labour for Christ to the extent of his ability in his place, and the work will go forward. It requires no officers, no cumbrous machinery. Now this method has a truth at its foundation, one of the truths embraced in our first proposition, but not both. It is a great advantage to have a simple way of doing our work, but there are things which men as individuals and *working alone* cannot accomplish. Sometimes the power of many individuals needs to be gathered up and directed to one end in order to do what must be done. We must have all the individual effort, but we must have *organized effort* too.

The *second method*—that of *voluntary organization*—has been proposed to meet this want. The doctrine is, "Let those, who choose to do it, combine together voluntarily for that purpose, devise their plans and prepare their machinery for carrying out those plans. Union is strength. Together we can accomplish what working singly it is beyond our power to compass." This method has the advantage over the other of organizing effort, of combining the single, and separate, and scattered into the manifold, and united, and well-directed. It takes into account both sides of the truth of our first proposition. But theoretically it involves a fatal error, in departing from the truth of our second proposition. It assumes that it is not the duty and prerogative of the church as organized of God,

to direct its own energies in its appointed work. It assumes that the church to which God has given the mission of saving the world is not fitted for its work, or is not equal to it, and that man can devise some better way of doing God's work. Practically, it is against economy, against unity, dangerous in its tendencies, and must prove a failure; *against economy*, for it introduces a new set of machinery, and every new set requires so much the more power in managing it; *against unity*, for it divides the energies of the church and weakens it by so much, disorganizing in organizing; *dangerous in its tendencies*, for it is irresponsible in its direction and control; *must fail at last*, for nothing can succeed that is not done in God's appointed way.

The *third method*—that of *organized church effort*—we believe to be the scriptural method. It was to the church, AS ORGANIZED *by Christ*, that the great commission to preach the gospel to every creature was given, and, with that commission, there was conferred upon it the authority to devise all the plans, and invent all the mechanism, and direct all the power required in its execution. It cannot be denied that this way has the advantage of simplicity. It does not divide the energies of the church, but, recognizing the fact that its work is one, it unites and concentrates all its power. Moreover, it keeps everything out of irresponsible hands, by giving the control to those whom God, in and through the church, calls to the position of authority, and who are directly subject to the church and responsible to it. More than all, it is willing to accept of God's way as the best way, though it be an old and plain way. It has thus all the advantages of unity and concentration, simplicity and directness, organization and responsibility, scripturalness and the consequent Divine favour. We hold it to be fundamental, *vital* truth, that it is at once the prerogative and the duty of the church as constituted of God to direct its own energies in its appointed work.

Our third proposition is that *the pastorate holds, under Christ, the chief place in the direction of the energies of the church in its mission.* The pastor is at the head of the directing element, whatever it may be. We cannot doubt that this is in accordance with the teaching of the Scriptures. Christ's

words to Peter, when he restored him after his fall, were, "Feed my sheep," "Feed my lambs," "*Shepherd* my sheep." These words unfold the work for the old and the young, and add to instruction, the office of guarding, directing, in short, whatever is included in "*shepherding*" the sheep. In his charge to the elders at Ephesus, Paul exhorts them to "take heed to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*." Christ is the shepherd and bishop of our souls. Under him, the minister is the under-shepherd and bishop; as Christ's representative, the head of the church over which God places him.

It cannot be denied that this has been substantially the theory of all the branches of the evangelical church in this country. Our Methodist brethren assumed this as the basis, and doubtless owe much of their efficiency in the past to their rigid adherence to it. The Protestant Episcopal body, although adhering to what we once heard Dr. Cox characterize as "the doctrine of the threefold disorder of the clergy," along with its hierarchical bent, has always given to the ministry the chief place in the direction of the energies of the church in the work of God. Congregationalism in this country, though starting from another theory in the abstract, has been compelled in its concrete working to come to the basis on this subject so well expressed in the "Saybrook Platform," which reads thus on this point: "We agree that the ministerial office is instituted by Jesus Christ for the gathering, guiding, edifying, and governing of his church; and continue to the end of the world." The Presbyterian Church gives no uncertain sound, as it makes the pastor the head of the session, which is over the church and everything in it from the choir to the Sabbath-school. Our third proposition must therefore be admitted to accord at once with Scripture, and with the views of evangelical Christians.

It is evident that departure from any one of these fundamental principles must destroy or impair the efficiency of the pastorate, while it cripples the work of the church. If, in the estimation of Christians, the mission of the church, and every member in it, is not one of earnest work for Christ, then there are not the energies for the church to direct. If it be not

considered the prerogative and duty of the church, as organized by its great Head, to direct those energies in the work, then they are, to say the least, out of the reach of the pastorate. If the chief place in directing be not accorded to the pastorate, aided by other office-bearers, then the pastor at once sinks to the level of any other man, and there is no one in the church who embodies the idea of unity which is so essential to success. But to turn from what *must be*, to what *has been*—from theory to fact. Practically, the majority of the churches do not hold by our first proposition. The church is looked upon too exclusively as a great ark, in which men are to be borne safely to heaven, and too little as a body of workmen, sent to use all its energies for the spread and prevalence of the gospel. We see no reason why a church of many hundred members filled with the Holy Ghost, and conscious of their true mission, should not to-day, with the grander facilities for work and influence, make themselves felt in the world as did those hundreds who went forth on that first mission for Christ; yet we know many a church with such a membership that scarcely holds its own from year to year. The elders, deacons, and private members practically all unite in saying, "We have nothing to do, and will do nothing;" and there are therefore no living energies to be directed. Practically there has also been a wide departure from the truth of our second proposition. The church, as organized of God and fitted for the work of directing its own energies in God's work, and gifted with the prerogative and duty of directing them, has been very largely denied its place in practice, or has failed to come up to its duty. The great number of voluntary organizations existing for the purpose of doing the work which God has made the special work of the church, and which often aim to control it rather than to be controlled by it, and which are wholly beyond the reach of the divinely-given government of the church, is proof in point. Now we admit that such organizations have had their origin in the failure of the church to do its work; sometimes in its refusal—and that they have been devised by earnest men in the church, under the apparent pressure of necessity, and we insist that the church, in allowing its work to call for any such new methods, is guilty before God; but we hold nevertheless

that there is a better way of remedying the evil; for while we admit that *organization* is invaluable, since two working together can accomplish *more* than twice what each one could if working alone, yet we hold it to be indisputable that the same energy, in the church and working in God's appointed way, will do more than working in any way which man can possibly devise. Where collision and conflict have not resulted from this course, the life has either been drained from the church, or its energies divided, and the element of power God has given it, for his glory, has been practically placed beyond its reach. But even where the first two principles have been acknowledged, that involved in our third proposition has too often been ignored or denied. In much of our country the pastor is looked upon too much as a *hireling* of the people. With many, disposed to give him a higher place, he is still merely a member of an honourable *profession*. Many who honour him still more, confine the sphere of the pastorate to the narrow limit of ministering to the sick and afflicted, and influencing his people in their social and domestic relations. Few are inclined to concede to him, beyond this, the larger and more important work of presiding and governing in the bending of the energies of the church to the work of the world's salvation. This is doubtless in great measure the fault of the ministry themselves; they have often given up their headship voluntarily, because of the amount of labour involved in it, and have been only too glad to let the church take its own course or no course at all, as best suited it; but in many instances we have known the pastor to be denied his true place, and even to be put out of it in all the work of the church. The Reformation justly cast out the *priesthood* from its idea of the ministry. In its failure to discriminate clearly, Protestantism has since almost cast out the thought of *direction* and *control*. With both the *priest* and *head*, the papacy wields a marvellous power; with neither, the church is shorn of its vigour.

Now it is evident the first adjustment, which these times demand, is the adjustment of the practice of the church to this Divine law. The Reformation under Luther fixed in the heart of the church the vital truth that man can only be saved by *personal faith* in the Lord Jesus Christ. We need a second

reformation to fix in the soul of every member of the church the vital truth that he has been saved, in order that he may become a *personal worker* for the Lord Jesus Christ, and that every man must go to work. This will give the energies to be directed. Christians must be brought to understand, and feel too, that the church is a Divine institution, ordained of God for the mission of the world's conversion, gifted with the requisite powers, containing in its simple organization all the machinery necessary and at once competent to the direction of those powers, and the wielding of that machinery, and bound of God to carry forward the work. And then the church, with this consciousness of its mission, instead of planting itself immovably across the track of progress, must carry forward the work in God's way. And the church must rise to that larger conception of the sphere of the pastorate, which shall clearly take in all its functions, and, recognizing the sacredness of the office, must seek in its schools of training, to mould and fashion those sent of God to fill that office, in accordance with such larger conception, that we may have the right man for the place. And then the pastor must take his place, and with a working membership, organized in the church, and with one chief director, we may expect glorious progress for the kingdom of God on earth.

We are thus brought to the second part of our subject: *the pastor for the age and place.* What sort of man must he be in his Christian character? What in his place of direction? What must be his training? In general we must have a soul inspired, energized, and moulded by God's word and Spirit, and fitted at once to reach out through a Christian life and activity, and impress the church with its own Christlikeness and to direct that church in like work. Success will depend upon the dignity and intensity of the life, upon its directing power and the energy given it of the Holy Ghost, and upon the bent and development resulting from its training and its contact with men.

a. In giving a more specific answer to the first of the questions proposed above, we would say that the first and pressing demand of the times is for *a better Christian man and worker* in the pastoral office. The "world" which the early disciples

were to overcome by faith had a mighty meaning. It was the iron world of Rome, embracing everything included in that, from the emperor to the slave, from the gods to the passions over which they presided, and from the laws to the legions. But we believe that the subtle, unprincipled, unimpressible world of to-day, pressing to perdition under pressure of steam and electricity with awful momentum, is quite as hard a world to deal with. To impress this world at all we must have a higher style of man, a man after God's own pattern, more pervaded by God's Spirit as a spirit of wisdom and power, and put in his place in God's own way. To sum up in a single period;—we need a man called of God, cultured and guided and energized of God for his work, upheld and directed by the promised personal presence of God, and possessed with an abiding and overwhelming sense of his mission from heaven. Nothing less can meet the demands of the age. These requirements are therefore to be insisted upon. We divide in order to impress them more distinctly.

(*a*) First then we would lay stress upon *an unmistakable call from God.* The earnest discussion we have had of the nature of the office of the ministry, by Dr. Wayland and others, has been timely. We have heard of late about an "overstocked ministry." In one respect not without reason. Speaking to his class on this theme, Dr. Addison Alexander once said—"The pastor is sent to feed the flock of Christ, but some men only drive the sheep about and fleece them." We rejoice that this applies to very few of the class to which we are calling attention; but turning from these to a larger class, proved uncalled by their lifelong idleness or uselessness, we hold that there is no possibility of emphasizing too strongly *the worthlessness of an uncalled ministry.* "Woe be to the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture! saith the Lord." An uncalled ministry must be an unqualified and an unsent ministry, for God only qualifies and sends whom he calls. "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran; I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied." A man who has simply gone through the training-school and been licensed and ordained by the Presbytery, is not necessarily a minister of the gospel in the sight of God. No mere human training and setting apart

can make him such. God only can call to the sacred office, and the one who enters uncalled helps to overstock the ministry and becomes the cause, unwitting and unwilling, of innumerable and grievous evils, it may be, even though it still be true, that we need a hundred ministers where we have but one. No man can speak or act with the authority with which men must speak and act in this day, to be heard above the thunder of the world's traffic, and heeded, without a call as real, if not as articulate, as had the prophets in the olden time.

(*b*) Secondly, we would emphasize the importance in the pastorate of the present day, of a man led of God to that *higher Christian life* in which the constant Divine presence is realized in speech and action, in all the life and work. There is valid reason to fear that much of the so-called Christian work of the day draws too little of its inspiration from the communion of the closet and the approbation of the God who sees in secret. The "right hands" too often spend quite as much time in telling the "left hands" what they have been doing as they occupy in the work itself, and, as might be anticipated, the workmen frequently acquire a greater facility in *telling* than in *doing*. It shows a state of things all wrong. The Perfectionism, advocated by various parties, and put into systematic shape byUpham in his "Interior Life," and "Life of Faith," we are inclined to think partly the result of the perversion of a dawning sense of the need of a higher and better life in the church. In the growing consciousness of this need, we find the explanation of the hearty response with which Boardman's "Higher Christian Life," was met by so many Christians. Now it is the advance in Christian attainment, which the latter book urges—greatly we differ from it in its terms and modes of explanation—that we plead for in the sacred office; that style of Christian life which comes from complete understanding and acceptance of Christ. Too many of us are living with only half a Christ, and that the half which has least to do with girding us for the work of life. We stop with the doctrine of justification by the blood of Jesus. The heathen Festus, in rehearsing to Agrippa the grounds of dispute between Paul and his Jewish accusers, said that it had to do with "one *dead* Jesus, whom Paul affirmed to be *alive* again." It takes the

two, the dying and dead Jesus and the risen and living Jesus, to lay a complete foundation for a Christian life,—*the dying Jesus,* by whose righteousness the law and justice of God are satisfied, and we forgiven and restored to the Divine favour,—and the *risen, living, interceding, reigning Jesus,* by whose promised personal presence along with us and in us, we are girded for all the struggle of life—it takes the two to make the strong man in the service of God. For many of us have only a *dead* Jesus. We are persuaded that this is a vital matter,—that just here is the secret of the inefficiency of many pastors. The completeness with which a man receives, is made alive, and lives by Christ, will, other things being equal, measure his power in influencing and moulding men. We are sent to be "*living epistles,* known and read of all men." The pastor of this age has got to take more note of *the imperial power of a right Christian life.* There are things too great, too deep, and too sacred to be spoken to men in all their fulness with mere words—he can only live them. We would not deny that truth is beautiful and forceful in its own unfading light, but it is when embodied in a life, and so made itself a living thing, that it shines with its richest splendor. While the life of Paul is a grander epic than Homer or Milton could produce, it is also as cogent an argument for the power of his religion as he ever penned. While the career of the incarnate Son of God is a sublimer tragedy than Æschylus or Shakespeare could imagine, it is also a clearer and grander expression of the love of God than the most significant of human words could voice. As Holland's new poem, "Kathrina," so beautifully shows, there is no logic of infidelity that can refute or resist a downright earnest, loving Christian life. Let us not be mistaken. We believe in creeds—and in creeds which utter no uncertain sound—but the source of the pastor's power is not so much in the right creed printed in his "Confession of Faith," as in that right creed embodied in his life. The work of God demands that every one called to the pastor's office in this day should rise to a life which shall have its source in implicit trust in the merit of a dying Christ, and find its strength in sublime confidence in a living, reigning, indwelling Christ, inspiring and

aiding him in all his work. The infatuated world will give heed to no other life than one right from God.

(*c*) And we cannot lay too great stress upon the necessity, to the pastor of this day, of *a constant and overwhelming sense of his mission for God to men.* The one called of God and filled of God with Christ, must have his gaze turned constantly in the direction of his work. An ambassador for Christ, beseeching men in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God, his mission is the grandest one ever given to man. He needs to have such a sense of it that everything shall be made to have reference to this work of saving souls, that every moment, every talent, every energy, every breath, shall be consecrated to this,—that the whole career shall be decided and shaped by this. We urge it, because we feel that nothing but this sense of a Divine mission can take away the hankering of men after their own self-devised missions; nothing but this feeling that the moments are God's, and given for the saving of souls, can preserve the clergy from the indolence and loss of studious habits, which threaten the ruin of so many; nothing but this living conviction, that every energy is God's for the highest work, can save the clergy from the petty ambitions which are fatal in so many cases; nothing but this perpetual sense of responsibility for souls, can save the clergy from that silence of indifference, in their intercourse with the people, which is leaving these multitudes to hurry in their own unhindered way to perdition, and nothing but this can transform the whole pastoral work into what it should be—*a seeking for souls.*

Given, the unmistakable call from God, the appropriation of a complete Christ and his embodiment in the Christian life, and this perpetual sense of his sublime mission from God, and you have the better man and better worker imperatively demanded in the pastorate at the present time. Such a man will have power even in an age like this. Men will not scoff at him and put him out of his place. He will make himself felt through all the barriers of business and fashion.

a. Our second question touching the man for the pastorate of the day concerned his adaptation to the place of direction. The second pressing want in the pastorate is *the development and application of a larger administrative ability.*

It is evident that, whatever his character, the pastor alone cannot overtake this steam-driven, giddy world. He can only do it by summoning all the church to his aid and directing them in the work. Dr. Pond presents this thought very clearly in Lecture 15 of his book. In Dr. Bushnell's address, to which we have already referred, occurs the following passage: "Our preacher, therefore, is not a mere public speaker —far from that as possible—but he is to have a capacity of being and doing; an administrative, organizing capacity; a power to contrive and lead, and put the saints in work, and keep the work aglow, and so to roll up a cause by ingatherings and careful incrementations. The success and power of the preacher, considering his fixed settlement in a place, will not seldom depend even more on a great administrative capacity than it will on his preaching. And with good reason, for it really takes more high manhood, more wisdom, firmness, character, and right-seeing ability, to administer well in the cause, than it does to preach well. No matter what seeming talent there may be in the preaching, if there is no administrative talent, then the man is a boy, and the boy will have a boy's weight—nothing more. On the other hand, being a true man, able to be felt by his manly direction, his mediocrity in the sermon will be made up by respect for his always right-seeing activity. In this office, then, of preaching, one of the very highest talents demanded is an administrative talent. Every preacher wants it even more than he would in the governing of a state."

With the qualification, that we look upon it from the side of the pastorate rather than of the pulpit, and with some exceptions, which we shall note in their proper places, we are ready to endorse the thought of this passage most heartily. Admitting the importance of the duties ordinarily assigned to the pastor, still we do not hesitate to affirm that the work of the pastorate in this age must be made *chiefly one of direction.* The pastor is to accomplish more by wielding the energies of the church than by his own personal effort. He cannot in any other way do what must be done. It is evident to one who discerns the signs of the times, that we have come upon the day when the administrative talent of the clergy needs to be

developed along with the individual activity of the membership. The attempts made to remedy the existing defects show this. Hence has originated the all-important discussion of the responsibility and agency of the *laity* in the work of God,—a discussion upon the decision of which, as we conceive, the future of the church must to a very large degree depend. As in all great religious movements, there are in connection with this, dangers patent to all discerning men, which it will require all the wisdom of God's people to avoid. The church all workers, the church with the prerogative and duty of directing its own energies in God's work, the pastor at the head of the directing element, we have seen to be the Divine law which should govern Christian effort. Any departure from this, even on what may seem the best of human grounds, must, in the last result, be fraught with evil. Least of all can the regulative, administrative capacity, lodged in the organized church and in the divinely appointed leader be dispensed with. There is reason for fearing that this is not enough taken into account in the present movement.

An increased development and application of administrative capacity in the pastorate, we must insist upon as important to success. We would say *administrative*, rather than *organizing*. We need power not to make new machinery, but to use efficiently what has already been given us of God.

This demand for increased administrative ability is enforced by the fact that there has been no period in modern times which afforded such facilities as the present for the exercise and direction of individual Christian activity. Says Dr. Pond, (page 217), "I count it one of the peculiar privileges of the present age, that it presents so many opportunities for labour in the cause of Christ,—labour not only for the officers of the church, but for all the members. Every one who has a hand and heart to labour in the Lord's vineyard can now find something appropriate for him to do. In this respect the times are very different from what they were two generations ago."

It is thus a special problem of the day how best to develope and direct the activity of the membership. The spheres are various. In the *home-church and congregation* there is always a wide field for Christian effort. The multitudes within the

scope of the home pastorate are to be reached and influenced and shaped by personal and constant intercourse with the pastor and officers; are to be led by Christian communion and interchange of views, sentiments, and experiences, to a higher piety and a larger and more intelligent benevolence; are to be brought together, and all the varied and even discordant elements to be moulded into unity and harmony and efficiency, and then pervaded with that indescribable but irresistible "*esprit de corps*," to which nothing by way of organized and energetic effort is impossible. In this scheme every man finds his place, and there need no longer be occasion for the impression of the honest Scotchman, that the only use of a deacon or an elder is to be at the bottom of all the church quarrels, and the only use of the members to furnish the material for quarrels. Within this general work there is the special agency which has to do with the preparation for the church of the next generation in training the young. The younger element in the membership requires of the pastor practical instruction which shall restrain the ruinous tendency of the day to inactivity in life and laxity of view, and the not less ruinous tendency to conceit, by laying a solid basis in doctrine, by giving intelligent conceptions of their mission, and leading to the early formation of right habits of Christian usefulness. There is besides a duty to the children of the church to be performed through the Sabbath-school and the family. To use the Sabbath-school aright as a place for training the church members to work for Christ, while leading the children to a knowledge of Bible truth; to give interest and efficiency to its work without a library of tenth-rate novels, a concert of theatricals, and a teaching made up of petty gossip and clever story, must demand of the pastor the exercise of an administrative capacity, which can lay hold of and employ all the piety and talent and energy of the church. Moreover, to bring back home-instruction to be what it should be, an efficient aid in training for the church: to show parents and make them feel that the work committed to them,—for which God has prepared them by the deepest and tenderest love, the most constant and winning example, and the strongest and most absolute authority,—cannot possibly be turned over with safety to any one else, and

to give the new impulse, so much needed, to home religion, will require of the pastor a weight of influence which shall shape the sentiment of the whole community. In bringing up the church to this various work, private communion and consultation and systematic visitation will be needed,—in short, every means of exerting influence—of leading others to active coöperation will be called into requisition. In *the outlying and destitute regions*, beyond the bounds of the immediate congregation, is an almost unlimited field of effort. In the cities this vast work is as yet almost untouched.

There are greater numbers yet to be reached by the gospel than are now found in all our congregations. We believe the "*Territorial method*"—introduced by Chalmers, advocated by Guthrie in his "Out of Harness" and "Sketches of the Cowgate," the results of which were so glowingly depicted in our last General Assembly by the Rev. Mr. Wells, the delegate from the Free Church,—is to be the chief and most efficient mode of reaching these multitudes. The church is gradually settling upon it with a firmer conviction. It takes into account all the principles which, in our discussion of the law of the pastorate, we have seen to be essential. In the work of the teachers and the helpers of the missionary pastors, is furnished a channel into which an amount of energy may be turned, which shall bring greater results than have been seen to flow from our efforts, by way of mission schools, and street, and dock, and theatre preaching, in all the past. Then there is the *great world beyond*, to which we may send a substitute if we cannot go ourselves. Is it not patent to every one that there has never been an age that admitted and called for such development in the right direction. The work is waiting on every hand. The channels are already prepared, but this rushing world will never be overtaken without all the energy the church can furnish, united and directed in the right way. The call is for men in the pastor's place, fitted by enlarged administrative capacity to be leaders of God's people. Wherever such men are found in the place, progress is made. The grandest success of the day is won by them. We have examples in the heart of London, in Newman Hall, with his twenty mission places, and in Spurgeon, wielding, in ceaseless

activity and in every direction at once, the largest membership in any one church organization in Christendom. There is a mission for some second Luther in rousing the church to a sense of the grandeur of its present opportunities, and impressing upon it the Divine law of right work under right direction. The absence of some one mighty soul sent for this end, casts the responsibility upon all in the ranks of the ministry.

Our third question touching the man for the pastorate in these times had to do with his training. Want of space compels us to pass this fertile subject with a few brief hints. Three things enter into our idea,—increased vigour of soul, enlarged sympathy with men, and more practical knowledge of the work; the first to meet the requirement for a higher style of man for the place, and the last two to secure a better adaptation to his place of influence and direction; and the training must seek the production of these intelligently. This training must send the pastor to his work *with a larger soul.* We include in this an increase both of mental and spiritual power.

We need a *more vigorous thinker,* with both greater acuteness and broader comprehensiveness. Let it not be said that this is a requirement for the pulpit only; it is as much a necessity for the pastorate, for problems more difficult are constantly presenting themselves there for solution—problems involving at once a keener logic and a more subtile metaphysics. *We must have stronger men and more of them.* It is related of Rev. Thomas Williams, the eccentric clergyman who preached the funeral sermon of Dr. Emmons, that one of the members of his church having determined to enter the ministry, broached the matter in this wise: "I have been trying my gifts, and find I have reason to conclude, I think without conceit, that I would make a tolerably good minister. What do you think about it?" The answer was characteristic. "I haven't a doubt of it, sir, but the difficulty is that we have too many '*tolerably good* ministers' already."

Strong habits of practical analytic and synthetic thought alone can fit for the work of the pastorate in this day. In fact the insight and comprehension called for in the place of administration are only analysis and synthesis under other names.

But we should err if we failed to insist on a better spiritual

nurture for those who are looking to the ministry. We have already seen that the style of Christian man most seriously affects the result of his efforts. Theological students should be directed and aided, intelligently and constantly, in growing in that preparation of heart which is after all more important than the preparation of intellect.

There is likewise a special call upon the schools for the production of *an enlarged sympathy with man, and an increased acquaintance with the actual work of the pastorate*, by way of adapting the man to the place. Mere acquaintance with correct theory is not enough. The pastor must have his right theory clearly defined, and besides this, there must be the existing bond of sympathy between him and the people, and then practical acquaintance with the ways of moulding them. The lack of these things in a large number of those who are entering the ministry, is beginning to be deeply felt on all hands. We believe that the higher instruction of the seminary may be retained and these essential features added. In this view many have regretted the failure of the proposal of the professors of Princeton Theological Seminary to the General Assembly of 1865, to add a fourth year to the theological course, in order both to compass this end and to bring the training for the ministry up to the advanced standard of education of the day in other departments. One of the professors in advocating this by private letter, wrote as follows: "The scheme, which we propose, involves as a part of it, that the vacation be regarded as equally sacred to ministerial preparation with the session of the seminary—affording the practical training, as the latter does the literary culture—after the analogy of schools of law and medicine, which are similarly supplemented. Let the Presbyteries supervise the student during his vacations, which are too long to be thrown away or spent in mere desultory occupation; let him be required to spend it in aid to some minister in his parish duties, visiting families, conducting prayer-meetings, learning from actual experiment under skilful direction, or in some other way that would accomplish the same end." Here is a plain way, at once common sense and scriptural, of securing the development of both the human sympathy and the practical skill which the

pastor needs, while the high culture is at the same time provided for.

With the Divine blessing attending, a ministry trained with a clear and intelligent conception of the *place* and *the man for that place*, cannot fail to make of the pastorate a power for good, such as it has not been since apostolic days. Under a large-minded, thoroughly-cultured, and wholly consecrated leader, we may expect, with God's blessing, a return to the working church of primitive Christianity.

In the family, the state, and the church, this is a day of questions involving grave issues,—but among them all there is none more momentous and far-reaching in its consequences, than this which we have been discussing. The success of the work of the church of the present day must be won by a return to the Divine idea of the pastorate, and the raising up and training of men adapted to meet the demands of the position as defined by God's word. By glancing along the line of progress by which the church has come, and noting God's methods of forwarding his purpose concerning Zion, by successive stages of trial and preparation, we shall be the better prepared to understand its position at the present, and shall get a clearer view of the momentous importance of what we have been pleading for. In the *progress of trial*, we first see Christianity brought face to face with the law and the legions, the culture and the gods of the old world; then, itself enthroned above all these and in possession of the place of ease and power, moulding the empire in its own way; again, in fierce struggle with barbarian force and overcoming it in subduing to Christ the Gothic and Slavic nations that overran the empire; once more, in the hour of its faintness, at the time of the Renaissance, meeting the forces of reawakened reason, and rising to a mightier life in the Reformation; still further on, coming out of the battle with the later Rationalism girded for the modern missionary movement. To-day, when we see it grappling with the dizzy, headlong, terrible energy of the world—what, we ask, will be the result? Turning to its *progress of preparation* for the world's conversion, we find the church, first defining and formulating its doctrine, while that world which is to receive the doctrine is yet unknown and inaccessible; then

advancing to the Reformation, while through the mariner's compass the world in its preparation for the doctrine of Christ keeps pace in becoming a known world; then rousing itself for the mission movement, while by the discovery of steam and its application to printing and locomotion, the world is being made accessible to the gospel of Christ. Now when we see the *energies* of the world being developed as never before, and heightened by the manifold adaptations of science and the direction of the mightiest and most subtile forces of nature, to the work of life; and when, along with this, we see innumerable channels opened for Christian effort, and waiting for this energy to be guided through them to the accomplishment of God's great purpose, what, we are constrained to ask, will be the result? This vast development and accumulation of human energy indicates the preparation for a final stage of progress. Sanctified and owned of God, it is just what is needed to hasten the work of the world's evangelization. Even now much of it is waiting to be directed into the ways of Christian effort. God is waiting to give it *all*, when the church shall sincerely and believingly ask for it, and show itself ready to wield it for his glory. Upon the *pastorate* of these coming years, even more than upon the pulpit, will depend the progress of the church and the hopes of the world. With the right man in the right place in all the church, and with the Divine blessing, the signs of the times would indicate the near approach of the great consummation.

ERRATA.

Page 94, line 5, for "The prerogative of duty," read, The prerogative and duty.

Page 94, line 27, for "govern," read, governs.

Page 95, line 2, for "embodies it," read, embody it.

Page 95, line 10, for "work," read, mission.

Page 95, line 29, for "are to be regarded in carrying out of the one plan of God," read, are to be engaged in carrying out the one plan of God.

Page 98, in quotation from "Saybrook Platform," for "and continue to the end of the world," read, and to continue to the end of time.

Page 102, line 6, for "pressing," read rushing.

Page 104, line 8, for "For many of us," &c., read, Too many of us, &c.

ART. V.—*Orthodoxy. Its Truths and its Errors.* CLARKE.
Essays, Philosophical and Theological. MARTINEAU.
Discourses on Religion. THEODORE PARKER.
Reason in Religion. HEDGE.
Endeavours after the Christian Life. MARTINEAU.

THE books whose titles are enumerated above, are representative of the Unitarian mind in all its gradations, from the most evangelical—if such a term can be applied at all—to the most sceptical and infidel. They take the reader through the multiform phases of thought which characterize that chameleon denomination. No one can carefully or carelessly peruse them without clearly ascertaining that Unitarianism is without form and void, as chaotic as the world was before its genesis. It rarely, if ever, enunciates a definite and positive evangelical principle. It reserves all its decisive utterances for the tenets of unbelief. It never supports a biblical truth or statement warmly and handsomely. If it adopts any scriptural declaration, it does so with an obvious desire to have it understood that it takes the revelation not as authority, but only lends it the authority of its own critical reason. Whenever it speaks kindly and generously of the Son of God, there is a latent feeling apparent that the Divine Being should appreciate the force or delicacy of the compliment. In fact, the general impression left on the mind of every unprejudiced reader of these books, and of all Unitarian works that it has been our fortune to peruse, is that Unitarianism is the most *self-conscious* of all forms of religion—its appreciation of itself suffuses all its religion and all its literature. Whether Parker, or Martineau, or Bellows, or Clarke, or Channing speaks, there is the same radiant self-satisfaction. The apostles and disciples of reason burn incense for ever on her shrine. The vestal lamp of their vanity is never suffered to go out. This consciousness of superior wisdom, and this

evident delight in its possession is sometimes amusing, sometimes painful, and always absurd. Orthodoxy, in all its forms, is always reverent of the Scriptures. It may dispute about interpretation, but it never questions their authority. Its various champions may discuss the principles of exegesis, but not one of them would controvert what a true exegesis fairly establishes. Scripture is the *ultima ratio.* And when orthodoxy reads Unitarianism it cannot suppress surprise, and often indignation, at the levity or unconcern with which its most sacred things are treated. Accustomed to accept with bowed head and reverent spirit the revelation of the Divine word as infallible, it can with difficulty comprehend a system which, with its apparent devotion and respect for the Bible, is yet the most insidious and dangerous foe its authority has ever encountered.

For no one can read the statements of modern Unitarianism, and the writings of its advocates, without perceiving that its resources of intellect and wealth of culture are devoted to the single object of lessening in the minds of men the authority and force of the Scriptures as a rule of faith. And this it does not by any direct and open assault, but by taking revelation under its patronage. It expresses the profoundest reverence for its Author, and yet invariably detracts from the meaning and authority of his words. It lays claims to piety, to love, to religion, to the most liberal Christianity, and yet weakens in the minds of all whom its influence reaches, the essential facts of the gospel. The extreme Unitarianism, as represented by Parker, is but a thinly varnished infidelity. The moderate Unitarianism, as represented by Clarke and Hedge, refuses to fall back on the logical conclusions of its system, creeps behind texts, but does not look facts in the face. It is a sort of truncated supernaturalism, its apex, that ought to pierce the heavens, cut off—a supernaturalism without the supernatural. It humanizes the Bible, and yet calls it a Divine revelation. It believes in man's greatness and rectitude, and yet talks about a Redeemer and Messiah. It quotes texts of Scripture, and yet asks men to believe in reason. With perfect good faith it "explains away" what is offensive to good taste or rational judgment. It has carried the art of interpretation

to such proficiency, that Scripture, in the plastic hand of a Unitarian, is but a nose of wax, and takes any shape the fancy or the reason may please. The first article of its creed is a denial of the devil. The oriental figures of speech explain all that is in the canon in respect to Satan. Paul no more believed in him than Martineau, though the apostle sometimes thought his best purposes were frustrated by the great hinderer. The Genesis, with its miraculous creation, the stories of Abraham, Daniel, and Elijah, are true as "symbols, not as facts." Moses and Isaiah never speak of Jesus, yet Jesus is a true man, and is right when he says they did. Jonah never visited the depths of the sea in the belly of a whale, and, in fact, there was never a whale at all. Thus while it professes to receive the Bible as the word of God, its theory of inspiration and of interpretation leaves not one member to another in the whole. It hews Scripture into pieces with the sword of exegesis, as Samuel hewed Agag before the altar. These things are evident to all students of Unitarian writings, so evident indeed, that one of their own more logical writers says, "that if the Athanasian creed, the thirty-nine articles of the English Church, and the Unigenitus could be found in Greek manuscript, and proved the work of an inspired apostle, no doubt Unitarianism would explain all of them, and deny they taught the doctrine of the Trinity or the fall of man." The Unitarian doctrine of inspiration—can any one tell what it is?

It is one of the artifices of this liberal philosophy to represent religious opinions in these days as wholly vague and unsettled. It seeks to convince the public mind that a great uncertainty belongs to the realm of Faith, that there are no well-established conclusions of religion on which the soul can rest with security and fixedness. It aims in this way to produce that "suspense of faith" of which it so constantly speaks. For it well knows that if the mind may be shaken in its religious convictions, or led to the belief that certainty of conviction is impossible, it will be easy to introduce its own rationalistic system. When it has swept the soul of its old inherited beliefs and ideas, it has made it ready for its own speculations. The first step towards rationalism is the feeling that there is nothing settled in religion. If faith offers no firm foundation,

reason resorts to its own conclusions. There is doubtless through the country an unsettled state of religious opinions, in many quarters. The liberal spirit has not infected the atmosphere for nought. Large numbers of men believe in nothing. Many scientific men have very vague notions on religious subjects. The masses of unreflecting minds have been to some extent affected with uncertainty. In some of the churches, especially in New England and at the West, there has been a slight wearing off from the doctrines of ancient orthodoxy. Some prominent pulpits, and perchance a professorial chair or two, have added to the uneasiness of the religious community, and taught us to think that certainty of truth was a difficult, if not impracticable attainment. Men who differ but little, and that not on essentials of faith, have made their differences greater by warm discussion, and the undisciplined public has exaggerated the differences that really exist among genuine Christians, and has learned to have little faith in religion itself. Then, too, this unsettled condition of the public mind on religion, so far as it exists, has been made the text of a great many Romish and semi-Romish attacks on Protestantism. Behold, exclaims the Romanist, or his cousin the Ritualist, behold how these Protestant sects divide and contend! See, what infinite variation of faith and worship! Consider what uncertainty is thrown by them on all the questions that affect the human soul and its destiny! Quit then this crumbling, falling Protestant edifice, filled with its dissonant cries, and come to us. We have a historical continuity. We have an apostolical order. We have the unchangeable faith of prophets and martyrs. We have a uniform worship and a splendid ceremonial. We insure the salvation of the soul. Our trumpet gives no uncertain sound. Thus Unitarianism on the one hand, and Romanism on the other, both animated by the same spirit, both disbelievers in the Divine authority of the word of God, both striving to blind the eyes of men to its real meaning, are striving to produce that very suspense of faith, that general unsettled condition of religious ideas, out of which they hope to profit to their own upbuilding and to the demolition of a true faith in the world.

But this uncertainty and unsettled state of religious opinions

is by no means so extensive nor so deep as many imagine. It is wide enough, too wide indeed; but not so prevalent as to cause distrust or beget despair. It is of the nature of Rationalism to unsettle religious ideas. And so far as this philosophy prevails will the minds of men be affected. Reason is discordant, various, in conflict with itself, at different times. Whenever it asserts authority in religion, it sets up a variable standard; one thing to-day and another thing to-morrow. And it is natural and necessary that those who are thus subject to reason should be affected with variations of religious ideas and a clear suspense of faith. It is natural too, that a mind so afflicted should attribute its difficulty to others, and should imagine the spiritual world was careering around it. Tossing up and down, in their little boats, it is not strange that rationalists should think the great promontories and headlands of Revelation were skipping and dancing before their eyes. Reeling and stumbling, like drunken men, intoxicated with their own theories, they suppose the stars have lost their centres, the globe its orbit, and the universe its order and relations. But the confusion is all the time in the brain of the theorist, and not in the system of Divine truth. That still holds its place, all the stars in the firmament of God, true always to their orbits, repeating their appointed courses and reciting their perpetual anthem. There is no dissonance, no variation in the Revelation, in the objects of faith. The transcendent mysteries of eternity, revealed to faith in the word of God, keep up the mighty crescendo of their march, with the undeviating exactness of the natural system. Faith, as a quality or element of the soul, may waver, but the objects of faith never fail nor lose any of their effulgence. Christianity, in all its parts and relations, was never so settled and established as to-day. Its supernatural verities were never so thoroughly substantiated. All the arts and sciences, all literature and history, have been pouring their proofs into her lap and verifying her statements. Nor was it ever so generally and absolutely credited in the minds and hearts of its advocates. Unitarianism will need to use still loftier powers of argument or persuasion to convince us that faith is suspended, or that the foundations of the Christian edifice are shaken by its disinte-

grating philosophy. An acquaintance with the history of theology in its largest sense, shows how changes and theories without end have swept past the grand facts of a common Christian faith, and left them more majestic than before. Many a time have the advocates of a liberal interpretation brought to bear the full force of their batteries on some doctrine or fact of Scripture, and in the smoke of the discharge which has blinded them, have thought they have demolished it for ever; but the wind sweeping down from the uplands, and scattering the cloud, has revealed the object of attack massive and beautiful as before. It is one of the strongest peculiarities in Christian history, that its historical truths have been exactly retained, never even revised, and that the continuity of belief has never been broken. Historical and didactic theology at our period, is fetched from the gathered stores of early Christian wisdom, and epitomizes the thought formerly expended on the deep problems of Divine truth. We can trace the channel of truth, from the beginning, as its streams have flowed from the fountain of life. It may have been infiltrated here and there by the influences of specific lands or times through which it has flowed. The thoughts of men as they have rained upon it may have had some effect, but the deep volume of the river of life has cleared itself of these feculent infiltrations and additions, by its very flowing, and he who tastes the stream now, may find the water the same as when it first gushed from the spring. This quality of clearing itself of impurities, however produced, is one of the most singular features of historical Christianity. When we imagine that we have cleared ourselves from past interpretations and have become independent of what our predecessors have found, and begin to draw conclusions at variance with their results, we soon learn that the very semblance of any breach with the past is impossible; that it is impossible to spin out of ourselves arguments and beliefs that are not in harmony with the constant facts of Christian faith and life. We may as well reason on theories that are at war with the law of gravitation, as attempt to construct a theology that is in conflict with the spiritual principles of God's kingdom, as they are revealed and established in his holy word. Orthodoxy, and by this we mean

the belief of the facts and doctrines of the Scriptures, unqualifiedly and heartily, is the unreserved repose of faith. It is the absolute resting upon reality. It is not the creation of certainty. It is the acceptance of certainty. It is not declaring the doubtful to be sure, but it is the leaning upon the sure, and giving the affection to its true object and carrying it to an eternal rest. Precisely here is the wider distinction between Orthodoxy and Liberal Christianity in their philosophies. The former is fixed and constant. It has a spiritual system of principles and laws as invariable as the laws of the heavens. These principles have wide relations and applications. They relate to faith. They apply to life. There has been no change in them since Christ first taught them in Judea. They are constant as the stars that shone on Abraham's tent in the plain of Mamre. We leave them for a while, or cease to guide our way by them, but soon come back to them as to a light that shineth in a dark place. Whatever our vacillations, they are like their great Author and Revealer, the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever. But Unitarian philosophy sets everything afloat. It accepts as parts of truth all that the capricious activity of the human mind can construct. It stamps as genuine each successive counterfeit of Christianity. Visions and prophecies and revelations are the easy attainments of ordinary minds. Broken cisterns that can hold no water are substituted for the fountain of living waters. It prefers the glittering spoils which human wisdom has accumulated, to the hidden treasures of the written word. It believes that earth can furnish what earth has always hopelessly failed to supply. It regards all things as emanations of the Deity. It is an optimist in its theory, and reproduces, for a modern graft on the Christian stock, the Neo-Platonism of Alexandria, the illusive wisdom of Rome and Athens. With such a philosophy it must have a shifting and variable religion. It could not be true to itself, were it not indeterminate and afloat.

The social life of man is first and most obviously affected by his religious faith. As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he in all his relations. His idea of God, and of the relations of the human race to the Divine Being, will form insensibly his institutions and penetrate every mode of thought. Calvinism

had a marvellous spiritual power. Its stern and logical system moulded the social life of New England. It bred a race of men and women as brave and pure as any that ever lived. It cast society into forms which still exist, though the spirit has deserted them. Its reaction was Liberalism; and the formative hand of the latter is as clearly seen now as the former was evident a hundred years ago. The influence of the reactionary spirit has extended farther than through the ranks of its own professed followers. It has modified in many respects the rigor of ancient orthodoxy. It has inbreathed its own spirit into a large part of its most cultivated and scientific men. It has pervaded its periodical and its permanent literature. It largely takes the control of its educational system, furnishes its text-books, and aims to direct its culture. The fundamental tone of New England society is gradually changing, and its intellectual leadership is passing into other hands. If the strict orthodoxy of its professional schools is called in question, it is not to their detriment, except in a few minds. In fact liberalism has tinged much orthodox preaching, and here and there has control of orthodox pulpits. The differences between the two systems of religious thought are wearing out, and it is not an unheard of thing for them sometimes practically to mingle. The writer knows of one Congregational orthodox church, with a most vigorous and trenchant Old-school Presbyterian elder in it, that has accepted for a term of years the ministrations of an avowed Unitarian. The leaven of liberalism has worked through the mass, and somewhat confused and unsettled men's ideas. Doctrinal discussion in public christian teaching has almost fallen into disuse. Ethical preaching is more in vogue, and the roots of moral instruction do not always run down into a doctrinal soil. Hence, it often happens that, outside of Unitarian pulpits, in all the other religious denominations, there is no less exposition of human rights and powers than development of the will and word of God. Social and moral questions furnish themes, to a considerable extent, to the pulpit.

That there is then a great difference from the past, that a change is in progress, seems hidden from no thinker of the day. It is freely admitted in the intercourse of thoughtful

minds, and proclaimed by observers on both sides. That this difference is impressing itself on the social ideas and usages of the age is equally obvious. It has its effect on the theory of civil government. Calvinism is eminently conservative, simply because it lays so much stress on law. It holds men's minds to the allied truth of equality and subordination. While its general scope is in harmony with freedom; while, in fact, it was the first religious system whose logical induction was liberty, it evermore held that liberty could never exist, except as reverence for authority and obedience to law. Boasting with a Pauline exultation in the liberty of Christ, in the emancipation of the conscience from the tyranny of ecclesiastical or secular prescripts, and in the deliverance of the intellect from the commandments and traditions of men, it yet also, with a Pauline satisfaction, delighted in the law of God after the inward man. It held that all freedom consisted in subjection to or in harmony with law. A planet has liberty only when it moves in its appointed orbit. Let it deflect from its path and it introduces anarchy into the heavens. Everything is free as it is in the plan of law. So man is free, but free only as he obeys the law written on his heart, free only as he observes the dicta of God's government. Let him disobey, and the Nemesis of God pursues his track, and unless he repents and is reinstated by grace into his normal relation to law, the retributions of Heaven will overtake him and grind him to powder. Such is the freedom of a spiritual orthodoxy. Obedience is liberty. When a man obeys from choice and love, he has made law his own. He moves freely in its plane, and his profit, his usefulness, his glory, all spring from his subordination. This system has its centre in God, the Supreme Ruler. It rarely discusses human rights, but often declares human duties. With its theory of human nature as corrupt, and fallen, and disobedient, it could do naught but lay the utmost stress upon the power, the glory, and the authority of the Divine government. What could man do against that? Who could reply to the Almighty? Should a plant complain of its structure, that it was wheat and not a rose, of the law that bound it to grow in one way and not in another, of the principle which made it bear a stalk and ear and kernel, and did not suffer it

to bloom with a flower and exhale a perfume? Should a star complain of its density, of its radiance, of its everlasting orbit, or should it rather sing as it shone the glory of its Maker? Should a man complain against God? Should the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me so? Should it beat its head against the adamantine buttresses of God's will, or should it accept the conditions of its existence, conform its will to the Divine, and move freely in moving obediently? Hence in Calvinism the solution of the problem of government is found in subordination. Obedience in the heart reconciles sovereignty and freedom.

And this religious idea worked itself out in human government. It penetrated every form of social life. It made, if you please, a watchful, and even a stern family government. It invested the father with an authority by a Divine right. It made law universal and absolute. Yet it produced a vigorous race of men, independent, bold, obedient, and authoritative. The modern Liberal Puritan possesses little of the self-sacrifice of the Puritan of old, who, if he knew how to command, knew also how to obey. Any system of religious faith that exalts God as a sovereign, that makes duty supreme, must of necessity mould all the forms of secular life. It strikes a solid and sure blow against that semi-atheistic philosophy which teaches that civil freedom consists in the *mere* extension of individual rights. It is one of the corollaries of Calvinism that the essential quality of political liberty is that a people obey law with consent and intelligence. One rule does not hold in religion and another in law. Freedom disowns ignorance, passion, insubordination, unbelief. Its real glory cannot be attained by an atheistical people or by a race morally and intellectually weak and degraded. A state holds its charter of freedom from Jehovah. When it apostatizes from him, he revokes its charter and sends it into Egypt to make bricks without straw. Hence the realization of perfect freedom in this world is an Utopian idea. It will have its drawbacks so long as men enjoy rights that are not based on the successful discharge of duties; so long as men are morally weak and vicious, irreverent of law, and bound by no ties to the unseen world. It will have its drawbacks so long as political philoso-

phy contradicts the principles of the Divine government, and imagines that the extension of the governing power and privilege in the state may outrun the possession of the governing quality, and supposes that a man is fit to be a ruler or an elector who has not first learned intelligently and lovingly to obey.

But a very different result follows the teachings of a liberal religious faith. The starting point of this latitudinarian philosophy is human and not Divine. Its postulate is not that the law of God is supreme, holy, just, and good; but that man is divine, needs no regeneration, and is adequate to his own salvation. This is the major premise of Liberal Christianity. The inherent rectitude of human nature, if held as a dogma of faith, will necessarily reveal itself in the various social and political institutions of life. He who believes such a doctrine will construct a Cosmos different from that which is the natural product of an orthodox faith. The idea of man and of sin will permeate all the social structure. If the theory of the optimist or pantheist is held, society will of course be subject to a set of principles corresponding to the theory. If human nature is inherently good, and not inherently bad, religion will naturally become a mere culture, and equality of social privileges the birthright of the soul. Church and state would fall out of their divine orbits into the place of mere educational and reformatory institutions. Men would be taught that unequal conditions are not the result of sin, but of circumstances, and if the conditions of life can be equalized the ideal state will be reached. And if the postulate of this philosophy is true, the conclusion is also true, for it is perfectly and unanswerably logical. If man is intrinsically good and only accidentally corrupt, then culture and reform are all the agencies that need to be evoked in his behalf. Liberate him from his evil conditions and he will work out a happy destiny. Give education, power, privilege, franchise, rights into his hands, and he will complete his redemption. Teach him his dignity, his divinity, and he will fall into the order of his duties. Let his reason have free play, untrammeled by tradition or ecclesiastical precepts, or secular force, and he will rise to a consummate manhood. But unhappily this system, being

contrary to fact, works disastrously. The world has not been without some appalling illustrations of the terribleness with which it works. Radical liberalism, beginning in religious faith, unsettling religious ideas, dethroning Deity, enthroning man, has given us some very positive testimony in respect to its relations to human freedom. France, inoculated with ideas of liberty that were not founded on the word of God, once made an attempt to be free and self-governing. Without recognizing the true source of freedom, she put forth her hand to gather its beautiful and blessed fruits. The fruit she plucked was mingled blood and ashes. She denied the existence of Deity. She enthroned the goddess of reason. She asserted the equality of men. She cast off the restraints of ancient authority, both human and Divine. She said to a people that discarded the Scriptures and defamed the Son of God, and despised the liberty which cometh from his hand,—Be free! And it would be well if the nations would always read and ponder the lessons, whose significance can never be exhausted, which may be learned from that Revolution. We may accept from it, indeed, that freedom is the inheritance and goal of man, but we must also find in it this other lesson, that without a deep spiritual faith, without a just recognition of God, and a profound conviction of human sin and want, a people never can be free. They may plant liberty-poles, set up images, decree privileges, proclaim rights, and pour forth endless torrents of silver oratory, but they will only "waken the furies of anarchy and join with them in a dance of death." Even the most thoughtful among the religious radicals of the age have seen this, and adopt a political philosophy in strange contradiction with their religious belief. They will not accept a theory of government which is philosophically and logically deducible from their religion. But under all protests faith works itself out in the social life. It was the remark of one of the most eminent and judicious statesmen of the past, the peer of Webster, and Clay, and Calhoun, in the Senate Chamber of the United States, that "Unitarianism was the diverging focus of all the nonsense in the country." With a singular insight for a public man, whose mind had not been wholly occupied with the relations and outgrowths of religious philosophy, he per-

ceived that such a system was, in its essential nature and work, destructive and revolutionary; that its natural effect would be upon the conditions of life; that it would spend its force in upsetting and destroying the external relations, orders, arrangements, and structures of religious, social, and political life, rather than in reaching the heart of man with the regenerating and sanctifying truth. A theory that holds evil to be in the conditions and not in the seat of life itself, must inevitably affect disastrously every fabric of society. Reforming not from within outwardly, not by a change of heart, but from without, by a change of circumstances, there would be no end to its tyrannical and revolutionary proceedings. Its mission would be to overthrow existing organizations of church and state, in the endeavour to exorcise the omnipresent spirit of evil. Each institution of society would in turn feel its renovating grip. In the hopeless attempt to destroy by discipline, by culture, by regulation and reform, the power of sin, it would succeed in overturning the world, but not in renewing and saving it. After all its work, man, the sinner, would remain; and each new social structure that was reared by him would show the impress of his hand and the quality of his spirit. Not until the axe is laid at the root of the tree, and man has a new heart created in him, and a right spirit renewed within, will his conditions be otherwise than evil. The true reformation is that which each man begins in himself. The ideal church or state is first within the soul. The kingdom of God cometh not with observation, but its foundations and superstructure are laid in the depths of man's own renewed spirit.

It is only astonishing to an unreflecting mind to see what theories, and notions, and projects to remodel the world and reorganize society have flowed immediately and indirectly from this liberal philosophy. Nearly all the evangelists of spurious reforms come from this quarter. Most of them have very shadowy notions of the authority of the Scriptures. The advocates of spiritualism, of woman's rights, of social changes of every kind, have nearly all of them been touched with a liberalism amounting to deism, and are inclined to reject as authoritative the Old and New Testament writers. A great many women who battle for the equality of the sexes in political

privileges, always ruffle their feathers and shake their heads when they read St. Peter and St. Paul. The lecturers who travel the length and breadth of the land, and cater to the popular taste on the exciting topics of the day, draw but very little of their inspiration from the sources of an orthodox theology. The Helicon which is the fountain of their outpourings, is a radical, religious liberalism. The millennium which they anticipate, and which in their imaginations is so near, is one whose central figure and whose crowned head and revealer is not the incarnate Son of God. It consists not in the attraction of men to God, in their communion with him; not in the restoration of the soul to the orbit of celestial obedience and love; not in the triumph of the blood-bought church and the new genesis of nature; not in a Cosmos whose law is the will of God, whose heavens and earth are filled with the glory of his dear Son, but in a world where humanity is emancipated and enthroned, where redemption is the acme and consummation of human energies; where the light that shines is the flame of the incense that man offers to himself. Are not the *avant couriers* of such an ideal state already impetuously crying aloud and filling our ears with the sound of their voices? Are not their "flaunting standards to be seen on every wooded knoll around us"? Are they not leaders of a motley host, whom our fathers fought long and successfully, composed of those who would attribute the glory of human development, never to Christ, but ever to the progress of an advancing civilization? But are they leaders whom we should follow? Shall a true defender of the ark of God, that ark which is the safety of the church and the palladium of the state, in which are the written words of life, over which are spread the wings of the cherubim, ever give ear to their voices? Never. Heaven save us from such a frantic crime! For then the Shekinah would depart and its glory would no more dwell with us. With the triumph of a humanitarian unbelief, the strong pillars of the nation would be shaken, and the bonds which unite us would be as tow. A liberal philosophy would dissolve the state as surely as its prevalence would demolish "that city which lieth four square, whose builder and maker is God." But let us hope that such a victory will never be won. We need not abandon Chris-

tianity, as the only agency that has any practical influence and worth on the affairs of men. It will work out the true solution of the problem of this world, if aught can. We need not distrust its power, the power of God in Jesus Christ to develope and ennoble the whole character of man. It is its grand peculiarity that it developes duties and not rights primarily, that it constructs and does not destroy society; that it sends man to work in God's vineyard, and tells him that neither his faculties nor their field of operation are his; that he has to subdue the whole field, and cultivate the whole garden for God, and must not rest save in that recreation that is the music of work, until the boundaries of the Redeemer's kingdom inclose the whole earth, until the many crowns are placed on the head of the Prince of Peace. The idea of history is faith. The power of history is faith. And if history shall be such as to realize the dreams, and prayers, and hopes of prophets and apostles, and not the indefinite illumination that a vague and haughty spiritualism would cast over the future heavens, the faith that makes it and fills it with the predicted splendours of the millennial epoch, must "behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

It would be a serious charge to make against Liberal Christianity to say that it weakened the moral forces of the individual and social life. For this is its peculiar boast, that it developes the highest style of morality. It has ever made this its religion. It has poured out its scorn on orthodoxy for insisting upon justification by faith. It has laughed at the idea of a justifying faith, and called upon the disciples of the no-creed to exhibit a loftier and grander morality than the adherents of the ancient faith of the gospel. And yet we think that Unitarianism is fairly exposed to this charge.

It has always been the doctrine of the Scriptures that the just man shall live by his faith. Need we say also that it has always been the actual source of the best and strongest life of the world. We can trace from old time the history, influence, and results of that sacred principle. It has been the starting point in every new stage of the spiritual life of our race. It kindled the souls of the ancient prophets. It was a fire shut up in the bones of the apostles. It inspired that long register

of heroes and saints of whom the world was not worthy. It was the only light that streamed across the darkness of Judaistic unbelief and idolatry. Augustin and Luther, and a thousand lesser prophets, went forth to victory over the world under its divine afflatus. It has ever been the trumpet-call of spiritual warfare, the watchword of mighty controversies, and the article of a standing or falling church. The connection between faith and life has been as obvious in all ages and nations as the connection between the fountain and its stream, between the sun and its light. The people that have had the purest faith in God, that have had the clearest conception of him as revealed in our Lord Jesus Christ, have ever had the best types of moral, intellectual, and spiritual life. The nation that has not served him has utterly perished. There are powers and passions in the human heart that only the eye of the living God can know. There are capacities slumbering in the human soul that only the hand of Jesus can touch, waken, and develope.

And yet in face of what thoughtful men of all times have confessed of the moral power that resides in faith in the Son of God, Unitarianism has ever been wont to say, there is no need of a Christian faith, and to assure us that it is of little consequence what a man believes, so long as his actions are right. Doing is of more consequence than believing. A true, loyal, and pure life is the best confession. A believer is nothing at all; only an upright life availeth. Morality is the best religion. In making these assertions, this liberal philosophy is certainly at variance with the word of God. For it is the ever-resounding voice of the Scriptures, that the soul commences and pursues its divine life in faith in Jesus Christ. They show that the revelation of the Godhead in nature, or in oracles, or in providence, was not enough to raise men from hypocrisy, formalism, and selfishness; was not enough even to save them from the most pervasive wrong and criminality. So they ever exhort men to live by faith. They assure us that all the glory of material civilization will vanish without faith. They convince us that men, communities, and nations, have their place and permanence in history only as they have reverence for the Son of Man. And they test the doctrine by giving us the

names in that long list of heroes, of every variety of circumstance, knowledge, and character, who through faith wrought righteousness, subdued kingdoms, and put armies to flight. Abel, who offered a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain, simply because his offering typified the blood of the Lamb of God; Abraham, the father of the faithful; Moses, the lawgiver and prophet; David, the psalmist and king; these were brilliant examples of its power. So also were the rough courage, the wild patriotism, and marvellous strength of Samson, Barak's acceptance of Deborah's guidance, Jephthah's nobler and untaught devotion. The epistle to the Hebrews had never been written, had it not been that faith was the essential element of an effective righteous life. And so the word of God is ever at war with that philosophy, which teaches that faith in Christ is not essential to a just and worthy life. It meets the postulate of Unitarianism with its stern negative.

But liberalism does away with faith itself as the determining principle of the life. It is as contrary to a sound mental philosophy as it is to the Divine word. The active powers of the soul are not its whole motive powers. Back of them lie determining principles of our nature. Man moves by law as truly as a star or a steam-engine. A star is not a mere mass of luminous matter. It has its orbit and motion, its secret and guiding principle. An engine is not a mere collection of rods, cylinders, and pistons placed in certain relations to each other, but it is constructed on a certain law of mechanics, with reference to the application of certain powers. The power which moves it is something aside from and independent of itself. And it never can act except on the application of that external principle or force. That principle is harnessed to the iron machinery, and sends it along its course to bear the freight of the world.

So, too, there is something in man which lies back of his active powers and determines and regulates their movement. There is a law, co-equal with his being, impressed upon it, and just in accordance with its character, yet most freely, does he act. This principle runs through the creation, and man is no exception to it. Each class of animals and plants acts by a law of its own. By its law the plant seeks the light and the

air. It turns its leaves from the darkness to the sun. By its law the bird builds its nest, cares for its young, finds its food, and soars and sings in the sky. By its law the bee builds its hexagonal cell, and never deviates from the beautiful pattern which God has given. We call it law, or instinct, or what name we will, and yet we know that as long as the world stands, that principle will work out its natural results, that it will make each material thing do the precise work which God hath told it to do. They will cover one field with the tasselled corn, another with golden wheat, another with bursting bolls of cotton, and another with forests of oak or of pine. Or if sentient things, they will fly in the eye of the sun, or build their nests on high crags or lowly trees, or sing each its peculiar note, and speak in language that all may hear, the word which God hath declared to them, but which no man can understand or interpret.

So with man. That governing force which we call law with plants and trees, with stars and suns; which is instinct with birds and beasts; is faith in man. Faith is his determining impelling, governing principle. As a man believeth, so is he. His life, in all its parts, in its play and work, in its social and domestic forms, is determined by what he believes. It determines his history, his fruit, his character. It may be of various kinds. All faith is not the same faith. There is a faith of idolatry, a faith of polytheism, a faith of Mormonism, a faith of Christianity, and a faith of Liberal Christianity. There is a supernatural faith also of Christ. And each kind of faith tells itself. It proclaims its own secret. The law written on the heart cannot be silent. It will find voice and speech. It will give movement and results, and all movement and results will be according to the peculiar character or object of faith.

There is nothing more absurd than for Unitarianism to say, as it constantly does, that it makes no difference what we believe, or whether we have faith or not. Even no creed is a creed; no faith is a faith. Selfishness is a faith. Indifferentism is a faith. Sensualism is a faith. And the character, the life, will be as the faith. If that faith has been formed by the world, it will be a worldly character. If it has been formed

by the devil, the life will be according to his law. If it has been written and impressed on the heart by the Spirit of God, then the life will proclaim the hidden and glorious secret of the incarnate and written word; it will bear fruit after its celestial kind.

Of course, Liberal Christianity, in discarding the orthodox doctrine of faith, logically does away with all that is distinctive in the gospel as a plan of redemption. It does away, in fact, with the necessity of a revelation. For revelation is only addressed to faith. Without this faculty or power of faith, it would be idle to address a revelation to man. For a revelation is the unveiling of invisible things to the mind of man. It would be impossible that there could be such an apocalypse, were there no power in the soul adequate to receive and comprehend it. It is not made to sense, for what has sense to do with invisible and super-sensible things. It is not made to mere reason, for it is the province of reason to find out, classify, and analyze things in the sphere of nature. It is the faculty which deals with that which can be seen and known in this sphere. Faith is the faculty which deals with the unseen and the unknown. What the eye cannot see, nor the ear hear, nor the heart conceive, the Spirit reveals to our faith. To apprehend the revelation, requires a faculty in correspondence with the objects revealed. It requires a power capable of seeing the unseen, of knowing the unknown, of grasping the supernatural.

The name of Christ is the chief name in the universe. It is the one above all that is named. But after that name, faith is the chief term in the Scriptures, because it is the power by which we apprehend the former. It is the correlative of the name, Christ—the Divine word is for ever calling on men to believe, because faith brings them into relation and harmony with the great object of faith. It is the principle by which we are brought into connection with God and with the supreme reality of eternity. The ear has no more correspondence with music, nor the eye with the beauties of art and nature, than has faith with the Godhead and with the grand mysteries and truths of the word of God. Through it, the vibrations of the heavenly reach to the earthly state.

Hence, not only logically, but practically also, to deny the need and use of faith, is to deny the revelation. All that is peculiarly addressed to faith is rejected. The invisible and the supernatural no more reach or affect our souls. Everything distinctive in Christianity is at once obliterated in the mind of the unbeliever, so far as his own act can do it. Christ fades away into the dim distance. All that is Divine in him is withdrawn from the observation of the soul, and that only which is human becomes the object of its thought and attention. The God is hidden and the man alone remains. For no man can call Jesus, Lord, but by the Holy Ghost. Liberal Christianity may see a beautiful and perfect man in him, but no one can see the God-man save by faith. That is the only telescope that can descry the Divine.

So also the atonement is exiled from the realm of the reason. For the doctrine of the cross is the fact of faith. It is the one marvellous truth that is for ever an offence to the unspiritualized reason, and foolishness to a natural philosophy. The expiation of sin by the blood of a vicarious sufferer, and by that alone, has been from the beginning until now, under the ban of ritualism and philosophy. It has been abhorrent to any system that makes righteousness, and salvation, and eternal life, a matter of good works, whether religious or secular. And therefore the true meaning and practical power of the atonement, in all times, has equally been denied by Romanism and by Rationalism. For both make religion consist in good works, in outward observances, in deeds of the body. Both make salvation a matter of merit. In the one case it is charged over to the magical efficacy of ablutions and vigils, of fasts and penances, and in the other case to the magical efficacy of an honest buying and selling, a careful and thrifty living, a prudent and exemplary behaviour. In both cases the merit of salvation belongs to the man, and not to the God-man.

Thus this system of religion and philosophy which repudiates faith as the true basis of morality, and as the only ground of righteousness and life, always ends either in formal religionism or in secular morality. Its practical religion will invariably be religious ceremonies, or educational and reformatory

enterprises. It drifts to an arrogant Pharisaism on the one hand, or to a volatile and giddy Sadducism on the other. The doctrine of justification by faith has always been equally assailed by Romanist and Rationalist, by Ritualist and Unitarian. And both, in giving it up, have logically and practically surrendered Christianity. Both have subjected it to interpretations, or squared it with systems that have demolished its paramount authority.

The favourite affirmation of Liberal Christianity, that the soul needs no creed and should refuse to be bound by one, is to say that man needs no revelation, and should hold any professed revelation as a matter of no concern. It is to construct a theory of life which blots out the sun, moon, and stars, in the firmament of revealed truth. It shuts us out from the certain knowledge of God, his will or law; from the knowledge of the unseen world, of angels and redeemed, which is so essential to the peace of our minds and the ordering of our lives. To say, as Unitarianism does, that it is no matter what a man believes if his life is right, is to do away with the necessity and with the entire system of Christianity. It is to affirm that all which God has spoken for faith to receive, is needless and absurd. It is to deny the written and incarnate word of God. And if God has spoken to man by the mouth of prophets and apostles, if Christ has made known aught that concerns him to know, it is to classify their communications with fables and myths, or with the utterances of uninspired wisdom. And if faith in the highest or noblest things in the spiritual world is essential to the right conduct of life, it is for ever to foreclose the soul to its true ideal,—the measure of the stature of a perfect man in Jesus Christ. The likeness of that which we behold by faith is impressed on the character. He who looks on Jesus, the author and finisher of faith, is changed into the same image, from glory to glory. He who looks on anything else or less, is changed into the image of what he beholds, and the life is eventually completely moulded by that which commands its religious devotion. A man cannot rise above his God. And if he degrades the conception of the true God, if he plucks from the head of the God-manifest his divine crown, even though he places on his brow the diadem of a perfect

humanity, he has robbed himself of the power of reaching the noblest type of manhood. For the only true conception we can have of the infinite and eternal God, is that which we obtain in the person of Jesus Christ. No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten of the Father, He has declared him. To discrown Christ is therefore to shut out the soul from any correct knowledge of God. Cast out from the warm home of the Gospels, from the God-illuminated church of Jesus Christ, from the household of the Redeemer and the redeemed by his blood, into the sunless wastes of the universe, to find the Deity, whither shall we go? Exiled from Christ as God, we cry with Philip, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us," and hear not the answer of the Son, "Have I been so long time with thee, and yet hast thou not known me?" Then we go forth to discover the invisible God where we may. How long will it be before our complaint will be as bitter, and our stroke as heavy, as that of the old patriarch, "Oh that I knew where I might find him, that I might come even to his seat. I go forward, but he is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive him; on the left hand, where he doth work, but I cannot behold him, and he hideth himself on the right hand that I cannot see him." The knowledge of the Godhead is therefore impossible to Unitarianism, for no man hath the Father but he who hath the Son. Deism is practical atheism. And practical atheism, in the long run, is selfishness and immorality.

We confess ourselves at a loss to conceive how Liberal Christianity reaches a just and exact knowledge of God the Father. Nor are we enlightened by its most forcible writings. It has a great deal of beautiful and splendid writing about the Father, but the picture it gives us of him is a mere human conception. It is man's portrait of the infinite Jehovah. It is a charming or brilliant ideal, but an ideal still. It harmonizes not with the Divine revelation, with that wondrous likeness of God's glory we find in the whole framework of the Scriptures. It is not the God of the covenants, nor the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a mere conception, the idol of the reason. It is not the actual God who is, without controversy, revealed to the faith of the Christian heart.

Hence the true and adequate knowledge of the Father is as rigidly interdicted to Unitarianism, as it was to the old Jews, who had no prophetic instinct or faith of Christ. If it were possible, in idea merely, to break up the Godhead, to separate the second and third persons in it from the first, and to leave the first for ever isolated from the others; were it possible thus to rend asunder that God of the revelation, and to suppose that the triune Jehovah exists no longer in one three-fold person, and that the Deity is no longer Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but Father only, we cannot imagine then how the mind would discover the Father, or to what goal it would certainly come in its searchings. No more can we conceive, to use an illustration where all illustration fails, how in the department of science, one could find a triangle when two of its angles are riven from it, and no longer constitute parts of its one, perfect, absolute entity. Take away the two angles of a triangle, and the third is also gone; lost, exhaled into space, undiscoverable and immeasurable for ever. And so it seems to us that the Father disappears from the Godhead when the Son is wrenched away from it. In point of actual history this has always been the case. The Father never has been known except in relation to the Son. Reason in her search for God, when she has not trod the path illumined by the Divine word, has never succeeded in her search. The pantheon of Athens, the temples of Rome, the fanes of India, the obelisks of Egypt, the philosophies of Plato, and of the Neo-Platonists of Alexandria, and the later schools of theistic or atheistic science, all testify with their discordant voices, that the religion of reason is either polytheism or pantheism; that it either makes all men to be as God, or else makes God to be as all men, humanity, the mere word and voice of God himself. It resolves the Father into an abstraction, taking such qualities as any one may desire, and leaves man to stand forth as his own God, redeemer, and saviour.

This is the practical result of Unitarianism. It starts forth in the search for God, for salvation, for life, and comes in the end to the assertion that man is the son of God, and that his essential rectitude and immortality are inherent and indefeasible possessions. Unable to find the Father where the Son is not,

it ends with declaring that man has no need of redemption, and that eternal life is his own birthright and not the gift of another. Man is his own atoner and saviour. His Lord and God, when he finds him, is not the Being upon whose wounds the doubting Thomas looked, and when he saw, believed; but it is none other than himself. He takes the name of the great God. He says, *I am!* I am good! I am immortal! I am one with God! I am the Son of God! The denial of Christ as God is not the better and fuller discovery of the Godhead, an ampler revelation of the Father, but it is the apotheosis of man. It takes away the God-man and leaves in his place a Man-god. It needs no argument to prove that such a faith as that will ultimately work itself out in universal strife and anarchy. Its logical conclusion is unimaginable conflict. The day on which we should all become as gods, knowing good and evil, there would be war in heaven and earth, rivalled only by the ancient strifes of the deities of mythology. Pelion would be piled on Ossa in another battle of the gods. What safeguard to a pure and permanent morality is there then to be found in a system of religion and philosophy that rejects the Christian idea of God? The social and individual life might be veneered and varnished by it with a superficial and showy morality, but would it stand? Ask of history. Ask of the elder Scriptures. Ask of the Gospels: What buildings stand? Are they not those that are built on the Rock, Christ?

Having discussed the attitude of Unitarianism toward the intellectual, the social, and the moral life, it remains now briefly to allude to its position with reference to the organic institutions of Christianity. How does it stand with respect to the church of Jesus Christ? So far as we have followed it, we have found it consistent in its theory. It excludes all supernaturalism. It is pure rationalism. "Christianity," it affrms, "is a revelation of reason." And therefore it interprets and explains *out of Christianity*, whatever conflicts with reason. It has allowed this critic of the revelation to exclude from it nearly all its distinctive statements and doctrines. The Scriptures have encountered the fate of inflexible *litera scripta* existing side by side with the ever-widening inductions of the reason. It has exploded the consecrated theory of the

universe which is preserved to us in the Mosaic cosmogony. The miracles of Christ have been unable to hold their ground against the march of science. The common parentage of the human race is denied, even though the whole system of revealed theology goes with it. The tower of Babel fades into a myth. The song of Moses and Miriam has at last been discredited, and it is shown that no Hebrew fugitives crossed the Red Sea. The atonement has been shorn of its divine proportion and made to be a mere natural exhibition of love, such as history is for ever repeating. The regeneration is a vigorous act of the natural will. The Son of Man is a little lower than the angels, and a little higher than men. What then does it do with the church?

Theodore Parker tells us that the church and her ordinances are "purely artificial. They are not good in themselves. They may have had an educational value for mankind. Some of them still have. But they have no tendency to promote natural piety and natural morality." "The outward Christian sacraments are only stones of stumbling in the way of mankind. They are as far from the real ordinances of religion as the dandling of a doll is from a mother's holy duty." Clarke tells us that "our visible church is a little dyspeptic. Sometimes, also, it seems to be rheumatic; at any rate, it cannot go and attend to its work. It is very subject to fever and ague. It has its pulmonary disease, too; its lungs are not strong enough to speak when it ought." "When the church has got its fences all arranged and its gates built to its satisfaction, it is obliged to throw them all down, to let little children and all the heathen pass through. The fences of the church are like the flaming walls of Tasso; they seem to be impassable, but as soon as one comes up to them, they are found to be nothing. Blessed be God, that humanity is stronger than forms." Other writers invite us into the liberal church. "Come unto us. Our scope is large. We have a God untrammelled by custom or covenant. We do not ask you to accept the difficult facts of the Scriptures, or 'the things hard to be understood' of St. Paul. In our church, Reason and Faith are married. The beautiful and the true are joined together. We have a community of knowledge and spiritual emancipation—a

dispensation of liberty and love. We have passed the period of bondage and fear, the age of law. We have gone beyond the dispensation of instruction and discipline and doctrine. We are looking forward to an era of spiritual life, untrammelled by priestly rule and dogmatic conditions, carrying its own authority in its own triumphant and beneficent sway. Let us remove the barriers of the past. Let us spurn the relics of religious feudalism. Let not doctrines and creeds divide brothers. Let us not stint the growth of man. Let not the church of the future be darkened with the jealousies and rivalries of the past. Let us down with all walls and gates; and in fraternal triumph merge into one great family of truth and love." Such are the voices that are now sounding in our ears—voices, too, that are not without their power; voices to which many souls give heed, and follow them into the inner apartments of this effulgent temple of rational religion.

To those who have had such experience of religion as Coleridge describes in his weird allegory of the temple of superstition, we can scarcely wonder that these voices are of commanding import. It is not strange when one reacts from the impostures and sorceries of a merely formal church like the Roman, and listens to the invitations that seem so unlike those of superstition and formalism. Spiritualism must wear an exceedingly attractive guise to him who has been bound and ground under the impositions of mere ecclesiasticism. And yet he who follows these voices will make a wide *detour*, only to come into the same temple at its backward gates. The living idol who sits within, as God upon the very throne of Deity, is bi-formed and Janus-headed. Its front is that of religious Superstition and Formalism. Its hinder face and shape is that of Rationalism. Superstition is own brother to Liberalism. He who believes more than is written, acts on the same law with him who believes less than is written. He who would extend miraculous powers to the priests of the church, is governed by the same principle with him who denies all miracles. He who places the Bible under lock and key, is not unlike him who neglects the Bible altogether. One excludes it from the people, the other rejects it before the people. One would hide it, the other would destroy it. One affirms the Scripture is invaluable

only when unread, the other disowns it openly as any source of authority. Thus, practically, Formalism and Spiritualism, Superstition and Rationalism come together. The infallible church and the infallible reason are the fore and hinder parts of the same idol, and a common roof covers the worshippers who come from the opposite and extreme doors. It can make no essential difference, when the law is reason, whether it transcends or falls short of the revelation; whether it constructs a system of forms for which there is no divine warrant, or repudiates all forms and creeds, for which there is equally no warrant. The authority on which both the Church of Rome and the Liberal Church rest, is the reason of man, acting outside of and independently of the Scriptures. Both discard the prevailing Protestant and Christian idea of the church. Both set up their own standards. Both reject the cross of Christ, the atonement of the Son of God, as the ground of justification and life. One would swallow all forms and absorb them into one. The other would reject all forms and merge them into itself.

With all its professed hatred of forms and creeds, it is clear enough that Liberalism is slowly and certainly crystallizing and taking upon itself an organic shape. Things exist in this world by distinction one from another; and Liberal Christianity is already combining its forces and making its boundary lines. It recognizes the great principle that all vital and effective forces have an organized character. Its isolated communities have had but little power. But there is now a strange movement among the motley hosts of unbelief. Some subtle, secret affinity is bringing them together, and welding them into a compact mass. A few years ago, Liberal Christianity had no churches. It had no sacraments, nor ordinances. It had no relation and unity of parts. But gradually it is organizing its churches. It is assuming the apparel and circumstance of Christianity. It has its membership, no matter how variant and discordant among themselves, yet all moved by antagonism to the ancient doctrines and institutions of Christian faith. It has its Baptism and its Lord's Supper, though in whose name it baptizes, and whose death it commemorates, we know not. Yet it avails itself of the help of "artificial sacraments." Its emancipated soul puts on a body,

such as pleaseth it, and it is harmonizing and arranging its forces for the final conflict.

We say for the final conflict, for it seems to us that history and prophecy both foreshadow a conflict of imposing magnitude and grandeur, between the church of Jesus Christ and the forces of Antichrist. "And who is Antichrist but he that denieth that Jesus is come in the flesh." To this conclusion must we come. The church of Christ will more and more assume its distinctive attitude and quality. Its various parts will be more and more brought into relation and harmony. The bright forces of the organic body of Christ will be compacted and gathered, in order that they may go forth, fair as the sun, clear as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners. So Antichrist will muster his squadrons. The deniers that Christ is come in the flesh, that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us; that the cross of Christ is the sole hope of man, will come together. Their points of difference will all be merged in their one point of agreement. Then the two parties will stand face to face, the church of prophets, apostles, and of Christ, will come into collision with the emancipated, "free-born church of the future." The fell spirit of unbelief, which disdaining to accept the Christ of the Gospels, rests on the essential rectitude of man, will seek the overthrow of the faith once delivered to the saints. To such a result the word of God and the signs of the times most obviously point. The great spiritual conflict of the future seems to us not likely to be on any of the old issues of the past. Romanism and Protestantism will hardly join swords again. It would appear as if the strife must come, if it comes at all, on essentially new questions, questions more vital indeed than any before. The very citadel of Christianity, the person and work of the Son of God, is to be the Gibraltar of attack.

Nor do they reckon wisely who imagine that this silver-tongued and silken-slippered Liberalism, whose words are so sweet, whose actions are so delicate, whose invitations are so loving and guileless, and which prates so much of spiritual freedom and emancipation, is incapable of the most bitter and terrible intolerance and persecution. Why are we called upon to give up every external defence of our faith, unless our

reward is to be a bondage by the side of which the ancient bondage of the church of Rome would be endurable? Why does Liberal Christianity attempt to destroy reverence and love for the word and church of Christ, unless it would bring about a servitude of scepticism. There have been things done and said in our day by this liberal spirit, that show us what we have a right to expect, if it should ever come to bear rule over us. History has given us many a lesson of what may be done in the name of liberty, and reason, and love. We have no cause to trust the mercy of Antichrist. If we grant there are many exceptions, if we admit there are those who have a lofty and universal sympathy among the adherents of this system, does not history tell us that the voices of the noblest and purest will soonest be hushed; that their sympathetic emotions will be rudely swept away; that their native kindness will quickly be overpowered by the destructive forces of an aggressive unbelief and materialism? Does not every system of thought and belief work itself out to its logical results? Will not vice borrow its palliations from unbelief? Will not wildness of thought beget frenzy of action? Are not sensualism, blasphemy, and persecution, the issue of scepticism? Will not the end of that liberal religion, which is really no religion at all, be no noble, generous, Christ-like, ideal man, but a slave of his own passions, a vassal of his own stormy imaginations? Shall we not find that the system which would weaken and disorganize the doctrine and the church of Christ in the minds of men, would not be slow to rear its own structures on the ruins of the edifice it aims to destroy?

A single word may not be amiss upon the mode in which the Christian church and ministry is to meet successfully the pervasive working of this liberal spirit, and prepare itself to cope with it in its final organized action. Rome preaches ecclesiasticism. Liberal Christianity preaches education, reform, secular progress. It remains for the friends of Christianity to preach Christ. Let the old doctrine *stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ* ring through the churches. Faith in Christ, not faith in forms, nor faith in deeds, justifies the souls of men. This is the blazonry of the true sacramental host. This is the doctrine, which, like the point of Ithuriel's spear, reveals the

real Satanic character of all the false and illusive systems of the world. Unless we would make our Protestantism like Romanism, our orthodoxy like a naturalistic belief and liberal Christianity, the faith and preaching of the church must rest in the word and on the Son of God. It would be unwise and fatal to be diverted from this simple end. It is on this Rock that the church remains impregnable to the gates of hell. When she quits this Rock, then she is as weak as water. It is for ecclesiasticism or Unitarianism to preach for doctrines the commandments of men, to make religion consist in forms or reforms; in ecclesiastical culture, or in an intellectual and social culture, in ritualism or in education, but it is for the followers of the Saviour to glory only in their Lord, to preach only his cross, and never to lend to unrevealed doctrines, or policy, or system, the sanction of religion. They do well to consider whether the modern tendency to associate secular objects with the ends of the church, to demand of men a belief in unrevealed things; to identify Christianity with this or that outside cause, or opinion, or culture, or reform, has not had something to do with the increasing power of the liberal system. Whenever the Christian church has resorted to the armory of its enemies for weapons with which to promote the cause of the Redeemer, they have lost their cause. They have abdicated their power in the greatest things only to use it in the least. They have thrown away the sceptre of princely influence, and no act of theirs can ever grasp it again. Therefore the church does well to consider whether she does not best promote the best things of earth, such as morality, temperance, order in society, education, justice, and obedience, by holding first, last, and evermore, the doctrine of Justification by Faith. Faith places the salvation of souls as the distinctive enterprise of Christian discipleship. Let that faith animate the church in its ministry, let it revive the spirit of the early ages, and burn once again brightly, as it has done, and then they should find a power adequate to beat the encroaching spirit of unbelief back to its dark fastnesses. We know but little of the power which resides in a pure gospel. We have not half used the weapons of its armory. We have sometimes been diverted from the simple ends of the Christian church

to those which are worldly and ambitious. Christ pledged himself that his kingdom should not be of this world. And what would have become of the world, had Christ intimated that there was anything in it greater than the soul of man, or more vital than its redemption? What would have become of Christianity, had he allied himself with the Herodians or Asmoneans of his day, and instead of founding his kingdom in tears and self-sacrifice, and blood, had gone to Rome to wear himself out in denunciations of the infamous Tiberius, or in supporting the pious Germanicus? What would have been the history of Christianity, had the apostles been the standard-bearers of earthly causes, affiliated themselves with the partisans of the imperial Titus, or conspired against the vindictive Caligula, instead of rendering honour to whom honour is due, and then with a faith that transcended all human questions, gone forth to preach Jesus and the resurrection? These were the mighty themes which once shook the world, overturned the monuments of Paganism, and in three centuries spread Christianity through the nations of Europe. To that lofty faith we are indebted for the church of the living God, and to it we shall be indebted for its preservation and for its perpetuity.

We do well also to pray that the Father of grace would unite all who are of the household of faith. When the foe of Christ is come nigh, when he lays his velvety and treacherous hand on the heads of those who have been sprinkled in the name of the Trinity, when he whispers fond and glowing deceits to the imaginations of the generous and unwary, when he concentrates his forces for the final assault, then we do well to resort to Him who rides in the ship and is the stiller of storms, and whose word can rebuke the unbelieving agitations of his own disciples and hush the fury of the outside waves. No ship will ever sink that carries Jesus Christ.

CORRECTION.

In the edition of the *Review* on Reunion published in New York, the first article of the Basis is printed with a comma after the words, "as it is accepted by the two bodies"—which comma is not found in the original document, or in any authorized copy of it, as published by either of the two Assemblies, or by the two Committees. It was, no doubt, an undesigned mistake: but it has worked mischief, as it very materially affects the signification of that article, throwing back those words as if referring to the historical sense, whereas they qualify the succeeding expression. This reading has led to a very common and serious misapprehension of the meaning of the Committee.

Hence, in Art. VI. of the October *Review*, the opening sentence reads—"The Plan of Union proposed by the Joint Committee requires that the Confession of Faith be adopted in *its fair historical sense, as it is accepted by the two bodies.*" Here it stops, in the middle of a clause of the sentence. The assertion is incorrect. We seriously aver that the Plan of Union proposed requires *no such thing*—the Committee never intended that it be so understood. Our language may not have been precise or unequivocal; but no member of the Committee meant that it should be so *mis*-understood by any one. We think the whole sentence, as given by us, is not susceptible of such interpretation. But we merely ask, that brethren, before they condemn the Committee for such a requirement, would read and consider the article as it is found in the Minutes of the General Assembly, or in the Plan of Union as sent to all our ministers by order of the Committee, and then judge and criticise accordingly.

CHARLES C. BEATTY.

SHORT NOTICES.

Ezekiel and Daniel; with Notes, critical, explanatory, and practical, designed for both Pastors and People. By Rev. Henry Cowles, D. D. New York, 1867. 12mo, pp. 472.

This volume partakes of the same general character with that upon the Minor Prophets by the same author, which is already before the public. The exposition given is brief, clear, pertinent, and very satisfactory, though many details are omitted or cursorily passed over, which are discussed in more extensive works. It is just such a book as the majority of intelligent students of the Bible require, to lead them to a better comprehension of the writings of the prophets. The principles of interpretation are sound and Christian, as opposed to the narrowness of Jewish literalism and the shallowness of modern unbelief; and they are, in the main, soberly and judiciously applied.

In rapidly turning over its pages, the only passage upon which we have fallen that is doctrinally objectionable, is the remarks on the valley of dry bones in Ezekiel xxxvii. These will certainly be understood to caricature the doctrine of the necessity of an immediate Divine agency in the regeneration of the sinner. It is true that this passage is not intended to teach the nature of regeneration, but it nevertheless affords an apt illustration of it. The exiled Jews were not "dry bones only in the sense of being utterly discouraged, and of having lost heart and hope in their nation's future," so that "preaching and prophesying to them the word of the Lord was the legitimate remedy." On the contrary, the very design of the prophet is to assure them that though they were powerless to help themselves or to effect their own restoration, the almighty power of God, which was alone adequate, would accomplish it for them.

Dr. Cowles has laid out his chief strength upon the exposition of Daniel. His views upon this book have been matured, as he informs us, by the studies of twenty-eight years. The introduction discusses its genuineness and date as fully as could be expected in so short a compass, or as would be compatible with the general character and design of the work. The structure of Daniel's prophecies, their mutual relations and parallelisms, their points of analogy and contrast, are treated with much greater care than is bestowed upon corresponding questions in the books of other prophets. One defect in the latter is the lack of these general views. The exposition proceeds verse by verse, and there is nothing to redeem the books from this frag-

mentary appearance, or to give a just impression of their unity or plan, or any clear notion of the particular work of each prophet as a whole, or the sum of the revelations communicated through him, or their specific character as compared with what is disclosed by their inspired compeers.

Our impression of the merit of this commentary as a whole, is such as greatly to enhance our regret that he has given in his adhesion to that most untenable hypothesis, as we cannot but regard it, which makes the legs of Nebuchadnezzar's image and the fourth beast of Daniel's vision represent, not the Roman empire, but that of Alexander's successors. Our repugnance to this view is doubtless increased by the difficulty of dissociating it entirely from the unbelief of which it was the offspring, and with which it is usually found in combination, but with which Dr. Cowles has no affinity and no sympathy. The only novelty he has added is the suggestion that Syria and Egypt may represent the two legs, and the ten kings, which in xi. 5—27 fill the interval between Alexander and Antiochus Epiphanes, and are equally divided between the two kingdoms, answer to the ten toes, five on each foot.

The Rock of our Salvation: a Treatise respecting the Natures, Person, Offices, Work, Sufferings, and Glory of Jesus Christ. By William S. Plumer, D. D., LL.D. Published by the American Tract Society, New York. 12mo, pp. 519.

No subject can be more delightful to the Christian heart, and more profitable than that discussed in this volume. Its suggestive title sufficiently explains its theme. It is filled with devout meditations upon the Redeemer, in the various aspects in which he is presented in the word of God. It concerns the foundation of the believer's hopes, the object of his supreme love and admiration, the source of his life, his perfect exemplar, his all in all. Whatever can increase his sense of obligation to Him who bought him with his blood, or kindle anew his attachment to Him, or exalt his ideas of His grace and excellence, or lead him to a closer communion and fellowship with Him, confers upon him the greatest of all benefits. May this book be such a blessing to thousands who may read it.

Confucius and the Chinese Classics; or, Readings in Chinese Literature. Edited and compiled by Rev. A. W. Loomis. San Francisco and New York, 1867. 12mo, pp. 432.

This interesting little volume is one of the many contributions which modern missions have made to our knowledge of foreign lands, and by which they have thus incidentally tended not only to further science and advance general intelligence, but to promote intercourse and aid in building up material in-

terests. It consists mainly of extracts from the Four Books of Confucius and his disciples, translated by the Rev. James Legge, D. D., one of the missionaries of the London Missionary Society, who here presents us some of the ripe fruit of a thirty years' study of the Chinese language and literature. The selections are made and the work edited by Rev. A. W. Loomis, a missionary of our own Board to the Chinese, first in their native land and at present in California.

The general interest attaching to this wonderful people and all that belongs to them, the hoary antiquity of their institutions, their peculiar civilization, and their remarkable, extensive, and varied literature, would render such a book as this welcome at any time. But it is especially timely now and here. The frequent immigration of Chinese on our Pacific coast, and the possible, if not probable, increased introduction of labour from that source in other sections of the country; the recent opening of steam communication with Chinese ports, and the swift strides with which the Pacific railroad advances toward completion, looking, as it does, to more intimate relations with Eastern Asia, have given a fresh impetus to the popular desire to know more of this people, who were once in advance of European nations in science and the arts, and who even now possess, in the recorded wisdom of their sages and in the mechanism of their frame of government, which has borne, as no other human institutions have, the test of time, much from which we might derive profitable lessons.

The Works of President Edwards, in four volumes, with valuable Additions and a copious General Index, and a complete Index of Scripture Texts. Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway, New York, 1868.

This is a compact and comprehensive, and, therefore, cheap and valuable edition of the works of America's most distinguished divine. The works of Edwards being imbued with the spirit of scriptural piety and with sound doctrine, will maintain their position as long as evangelical religion and the Augustinian faith shall retain their ascendency in the church. His metaphysical acumen is everywhere exhibited, although often expended on verbal distinctions rather than on differences of thought, and often therefore leading to sophistical arguments, founded on a play of words. His great work on The Will is marred by reasoning of this kind, and by a failure to adhere to one definite sense of the important terms constantly recurring. The most remarkable specimen of this false metaphysical reasoning, however, is to be found in his speculations of identity, in his work on Original Sin. Edwards, although himself so sound in the faith, became the parent of heresies, by putting forth theo-

ries, as matters of speculation, which he himself did not allow to control his doctrinal belief, but which his successors adopted and carried out into Emmonism, Hopkinsianism, and other forms of doctrine which, to a greater or less extent, have prevailed *in thesi*. These are dying out, together with the theories whence they sprang, and the solid Scripture truth which Edwards ever maintained, is proving itself more and more to be the wisdom and power of God. The Messrs. Carter have rendered an important service in bringing before the public the collected works of this great theologian in a form so suited to meet the wants of our ministers and students.

The Apologetics of the Christian Faith. By the late William M. Hetherington, D. D., LL.D., Professor of Theology, Free Church College, Glasgow. With an Introductory Notice by Alexander Duff, D.D., LL.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford & Co., 654 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 561.

This volume consists of a course of lectures which the author was accustomed to deliver to the students under his instructions. The doctrines of Natural Religion are first presented, and the usual arguments in support of Theism are fairly exhibited. The writer then proceeds to prove the possibility and necessity of a supernatural divine revelation. That the Christian Scriptures contain such a revelation is then proved, both from external and internal evidence. This leads to a full discussion of the subjects of miracles and prophecy. That the Scriptures not only contained such a revelation, but that they are themselves that revelation, being in all their parts the words of God to man, is proved under the head of Inspiration. And it is shown that this revelation is of supreme authority, to which the reason and conscience of men are bound to submit. An appendix follows, which treats of instinct, reason, faith; of scepticism, rationalism, humanism; of pantheism, materialistic and idealistic. The statement of the contents of this volume, with the high reputation of its author, will command the attention of a large class of readers.

General Problems of Shades and Shadows formed both by parallel and radial Rays, and shown both in common and isometrical projection: together with the theory of Shading. By L. Edward Warren, C. E., Professor of Descriptive Geometry, &c., in Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and author of Elementary Plane Problem, Drafting Instruments, &c., &c., &c. New York: Wiley & Son. 1867. Pp. 140.

"The study of Shades and Shadows is an application of Descriptive Geometry, in connection with a few physical principles." "There is a beauty in the idea, that from any distance and direction of the source of light, and from any form and position of the bodies casting and receiving shadows, the

mind can know, and the hand can execute those shadows truly. The utility, however, of delineated shade and shadows, in rendering working drawings at once more beautiful and more intelligible, because more conformed to reality, is the chief ground of interest in the study of them."

Language, and the Study of Language. Twelve Lectures on the Principles of Linguistic Science. By William Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanskrit, and Instructor of Modern Languages in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867. Pp. 474.

The author very justly remarks in the preface to this volume, that "It can hardly admit of question that at least so much knowledge of the nature, history, and classifications of language as is here presented, ought to be included in every scheme of higher education, even for those who do not intend to become special students in comparative philology." Much more necessary, of course, is it to those who cherish such intention. Professor Whitney has conducted with distinguished success, such a course of instruction in Yale College, and therefore is entitled to speak with confidence on this subject. Hoping in a future number to present our readers with an extended review of this important work, we content ourselves with simply calling to it the attention of our readers.

Short Studies on Great Subjects. By James Anthony Froude, M. A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868. Pp. 532.

This work evinces great ability and fulness of learning. The style is clear and forcible. The subjects are really, for the most part, great subjects, and the information communicated is valuable and timely. The spirit and tendency are, as to all matters of Christian faith, latitudinarian.

The Three Gardens: Eden, Gethsemane, and Paradise: or, Man's Ruin, Redemption, and Restoration. By William Adams, D. D., Pastor of Madison Square Presbyterian Church, New York. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868. Pp. 284.

A slight inspection of this volume makes clear to the reader how it is that Dr. Adams has long been one of the impressive and attractive preachers of the present day. Elevation of thought, fervid feeling, fertility of imagination, polished and appropriate language, combined with a devout spirit, and pleasing voice and manner, are enough to render a man prominent as a preacher. In a doctrinal point of view, the first sentence of the introductory note, "There are many theologies: only one CHRISTIANITY," is rather a deceptive aphorism. In one sense this is true; but Christianity is itself a theology. It is Divine truth in a specific form. Those who relinquish

the form, loose the substance. The attempt has often been made so to generalize the statement of Christian doctrines as to include all the forms in which they have ever been presented; but never with success. What remains after this process is too vague to have power over the understanding or the conscience, and utterly fails to meet the necessities of the convinced sinner, or growing believer. Nothing is more definite than the Scriptures. The anthropological and soteriological doctrines of the word of God, are to be found in no human system of theology in a more definite and specific form than in Paul's epistle to the Romans. The universal sinfulness of men; the fact that this sinfulness is due to the apostacy of Adam, for whose one offence the sentence of condemnation passed on all men, and hence death, temporal and spiritual, therefore came upon all; that from this state of condemnation and spiritual death, no man can deliver himself; he can neither satisfy the demands of the law nor change his own heart; he can no more do the one than the other; that justification is solely on the ground of the righteousness of Christ, by whose obedience the many are constituted righteous; that we receive this righteousness by faith; that He, by whose righteousness we are justified, is, as to his humanity, the son of David; as to his Divine nature, the Son of God; himself God over all, blessed for ever; that those, and those only in whom the Spirit of God dwells, by whom they are quickened, enlightened, and led, are made partakers of the redemption of Christ, and that in the saving gift of the Spirit, God acts according to his own good pleasure, doing injustice to none, but having mercy on whom he will have mercy. These doctrines are just as clearly and definitely taught by Paul as by Augustin or Calvin. Those who believe in the Bible, and yet cannot receive these truths, one and all, acknowledge that Paul's language admits of this interpretation. Those who can receive them, see them in the Bible, clear as the sun; and those who reject the authority of the Scriptures, say that, beyond doubt, such was the theology of Paul. We hope Dr. Adams will agree with us in saying, as there is only one Christianity, there can be only one true Christian theology.

Katharina: Her Life and Mine, in a Poem. By J. G. Holland, author of "Bitter Sweet." Fourteenth edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867. Pp. 287.

A poem, which in a short time reaches its fourteenth edition, may be assumed to have received the unmistakable seal of public favour.

The Household of Sir Thomas More. By the author of "Mary Powell." New Edition, with an Appendix. New York: M. W. Dodd, 506 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 257.

The two works named in the above title belong to the same class as the Schönberg-Cotta family. They are written in the form of contemporaneous journals. They have, therefore, being skilfully executed, the aroma of antiquity about them. They give a photographic picture of persons and scenes, which is a near approach to personal acquaintance. They have an interest much beyond that of narration or description. We doubt not this account of the Household of Sir Thomas More will command as much favour as the other popular work by the same gifted writer.

Hymns of Faith and Hope. By Horatio Bonar, D. D. Third Series. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1868. Pp. 324.

Dr. Bonar is the most copious, and one of the most popular writers of religious poetry of the present day. This volume contains many compositions that do not belong to the class of hymns of either Faith or Hope; compositions, which, although pleasing and edifying, are not suited for the purpose of worship. Those pieces which are properly hymns, songs to be addressed to God, are, in our judgment, much superior to the other pieces. The volume also contains metrical versions of the first thirty-six Psalms, and some ten or twelve others selected from the Book of Psalms. These translations strike us as excellent, and sufficiently literal to meet the demands of those who have been accustomed to the use of the Scottish version.

Life and Letters of Elizabeth, last Duchess of Gordon. By Rev. A. Moody Stuart. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1868. Pp. 422.

Elizabeth Brodie, granddaughter of the "good Lord Brodie," was married in early life to the Marquis of Huntly, who succeeded to the dukedom of Gordon. For some years after her marriage she lived in the gayeties of the world; but being brought to the saving knowledge of the truth, she became an eminently devoted Christian, illustrating in her exalted station the religion of the meek and lowly Saviour, whose disciple she professed to be. She had the happiness of bringing her husband to the profession of the same faith which she cherished as her life and hope. This volume of her Memoirs is one of the most interesting and edifying pieces of religious biography now before the Christian public.

Lectures on Pastoral Theology. By Enoch Pond, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Bangor. Boston: Draper & Halliday. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard & Co. 1867. Pp. 395.

Dr. Pond has been long known as a professor and writer. In this volume he presents the fruits of his ripe experience and observation in the form of advice to his younger brethren on all departments of their pastoral duties. The pastor, whom he has in view, is the pastor of a Congregational church, and therefore many of his counsels have reference to that peculiar relation. The greater part of the work, however, is suitable to ministers of all denominations.

The Heavenly Life: Being Select Writings of Adelaide Leaper Newton. Edited by the Rev. John Baillie, author of her Memoirs. Third edition. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867. Pp. 372.

The Epistle to the Hebrews compared with the Old Testament. By the author of "The Song of Solomon compared with other parts of Scripture." Fifth edition. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 306.

These volumes are by the same author, a lady to whom the Scriptures were a constant study and delight. The leading characteristic of both is fulness of scriptural knowledge. Many of the selections consist of passages of Scripture mutually illustrative. Containing so much of the Bible, and exhibiting the operations of divine truth in a pure and elevated mind, these works are well-suited to be a means of instruction and of spiritual edification.

Donald Fraser. By the author of "Berthie Lee." New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867. Pp. 224.

"Many of the incidents of this little story are true, even that of the Chinaman, which will be considered perhaps the most remarkable." This is not only an instructive story, but it is full of Bible instruction, skilfully and attractively presented.

Bessie at the Sea-side. By Joanna H. Matthews. "And a little child shall lead them." New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 357.

The True Sister, and other Tales. Compiled for the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 821 Chestnut street.

The frontispiece to this volume is worth the price of the book.

Three Boys and their Stories. A Tale for Youth. By Margaret E. Wilmer. Presbyterian Board of Publication, 821 Chestnut street.

Hymns of the Church Militant. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1868. Pp. 640.

This is a book of hymns for private use. They are chosen from many sources; are of all countries; and were written, some of them, centuries ago. There are few means of religious culture and comfort, few means of awakening and strengthening devotional feelings, better than sacred poetry. This the Bible recognises; and therefore so much of the sacred Scriptures was written by poets. The selection in this volume is from a wide field, and is judiciously made. We hope it may prove to many a means of great good.

Bible Jewels. By Rev. Richard Newton, D. D., author of "Rills from the Fountain of Life," "Safe Compass," &c. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867. Pp. 316.

This is another useful book from the prolific pen of Dr. Newton. Jesus is the pearl of great price. The diamond is the true Christian. The ruby is love for Christ and his people. The emerald is hope. The amethyst temperance. The sapphire faith, and so on. The writer tells his readers what these jewels are, their work and use—and shows how far more valuable are Christian graces to the gems so much coveted by the children of this world.

A Memoir of the Life and Labours of Francis Wayland, D. D., LL.D. Late President of Brown University. Including Selections from his Personal Reminiscences and Correspondence. By his sons, Francis Wayland and H. L. Wayland. Vols. I. and II. New York: Shelden & Co. 1867. Pp. 429 and 379.

Dr. Wayland filled so large a place in the public mind, and was so long an eminent preacher and teacher, and so distinguished as an author, that this memoir of his life and labours is due to public expectation. It not only serves to commemorate the services of a man universally revered, but is an important contribution to contemporary history.

The Gospels: with Moral Reflections on each Verse. By Pasquier Quesnel. With an Introductory Essay by the Rev. Daniel Wilson, D. D. Revised by the Rev. H. A. Boardman, D. D. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 1867.

This is a handsome reprint of the edition published by Parry & McMillan, in 1855. Mr. Randolph has done a good work in putting these valuable volumes in so attractive a garb. Very nearly two hundred years have elapsed since Quesnel gave to the world his first edition, and he lived to add the riper knowledge and experience of almost fifty years to what was already so good. It was his honour to have called forth from Pope Clement XI. the famous bull "Unigenitus," in which the "in-

dignation of Almighty God and of his blessed apostles Peter and Paul," is denounced against the proposition that "Faith, the use, the increase, and the reward of faith, are all a gift of the pure bounty of God," and a hundred other theses drawn from Quesnel's "Moral Reflections." We never look to Quesnel for critical exegesis, but for suggestive and spiritual illustrations and applications of the Scriptures we love to turn to his pages. No revision of the most evangelical of Anglican bishops and Presbyterian doctors could remove the Catholic complexion from Quesnel's work. A thorough double sifting has removed such things as might prove too repulsive to the taste of Protestant readers. A largely increased familiarity with works like this, such as we hope these volumes may secure, will expand and enrich Christian charity, ripen Christian experience, and reveal more of the mind of the Spirit, who finds chosen instruments in many diverse communions.

Parental Training. By the late Rev. William Bacon, author of "Salvation Sought in Earnest," &c. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee, 1334 Chestnut street. New York: A. D. F. Randolph, 770 Broadway. Pp. 209.

This is a book on a very important subject. Its spirit and aim are excellent, and its sentiments judicious.

Thanksgiving; Memories of the Day; Helps to the Habit. By William Adams, D. D. 12mo, pp. 372. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

Thanksgiving services on Madison Square must be attractive and profitable both to mind and heart, if these are their average fruit. The sentiment, the principle, the grace of thanksgiving,—the providential agencies by which these are evoked and developed,—the abundant proofs of God's profuse bounty and faithful love contained in the familiar experiences of the least extraordinary lives,—the historical constitution of Thanksgiving Day, with its contributions to our social, civil, Christian life,—these and many other such things are suggested to us, and illustrated before us in these chapters. The cultivated mind, the warm heart, the polished utterance, the practical wisdom and tact of the author are by no means revealed to us here for the first time. We are glad to add this to other memorials of him. The concluding chapters show us how the patriotism and piety of our author prompted him to speak to his people at successive crises during the war, and with no uncertain sound. These are of their time and for their time,—yet not for this only. May the days never return when "Daily Marvels," "Exuberant Goodness," "Happy Mediocrity,"

"The Blessedness of Tears," shall not be sufficient preaching for the times!

Ancient Cities and Empires: their Prophetic Doom, read in the light of History and Modern Research. By E. H. Gillett, author of "Life and Times of John Huss," &c. 12mo, pp. 302. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee.

The last thirty or forty years have added very much to the cogency of the argument from prophecy in behalf of the Scriptures and Christianity. And this is not by the fulfilment of prophecies before accomplished, but by the uncovering of many a record that had lain for ages buried under Egyptian, or Mesopotamian, or Syrian sand, or under hieroglyphic and cuneiform riddles. It is Dr. Gillett's object to set side by side with a portion of the Divine denunciations by the mouth of ancient prophets, against mighty cities and nations that had provoked this doom—some of the more recently discovered evidences or confirmations of former evidence, that God never fails either in threat or promise. Pertinent and impressive testimony is gathered from Wilkinson, and Robinson, and Thomson, and Porter, and Layard, and many other modern travellers. The human spirit bows reverently before him who can really lift the veil from the future. The shallow pretence of such a power has gathered what throngs about ancient oracles and modern fortune-tellers and spirit-rappers! Jehovah challenges this homage for himself alone, and sets his seal to all communications from him that are authentic. Dr. Gillett helps us to draw near with new conviction and adoration before Him who only seeth the end from the beginning.

On Both Sides of the Sea: a Story of the Commonwealth and the Restoration. A Sequel to "The Draytons and the Davenants." By the author of "Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family." New York: M. W. Dodd. 1867. Pp. 512.

The first work of Mrs. Charles stamped her as a lady of genius, accomplishments, and piety. Her reputation has been fully sustained by her subsequent writings. They serve the double purpose of giving a vivid picture of the period in which the scene of her story is laid, and thus have a high historical value; and they serve to impress sound religious truth on the mind of the reader.

"Olive's Recollections" and "Lettice's Diary" carry on through forty years more the experiences of the families to which we have been so pleasantly introduced in the preceding volume. The stirring events of those momentous times are skilfully employed as the frame-work of these personal experiences. Owen, and Baxter, and Bunyan, and George Fox the Quaker, and the

Port Royalists, and John Eliot, "the Apostle to the Indians," are employed with the author's well-known facility and felicity, so as to add greatly to the verisimilitude of the story, its historical instructiveness, and its spiritual power. We question whether there is not too much extended quotation from some of these great men. "The Schönberg-Cotta Family" came to us with a freshness and novelty of which none of its successors have had the advantage. But many of the author's later works, and this pair of volumes by no means least, constitute a valuable addition to their department of our literature.

Meditations on the Actual State of Christianity, and on the attacks which are now being made upon it. By M. Guizot. 12mo, pp. 390. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

A translation may perhaps be allowed to retain a little of the distinctive flavor of the language from which it is made; but it should not often throw us back upon the inquiry what word or phrase the author used, and require us to re-translate for ourselves. We regret that these exceedingly interesting "Meditations," "translated under the superintendence of the author," had not passed under the eye of one to whom English was vernacular and the distinction between French and English idioms familiar. We are tripped just often enough by these Gallicisms which divert attention from the thought we are reluctant to leave, to be constrained to give expression to this regret. We would rather not stop to think of the French *intime* as we read of "intimate hopefulness," or of *tour à tour* when we read "turn by turn," or of *meriter*, in the phrase "he merited a better understanding," &c. M. Guizot has passed his eightieth year, and nearly sixty years of his public literary career have been completed. These "Meditations upon Christianity" are adding a crown of glory to his old age. He departs from the order first proposed, and now gives us in the second volume the subject before assigned to the third place. His discussion of the present state of Christianity is thus brought in before that delineation of its history through which he proposes to show how Christianity meets those wants which have found no relief from the Protean systems that are assailing the Scriptures and the Church of Christ.

The volume now before us has interested us more than its predecessor. The opening essay is a very clear and graphic exhibition of "the awakening of Christianity in France in the nineteenth century," first in the various movements, progressive and reactionary, that have occurred in French Catholicism, and then the quickening of Christian faith and life in the Protestant body. He writes of men and movements that he

has known, and his characterizations seem to us very just, as they are certainly lifelike. We are glad to learn his estimate of *De la Mennais*, *Lacordaire*, *Montalembert*, *Dupauloup*, and again of *Vincent*, *Encontre*, *Vinet*, and *A. Monod*. We love and honour Vinet more than ever as we read, "suppose not that a complaisant Christianity will ever cancel any article or expunge any idea to accommodate itself to the age; no, it derives its strength from its inflexibility, and need not make any surrender to be in harmony with what is beautiful, legitimate, true; for it is in itself the type of them all." And again, "Whatever the progress made by the ancients, there never was a time when there existed not an infinity between their ideas and the ideas of Christianity; and infinity alone can fill up the gulf between."

This introductory essay, which makes up more than half the volume, is followed by others on Spiritualism, Rationalism, Positivism, Pantheism, Materialism, Skepticism, etc., with a like vigorous delineation of the systems and more or less of the representative men.

Incidentally M. Guizot has occasion to touch upon educational questions and conflicts. We are gratified to find his testimony so explicit in regard to his own convictions, and in respect to the reaction in France in favour of the old and honoured classical training. "Faithful to her convictions and traditions, even while accepting the experiments that were forced upon her, the University has surmounted perils from within and rivalries from without; on the one side, little by little, it has returned to its system of a large and solid teaching of the classics," &c. "The literature of the Greeks and Romans has preserved in the education of Christians the place which it gained in their history by the right of genius and by the splendor of its productions."

Geschichte der Stadt Rom. Von Alfred von Reumont. Erste Band. (8vo, pp. xvii. 868) Berlin, 1867.

This magnificently printed volume, from the Royal Press at Berlin, is the first of three which are designed to give the History of the city of Rome from its foundation to the present time. This volume brings us down to the fall of the Western Empire. The author is one of the accomplished scholars whom Prussia has honoured itself by employing in its diplomatic service. He has published at least twelve or fifteen volumes before, illustrating Italian history and literature. To this particular work he was summoned by the kings of Prussia and Bavaria, and has every encouragement and aid that courtly patronage can give. The result is, and will be, one most

complete and valuable history of the Eternal City. The mediæval and modern periods will each supply materials for one volume.

A Reply to the Rev. Dr. George Junkin's Treatise, entitled "Sabbatismos." By Justin Martyr. Philadelphia: T. Elwood Zell, publisher, 17 and 19 South Sixth street. 1867.

The Divine Rest; or, Scriptural Views of the Sabbath. By John S. Stone, D. D. New York: Anson D. T. Randolph. 1867.

The Sabbath. By Charles Elliott, Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the North-West, Chicago, Ill. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

The first of these volumes has been called forth by the late controversy in regard to running street cars on Sunday in Philadelphia. It is quite vehement and bitter against the doctrine of the perpetual obligation and Divine authority of the fourth commandment. It is a convenient and condensed thesaurus of authorities against the strict, and in favour of the lax view of the Sabbath. The author, of course, makes the most of the ante-Reformation doctrine and usage; the lax view of Luther and Calvin, the continental churches, and of nearly or quite all other churches not directly or indirectly tracing their origin to Great Britain. He also misrepresents or perverts the meaning of those who hold that the fourth commandment is partly moral and partly positive; moral and unrepealable, as requiring regular times to be set apart as sacred to Divine worship and religious culture; positive, in respect to the particular day fixed upon for this purpose, which therefore was subject to change according to the positive ordinance of God, and was actually, at the resurrection of Christ, so changed, from the seventh to the first day of the week. He would have it appear that they contradict themselves in pronouncing it at once moral and positive, as if it might not be moral in one respect and positive in another; or, in the language of our Confession, at once "positive, moral, and perpetual." And he argues that it is not moral in its nature, because aside from special express Divine relation, its obligation is not intuitively evident to men.

We know of no better antidote to this poison than the excellent treatises of Drs. Stone and Elliott. Although prepared without any reference to the other volume, or the particular controversy which called it forth, they present an admirable refutation of all its main positions, while they are immeasurably higher in tone and spirit, in breadth and depth of thought, in elegance and force of style. Dr. Stone's book is quite the

more extended discourse. It is thoroughly evangelical. The last objection above-noted, to the moral nature of the fourth commandment he thus meets:

"Both the design and the duties of the Sabbath are preëminently moral. The connection between these and the day itself is clearly necessary. The precept therefore which enjoins them all is emphatically a MORAL precept.

"It is pseudo-philosophy to say that ethics have their whole foundation in the native intuitions of our common humanity; that nothing is inherently or essentially moral but that which the natural reason and conscience of men perceive and recognize as such, without the teachings of religion, or revelation, that which lies as a distinctly felt dictate of nature, in the minds of all men; that in this, our common nature, there is nothing which suggests a SEVENTH day for special religious observance; perhaps nothing that suggests for such consecration any portion of our time, and especially nothing that suggests a Sabbatic Rest for men's beasts of burden; and that, therefore, the fourth commandment lacks the true nature of a moral precept, and is rather in part positive, and in part ceremonial in its character. Alas! how much morality would there be in the world, if it had no other teacher than such an intuitive self-acting sense of moral fitness? True philosophy gives to morals a broader base than this. That is truly moral which, when revealed and made evident by religious culture, meets in man with an affirmative response, which finds in our nature something that recognizes and assents to the binding force of what is thus inculcated. This philosophy looks for its base, not to the merely instinctive or voluntary promptings of a religiously untutored nature, but to the real and full capabilities of this nature, under the schooling of Him who gives it to man, and who alone knows all that is in it, and all that is sure to meet from the answer of a fully enlightened conscience, and the submission of a rightly regulated will." Pp. 85, 86.

The Physiology and Pathology of Mind. By Henry Maudsley, M. D., London, Physician to the West London Hospital; Honorary Member of the Medico-Psychological Society of Paris, formerly Resident Physician of the Manchester Lunatic Hospital, etc. New York: D. Appleton & Company. 1867.

This is a book of high ability in its way, betraying great insight and learning in certain lines of inquiry, and no less blindness and ignorance in other directions of equal moment to the main subject treated. The author exhibits with great assiduity and skill all those psychological phenomena which indi-

cate the mind's dependence upon and interaction with the body. He ignores whatever shows that they are distinct substances, with distinct properties, although mysteriously united and interdependent, in man's present state. Hence the book is thoroughly materialistic, and is one of the more important contributions to that type of materialism which has of late been coming into vogue. He expatiates largely on the nerves and centres of "ideation," and much more the like. The work, however, though thus one-sided and fatally erroneous, is full of valuable information in regard to both the healthy and morbid actings of the mind as implicated with the body. Its diagnosis and illustrations of various forms of insanity are admirable. In fact its faults and merits have one origin. The author has studied the phenomena of mind simply in a medical light, and therefore as affected by the body. This he has done ably. But he has overlooked other and higher phenomena, which evince its spiritual and immortal nature. A long microscopic inspection of the lungs would doubtless give us much valuable knowledge of them; but it would sadly err if it mistook these for the whole body.

The work exhibits precisely such a religious attitude as might be expected from its philosophy. Religion and Christianity are referred to, sometimes with a patronizing condescension, but generally as among those phenomena of the human mind which have no objective basis of enduring truth and reality, but rather as incidental, and, for the most part, distempered psychological phenomena.

Prayers from Plymouth Pulpit. By Henry Ward Beecher. Phonographically reported. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

The unprecedented character of this book, as well as the celebrity and genius of its author, must necessarily procure for it a large circle of readers, who will find in it some of the finest breathings of pious sentiment which have issued from his prolific mind. It is due to Mr. Beecher to say, that he was wholly unaware that his prayers were being taken down when uttered, and was only advised of it, when asked to assent to their publication. In regard to this he was purely passive. He did not aid, nor did he feel at liberty to forbid it. Under such circumstances criticism is disarmed. As effusions of pious and poetical sentiment many of them are gems. Not a few breathe the spirit of pure and exalted devotion. But as a whole, however we may admire them as brilliant religious utterances, they come short of the chaste and severe simplicity in Christ which should mark addresses to the ear of the Most

High, and which characterize all those great devotional compositions that have lived through the ages.

The Old Roman World, the Grandeur and the Failure of its Civilization. By John Lord, LL.D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

Those who have heard any one of Dr. Lord's series of lectures will need no stronger inducement to peruse this volume, than the assurance that they exercise a stronger fascination when read on the printed page, than in their original delivery, uniquely forceful and stirring as that is. His thorough knowledge of historical facts, his original and profound analysis of their meaning and mutual relations; his constant and living presentation of history as "philosophy teaching by example;" his classic elegance and poetic vividness of style, intensified by somewhat of antithesis and paradox, render this volume in the highest degree attractive and instructive. It is just what its title indicates, a successful portraiture of the "Old Roman World," in its historic origin, conquests, material grandeur and glory, art, social constitution, jurisprudence, literature, philosophy, science, and internal life; together with its final fall, the inherent insufficiency of Pagan civilization, and the too late entrance of Christianity, to arrest or prevent it. The successive chapters on these great themes are, if sufficiently idiosyncratic, nevertheless grand and masterly.

The Atonement. By the Rev. Archibald Alexander Hodge, D. D., Professor of Didactic, Historical, and Polemical Theology in the Western Theological Seminary at Allegheny, Pa. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

We find this volume a rich repository of that "Didactic, Historical, and Polemic Theology," of which the author has already become a distinguished Professor. And this too in reference to that doctrine which is most central, vital, and determinative of our conceptions of all other Christian doctrines. The discussion is at once clear, logical, exhaustive, and compact. It unfolds the doctrine as revealed in Scripture, held by the church, formulated in her symbols, the support of her members in life and in death; as having its root in the immaculate purity and justice of the Divine nature, and the inherent ill-desert of sin; its nature in a true and proper satisfaction of that justice through the sufferings, death, and obedience of Christ in behalf of his covenanted people; its end in the certain, complete, and eternal salvation of the church thus purchased by his blood. It states and vindicates this glorious truth against all forms and degrees of opposition, all Socinian, Arminian, or later rationalizing theories, which make the atonement merely governmental, moral, symbolical, or instructive—

any and everything indeed but what it is in fact, truly penal and substitutional, a real and proper satisfaction of Divine justice. The author shows a thorough insight into all these antagonistic schemes, their precise nature, the grounds of their plausibility, the truth in them which gives them their power, and the attendant error which saps them. He also discusses, with decisive power, the ethical, anthropological and theological truths which enter into, underlie, surround, and condition the doctrine—such as the nature of holiness, justice and benevolence, the doctrine of our sin and condemnation in the fall of the first Adam, as the counterpart and illustration of our redemption and justification by the righteousness of the second Adam, the Lord from heaven. The chapter on original sin, and the imputation of Adam's first sin, is lucid and strong. Indeed no more important contribution to theology has appeared for a long time. In the present indifference, or ignorance, or confusion of view, which now so widely prevail in regard to fundamental Christian doctrines, we can think of no better antidote than the general circulation of this most sensible volume. L. H. A.

The History of the Church of God during the Period of Revelation. By Rev. Charles Colcock Jones, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

The name of Charles Colcock Jones is familiar and honoured in the Presbyterian Church, not only in connection with the theological chair, but with untiring and successful labours for the evangelization of slaves. This volume presents the church history of the Old Testament, especially as related to Christian ordinances, doctrines, and institutions. It is a valuable addition to our literature in this department. Without endorsing every view it presents on slavery and some other topics, we gladly commend it, having a place of its own, not otherwise filled, for ministers, theological students, and private Christians.

History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America. By Abel Stevens, LL.D. Volumes III. and IV. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1867.

In noticing the previous volumes of this work, we have indicated its high value as a complete and minute record of the progress of Methodism in this country. It is in the main faithful and exact, although not always free from sectarian bias. An amusing instance of this occurred when the planting of Princeton College was credited to the Methodists, because its founders were Presbyterians generally in sympathy with Whitefield. The work, however, is replete with matter of interest and moment, from which Christians of every name can gather useful instruction.

Life Lessons in the School of Christian Duty. By E. H. Gillet, D.D., author of "Life and Times of John Huss," &c. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee.

Dr. Gillet, since the enviable success of his first work, has been growing prolific in authorship, and generally quite to the acceptance and edification of his readers. The present volume is no exception. It is made up of a series of practical discourses, in which the duties treated are well set forth and urged upon the conscience, in a style always neat, often brilliant and fervid.

The Beggars of Holland and the Grandees of Spain. A History of the Reformation in the Netherlands from A. D. 1200 *to A. D.* 1578. By the Rev. John W. Mears, D.D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee.

A real history of a glorious era in a noble nation, with all the interest and charm, and ten times the value of the feeble novels and drivelling stories that make up so much of even the religious reading of the young, saying nothing of "children of larger growth."

Among the Masses, or Work in the Wynds. By the Rev. D. MacColl. London: T. Nelson & Sons, Paternoster Row; Edinburgh and New York. 1867.

Another contribution to the growing body of information in regard to Christian work among the degraded masses that form the wretched under-stratum of great cities. No mission-work is more heroic or blessed than this.

The Visitor's Book of Texts; or the Word brought nigh to the Sick and Sorrowful. By the Rev. Andrew T. Bonar, author of "Memoir of Robert M. McCheyne," &c. Fourth edition. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The title of this book will commend it to ministers, theological students, and private Christians in affliction.

Tales of the Good Woman. By a Doubtful Gentleman; otherwise, James K. Paulding. Edited by William J. Paulding. In one volume. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

Those familiar with the authors of a past generation, who pleased the public by their originality and humour, remember that Paulding held an honoured place among them. His tales are more than common-place, and find many admiring and delighted readers.

Bible Hours. Being Leaves from the Note-Book of the late Mary B. M. Duncan. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1868.

A series of devout and instructive meditations on various passages of Scripture.

A Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible, mainly abridged from Dr. William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, but comprising important Additions and Improvements from the works of Robinson, Gesenius, Fürst, Pape, Pott, Winer, Keil, Lange, Kitto, Fairbairn, Alexander, Barnes, Bush, Thomson, Stanley, Porter, Tristram, King, Ayre, and many other eminent Scholars, Commentators, Travellers, and Authors in various departments. Edited by Rev. Samuel W. Barnum. Illustrated with Five Hundred Maps and Engravings. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.

This is one of the various Bible Dictionaries now issuing from different publishing houses to supply the public want in this respect, to which we called the attention of our readers in the *Repertory* for April, 1867, p. 321. It is issued in numbers of forty-eight pages each, double column octavo, closely printed, at thirty cents the number. The eleven numbers already out, have reached the letter L, and it is designed to complete the whole in about twenty-two numbers of the same size.

It is evidently edited with critical care and ability, and its abbreviations are often not so much omissions of valuable matter, as happy and wholesome condensations or modifications of the original. It serves to bring a very valuable work within the reach of many who cannot afford the larger and costlier editions.

The following are a series of books of narratives and tales for children and youth:

Weighed in the Balance. By the author of the "Win and Wear" series. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1868.

Lady Alice Lyle, the Last of the English Martyrs. By the author of "The Times of John Knox and Queen Mary," "William Tyndale," etc.

Margaret, the Pearl of Navarre. A Narrative compiled from authentic sources.

The True Boy. Obstacles well met, and Ultimate Triumph.

Ben Holt's Good Name. By the author of "Basil; or, Honesty and Industry."

The foregoing are late issues of the American Tract Society, New York.

Flora Morris's Choice; or, Be not Conformed to this World. By Mrs. Mary J. Hildeburn, author of "Money," "Far Away," etc. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee.

The Curious Chapter, and how its Prophecies were fulfilled by the Young King Josiah. By the Rev. William M. Blackburn, author of "The Exiles of Madeira," etc. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

The Forest Boy: A Sketch of the Life of Abraham Lincoln. For Young People. By L. A. Mudge, author of "Lady Huntingdon Portrayed," "The Christian Statesman," etc. Four Illustrations. New York: Carlton & Porter.

The Two Wallets. By the author of "Aunt Betsy's Rule," etc. Presbyterian Board of Publication.

Juvenile Library. Bound in eight volumes. New York: American Tract Society.

The Shoe-Binders of New York; or, The Fields White to the Harvest. By J. McNair Wright, author of "Annie Lorimer," "Path and Lamp," etc. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee.

The following pamphlets have been received.

The Bible Baptist. By Thomas P. Hunt. Presbyterian Board of Publication.

An argument extremely pithy and pointed, on the right side.

Bible Baptism. Two Letters to a Young Christian. Presbyterian Board of Publication.

A vigorous and effective little tract.

Gambling and Lotteries. New York: American Tract Society.

Woman's Rights. By Rev. John Todd, D. D. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1867.

Popular Amusements: An Appeal to Methodists in regard to Card-playing, Billiards, Dancing, Theatre-going, etc. By Hiram Mattison, D. D. New York: Carlton & Porter.

Companion to the Bible. Part I. Evidences of Revealed Religion. By Rev. E. P. Burrows, D. D., Professor of Biblical Theology. New York: American Tract Society.

"This work is to be continued by Professor Burrows, to embrace the principles of interpretation, introductions to the several Books, and all essential helps to the attentive reader of the inspired word."

The Duty and Discipline of Extempore Speaking. By Barham Zincke, Vicar of Wherstead and Chaplain in ordinary to the Queen. The First American from the Second London Edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867. Pp. 262. Published by arrangement with the author.

This is a valuable book. The counsels which it gives are founded on experience. As most American preachers are forced to preach a great deal without writing, it is well for them to make extempore speaking a matter of special attention and training. It is a very easy thing to do badly; and very difficult to do well.

The Queens of American Society. By Mrs. Ellet, author of "The women of the American Revolution," &c. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 654 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 464.

An entertaining volume, containing an account of the leaders of fashionable life during the past and present generations. The book is handsomely got up and adorned with the portraits of distinguished ladies.

Eighty years of Republican Government in the United States. By Louis J. Jennings. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868. Pp. 288. Published by arrangement with the author.

Mr. Jennings was, we understand, for several years the regular American correspondent of the *London Times.* He has therefore had the opportunity not only of studying, but of observing the operation of our institutions. He has written with a spirit of fairness, and his intelligence and practised skill as a writer have enabled him to present a work attractive as well as instructive.

Fred, Maria, and Me. By the author of "The Flower of the Family." Illustrated by W. Magrath. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868. Pp. 71.

The story of Fred, Maria, and Me, originally appeared in the first two numbers of HOURS AT HOME. Its quaintness, simplicity, and truthfulness to nature, secured it wide popularity so as to create a demand for it in a separate form, and with the author's consent, it is now republished. It is beautifully printed, and makes a very suitable gift volume for the season.

Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours during an eighteen Years' Residence in Eastern Africa; together with Journeys to Jagga, Uscumbara, Ukambam, Shoa, Abyssinia, and Khartuni; and a Coasting Voyage from Mombaz to Cape Delgado. By the Rev. Dr. J. Lewis Krapf, late Missionary in the serviee of the Church Missionary Society, &c. With Portrait, Maps, and Illustrations. Reissue. 8vo. cloth. Pp. li. 566. London: Trübner & Co. 1867.

This is a reissue of an important work. Whatever gives trustworthy information as to the country in which we all now take so much interest, cannot fail to be acceptable to the reading public. Dr. Krapf spent some time in Abyssinia, mixed with the people, conversed with the priests and the leading men, had interviews with King Theodorus; and here records many important facts as to the country, the condition of the people, and the character of the King. Few travellers have had better opportunities of obtaining information, and we think the English government have acted wisely in securing his services as interpreter and guide, as it were, to the expedition. Dr. Krapf's picture of King Theodorus would hardly seem to relate to the drinking, dissipated, half-clothed savage, whose doings have lately been recorded in our newspapers. Writing in 1860, our author gives the impression made upon him by King Theodorus five years earlier: "The King is about thirty-five years old, a handsome man, dark-brown complexion, middle stature, and keen glance. Although friendly and condescending towards those about him, he never forgot his kingly dignity. Whatever he does is done with the greatest quiet and circumspection. His judgment is quick, his replies brief, but decisive.

He is friendly to Europeans, to whose advice and information he willingly listens. To the poor, the priests, and the churches, he is extremely liberal. In judicial matters he is exact and just."

Dr. Krapf describes the people as having great confidence in the king's justice. Theodorus from two o'clock till eight in the morning, hears and determines complaints. In addition to this, he conducts all warlike operations. The labours these various duties entail is so great that his courtiers have sought to lessen it by urging the king to forego this personal dispensing of justice, but the king's reply has been worthy of the most civilized ruler—"If I do not help the poor, they will complain of me to God: I myself have been a poor man." The career, however, of King Theodorus is hardly reconcilable with this love of justice. He seems versed, however, in statecraft, and might cope with many a western statesman. Knowing the foibles and the superstition of his people he turns them to his own account. The Abyssinians are a religious people, hence Theodorus is most submissive to the priesthood. The Abyssinians had a tradition of a coming monarch, by name Theodorus, who was to overcome the Mohammedans, extend the kingdom, and make Abyssinia a great nation. The career of the present king was so remarkable, that on attaining supreme power he assumed the name of Theodorus, so as to connect himself, if possible, with this tradition. The press has given currency to the idea that the English have to do with a barbarian king, and a half-armed savage people. Books like this of Dr. Krapf are needed to expose this fallacy. King Theodorus had at the time Dr. Krapf wrote, 40,000 men at his command, with the power to double that number. These 40,000 men were not an undisciplined mob, but a real military force, whose fighting qualities were of the highest order, and whose prowess had been tested on many a battle-field. It is true that they never hitherto fought with troops armed and appointed as the English forces will be, but soldiers who scorn to turn their back to the foe, who care not what are the odds against them, and think it glorious to die on the field of battle, are not contemptible enemies, and it would be rash to treat them as such. The work has not been reprinted in this country, but can be had of the importers.

Descriptive Catalogue of the Publications of Charles & Scribner Co. New York: 654 Broadway.

This catalogue not only contains a list of valuable publications, but a large amount of bibliographical information. This gives it a value even to those who may not be extensive purchasers. "Copies will be sent to any address upon application" to the Messrs. Scribner & Co.