



LIBRARY  
Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

No. Case, Division 132

No. Shelf, Section 8

No. Book, 47

R

A-1.99

A14

1869





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

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1869.

---

No. III.

---

ART. I.—*The Writings of St. John, with special reference to the Recent Assaults on the Gospel of St. John.* [Translated from the German of Dr. LANGE, with additions by Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF.]

THE writings preserved by the Church under the name of John, with all their diversity, corresponding to the diversity of their literary species, have so many and so important peculiar traits, and have these traits, too, so much in common, that, with a better developed taste in regard to biblical style, we shall be no more able to ascribe them to different authors, than to attribute the different masterpieces of one great painter to different masters.

The peculiarities of the matter of these writings are: (1.) The depth and fulness of the christological idea of Christ and his kingdom (*the Word*); (2.) The spiritual concentration of the depth and fulness of the Messianic life in the personality of the Lord, making heaven and earth a symbolism of Christianity, of its struggles and its triumphs (*Love*); (3.) The universalism of Christianity, grounded in God, embracing and shining through the world (*Life*); (4.) The festive spirit of the assurance of victory, wherein Christ in his imperial power

destroys the works of the devil as works of falsehood and darkness (*Light*). Love, life, and light, in the sense of infinite fullness and personal distinctness, come forth with the Word, and destroy the kingdom of hatred, darkness, and death.

In reference to the first trait, compare John i. 1-3; 1 John i. 2; Rev. i. 5-8. For the second, see John i. 4, 14; 1 John iv. 8, 12; comp. chap. i. 7; Rev. i. 17, 18; comp. chap. v. 6. For the third, John v. 26; xi. 25; xiv. 6; 1 John i. 2; ii. 25; Rev. vii. 13; chap. xxi. For the fourth, John viii. 12; 1 John i. 7; Rev. xxi. 23. The views homogenous, however, pervade all the writings of John; everywhere the divine Word, Love, Light, Life; the destruction of the destroyer of man, and of his manifestations, hatred, darkness, and death.

If it be objected that these traits appear also in the other apostolic authors, we most readily grant it in a certain sense; for John is not Christ, and has no new Christ. But in the proportions of his christology he is beyond even Paul, with reference to the first trait, in the *distinctly expressed* celebration of the Logos with God *in an ontological trinity*, his eternal existence *God-ward*; with reference to the second, in the fact that for him the personality of Christ is his history, not the converse, and of Christ not only as made man, but also as made flesh; with reference to the third, in his making Christ not only the creative and upholding force of the world, as in Paul (Col. i. 17), but also the inmost kernel, the gist, the truth of its life (John xv. 1); with reference to the fourth, in the fact that, with John, Christ not only in an ethical operation enlightens the world, and luminously judges and awakens it, but also is the ideal truth and reality of the world, reducing and exalting the whole real world to a transparent symbol of the eternal kingdom of light and love.\*

\* [From Schaff's *History of the Apostolic Church*, p. 648: "John's theology is by no means so complete, or developed with such logical precision and argumentative ability, as that of Paul. It is sketched from immediate intuition, in extremely simple, artless, childlike form, in grand outlines, in few but colossal ideas and antitheses, such as light and darkness, truth and falsehood, spirit and flesh, love and hatred, life and death, Christ and Antichrist, children of God and children of the world. But John usually leaves us to imagine far more than his words directly express—an infinity lying behind, which we can better apprehend by faith, than grasp and fully measure with the understanding. And especially

To these peculiarities of the matter of the Johannean writings, their peculiarities of form correspond: (1.) The mighty unity of principle ruling the whole representation—that is, the clearness and transparence of the theme, the motto of the books. (2.) The personal holding and shaping of all historical and didactic matters, to give their central, spiritual, hearty expression. (3.) The universal grandeur, sublimity, and organically pure structure of the compositions, and the richness of the elements embraced and organized by them. (4.) The lyric, festive diction, with the consequent directness of expression, the limited but pregnant fund of language, and the inimitable coloring, reminding only of the Song of Songs, and of the highest products of human poësy. On the diction of John, and his circle of words, see Credner, *Einleitung*, p. 222; Guericke, *Isagogik*, p. 205 [p. 213 in the 3d ed. of 1868].

Just this deep and beautiful monotony of the Johannean view and statement contains the reason, however, why the Johannean spirit unfolds itself in the copious variety of views and of forms. The trunk, rooted in a bottomless depth, strong in its solitary unity, spreads its palm-crown far out over the New Testament.

We have four Evangelists in the New Testament; John, the Evangelist, who lay on Jesus' bosom, wrote the most profound and far-reaching Gospel, the fourth, and the complement of the other three.

The Apostle Paul left the richest treasure of Epistles; John, the Apostle and primitive presbyter of the Church, left a trilogy of Epistles, in which the deepest essence and the ideal order of the fellowship of the Church in Christ reflects itself for all ages.

does he connect every thing with that idea of a theanthropic Redeemer, which had become part and parcel of his own soul; nor can he strongly and frequently enough assert the reality and glory of that which was to him, of all facts and experiences, the surest, the holiest, and the dearest. But with regard to its principle, and the point of view from which it is constructed, the doctrinal system of John is the highest and most ideal of all—the one toward which the others lead and in which they merge. It wonderfully combines mystic knowledge and love, contemplation and adoration, profound wisdom and childlike simplicity, and is an anticipation, as it were, of that vision face to face, into which, according to Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 12; comp. 2 Cor. v. 7), our fragmentary knowledge, and faith itself, will finally pass.”]

The Evangelist Luke is, next to Paul and John, the most copious author of the New Testament (the Gospel of Luke and the Acts). Luke, in his exhibition of the life of Jesus, went back to the historical beginning of his childhood, and Luke's final historical goal was the Church in Rome; but the Gospel of John goes back into the depths of the Godhead, and the Apocalypse exhibits the entire history of the Church to its consummation in the new, eternal city of God (not in the eternal world, for the actual world must merge organically in the thoroughly personal city of God).

If we remember that the first three Evangelists wrote on special occasion, and that the Epistles of Paul were in reality not literary productions, but historical acts, John appears as pre-eminently *the author* of the New Testament, even more than Luke, and, as such, entirely fitted to appear for the holiness of the Bible. The language of Scripture is the word of spirit; in this language must the disciple who does not die especially speak.

Some have found a considerable difference between the Gospel and the Epistles of John. But here the unity in the diversity needs apology least of all.

But the contrast between the Gospel of John and the Apocalypse has been urged with very special emphasis. It has been said (by De Wette, Lücke, Bleek, and others) that John, the author of the Gospel, cannot have written the Revelation. Minds like Luther and Goethe have measured and mis-measured their strength upon the Apocalypse. Then again it has been said (by Dr. Baur and the Tübingen school), John was the author of the Apocalypse, and therefore cannot have written the fourth Gospel. But in the end it has to be conceded that only one person, the author of the fourth Gospel, could have written the Apocalypse; and that, conversely, only one man, the author of the Apocalypse, can have been the writer of the Gospel. It is one thing to speak in the understanding ( $\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ), in reflective consciousness; another, to speak in the spirit ( $\piνε\upsilon\mu\alpha$ ), in the directness of an inspired frame (1 Cor. xiv. 15). The Gospel requires the Apocalypse, the Apocalypse presupposes the Gospel (see my *Vermischte Schriften*, vol. ii., p. 173, and Schaff, *Hist. of the Apost. Church*,

§ 107, pp. 422 ff.). The supposition of two authors, besides, is connected with Eusebius' old fiction of the presbyter John of Ephesus, which arose from a misinterpretation of Papias. (On this, comp. Guericke, *Die Hypothese von dem Presbyter Johannes, als Verfasser der Offenbarung*, Halle, 1831; my *Apost. Zeitalt.*, i., p. 215; Schaff, l. c., p. 421).

In the Apocalypse the highest immediacy and directness—that of vision—is combined in the most wonderful manner with the highest sacred art—that of apocalyptic, traditional symbolism (see Lücke, *Einleitung in die Apoc.*). And in this view, we have in the form of this Apocalypse a sealing of the incarnation, an incarnation raised to the highest power; the intensely earnest seer-spirit becomes art in the purest sense; art in ghostly severity becomes the prophetic of the judgment and the glorification of the world.

To come to the contents: The writings of John form a trilogy. The Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse represent the evangelic founding, the organic shaping, and the eternal future of the Church; Christ who was, and is, and is to come.

But each unit has again a trilogical constitution. The Gospel testifies in the prologue the outgoing of Christ from eternity (chap. i. 1-18); in the body of it, his historical manifestation; in the epilogue (chap. xxi.), his future spiritual presence in the world, represented by the Petrine and Johannean type of Christianity and the Church.

As to the three epistles: The second and third form corollaries to the first. The first sets forth the fellowship of believers in the love of Christ, in opposition to those who do not belong to them; the second speaks against the lax obliteration of the line of this fellowship, requiring the condition of the essential confession; the third reproves the harsh contracting of the line in fanatical stringency. We readily see that these two Epistles stand in regular sequence, and that the second could not be the third, nor the third the second.

The Apocalypse places itself at the beginning on the historical basis of the seven churches, and of the seven epistles which transform those churches into types of the future (chap. i.-iii.). Upon this the prophetic images of the future are un-

rolled. (After the seven churches, the seven seals, the seven trumpets, the seven thunders, the seven heads of Antichrist, the seven vials of wrath, then the consummation, as the total manifestation of the seven spirits at the beginning.) At the end, after the consummation of the judgment, appears the counterpart of the seven churches, the eternal city of God (chap. xxi.).

#### THE GENUINENESS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The Gospel of John has never been seriously assailed in the Christian Church till the nineteenth century. The rejection by the Alogi, of the second century, was a consequence of their denial of the doctrine of the Divine Logos, and unsupported by any argument. The doubts of Evanson, 1792, Eckermann, 1796, Ballenstädt, 1812, and others, were superficial, and made no impression. But more recently it has become the chief battle-ground between the old faith and modern criticism as applied to the documents of primitive Christianity. The first respectable critical attempt to dispute the Johannean authorship, was made by Bretschneider, in his *Credibilia de evang. et epistolarum Johannis apostoli indole et origine*, 1820. Since then, its apostolic origin was positively denied with more or less show of argument by Strauss, 1835, Bruno Bauer, 1840, Lützelberger, 1840, F. C. Baur (the ablest and most formidable opponent of the Gospel), 1844, 1847, 1853, &c., and his followers of the Tübingen school (such as Zeller, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Lang), also by Schenkel, 1864, Scholten, 1865, and Keim, 1867. The composition was assigned by these writers to some anonymous author of the second century, though without any agreement as to the exact time. The author assumed the name of John to give apostolic sanction to his theological system, which, according to Baur, is the last and most ingenious attempt to reconcile the supposed antagonism of the Jewish-Christian or Petrine, and the Gentile-Christian or Pauline types of Christianity, and presents an artificial history as the symbolical vestment of ideas. Renan, like Weizsäcker (1864), denies only the genuineness of the discourses of Jesus, and admits the Johannean composition of the historical portions. He de-

fends this position in a concluding essay to the thirteenth edition of his *Vie de Jésus*, 1867. Schenkel also, in his *Charakterbild Jesu* (1864, p. 32), admits a basis of Johannean traditions for the post-apostolic speculations of the fourth Gospel. But these inconsistencies are untenable, and must give way to the alternative of a whole truth or a whole fabrication. Strauss, in his new *Life of Jesus*, 1864, exchanges his former mythical hypothesis of unconscious poetic composition for Baur's hypothesis of conscious invention, as the *only* other alternative to the orthodox view, and thereby he shows his sound and clear sense. Keim, in his *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara* (Zürich, vol. i., 1867, pp. 146 ff., 167 ff.), with all his attempts to mediate between the traditional view and the Tübingen school, arrives at the same result, but traces the composition of John about fifty years higher than Baur. He represents it as the production of an anonymous genius, a liberal Jewish Christian of Asia Minor in the age of Trajan (100–117), *i. e.*, almost within the life-time of John. To call such a pseudo-Johannean work by its right name—a literary forgery—is, according to Prof. Keim (p. 170), a sign of ignorance, or results from a rough nervous constitution. He even doubts that John ever was in Ephesus. English and American divines so far have had too much reverence and common sense, or too little interest in such problems, to be affected to any considerable degree by the bold hypercriticism of the Continent. But quite recently, it has been re-echoed by some writers in the *Westminster Review*, more elaborately by J. J. Tayler, *Attempt to Ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel*, London, 1867, and by Dr. Samuel Davidson, in the new edition of his *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, Critical, Exegetical, and Theological*, London, 1868, 2 vols., vol. ii., pp. 323 ff. and 357 ff. Dr. Davidson, a man of learning, but little judgment, who, in his first edition (1848, vol. i., pp. 244 ff.), had vindicated the Johannean authorship of the fourth Gospel against the crude vagaries of Lützelberger, now openly advocates the subtle speculations of the Tübingen school, and assigns the composition of John to an anonymous writer about A. D. 150. "This great unknown" (as he calls the author, p. 449), "in departing from apostolic tradition, teaches us to rise

above it. He has seized the spirit of Christ better than any apostle; and if, like him, we ascend through their material setting to ideas that bring us into close contact with the Divine ideal of purity to mankind, we shall have a faith superior to that which lives in the visible and miraculous." This is all idle illusion. An anonymous tract, entitled, "*Was St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel?*" by a Layman, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, London (Longmans, Green & Co.), 1868, takes a similar view, and, after a superficial discussion of the alleged discrepancies between the Synoptists and the fourth Gospel, arrives at the conclusion that the latter is the invention of some unknown author of the second century, with the exception of those passages that are to be found in some one of the other Gospels. But the discrepancies between the antagonists of John are far more serious and fatal than the discrepancies between John and the Synoptists. In one thing only they agree: in rejecting the Johannean origin of the fourth Gospel, and ascribing this sublimest of all literary compositions to an unknown impostor, they make it the greatest mystery in the history of literature. All these attacks will pass away without being able to "pluck a single feather from the mighty wing of this Eagle," who sails serenely and majestically above the clouds, in full vision of the light of eternal truth.—P. S.]

On the historical testimony to the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, compare Lücke's *Commentary*; Luthardt, *Das Johanne-Evangelium*; Tholuck's *Commentary on John*; Tholuck's *Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte*; Guericke, *Isagogik*, p. 179 [199 ff. in the third ed. of 1868—P. S.], Kirchofer, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons bis auf Hieronymus*, p. 142; the treatise of Schneider, *Die Aechtheit des johanneischen Evangeliums nach den äusseren Zeugnissen*, Berlin, 1854; Heubner, p. 212; and others.

The evidences of the authenticity of this Gospel begin properly in the New Testament itself; to wit, in John xxi. 24 (see Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigkeit*, p. 276). This testimony is, indeed, without subscription, and has become a constituent of the thing to be attested; but it has force from the fact that it passed under the criticism of the early Church, and was ac-

knowledged by it (see my *Leben Jesu*, i., p. 169). To this add the following consideration : The author of the Gospel does not, indeed, name himself ; but he repeatedly speaks of the disciple whom Jesus loved, and is designated by the Gospel itself as this disciple, chap. xxi. 24. Of this disciple it is said, in chap. xiii. 25, that he lay on Jesus' bosom, and the ancients named John as this disciple who lay on Jesus' bosom (Tholuck, p. 6). Again, when the power to estimate the apostolic characters shall be further developed, it will undoubtedly be perceived that the Gospel of John, the Revelation, and the Epistles of John, stand or fall together (and they will *stand*), as the productions of one clearly distinct mind (see my *Vermischte Schriften*, vol. ii., p. 173 ff. : "On the indissoluble connection between the individuality of the Apostle John and the individuality of the Apocalypse"). The relation of the two closing verses to the Gospel is to be treated hereafter. The words *καὶ οἶδαμεν, ὅτι ἀληθὴς ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτοῦ*, are undoubtedly to be considered in any case an addition, probably an interpolation of the Ephesian church.\* We certainly cannot esteem it any glory to theology, to have made the Gospel and the Apocalypse mutually exclusive in regard to authenticity. (Lücke : Because the Gospel is Johannean, the Apocalypse cannot be ; Baur, the reverse.)

So early as Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Romans, chap. vii., we find distinct allusions to the Gospel (Lücke, p. 43) ; and the fact that Papias does not name it, is accounted for by the predilection, extolled by himself, for oral tradition, which, in reference to John, he was permitted to enjoy. (See *Leben Jesu*, i., p. 151.)† Yet, according to Euseb., iii., 39, 8, Papias

\* [Comp. Abbot's addition to Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, ii., p. 1430. Abbot justly concludes : "The only plausible explanation of vers. 24 and 25 seems to be that they are an attestation of the trustworthiness of the Gospel by those who first put it into general circulation—companions and friends of the author, and well known to those to whom it was communicated ; and the only plausible account of the first 23 verses of the chapter is, that they are a supplementary addition" [or rather the Epilogue, corresponding to the Prologue, as Dr. Lange regards it], "which proceeded directly from the pen, or substantially from the dictation, of the author of the rest of the Gospel."—P. S.]

† [Dr. Lange omits to notice, in the third edition of his Commentary, published in 1868, some important data which have come to light since his second edition in 1862. We can now appeal to two or three *direct* and explicit testimonies of

knew the First Epistle of John, and this [in view of the obvious and universally admitted identity of thought and

Papias in favor of the Gospel of John. These set aside the argument from his alleged *silence*, which has been recently urged by Strauss, Renan, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, and others, as a very dangerous argument against the apostolic origin of the same. (1.) The first is found in a Latin MS. of the Gospels in the Vatican Library, marked "Vat. Alex. No. 14," and dating apparently from the ninth century, where in a prologue to the Gospel of John, the following remark occurs: "Evangelium iohannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut papias nomine hierapolitanus discipulus iohannis carus in exotericis [no doubt an error of the copyist for *exegeticis*] id est in extremis quinque libris [i. e., at the close of the fifth book of his lost *λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*] retulit." This testimony (which is not invalidated by the additional improbable notice that John dictated his Gospel to Papias) was known already to Cardinal J. M. Thomasius, who entered it in his collections (*Opp. omnia*, Rom., 1747, tom. i., p. 344; comp. Aberle in the Roman Catholic *Quartalschrift* of Tübingen, 1864, pp. 1-47), but it attracted no attention until it was recently rediscovered in the Vatican Library, and brought to notice by the eminent Benedictine scholar Cardinal Pitra, and Prof. Tischendorf, on his visit to Rome, March, 1866, who assigns the Prologue to a writer before the time of Jerome. (2.) The second testimony which was discovered by Aberle (*l. c.*) in a Proëmium to the Gospel of John in the *Catena Patrum Græcorum*, ed. by Corderius, is from an anonymous Greek commentator, who asserts that John, the Son of Thunder, dictated his Gospel to his disciple Papias of Hierapolis τῷ ἐαυτοῦ μαθητῇ Παπία εἰβιώτῳ [probably for ἐπισκόπῳ] τῷ ἱεραπόλιτῳ. Although this tradition may have no foundation in fact, it proves, nevertheless, the intimate connection of Papias with the Gospel of John in the opinion of the ancient Church. (3.) Finally, Irenæus, at the close of his work, *Adv. Haer.*, v. 36, §§ 1, 2, quotes a passage from John xiv. 2, in such connection with Papias, and other presbyters who had known John personally (*presbyteri qui Johannem discipulum Domini viderunt*), as to make it extremely probable that he quoted either from the work of Papias, or of the presbyters, who were still older and better witnesses. On the other hand, we can make no use (as Dr. Wordsworth does for another purpose) of the fragment of "Papias" in an Oxford MS. (see Grabe, *Spicil.* ii., 34, 35, and Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. i., 16) on the four Marys (among whom he mentions "Mary Salome, the wife of Zebedæus, the mother of *John the Evangelist*"), for this passage is an extract from a Dictionary or Glossary of another Papias, of Lombardy, in the twelfth century, as Hofstede de Groot (*Basilides*, &c., p. 112 ff.) has conclusively proved from another copy of the *Lexicon Catholicum* of the mediæval Papias. Comp. on these testimonies of Papias to the Gospel of John (which have escaped also the attention of Prof. Fisher and Ezra Abbot) the fourth revised and enlarged edition of Tischendorf, *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien geschrieben?* Leipzig, 1866, pp. 101-119, especially p. 118, and P. Hofstede de Groot, *Basilides*, &c., Leipzig, 1868, pp. 109-116. The latter closes his discussion with the remark: "Who knows what else may not yet be discovered? But, for the present, the facts adduced are sufficient to prove that Papias was acquainted with the fourth Gospel as a production of John."—P. S.

style in the two compositions] constitutes him indirectly a witness also to the Gospel. In Polycarp, too, appear proofs of intimacy with John (see Tholuck, p. 25).\*

If John, according to an established tradition, lived to the close of the first century, a living Gospel, we may be satisfied if we find even in the middle of the second century perfectly sure signs of the existence of his Gospel, as we do in the Logos-doctrine of Justin Martyr, though the Evangelist is not cited by name (since Justin wrote primarily for the West, where the fourth Gospel was as yet comparatively very little current).† On Justin's acquaintance with the fourth Gospel, see Ewald *Jahrbücher*, 1852,-'53, p. 186; Lücke, i., p. 44; Meyer, p. 4, and Tholuck, p. 27, with reference to Semisch's *Justin*, p. 188. [See also Weizsäcker, Tischendorf, Keim, and the article of Prof. Fisher above cited, *Essays*, p. 46 ff., and his addition to Smith's *Dictionary*, ii., p. 1433. Even the sceptical Keim, *Leben Jesu*, i. (1867) p. 138, admits that Justin knew the Gospel of John, and ridicules the absurd idea of a dependence of John on Justin.—P. S.]

These indications further appear in the fact that Tatian, a pupil of Justin, composed a work on the Gospels, entitled *Diatessaron* (διὰ τεσσάρων, one out of four, an expression looking back to the ἀπομνημονεύματα of his teacher), which could have had none but our four Gospels for its basis; that the Valentinians, toward the middle of the second century, knew the

\* [Polycarp, a disciple of John, quotes, from 1 John iv. 3, the passage concerning the mark of Antichrist (*Ep. ad Philipp.*, c. 7.)—P. S.]

† According to Volkmar (*Ueber Justin den Märtyrer und sein Verhältniss zu unserem Evangelium*, Zürich, 1853), it should of course be granted that Justin was ignorant of the fourth Gospel. John writes ἀνωθεν γεννηθῆναι, Justin ἀναγεννηθῆναι. But Justin was free from pedantry; and in Rome, where the Petrine term (1 Peter i. 3, 23) was familiar, did well to use it. [That Justin, *Apol.*, i., 61., in quoting from memory (as was usual with him) the passage on regeneration, John iii. 3-5, uses ἀναγεννάω for γεννάω and βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν for βασ. τοῦ θεοῦ is not strange if we consider that ἀναγεννάω besides being found in a few MSS., had become the current term for regeneration; that the Synoptists use βασ. τῶν οὐρανῶν and that the same inaccuracy in quoting this very passage occurs frequently in Irenæus, Eusebius, Chrysostom, and other fathers, as has been shown in a learned note by Abbot in his and Hackett's edition of Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (1869), ii. 1433. Even Jeremy Taylor once quotes the passage inaccurately thus: "Unless a man be born of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of Heaven."—P. S.]

Gospel, since even the Valentinian Heracleon accompanied it with a commentary; and that the Montanists, in the second half of the second century, appealed to the promise of the Paraclete, which involves their familiarity with the Gospel of John.

Add to these the first new discovery, made by means of the close of the Clementine Homilies found by Dressel, that the author of it (perhaps about A. D. 160) knew the Gospel of John, and the second new discovery through the "Philosophoumena," edited by Miller [1851, and better by Duncker and Schneidewin, 1859—P. S.], that even the Gnostic Basilides, a younger contemporary of John, knew his Gospel (Tholuck, p. 28, with reference to the treatise of Jacobi, *Deutsche Zeitschrift*, 1851, p. 222).\*

The acquaintance of the Gnostic Valentine and of Marcion (first half of the second century) with this Gospel, has likewise become more and more certain. [Comp. Fisher, *l. c.* p. 59 ff., and especially Hofstede de Groot, *Basilides, &c.*, pp. 90-106.—P. S.]

But then, in the second half of the same century, Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autolye.*, ii., 22) and Irenæus (*Adv. Hæres.*, iii., 1) appear as express witnesses for the authorship of John. They are followed by a series of the Church fathers, beginning with Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius.

The peculiarity and elevation of the fourth Gospel passed among the ancients, with scattering exceptions, for a special seal of its apostolicity. Characteristically, the same circumstance had that weight with them which to the modern rationalistic criticism makes the Gospel pre-eminently suspicious, or rather gives this criticism occasion for its cavils.

In the history of this criticism we must distinguish two stages: First, the objections of the vulgar rationalism, which we may designate also as Ebionistic. The judgment of its critique runs thus: The Johannean Christ is not true enough

\* [On the important testimony of Basilides (A. D. 65-135) brought to light in 1851 with the discovery of the "Philosophoumena" of Hippolytus, see the learned and able treatise of P. Hofstede de Groot, of Groningen, written first in Dutch, and then enlarged in German: *Basilides als erster Zeuge für Alter und Autorität N. T. Schriften, insbesondere des Johannesevangeliums*, Leipzig, 1868.—P. S.]

to have been actual; the Synoptists alone portray the actual and true Christ. Then, the objections of the modern pantheistic rationalism, which may, in like manner, be called Gnostic. In its opinion, the Christ of the fourth Gospel is too true—that is, a too far developed idea of the ideal Christ to have been actual. The two views agree in establishing a contradiction between the Synoptists and the fourth Gospel. To the first class belong the Alogi of the ancient day,\* and, [in our time, Evanson (1792), Eckermann, Schmidt, Bretschneider, and others (see Lücke, *Comm.*, i., p. 89; Guericke, *Isagogik*, p. 188); to the second, Baur and his disciples. A party which forms a bridge between these opposites, finds in this Gospel some things too real, some too ideal, for the book to have been genuine (Strauss, Weisse).]

It is remarkable, that Bruno Bauer [not to be confounded with F. C. Baur] makes the Gospel to have proceeded from the bosom of the orthodox, poetizing Church; Lützelberger, from the borders of the Church, from the hand of a Samaritan Christian; Hilgenfeld, from the bosom of the Valentinian

\* [From the account of Epiphanius, *Hæresis L. adv. Alogos*, which is almost the only source of our information on the Alogi (so called first by Epiphanius, as deniers of the Logos, with a sarcastic insinuation of their unreasonableness), it is not clear whether they rejected the divinity of Christ altogether, or simply John's doctrine of the Logos (i. 1-14). He says, indeed, that they denied the Gospel of John, *καί τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντα θεὸν λόγον* (*Hæ.*, liv., c. i.); but, on the other hand, he closely distinguishes them from the Etionites, as well as from the Gnostics. They rejected both the Gospel and the Apocalypse, and absurdly ascribed these books to the Gnostic Cerinthus, a later contemporary of John. This very fact, however, proves that these books were regarded as ancient at the time of the Alogi, who flourished during the Montanist controversy, about 170, and furnishes a strong argument against the position of the Tübingen school, which would put the composition of the Gospel of John down to the middle of the second century. Had the Alogi had any idea of its late origin, they would no doubt have turned it to account. According to Heinichen (*De Alogis, Theodotianis atque Artemonitis*, Leipzig, 1829), they rejected merely the Apocalypse, not the Gospel of John. But this is irreconcilable with the account of Epiphanius who expressly says (*Hæ.*, l., c. 3), that if they had cast off the Apocalypse only, there might be some excuse in view of the obscurity of that book; but since they rejected all the writings of John, they showed clearly that they belonged to the antichrists spoken of, 1 John ii. 18. They tried to refute John with the Synoptists, [but very feebly. They were also violently opposed to the Montanists, and denied the continuance of prophecy and miraculous gifts in the Church.—P. S.]

Gnosis. How wanton the confusion of notions sometimes is which this negative criticism permits, is shown by the remark of Hilgenfeld, that we have to do with an age in which the idea of literary property was wholly wanting. Tholuck, on the contrary (p. 6), adduces evidences against literary frauds. And it must above all be borne in mind, that the instinctive moral idea, which abhors falsification, and the modern legal idea of literary property, are utterly different things.

For extended demonstration of the genuineness, we refer to the works already cited; to Credner, p. 261, and others; to the *Evangelienkritik* of Ebrard, p. 823 ff.; the well-known critical apologetic treatises on the life of Jesus; the work of Ebrard, *Das Evangelium Johannis und die neueste Hypothese über seine Entstehung*; and Bleek, *Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik*, pp. 175 ff.

[In addition to these works, the following more recent apologetic treatises on the Johannean question deserve special mention: Prof. Riggenbach (of Basle), on the *Testimonies for the Gospel of John*, Basle, 1865; Prof. Godet (of Neuchatel), *Examination of the Chief Questions of Criticism concerning John* (French and German), Zürich, 1866; Prof. Van Oosterzee (of Utrecht), *The Gospel of John*, four Lectures (Dutch and German), 1867 (English translation by Dr. J. F. Hurst, Edinburgh, 1869); the *fourth* revised and enlarged German edition of Tischendorf's valuable book on the *Origin of the Gospels* (*Wann wurden unsere Evangelien geschrieben?*) Leipzig, 1866 (English translation by W. L. Gage, Boston, 1868); Prof. Hofstede de Groot (Groningen), on the *Testimony of Basilides for the N. T. Books, especially the Gospel of John* (Dutch and German), Leipzig, 1868; Abbé Deramey, *Défense du quatrième évangile*, Paris, 1868. See also the Commentaries of Lücke, Tholuck, De Wette (the 5th ed. by Brückner, 1863), Meyer, Luthardt, Baumlein, Astié, Godet, and Holtzmann in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, vol. viii. (1866), pp. 56-77. The best English discussions of the Johannean question with reference to the attacks of the Tübingen school, are by Prof. George P. Fisher, of New Haven, *The Genuineness of the Fourth Gospel*, first published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1864, and then incorporated in his *Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Chris-*

*tianity*, New York, 1866, pp. 33–152 (comp. also his addition to Smith's large *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii., pp. 1431–'37); and by H. P. Liddon, in the fifth of his Bampton *Lectures on the Divinity of Jesus Christ*, London, 2d ed., 1868, pp. 207 ff. For a complete list of the polemic and apologetic literature on John, see Meyer, *Comm.*, 4th ed. (1862), pp. 31–33; Ezra Abbot's addition to W. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii. (1869), pp. 1437–1439; and Dr. Hurst's Appendix to his English translation of Van Oosterzee's *Apologetic Lectures on John's Gospel*, Edinburgh (1869), pp. 241–246.—P. S.]

Here it may be suggested, that the criticism which denies the genuineness of the Gospel, annihilates itself most effectually by its own internal confusion and contradiction. The earlier rationalists make the Gospel of John an obscuration of historical Christianity; the later, an ideal amplification and provisional completion of it. According to one, John existed as a Jewish apostle, who is supposed, in a qualified sense, to have written the Apocalypse (Baur); according to another, the Apostle did not exist at all, at least as the author of the fourth Gospel, which was composed by a Samaritan toward the middle of the second century (Lützelberger). Thus, a Samaritan forged it, according to Lützelberger; the Christian community invented it, according to Bruno Bauer. According to Zeller, Valentinianism grew out of the conceptions of John; according to Hilgenfeld, the Gospel grew out of Valentinianism.

The objections which have been made against the Gospel may be classified as follows:—

(1.) Supposed historical contradictions with the Synoptists.

(a.) The different festival journeys of the Lord in John, together with the many incidents peculiar to him. Explained by the difference in the character of the Gospels, and by the complementary position of the fourth.

(b.) The many omissions of John: the Lord's Supper, the agony in Gethsemane (with which the exhibition of the triumphant spirit of Christ in his sacerdotal prayer is supposed to be inconsistent). Explained by the fact that the place of the Supper is plainly enough marked (chap. xiii. 34), and that there is abundant cause for the strongest alternations

of experience in the life of our Lord, and the actual occurrence of them in every Gospel by itself.

(c.) The dates of the last Passover and the death of Jesus. Compare, on this point, this Commentary on *Matthew*, Special Introduction to chaps. xxvi. and xxvii.; my *Geschichte des apostolischen Zeitalters*, i., p. 69; Tholuck, p. 38 ff.

(d.) Supposed differences of minor importance. Accounted for by what has already been said; especially by the fact, to be emphasized, that the Evangelists have given Gospels, *i. e.*, religious, historico-ideal views, each his own, of the gospel history; not chronological pragmatic reports of events.

(2.) Pretended doctrinal differences between John and the Synoptists. The presumption that John was a Jewish Apostle, and therefore Judaistic, and that, consequently, he could not have written the Gospel, we pass; it falls with the Ebionite hypothesis of Baur. (Comp. Tholuck, p. 53.)

(a.) Jesus here speaks, in general, chiefly of his person. Answer: He speaks of his person also in the Synoptists; John differs from them only by collecting more especially the utterances of the self-consciousness of Jesus.

(b.) The speculative tone. But this is just what makes John John. Tholuck refers to the fact that Plato has written of Socrates in a higher tone than Xenophon (*Glaubwürdigkeit*, and Comm. [Krauth's translation, p. 30]). Heubner finds this doubtful (p. 213). The analogy would only be doubtful, if Tholuck had at the same time said that John has Johanninely idealized the actual Christ, as Plato Platonically idealized Socrates (which Weisse holds). We can perfectly maintain the complete dependence of John's view of the objective Christ, and yet perceive that John, according to his subjective individuality, has apprehended just that which is most distinctive in the objective Christ. Heubner mistakes this truth, and would not admit the individuality of John as a factor (p. 213). He is right, however, in insisting that Christ was inexhaustibly rich, therefore endlessly manifold, in his self-revelation; citing Demosthenes as an analogy (note on p. 213).

(c.) The difference in the teaching of Christ. But there is enough that is Johannine in the Synoptists, on the eternal Godhead of Christ, his pre-existence, his sole relation to the

Father (see Matt. ii. 15 ; iii. 3, 17 ; xi. 19 and 26-30 ; xvi. 16 ; xxvi. 64 ; xxviii. 18 ; Mark i. 2 ; ii. 28 ; xii. 35 ; xiii. 26 ; xvi. 19 ; Luke i. 16, 17 ; ver. 76 ; ii. 11, &c.), and enough that is synoptical in John (chap. ii. 14 ; v. 19 ; vi. 3, &c.) to establish the result that the Christ of all four Gospels is the same, but that the particular calling of John was to hold forth especially the spiritual glory of Christ. If in this he has his own mode of representation, he need not be found "dissolving" because he is solemnly elevated, nor "inaccurate" because, as is proper to his solemn style, he soars above logical forms of transition. If, finally, Christ speaks in proverbs and parables only in his discourses to the multitude, and, even according to the Synoptists, had other discourses besides, the prevalence of the dialogue and the discourse in John argues genuineness, since it corresponds to the different nature of the occasions and circumstances.

(3.) The mutually exclusive authorship of the Gospel and the Apocalypse. According to Lücke, this does not indeed touch the genuineness of the Gospel; only, the Evangelist John cannot have written the Apocalypse, because he wrote the Gospel. According to Baur, on the contrary, he cannot have written the Gospel, because he wrote the Apocalypse.

We maintain that the Gospel and Apocalypse require each other. If it be first sufficiently considered (*a.*) that there is an essential difference between speaking *ἐν τῷ νοῖ* and *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι*, according to 1 Cor. xiv. 15 ; (*b.*) an essential difference between an historical and an apocalyptic, *poetico-symbolical* work ; \* (*c.*) that the Gospel of John has no special eschatology, as the others have ; (*d.*) that the Apocalypse presupposes a kindred Gospel, especially the Evangelist and Apostle ; (*e.*) that the Apocalypse evinces the same theological depth, the same fulness of ideas, the same universal view, as the Epistles of John and the fourth Gospel. After these considerations, we cannot help concluding, that all the books attributed to John can have been written only by one man ; and that one, this unique

\* [The remark of Tholuck, p. 11, that "the Old Testament prophets speak not a whit more impure Hebrew than the prose writers," mistakes the main point here at issue—to wit, the difference between the states of consciousness, in which a Hebrew at one time speaks pure Greek, at another, Hebraizes.]

John, with whose pre-eminent trait of contemplativeness in the Gospel and in the Apocalypse the contemplative character of the Johannean books is in perfect harmony.

(4.) Intrinsic difficulties which the Gospel is supposed to present. Particularly

(a.) The improbability that such discourses as those recorded by John should be retained by the memory. But this objection has never duly considered, that John could as well have put down his memorabilia at once during his intercourse with Jesus, as the many, of whom Luke speaks (Luke i. 1). Nor has it further put to the account, that the ways of memory are different, and that the memory of the loving worshipper is always tenacious of the words kindred to its spirit; and it has confounded the notions of a substantial and a verbal record. That Christ might receive a Johannean coloring in the representation of John, without being transformed from a Johannean Christ to a Christian John, is made perfectly clear by the analogy of the three Synoptists.

(b.) Wearying repetition and diffuseness. This objection becomes at once a self-accusation of the critics. The pregnant, the lyrically iterative, in the language of an inspired ideal intuition, presupposes yielding harmony and affinity of spirit.

#### THE INTEGRITY OF THE GOSPEL.

The unity of character of the fourth Gospel, the whole incommunicable spirit of it, is so plain, that the hypothesis of the working over by a later hand of an original record by John (Weisse, *Die Evangelische Geschichte, et al.*), or of the filling out of such a record by interpolations (A. Schweizer, *Das Evangelium Johannis*), may be passed over (see *Leben Jesu*, i., p. 197; Luthardt, *Die Integrität.*)\*

\* [Luthardt, in the first chapter of his able work: *Das Johanneische Evangelium nach seiner Eigenthümlichkeit geschildert und erklärt* (Nürnberg, 1852, pp. 1-20), satisfactorily defends the integrity of the fourth Gospel against the views of Weiss and Schweizer, which may be regarded as exploded. But since that time the same error has been renewed in a modified form. Renan (*Vie de Jesus*, 1863) is disposed to regard the narrative portions of John as genuine, and to acknowledge an historical substratum even in the discourses. He accepts as historical the belief in the resurrection of Lazarus, but turns it into a counterfeit miracle, the result of guilty collusion, which is certainly no better, but worse, than the German notion of a mythical poem, or a symbolical vestment of the idea of im-

The genuineness of the 21st chapter of the Gospel remains to be specially considered. The words of John xx. 30, have been supposed to form the evident close of the Gospel; and then the 21st chapter itself has been thought to bear traces of spuriousness. Accordingly, many who have acknowledged and honored the Gospel, from Grotius to Lücke, and others, have declared against the genuineness of this chapter. (See the list in Meyer's *Comm.* [p. 571, 4th ed.]). On the contrary, the genuineness of it has been as decidedly vindicated, from Calovius to Guericke and Tholuck. According to Meyer, the chapter, excepting the last verse, is *a supplement* to the Gospel of John, which closes with the 31st verse of the 20th chapter. But a supplement can be only an appendix, as Meyer intends, in case the book itself is completed according to its plan. Now, a careful estimate of the total structure of the Gospel leads to a plan which constitutionally includes the 21st chapter. In this view we distinguish the Prologue, chap. i., 1-18, the historical Gospel, more strictly speaking, and the Epilogue, chap. xxi. The division of the Gospel, made and pursued in this volume, must justify this conception; and we here refer the reader thereto. Even most of the advocates of the genuineness, however, have more recently explained the 24th and 25th verses as a later addition; and again, Weitzel has declared against this (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1848, i., 1). We hold that, if the interpolation: "We know that his testimony is true," be an interpolation of the Ephesian church, the

mortality. In the 13th edition of his *Vie de Jésus*, Paris, 1867, Renan enters for the first time into a discussion of the Johannean question. He distinguishes, in the Preface, four views on the subject: (1.) the orthodox, which holds fast to the whole Gospel of John as genuine; (2.) the middle position, which recognizes him as the first author, but admits that it has been brought into its present shape and form by his disciples; (3.) the critical, which derives it from a disciple of John about A. D. 100, and gives up the discourses, but admits a Johannean tradition in the historical portion; (4.) the second critical view, which regards the whole as a fiction or historical novel of the second century. He professes to hold the third view, and defends it in a concluding essay. Weizsäcker, who is Baur's successor in Tübingen (in his *Untersuchungen über die evangel. Geschichte*, Gotha, 1864; comp. his notice of Renan in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, for 1868, pp. 521 ff.), substantially agrees with Renan, and divides the authorship between John and one or more of his disciples, probably the elders of Ephesus.—P. S.]

rest reveals the hand of the Evangelist himself; since ver. 24 looks back to chap. xx. 31, and the proverb in ver. 25, though termed by Meyer an *absurd exaggeration*, is entirely characteristic of John's contemplation.\*

It is otherwise with the section, chap. viii. 1-11.† It is, in the first place, established, that the section is wanting in a series of the most important codices, B. L. T. X. Δ., to which certainly Cod. Sin., and probably A. and C., are to be added; and that a series of the oldest and most eminent fathers, from Origen downward, are entirely silent respecting this section. Add to this the fact that the section, at first view, does not improve, but impairs the connection of the Gospel. We ourselves have hitherto thought there were sufficient proofs that it belongs to the day of the great onsets of questionings which the Pharisees made upon the Lord on the Tuesday after the feast of Palms (see Lücke, ii., p. 243; Hitzig, *Ueber Johannes Markus*, p. 205; my *Leben Jesu*, ii., p. 952; p. 1222). From this apparent misplacement of the section, however, it would not necessarily follow that the passage itself is not apostolic; not even that it is not Johannean. Since the other Evangelists have described those onsets, it is improbable that the section should have come from them (as, for example, Hitzig places the passage in Mark, between chap. xii. 13-17 and vers. 18-27). On the contrary, it is more natural to suppose that this Gospel relic belongs to John, or, at all events, to the Johannean tradition in Ephesus. The codd. 1, 19, 20, put it at the close of the Gospel; codd. 69, 124, 346, put it after Luke xxi. 38. We might well suppose that the latter manuscripts are in the right as to the place of the incident, the former as to the authorship of the account. We think it suitable, however, to recur to the question in the Commentary on the section itself; since, on a more accurate weighing of the critical and historical considerations, the section might decidedly maintain its existing position. (On the critical treatises relative to this section, compare Meyer, on chap. viii. [p. 273].)

\* [Comp. foot-note on p. 331.—P. S.]

† [The genuineness of John viii. 1-11, or rather vii. 53-viii. 11, as also of ch. vi. 4, with the last clause of ver. 3, is purely a question of textual criticism. See the *Textual Notes in loc.*—P. S.]

## SOURCES AND DESIGN OF THE GOSPEL.

The Gospel of John appears the most original of all the Gospels, in that it shows itself thoroughly independent of the Synoptical evangelical tradition while yet presupposing it, and confirming the essential substance of it. It manifestly rests on the personal memories of one of the earliest disciples of Jesus—the most profound and spiritual of all—on whom the Lord's exhibitions of himself impressed themselves in indelible lines.

That John early committed to writing in *memorabilia* the most important matters of his recollection, especially the Lord's discourses, we may well suppose, though these constituents of his Gospel continually became fresh again and clear by the suggestions of the promised Paraclete, which co-operated with his enthusiastic love for the Lord.

But since, by the direction of the dying Saviour, he was made the son of Mary, and Mary thenceforth lived with him in his house (see the article *Maria*, in Winer), and this little family, formed under the cross, could have had no more engaging matter of conversation than the memory of the Lord, we may doubtless ascribe to Mary a mental share in the gradual formation of this slowly maturing Gospel.

To the memories of the Apostle must be added the experiences of his life, especially the friendly and peaceful movements of his apostolic development. How he might thus have been led also to his peculiar shaping of his Logos doctrine, is suggested by Lücke's and other treatises on the Prologue.

To speak now of the design: The Gospel, like Christian worship, which is in this respect akin to art, and like every thing belonging to the Christian Church, must have been produced primarily for its own sake, as the one spontaneous effusion of the lofty contemplations of the Evangelist. If this may be said even of the first Evangelists, and our school theology must be charged with inquiring far too readily and too exclusively for an exterior design, while a due regard to the fervid spontaneity of the four Gospels might cure criticism of many prejudices of a lower conception;—all this is true in a very peculiar degree of the fourth Gospel. Contemplative

minds like that of John must give expression to their experiences and views first of all for their own satisfaction; and if we have understood any thing of the nature of John, we cannot wonder that we find five productions of his hand, forming at bottom a trilogy of the evangelic, epistolary, and the apocalyptic character in the New Testament.

Yet, as the Christian cultus, with all its art-like character, by no means stops in the idea of mere exhibitiv art, but builds itself out of the elements of eternally active truth, and aims with distinct purpose in efficient enthusiasm at edification, the Evangelists must as distinctly, and with still more distinct consciousness, have had their objective impulse and their practical design. And the Evangelist John has himself distinctly stated his first and his next practical design (chap. xx. 31). His immediate and decisive aim was neither to fight a heresy nor to complete the other Gospels. He knew too well that the positive statement of the life of Jesus, purely and fervidly given, was itself the most effective polemic (chap. iii. 19), and that a round, complete collection of the most significant points in the life of the Lord, set forth in orderly succession, would form the most fitting supplement (John xx. 31).

Nevertheless, this great apostolic presbyter-bishop of Ephesus could not have stood for half a century between the opposite germinant motions of Ebionism and Gnosticism, without writing his Gospel in the consciousness that it would practically transcend that antagonism, nor without, in this conviction, everywhere emphasizing the relevant anti-Ebionistic and anti-Gnostic points. The expressly polemic passages in his Epistles (comp. 1 John ii. 18, 22, 23; iv. 1 ff., 2 John), as well as in the Revelation, particularly in the letters to the seven churches, give abundant proof that he was fully conscious of the historical and dogmatical points in his Gospel against the heresies of his time, and that he relied upon their operative force. And undoubtedly it was his Logos doctrine especially, in connection with the doctrine of the historical personal Christ, which in the second century most effectively contributed to the victory of the Church over both Ebionism and Gnosticism. The doctrine of personality, concretely defined by the doctrine of the person of Christ still ever operates

as a two-edged sword against all Gnostic and Judaistic distortions of the truth. "With John, therefore, in his Gospel, the person of the Saviour is of supreme importance."

The consciousness of supplementing the first three Gospels, which at the time of the origin of John's Gospel had already gained a considerable currency among the Christians, was likewise natural. The Evangelist may even have been conscious of the twofold completion, internal and external, which he furnished; and in that case he surely intended to furnish it. But not in such sense as to be a theological or historical emendator.

When Clement of Alexandria (according to Euseb., vi., 14) remarks that the other Evangelists have delineated particularly the external history, giving us a *εὐαγγέλιον σωματικόν*; and the object of John was to give something higher, a *εὐαγγέλιον πνευματικόν*, he unites in one expression a partial truth, and a leaning of the Alexandrian turn of thought which must not be overlooked. Luther's dictum also, of the "one true, tender leading Gospel," needs to be reduced to the most strictly qualified sense. All the Gospels are spiritual, pneumatic, each in its way; but the fourth Gospel is pre-eminently the Gospel of the real ideal personality of Christ, and as such, in the phrase of Ernesti, the heart of Christ (*pectus Christi*).

Clement further states that John wrote his Gospel at the request of his friends; likewise, the canon of Muratori, which Jerome ingeniously interpreted thus: that the bishops and churches of Asia Minor urged him to write his Gospel against the incipient heresies, and in it to make the divinity of Christ distinctly appear. But John hardly needed such a spur; he might at most have been hastened by it in the publication of the Gospel. The *historical* supplementing of the three Synoptists is made prominent, particularly by Eusebius (iii. 24) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Comment. in Joann.*). But if, beyond his delight in a more exact statement and essential enrichment of the Gospel history, John had been moved by the desire of an external supplementing of the records of his predecessors, the chronological points would have appeared still more clearly marked, and the array of facts and events much more copious. His object lay on a higher level than this:

and so, indeed, did the object of the first three Evangelists themselves.

The modern criticism has come down so low as to represent John in his Gospel, according to Strauss, as aiming an indirect polemic against Peter; according to the anonymous Saxon work, "*Die Evangelien*," as tending to glorify himself and put himself in Peter's place; according to the Baur school, a fraudulent writer allowed himself to put forth, in the interest of an irenical tendency, a pseudo-Johannean Gospel.

But all these modern speculations which proceed from an utter want of sympathy with the spirit and aim of the great apostle, evangelist, and seer of the New Dispensation will soon pass away like fleeting shadows, while John will continue his holy mission and bless the Christian world to the second coming of Him whose divine-human glory he has reflected in his writings.

Volat avis sine meta  
 Quo nec vates nec propheta  
 Evolavit altius:  
 Tam implenda, quam impleta  
 Nunquam vidit tot secreta  
 Purus homo purius.

Bird of God! with boundless flight  
 Soaring far beyond the height  
 Of the bard or prophet old;  
 Truth fulfilled, and truth to be,—  
 Never purer mystery  
 Did a purer tongue unfold!

---

ART. II.—*A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble, M. A., late Vicar of Hursley.* By the Right Hon. Sir J. T. COLERIDGE, D. C. L. James Parker & Co., Oxford and London. [New York: Scribner, Welford & Co.] 1869.

ON the 29th of March, 1866, all England was deeply moved by the tidings that, at Bournemouth, a beautiful sea-side retreat a few miles from his quiet vicarage of Hursley, John Keble had fallen asleep. On the 6th of April he was buried in his own church-yard, and on the 18th of May there was laid

by his side the wife whom, as a life-long invalid, he had watched with the most assiduous and tender care, honorable alike to her and to his own manliness and piety. Many pilgrims, from other lands as well as his own, had in previous years made their way to that quiet country parish to pay the tribute of their respect to the living Keble, and now that only his resting-place invites their saddened steps, the unabated stream of visitors attests the world's estimate of his worth.

He held no higher ecclesiastical dignity than that of vicar of a country parish, otherwise all but unknown. No weightier academical title dignified his name than that of an Oxford master of arts, and a former professor of poetry in that university. Yet his church and his country held him "Venerable" without an archdeaconry, "Very Reverend" without a deanery, "Right Reverend" without a bishopric, and even "The Most Reverend His Grace the Lord Archbishop" may be well content if his fame and influence shall equal those of the Vicar of Hursley. He is "the most representative character," says the *Athenæum*, "produced by the Church of England—at least since the days of that 'meek Walton' whom Keble himself delighted to honor." Arnold, Milman, and Keble, says Dean Stanley, in *Macmillan's Magazine*, "amongst the departed lights of the English hierarchy in this century, were unquestionably the chief." "We felt," says his biographer, with reference to the universal sadness occasioned by his death, "that we had lost a true saint, a true poet; a saint whose holiness and purity no verse he ever composed could blemish; a poet whose genius was elevated and sanctified by the perpetual heavenward inspiration under which he wrote." With respect to the breadth and intensity of his influence, the *Athenæum*, no fond, blind friend of Keble or his school, says, "It is not too much to say that he was an oracle."

These are the lives that it is good to study; such an influence it is well to analyze, and learn its secret. The commemoration has fallen into most competent and loving hands. Sir J. T. Coleridge, a nephew of the great poet, a quarter of a century an honorable judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, a member of the Privy Council and of its Judicial Committee, father of the present Solicitor-General of England, an active

participant in many of the ecclesiastical and educational movements of the last generation, will only add to his honors by the graceful, tasteful, faithful way in which he has become the biographer of his friend. Their correspondence of fifty-five years has directly furnished him and us some of the best material of the memoir before us, and indirectly has given him much of his competence for his work, and us much of our confidence that we are looking upon the real Keble. Too high in character, attainments, and station to need his subject's fame as a ladder by which he might himself rise to a more conspicuous position, too stanch and positive in his own convictions to approve and laud indiscriminately, he is just the biographer we would have for such a man. We have turned to Stanley's life of Arnold to read with renewed pleasure Coleridge's loving tribute to this other friend of his college days, the man who made teaching a new vocation in England.

A few lines, or at most a few pages, would have sufficed to tell the whole story of Keble's outward life. He was the son of a pious and scholarly country clergyman, and was by his father prepared for the university, where he entered at the age of fourteen as a scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. His career as an undergraduate was brilliant, Sir Robert Peel alone having preceded him in the double honor of a first-class both in classics and mathematics. He was fellow of Oriel and tutor in the same college, and eight years later became professor of poetry in the university, which honor he held for a double term from 1831 to 1841. Meanwhile he had held for a short time the curacy of three little parishes near Fairford, his native place, had been a year curate of Hursley, had resigned his charge to watch over the last years of his venerable father's life, and had in 1836 entered upon the vicarate at Hursley, which he held for the remainder of his days. In all these professional relations he was distinguished for the conscientious fidelity with which he gave himself to his immediate duties. In his attention to the little ones and the lowly ones of his country charges he was no less watchful and untiring than when preparing and delivering in Latin the *Prælectiones* of his Oxford chair. It is the testimony of his biographer that "his duties as a parish priest, without unwisely weighing one

obligation against another, he did esteem most pressing; he thought his calling beyond all others holy, his mission in our church from Supreme authority, his task such as he never could believe he performed, or could perform, except imperfectly and unworthily. But as he adored the greatness and majesty, so he lovingly trusted in the mercy of his Master, Redeemer, and Comforter."

It is doubtless for the holy assiduity of this ministry that his crown shall shine brightest at the last, and for the gentleness, the purity, the holy wisdom with which he fulfilled all the duties of domestic and social life among men. This personal saintliness of life not only gave great power to his ministry, but, so far as he was personally known, made all his utterances as a Christian poet, and a leader in the theological debate and the ecclesiastical movements of his day, tenfold more expressive and effective.

For he had other high endowments and large opportunities which were to him a solemn trust, to be "occupied" for his Lord. And it is mainly of Keble, the Christian poet of modern England, the real originator of the so-called "Tractarian" movement in the church, that we had proposed mainly to speak.

Dean Stanley assigns to the "Christian Year" the place of "a formulary of the Church of England. It has taken its place—certainly for this generation—next to the Authorized Version and the Prayer Book, far above the Homilies and the Articles. For one who would enforce an argument or defend a text by quoting the Eleventh Article or the Homily on Charity, there are a hundred who would appeal to the "Christian Year." We suppose that the Dean knows of what he affirms, and is not overstating the fact. And among other illustrations of the breadth of its popularity he gives this example. "In the Crimean war some fanatical chaplain had opposed the introduction of the 'Christian Year,' into the hospitals: but by the next arrival from England was a whole cargo of 'Christian Years,' brought by the daughter of the greatest of Scottish divines—Dr. Chalmers." In England one hundred and twenty editions have appeared since 1827, and not a few in this country.

To account for the wide-spread popularity of the "Christian Year," is by no means difficult. There is its eminently practical object, the advancement of private as distinguished from the social religious life; its purity unfeigned and unquestionable to commend it to God's people of every name; its pure and genuine poetry to charm a cultivated taste, and to cultivate the unrefined; its vivid apprehension and reproduction of the characters and scenes that fall within its proper scope, with its strong grasp upon the humanity as well as the divinity of our Lord, to make it very precious to the spirit, especially in thoughtful and chastened moods. Each of us has no doubt his favorite and familiar passages, and these will be determined not so much by our intellectual differences, as by the particular phase of our experience, and the stage of our spiritual development when we were made most familiar with the poet. Of Christian duties, experiences, and prospects he sings as one taught of the Spirit, taught the great saving truths, yet taught also of the limits of present religious knowledge. Compare the heaven to which he points, and for which he does so much in guiding, steadying, strengthening our aspirations, with the childlikeness of that inquisitive and undevout fiction "The Gates Ajar."

"What is the Heaven we idly dream?  
The self-deceiver's dreary theme,  
A cloudless sun that softly shines,  
Bright maidens and unfailing vines,  
The warrior's pride, the hunter's mirth,  
Poor fragments all of this low earth;  
Such as in sleep would hardly soothe  
A soul that once had tasted of immortal truth.

"What is the Heaven our God bestows?  
No prophet yet, no angel knows;  
Was never yet created eye  
Could see across eternity;  
Not seraph's wing forever soaring,  
Can pass the flight of souls adoring.  
That nearer still and nearer grow  
To the unapproached Lord once made for them so low."

We cannot doubt, however, that the poet of the "Christian Year" has been a more effective minister of the Church of

England, then Keble the preacher, or the controversial theologian. And high-churchism, we as little doubt, has found few more effective pleaders than this saintly poet. In its outward form the collection is churchly, in its inward spirit intensely so. His views have insinuated themselves into and intrenched themselves in not a few minds when under the spell of his wonderful verse. Such a character underlying and uplifting such a genius would be, we apprehend, to many a welcome warrant for the adoption of his extremest views. We are, therefore, especially grateful to Keble's biographer for showing so distinctly in two marked instances, how far they must go who are tempted to adopt our poet's theology. One has reference to the doctrine of the real presence, and the other to the honor due the Virgin Mary. It has been a matter of surprise to those acquainted with Keble's views, that he could write in the poem commemorative of the "Gunpowder Treason,"

"O come to our Communion Feast:  
There present in the heart,  
Not in the hands, th' Eternal Priest  
Will His true self impart."

He had always said that he meant "not in the hands *only*," in opposition to the idea of a carnal presence. "Some weeks before his death, however," says his biographer, "a member of the Upper House of Convocation, addressing it, quoted the lines with approbation in the sense most commonly attributed to them; this he thought entirely altered the case, and prevented him from any longer overlooking or acquiescing in the misinterpretation, and he determined therefore to accept an alteration which had before been suggested by a friend, etc." Keble, therefore, now says, as his friends knew he always believed, "There present in the heart, *As* in the hands," etc.

Mr. Coleridge here publishes, for the first time, a poem written in 1844, which he himself and Dyson, with great effort, persuaded Keble not to publish soon after in the "Lyra Innocentium." It is entitled "Mother out of Sight." Its drift will appear from the eighth, tenth, and eleventh stanzas, which we give:—

" What glory thou above hast won  
 By special grace of thy dear Son,  
 We see not yet, nor dare espy  
 Thy crowned form with open eye.  
 Rather beside the manger meek,  
 Thee bending with veiled brow we seek;  
 Or where the angel in the Thrice Great Name  
 Hailed thee, and Jesus to thy bosom came.

" Thenceforth, whom thousand worlds adore,  
 He calls thee Mother evermore;  
 Angel nor saint his face may see  
 Apart from what he took of thee;  
 How may we choose but name thy Name,  
 Echoing below their high acclaim  
 In Holy Creeds? Since earthly song and prayer  
 Must keep faint time to the dread anthems there.

" How but in love on thine own days,  
 Thuo blissful One, upon thee gaze?  
 Nay every day, each suppliant hour,  
 Whene'er we kneel, in aisle or bower,  
 Thy glories we may greet unblamed,  
 Nor shun the lay by seraphs framed,  
 Hail, Mary, full of grace! O welcome sweet,  
 Which daily in all lands all saints repeat."

But we must pass to speak more specifically of Keble as a theologian and a churchman. His position in these respects is not by any means to be measured by the bulk of his theological writings. These were not in themselves of very great moment as permanent treatises. Yet Dr. Newman calls him "the true and primary author" of the movement afterward called Tractarian, and again says of the day when Keble preached the Assize Sermon in the university pulpit on the "National Apostasy," "I have ever considered and kept the day as the start of the religious movement of 1833" (*Apologia pro Vita sua*). He was one of the projectors of the famous Oxford "Tracts for the Times," although he contributed personally but four to the series. The object of the collection, as stated by himself in a letter to his friend Dyson, was, "first, the circulation of primitive notions respecting the Apostolical Succession, &c.; and, secondly, the protection of the Prayer Book against profane innovation" (*Memoir*, p. 211). In 1838

he became engaged with Drs. Newman and Pusey in editing the "Library of the Fathers," and a few years later was employed in a similar way on the "Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology," for which he himself prepared the Works and a Life of Bishop Wilson. Of his own independent labors the most considerable was his edition of Hooker, to which he devoted more than five years of the valuable period for study and production, which he spent with his venerable father at Fairford, in the interval between his curacy and vicarate at Hursley. This, too, was the time when he made his most thorough study of the Fathers, a study never abandoned, but pursued afterward with many interruptions and disadvantages. The volume of "Academical and Occasional Sermons," published in 1847, had a theological and ecclesiastical aim, and the little work on "Eucharistical Adoration," published in 1857, embodied much of the thought and research of thirty busy years. His other publications were occasional, and yet had more weight than elaborate tomes from many another.

Keble is everywhere the intense churchman. He says, in a letter written in 1844 (*Memoir*, p. 292): "This is why I so deprecate the word and the idea of Protestantism, because it seems inseparable to me from 'Every man his own absolver,' that is, in other words, the same as Peace where there is no Peace, and mere shadows of Repentance." In the same letter he speaks of "the tradition which goes by the name of Justification by Faith." Three years earlier, about the time when the series of "Tracts for the Times" was abruptly terminated by the censure pronounced on Newman's famous ninetieth tract, for which, Keble says in an official letter, "that he is himself responsible, as far as any one besides the actual writer can be;" he wrote to Mr. Coleridge, "I cannot go to Rome till Rome be much changed indeed; but I may be driven out of the English Church, should that adopt the present set of charges and programmes." The prevalence of "Evangelical" or "Puritan" principles and practices would force him out of his church, and he worked with might and main for forty years, to prevent any such prevalence. To him the Primitive Church was the representative of real Christianity. Tested by his reason, the Church of England had so clearly and distinctly

“the marks of reality” as to satisfy this side of his nature; only these must not be effaced or dimmed, but freshened and brightened. Then feeling came in to supplement argument, and sometimes, it should seem, even to take its place. There were dark and stormy hours when it seemed to be almost wholly a deep and sacred sentiment that kept him firm, a sense of dutifulness to his church, in favor of which there were the strongest presumptions, hardly, if even possibly, to be overcome by any reasonings or any probable course of events. His humility shrank from distrusting what had satisfied the loved and honored of many ages. In view of the intellectual perplexities that often enveloped the debated points, he thought, says Mr. Coleridge, “that the true question for himself was: Shall I be safe where I am? this allowed him to admit all moral arguments into the inquiry.”

His language with reference to the Church of Rome varied at different times, as might be expected with one whose emotional nature was so largely developed. A few months before Newman went over to Rome he wrote of “the danger we are in of losing dear —— from our branch of the Church.” And in the same letter, after referring to the state of doubt in which a discussion of the controverted points would leave him, he says: “This being so, I suppose it is one’s duty to long for and aim at a kind of neutrality in one’s judgment and demeanor toward Rome; and this I imagine to be really consistent with the English system, etc.” (p. 293). But at other times (*e. g.*, p. 401) he speaks of “the violent contradictions of fact, and *petitiones principii*, which are quite necessary to every part almost of the Roman theory.” So when the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was announced, he says, “They cannot but know in their hearts that it has not the shadow of a tradition.” Here papal infallibility and supremacy are scouted with decision enough.

But what was Keble’s position on the vital question of the mutual relations of the Church, the Scriptures, and Tradition? Was it true of him as of his pupil and friend, Harrell Froude, of whose “Remains” he was, with Newman, a joint editor, that “he felt scorn of the maxim, ‘the Bible, and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants’”? and that “he gloried in

accepting Tradition as a main instrument of religious teaching" (Newman's *Apologia*)? Did he hold with Dr. Hawkins, Newman's predecessor as Vicar of St. Mary's and afterward Provost of Oriel, who taught Newman his doctrine of Tradition, "that the sacred text was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and that if we would learn doctrine we must have recourse to the formularies of the church; for instance, to the catechism and to the creeds?" Did he put creeds, catechisms, or the church itself, between the individual soul and the Word of God as its needed and binding expositors?

He held (see p. 475), not only that all final judgments, in questions of doctrine and spiritual discipline, "are divinely intrusted to the Apostles and their successors, even as the powers of order," but also that in interpreting the language of Scripture, while they are bound to avail themselves of the opinions of the best scholars, "they cannot transfer to them the right of *authoritative* interpretation, because they cannot transfer the responsibility." Of course what "the Apostles and their successors" cannot transfer, no other may usurp. No other than the Apostles and their successors have a right to any thing more than an *opinion* concerning the meaning of God's word. It were a vain hope that the Holy Spirit, the inspirer of the Word, should depart from the line of the apostolical succession in leading the church into all truth. You may not go straight to the fountain-head for this living water; you must, perforce, resort to this tube, not always of the best.

Not only would Keble and his school restrict the church and the world to this one mode of obtaining "*authoritative* interpretations" of the meaning of God's word. The value of that word, as a means of knowledge and grace and life, is greatly over-estimated by all "Evangelicals." In his Preface to Hooker (p. lxxxvii.) he commends that author as being "very full and precise in guarding against another theory," *i. e.*, another than the Zuinglian, "less malignant, but hardly less erroneous and unscriptural (though unhappily too much countenanced in later days); the theory which denies, not indeed the *reality*, but the *exclusive* virtue, of the Sacraments, as ordinary means to their respective graces. He hesitates not

to teach, with the old Christian writers, that baptism is the *only* ordinary mean of regeneration, the Eucharist the *only* ordinary mean whereby Christ's body and blood can be taken and received." Newman emphatically acknowledges his indebtedness to Keble for recasting for him the fundamental principle, already found in Butler, which underlies the sacramental system. And this is likewise brought out in his preface to Hooker (p. xci.), "Every thing to them," *i. e.*, the Fathers, "existed in two worlds: in the world of sense, according to its outward nature and relations; in the world intellectual, according to its spiritual associations. And thus did the whole scheme of material things, and especially those objects in it which are consecrated by scriptural allusion, assume in their eyes a sacramental or symbolical character." Of course the number of mysteries or *quasi* sacraments admits of indefinite multiplication, and "those fragments," says Keble, "of the primitive ritual, which are still, by God's providence, allowed to remain among us, are to be cherished as something more than merely decent and venerable usages. They are authorized, perchance divinely authorized, portions of the Church's spiritual sacrifice, etc." While in the alembic of a soul like Keble's, some spiritual profit might perchance be distilled out of these "perchance divinely authorized portions," we question somewhat the value of the general result to the church. These semi-sacramental and demi-semi-sacramental observances have multiplied, how widely, as miserable mummeries. His sanction distinctly covers "bowing at the name of Jesus, and turning toward the east in prayer," etc. The Fathers and their symbolism are in these days studied to good purpose at St. Alban's and Dr. Ewer's, and results gorgeous and mournful are the result. Would the Apostle Paul now write as to the Corinthians, "I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ"? An Apostle fear corruption in the "Primitive Church," and men eighteen centuries later try to throw the responsibility of it on him!

Surely, if it were not for the logic of the thing, there would be no great need of leaving such an Anglican Church as Keble would make, or with his Catholic spirit would allow,

for Rome or anywhere else. Keble was saddened, he cannot have been surprised, when dear friends of his, failing to see or to feel those delicate distinctions by which he kept himself an Anglican, and the Anglican Church the true representative of the Primitive Church, "got into an Utopian dream, and rather than give it up, shut their eyes and made a jump" (so he describes the conversion of Archdeacon Wilberforce). During the last years of his life he seems to have regarded it as his great mission to quiet excited and unsettled minds. This was not so easy as it had been to excite and unsettle them by what his biographer, strong churchman as Sir John T. Coleridge is, calls his "fallacy" in referring every thing to the standard of the Primitive Church. As early as 1847 he began to see the need of these quieting influences, and it was a distinctly avowed object in the preparation and publication of his "Eucharistical Adoration," in 1857, "to quiet people, or, at least, show those who wish to be quiet, that they are not wrong in being so." His position in regard to the kind of assent and consent required of those who hold the teaching offices of the church, was: "1. That the teacher should be pledged to the faith and practice of the church; and 2. That the taught should know them to be thus pledged."

A man who was so docile a believer in the Primitive Church as well as in the Scriptures, would be little tolerant of doubt, or of the spirit of criticism. Hence, Keble's long estrangement from Arnold. In connection with his reading to his invalid wife, he "doubts whether he should (or she would) like Robertson's Life; 'honest doubts' as one calls them, are not very pleasant on a sick-bed." Solicitor-General Coleridge communicates the substance of a conversation with Keble on the subject of Inspiration, which Keble ended somewhat abruptly by saying with unusual sharpness, "that most of the men who had difficulties on this subject were too wicked to be reasoned with." As though there might not be a faith too broad and willing, as well as a faith too cautious and hesitating. And have not the very excesses of his school contributed somewhat to the development of a rationalizing spirit within and about the Church of England? And is not

Oxford very naturally the centre of both movements if of either?

A few words in regard to his relation to his university, and we have done. As an undergraduate and a fellow he had been its pride and boast. "His had been the first name," says Newman, "which I had heard spoken of with reverence rather than admiration, when I came up to Oxford." His five years' tutorship was a period of arduous but pleasant labor, full of profit and of delightful memories to his pupils and to himself. His professorship deepened and enriched his own culture, and set before the successive classes to which he lectured, not only lofty models in thought and style, but judicious and appreciative criticisms of poetry and the poets, with the strongest emphasis always laid on the moral and religious relations of the art. He took the deepest interest to the end of his days in every movement or proposal touching the welfare of the university. In all projected reforms he was, as might be expected, on the side of the past, deprecating most earnestly "disregard of Primitive Models." And it will surely be no slight or unmerited tribute to the man, his services, and his principles, if in the midst of the reforms that are and that must be, Keble College should stand not merely as his most permanent visible memorial, but as the source of a culture such as he would see prevailing in the church and the school.

Apart from this, and when the excellencies and the graces of the man shall be little more remembered, he will live mainly in his gift of song. Deplore as we may the subtle and seductive sacramentalism that so pervades it, we cannot but regard it a valuable treasure to the Church of God. Many a soul has it refreshed and strengthened, and while there shall be song on earth, the chamber and the closet of God's saints will very often contain in some cherished place the "Christian Year."

The volume of Keble's miscellaneous poems,\* which has appeared since the publication of the Memoir, will be examined with interest by the lovers of the man, and the admirers

\* *Miscellaneous Poems.* By the Rev. J. KEBLE, M.A., Vicar of Hursley. Oxford and London: James Parker & Co., 1869 (pp. xxxii., 309).

of his gift of song. They will find that about half of its contents is new, while the other half is made up of productions collected from the "Lyra Apostolica" and other more scattered sources. Some of the poems date from his youth, others from his maturest years; some are evidently rough drafts, others very finished productions—finished, we mean, according to his type, for he never risked the loss of truth or sentiment in the process of weighing, measuring, or polishing a syllable. The large majority are deeply, tenderly religious, comparing, in purity, sweetness, and scripturalness, with the best of his more familiar works. There are but few poems in the volume which we think will be pronounced a rich addition to our poetical literature, or will be regarded as adding to his fame. Yet there are frequent lines, couplets, and stanzas that will often recur to those who have once read them, affording delight, solace, counsel, or strength, according to their various nature, or the state of him to whose inmost soul the poet so directly and vividly appeals.

From among those here published for the first time, we have specially admired, of the translations from ancient church hymns, "Sing, my tongue, of glorious warfare" (p. 144); the ballad, "Robin Lee" (p. 184); the sonnet, "Spring Flowers" (p. 217); the scriptural hymn, suggested by Mark xvi. 4, "Draw near early as we may" (p. 263); and "Prayers of Saints" (p. 293).

In the brief preface by the compiler, beside a statement of the nature and sources of this collection, there is a felicitous statement of Keble's ideal of poetry, with a loving and appreciative application of these tests to Keble himself. He closes by saying of his volume: "It will help to present even more fully than the other volumes, the very truth—from boyhood to old age, in his home, among his friends, in his parish—of the holy man whose memory the church cherishes, and will surely continue to cherish as one of the most fragrant and precious of her treasures."

ART. III.—*Christian Work in Lower and Middle Egypt.*

IN the first article on this subject in these pages an attempt was made to sketch the general features of the land of Egypt with a special reference to their bearing upon the inhabitants; and the inhabitants themselves—in the Moslem section at least—were placed before the reader in some of their prominent social and religious aspects. In the article which followed, the so-called Christian part of the population was similarly dealt with; and had the design, in accordance with which this line of treatment was adopted, been followed, the next subject which should have engaged our attention would have been, an historical sketch of missionary labor in the country prior to the establishment of the agencies now in the field. Circumstances, however, over which the writer had no control, have materially interfered with his plans; and he is forced to pass over that part of his narrative for the present at least. He does so with great reluctance indeed, for although the earlier experiences of the missionary in Egypt are to be found recorded in the *Missionary Cyclopædias* and other such works, yet there are some things connected with the last abandoned agency—that, viz., of the English Church Missionary Society—which might have been set forth with benefit to all who are interested in the general subject of Missions. Still it may not be impossible to return to the subject in some future number.

In the present paper we purpose adhering to our original character, and confining ourselves still to the narration of things present. We have seen and learned something of the Modern Egyptians; we have now to see what is doing for their enlightenment and the amelioration of their condition. And to do this with as much success as possible, the following order shall be followed:—We shall first give a short summary view of the Evangelistic operations at present being carried on in the land. Then we shall ask the company of the reader on a short visit to the capital of Upper Egypt for the sake of a little closer insight into the religious character of the native Christians, and at the same time, a nearer view of

the daily work of a Mission Establishment. And finally should he not be too fatigued by the time, we would like to introduce him to a native Presbyterian congregation, and specially to one of the most prominent characters in the Mission history of Egypt.

We begin then with a general view of Christian work.

The land of Egypt is divided into three districts: Lower Egypt, or the Delta, of which Alexandria is the chief city; Middle Egypt, of which Cairo is the metropolis, and Upper Egypt, of which Osiout is the capital.

Alexandria, to begin with it as the first town the visitor enters, is scarcely at all an Eastern city. Of its 200,000 inhabitants, one half are European, comprising representatives of every nation in Europe, with additions from almost every other country in the world. In the central part of the city may be counted the flags of every nationality of the West as they float above the various consular residences, and if one has but eyes to see, and ears to discriminate, he may in a few walks round the town and harbor see the men and hear the tongues of some thirty or forty different peoples. Greeks and Italians are the most numerous. There are large numbers of French, many Maltese, and a few English, Scotch, and Irish. Then come Spaniards, and Portuguese, Russians, Poles, and Germans, Swedes and Norwegians. From the backwoods and prairies of America, as from the far East of China and Japan, the motley group is swollen to the number of the hundred thousand, and within the narrow limits of a small city "double double toil and trouble," as incongruous and as venomous a collection as bubbled in the witches' caldron to the weird music of these words. And any one who knows any thing of modern Greeks, Maltese, and Italians will not be surprised to learn that the city is not more conspicuous for the varied character of its people than for its wickedness, immorality, rottenness, and utter godlessness, without even taking into account that the men who find their way thither are generally speaking the worst possible representatives of their countrymen.

For the religious instruction of these masses the means are very limited. In respect to education and educational insti-

tutions there is no lack. Schools there are in galore of all kinds and classes. There are Greek schools, Italian colleges, French seminaries, German gymnasia, schools exclusively for Europeans, others solely for the speakers of Arabic, schools secular, and schools religious, Christian and Moslem—good, bad, and indifferent. In almost all, except of course the Mohammedan places, the great and all prevailing characteristic is the attention given to modern languages. Writing and account-keeping, in short the elements of a commercial education, are also taught in most of the seminaries, while history, geography, and such branches are almost, if not wholly, lost sight of in the haste and thirst for the acquisition of languages.

And not only are there the means of secular education, there is also no want of the accessories of religious worship. The Roman Catholics, the Greek Catholics, the Greek Church, the Armenians, the Copts, all have their churches and chapels in abundance, but unfortunately many churches do not imply a multitude of saints; and religion is indeed as low as can be. No, the people there have no time for such things, cannot be troubled with them, or do not believe in them; and if any attend church they either are, or are regarded as, women and children. Feast days, are of course an exception, but then they are festivals both in and out of the churches, holydays in the double sense. If one wishes to compound for his sins by going to church on such occasions there is a grand pageant to relieve the burden; more commonly he will seek to forget them by making up a gay party to the country or helping out the festivities at home. And it need scarcely be added that the Sabbath is little known as a day of rest, and still less as a day of worship—a statement which applies almost as fully to English and Scottish mercantile houses as to the Continental residents whom the foregoing remarks chiefly regard. Every year, too, seems to be making matters worse. Formerly there were a few houses in the square whose closed doors and covered windows marked the first day of the week, but latterly, and especially since the new Indian postal contract came into force, even this remnant of the old country has passed away, and now clerks and business men seem busier on Sabbath morn-

ings than on any other, taking advantage of the last moment before the departure of the weekly mail for England. Nor are the mail steamers the only ones which leave on that day, merchant steamers also take their departure on the Sabbath if ready, and if not ready they work their hands as busily as if Sabbath was unknown; and worse still, this line of action is reacting on England, and steamers now leave Liverpool for Alexandria every Sabbath morning.

Protestant effort in Alexandria emanates from three special centres. There is the Episcopal Church for the English residents of that communion, the Scottish Presbyterian Church for dissenters, and the American Mission Establishment for all and sundry, but specially the Arabic-speaking population. Then there is an agency of a Swiss mission, and two or three schools for natives, presided over and conducted by Protestants.

The work of the Scottish Presbyterian Church began in 1858, as a branch of the Church of Scotland's Mission to the Jews, but the missionary having been appointed Consular Chaplain, his chief energies have since been given to the dissenting population, and very largely to that portion of it connected with the shipping. From the migratory character of the people, fruits of such labor are very little seen, but there has been, in many respects, considerable encouragement. The town congregation for the most part consists of English Independents and a few Scottish Presbyterians, although their numbers are not what they ought to be. The blight of the city appears to fall on all who enter it, and even the Scotch, with all their home training, seem to care less than many others for religious ordinances.

Last year a handsome church was erected for the congregation, with commodious school-rooms attached, and there is a prospect of a vigorous work, both of a religious and educational character, being now carried on for the reclamation of the many who are living without God and without hope in the world. The missionary, the Rev. Dr. Yule, has wrought indefatigably in these past years, and now that his work is assuming something like definite shape, every one must pray that success may attend his labors.

Passing over the Mission Establishment of the American Church, and taking a run up to Cairo, which can now be done by express train in about four hours, we find ourselves in a purely Eastern city. There are still Europeans to be found, but they are in a marked minority, and almost look out of place. There is one street which has an Italian or French air about it, but all besides is characterized by the Eastern height of the houses, narrowness of the streets, and filth of the roads in which all sorts of characters pass and repass, sometimes with great enough difficulty, as when a string of camels is met loaded with immense trusses of clover or chopped straw on both sides. But we must resist the temptation of dwelling upon the first impressions of the visitor to Cairo, and restrict ourselves to the spiritual aspects of the country. In population Cairo is estimated to be well nigh equal to Glasgow; and of its four hundred thousand inhabitants, the great mass is Mohammedan. The Copts are more numerous here than in any other town, while there are small sections of Greek and Roman Catholics, and the other sects already mentioned, and the remarks made of their co-religionists in Alexandria hold equally good here in Cairo.

Of Protestant establishments there was formerly in Cairo the head-quarters of a mission established by the Church Missionary Society of England, but it ceased to exist several years ago, and the only institution now directly supported by English money is an educational seminary presided over by a lady—Miss Whately, daughter of the late Archbishop of Dublin. Here a boys and girls' school for Moslems and Christians indiscriminately is carried on with great energy, nearly one hundred and fifty of the former, and over fifty of the latter being in daily attendance, while by the distribution of books and other humble labors of one or two lay agents a considerable amount of religious and moral light is disseminated.

But the institution in Egypt which is doing the work of the Gospel on the largest and most thorough-going scale is the American Mission as it is called. Commenced some twelve years ago by the settlement in Cairo of a single missionary, who confined his instructions to those whom he could gather into his own house, it was gradually extended till now it has to a

greater or less extent overspread the whole land. In all the chief towns, such as Alexandria, Cairo, Mansoura, Osiout, missionaries have been stationed, schools have been organized, the gospel preached, and the Scriptures circulated. And not to these towns alone have their labors been confined, but taking them as their bases of operations, the missionaries have extended their work to the whole district of country lying around, while periodically journeys have been undertaken to those outlying parts of the country, otherwise inaccessible, for the sake of preaching and circulating the Word. The progress of the mission has been gradual, but to all appearance it has been sound and sure; and although the fruits that can be shown may be small for the labor expended, yet they have been as great as in any other field, while in many instances there are indications that when they do begin to come the results will be surprisingly abundant. As in reclaiming marshy or boggy land soil has to be cast in, load after load, day after day, week after week, before any progress seems to be made, so in such a land as Egypt the missionary has to labor on, earnestly and faithfully, oftentimes it may be with drooping hopes and aching heart, beaten off, perhaps, for a season by the opposition of enemies or the callousness of friends, yet returning again and again to the charge, working in faith and not walking by sight till it may be he is taken to his rest, and thereby transferred to a stand-point where his labors and their fruits stand out in a different light and truer relations; or perhaps he is startled by some work of revival starting up in places little expected, and sees in a few weeks, or even days, more than repays him for his years of toil. Such has been the actual experience of more than one missionary in Egypt.

The mission as such was established and has been wrought and supported by the United Presbyterian Church of North America, although in more instances than one the liberality of the churches in Scotland and Christians in England, has been laid under contribution for its assistance. At the present time there is a force of eight ordained missionaries stationed at different parts of the country, and associated with them are three female missionaries. In and for the schools which have hitherto formed a prominent part in the mission work, teach-

ers have been trained from the youth of the land, and now there are eighteen male and fifteen female preceptors, many of them accomplished and apt to teach; while proceeding in the same way with regard to the supply of the pulpits the missionaries have been training young men in general and theological education and pastoral duties so that now there are eight native probationers, or preaching assistants. One has even been called, ordained, and settled over a congregation which has been completely organized with its staff of elders and deacons. Another agency, and one which is likely to be abundantly instrumental, is the printing establishment which has been set up in Cairo. In Arabic there is or was only a few years ago absolutely no Christian literature. Previously to this century there was no demand for it; since reading was an accomplishment little cultivated by the Christians. Now however that an educated youth are growing up, it is necessary that books both of an educational and religious character be provided for their perusal; and accordingly the Mission Presbytery has delegated one of its number to give his whole strength to the work of preparing and editing materials for and generally superintending the work of book printing.

As has been said, the schools have all along formed one of the most prominent departments of the Mission work in Egypt. At each of the stations a school for boys and one or more—as in Cairo—for girls were opened at the outset, and while a good, thorough, education in their own language was imparted, and where desired classes formed for Italian, French, or English, the resident missionary has always devoted a certain time every day to religious instruction, while exercising a general superintendence over the whole work of the school. In this way within the last ten years thousands of boys and girls have come into possession of a fair and in many cases a very superior education, and if the number of conversions or additions to church membership has not been so great as might have been hoped for, it cannot be doubted that the foundation has been laid for an immense improvement in the condition of the modern Egyptians. In point of fact the great majority of the clerks in the government offices, rail-

way stations, and telegraph offices have received more or less of their training in these mission schools; and one reason why so little outcome has been shown by the schools in the way of church members is the great inducements offered to well-educated youths to enter these establishments, while again their entrance, involving as it does the breaking of the Sabbath, is an effectual bar to their attending church. There are many other features connected with these schools which, did space permit, might detain us both pleasantly and profitably. The contrast presented by the children, trained to habits of order, attention, and thoughtful study, light hearted all the while and enjoying their attendance upon school no less than the play outside, to their fellows, who are deprived of these privileges, running about, dirty and ill mannered, rude and ignorant, real "city Arabs" in more than name;—the interest with which an English or American stranger on passing the school building listens to the air of Happy Land or the tune of Old Hundred, and his surprise on entering at finding every word unintelligible as if it were Arabic, which indeed it is;—and the immense advancement in liberality of view indicated by the attendance at school of hundreds of native girls both Moslem and Christians—are a few of these points, and there are a host behind. Recurring for a moment to this last—the attendance of the girls—it is only necessary, to show that things *are* advancing in Egypt, to say that a few years ago a mother or father would almost as soon have cast a daughter into the river as permitted her to attend school. If she were pretty or clever she would use her acquisitions of reading and writing for carrying on love intrigues—if stupid or plain, the answer was—"What, my girl—go to school! as well send the donkey there!" and so much is this changed that girls of every class are now found in the schools, and not only so but their parents are willing to pay for their education.

With regard to Mission work proper it may be said generally, that there have been five congregations formed with a membership of about a hundred and fifty and an average attendance at worship of double that number; and for more particular reference I may be permitted to quote an extract from a letter written when in the land with reference to the

church at Alexandria. "In the church," the letter proceeds, "service is conducted twice every Sabbath in Arabic, of course according to Presbyterian ritual, to a congregation averaging from thirty to fifty, male and female, and made up for the most part of Syrians, some Armenians, and a few Copts. The membership now numbers twenty-five, the great majority of whom have come over from one or other of the corrupt churches of the East. And small though the numbers be, it may without any fear of contradiction be affirmed that there is more spiritual life and Christian activity in this little community, than in many congregations at home many times as large. A prayer meeting is held twice a week in the houses of certain of the members, who almost all make it a point of conscience to attend, and in the services of which, presided over and guided by the missionary, every one of the attendants, no matter what his station or his learning or ignorance may be, cheerfully, humbly, and earnestly takes part. Nor is their religiousness exhausted in the words of their devotions; the grace of giving to charitable and congregational objects is as conspicuous as their gift of prayer. Certainly though it be quiet and little heard or made of, a good work is here going on, and though the difficulties be great and the discouragements endless in variety and number, one which let us hope to be destined to accomplish great things."

The reader it is hoped will now have some idea of the nature and extent of the work going on for the regeneration of the Egyptian Church—and now we shall pass on to the second division of the subject. Hitherto we have been vibrating between Alexandria and Cairo, in most of the remarks we have been making, although the numbers given include the whole country; but now we shall take advantage of the winter weather to hurry away to the South, with its cloudless sky and rainless atmosphere. It would be too tedious to take the reader all the way by river boat, although if he had the time to spend he would much enjoy its quiet and varied manner of living, with its equally strange and varied scenes. We must forego all that, and by the help of imagination make a single leap from the metropolis Cairo to Osiout the capital of the upper country. Before settling down here, however, there are

one or two things that may be worth saying about the people of this region.

For, in several important features, the Christians of this district differ from their fellow-countrymen in the north—many of them, features of disadvantage, but some of favor, the principle of compensation being here, as elsewhere in the world, pretty clearly manifested. In one respect indeed, the balance is all against them, inasmuch as they have suffered in past ages, and are still, to some extent, liable to suffer peculiarly oppressive treatment at the hands of intermediate officers of the government, such as magistrates, sheikhs, tax-collectors, &c., whose distance from the capital renders them almost irresponsible. The same cause—their inland position—has prevented them from experiencing, at least so soon, the beneficial influences which have followed the influx of European life, although perhaps they have thus lost less than they have gained in having so far escaped the contamination of Frank vices. Again, they may be more ignorant, but they are less sophisticated and more tractable; they will treat a stranger with respect, and give to his story an attentive ear, although the advantage which might thus be experienced by the missionary is somewhat counteracted by the greater fear of ecclesiastical wrath which proceeds from the same simplicity of character. And in these country districts they are much more at the mercy of the priesthood than they are in the larger towns of the north. An Episcopal excommunication presents here almost only the one prospect of exile or death by starvation. Take for instance, the case of a man in a village of which say one-half the inhabitants are Christians. He is excommunicated. His fellow-Christians will have no dealings with him, and the Moslem dealers will only serve him so long as his money lasts. More money he cannot get, for employment is not to be had, being refused by the Christian on the ground of the curse over his head, and by the Moslem, who is not likely to employ an “Infidel” so long as a believer can be had. Even this might be fought against, and fought down by a people of any energy or resource; but when regard is paid to the long centuries in which the Copts have been trodden under the iron heel of the oppressor, it

ceases to be strange, that rather than encounter the sufferings and sacrifice which the opposition of the priesthood would entail, they are contented either to close their eyes to the new light altogether, or compromise the matter by opening to it the one while closing the other to the corruption and errors of their church and clergy.

In the towns, the character of the people is very much the same as that found in the cities of the north. If there is any difference, it is that they are more wedded to the ways and thoughts of the past. The old plea is constantly in their mouths:—"This Protestantism," they say, "what is it but a thing of yesterday? whereas our church goes back to the beginning of time." They are also more under the power of the priests, as they are perhaps more at their mercy. For in the towns the consequences of priestly enmity are quite as dreadful in their eyes as those to which reference has just been made. Not only can the ecclesiastical sword—which perhaps is blunt enough, and in itself sufficiently innocent—be held over their heads, but the temporal arm too can be used to follow up the stroke, and though the connection between the two is scarcely if ever acknowledged—for that would be much too open for Eastern taste—it is not the less close and causal. Indeed, the more the position of the parties is considered, the greater will appear to be the power in the hands of the church over its members. The Copts are all subjects of the government, and wholly at its disposal. And so when one of them displeases his ecclesiastical chiefs in a manner sufficiently heinous, the latter have nothing more nor less to do than submit his name to the government authorities, and the poor man is made to pay the penalty of his transgression on the first opportunity. If he is not actually in the service of the government, his name is sure to be included in the first draft of men for the railway or canal works, or the army; and if a government servant, he is either dismissed on some flimsy pretext, or selected for service so distant or dangerous, that his election is tantamount to banishment, or even death. And in all this they have a ready answer to any complaint that may be made on behalf of the victim by the missionary or his consul: "Why," says the magistrate, "these men are our

servants, and subjects, and who are you, to interfere between us?"

Or, the church may work the government power in yet another way. The scribes, who are certainly the worst class of Copts, trained as they are from their youth in all kinds of deceit and intrigue, overreaching and lying, invariably take the side of the church, and when any case in which a Protestant is concerned, comes before the court in which they officiate, judgment is sure sooner or later to go against him. They have even been known to turn a Mudeer (or Sheriff) from being decidedly favorable to a Protestant plaintiff, right round to indignant denunciation, and by means of forged documents and prepared witnesses, succeeded, if not in obtaining a judgment of acquittal for the Coptic defenders, at least in shelving the case altogether.

They got the magistrate to take the case (as a Scotchman would say) to *avizandum*, and took good care that it never got back!

If, therefore, the provinces of the South offered some advantages to the Christian worker, and in some respects hold out prospects of success, they present also their own difficulties and drawbacks. To be sure there are in the towns men of sufficient position and wealth to command freedom of religious thought and action for themselves, but even they cannot do so without difficulty, and in many cases considerable sacrifice. We must not, however, go further in these general remarks, but shall now ask the reader to settle down for a little while in the capital of the district.

Osiout is decidedly lovely for situation, that is to say, for an Egyptian city. The ground on which it stands is, indeed, as level as the rest of the country, but the site is in the bosom of the Libyan range of hills which here rise to a considerable height, and make a sweep inward toward the river. The houses and streets still bear some traces, in their greater substantiality and openness, of the days when the Mamlooks made the city their retreat, and the suburbs in seed-time and harvest surpass any thing else of the kind in Egypt. The view from the mountain behind, is one of the few to be had in the land. The plain below for miles on either side is

level as a floor; but innocent as it is of hedges or dikes, the color of the different patches, varied yet ever recurring, gives it the appearance of a floor richly and profusely carpeted. Away in the distance stretch the Arabian mountains, the eastern bulwark of the country; near at hand is the town with its fifteen or sixteen minarets, so delicate, plain, and tall as to appear solely intended for so many finger-posts to the clear heaven above, and its houses of dark brown brick, of which the dirt is covered by the distance; here and there a grove of palms, or a pleasure garden; while, as if to complete the picture, the river flows in the mid distance, a mile and a half from the town, in a course as winding as that of the Meander itself. And the desired elements of warmth and life are abundantly afforded by the bright unclouded sun overhead, and the motley groups of busy laborers in the fields beneath.

In another respect the city is peculiar, at least among the towns of Egypt, inasmuch, viz.: as it possesses a thoroughly Oriental "Gate," and there are few things more pleasing to the traveller on his first riding up from the river, than the appearance of the entrance. Unprepared for any thing new he is first gratified by the shade of the tall large trees which line the road for a considerable distance, and then as he enters the wide gateway, and sees on either side what appear to be offices, with stone seats along the wall, and a continual thoroughfare between the various departments, a few Turks being conspicuous by their costlier, Frankish dresses, while the majority are Copts, unmistakable from their lank figures and dark habiliments, the idea gradually takes form in his mind, and probably finds expression: "Surely this is *a gate*." And if he have occasion often to pass out and in he may see the magistrate seated on a chair in the midst of the court-yard, surrounded by clients of all sorts and sizes, and such other features as forcibly to remind him of "the elders sitting in the gate." But, alas, with what a difference from those days—past or future—when the walls can be said to be salvation and the gates praise.

The town is also notable in an historical point of view. Dating from the days of hoary antiquity when wolves were honored as tutelary deities—as its ancient name Lycopolis suggests—it is noted in church history as the birthplace of

Plotinus, the most eminent representative of Neo-Platonism in the Alexandrian school, in that period when Eastern intellect seems to have made its last bright flicker before its almost final extinction. Alexander, the earliest literary opponent of Manicheism, and Meletius, famous for the schism which he headed, gave Osiout a certain notoriety by having occupied its episcopal chair, while from this town came forth that worthy old veteran, Paphnutius by name, who with many a scar and more than one disabled limb, telling of his sufferings under heathen persecution, rose up in the Council of Nicea, and single handed fought a successful battle against those who would have had celibacy a compulsory yoke upon the priesthood. In these palmy days the see of Osiout was second in extent or importance only to that of Alexandria itself.

Those bright days, however, have long since departed, and it is almost beyond the power of hope itself to expect that they shall ever return. For years the Christian church, which numbers about 5000 adherents, being about an eighth of the inhabitants, has had the reputation of being spiritually dead and morally corrupt, almost hopelessly so; and were it not that dry bones have been made to live, even Christian enterprise must have recoiled from the attempt at its purification and resuscitation. All that has been said of the hardness and careless bigotry of the people, and the ignorance, oppression, and unscrupulousness of the priesthood, finds here abundant illustration. Still in the district around, villages of various sizes rise in considerable number, and though the light of divine truth should not enter a single soul of the inhabitants of the town itself, from the presence and labors there of the Christian missionary, yet the good that may flow forth by the many open channels to the country around, more than warrants the selection of Osiout as a centre of evangelistic operations. Much more than that is of course to be expected, and although the Gospel messenger may have to "grieve his righteous soul," it may be for many days, yet the regular, earnest, vigorous proclamation of the truth, in word and in life, must, we would almost say, necessarily produce palpable fruit.

The mission here has been in operation for somewhat more

than three years, having been opened in February, 1865, by the Rev. Mr. Hogg,—a Scotchman, an alumnus of Edinburgh University, and a licentiate of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland,—who for the purpose removed from Cairo, where he had been doing yeoman service, and, although with some interruptions, caused by impaired health and exhausted strength, has been carried on with more or less vigor since that time. Visited several times in previous years by the missionaries, in their evangelistic and colporteur itinerancies in the Nile valley, the ground had been, to some little extent, prepared, and the character of the new-comers, and the object of their settlement, was at first so far approved by the people, that for several Sabbaths the little church proved much too small for the accommodation of those who came to the services. And although curiosity may have been the main cause of attendance in many cases, yet such a number seemed to hear the word gladly, and even to give expression to their newly-awakened feelings in tears, that it almost seemed as if Osiout were about signally to redeem its reputation. The hope, however, was doomed to a short life. The ban of the Patriarch went forth, and as a consequence the mission church was deserted. A boys' school had been opened with equally encouraging success, and the attempt was also made to frustrate the good work in this direction. The means, however, were much more legitimate, at least in the first instance, having been confined to the opening of a school of their own by the church party. And though the opposition was so far successful that it took away the best, yea, almost all the boys who had been enrolled in the mission institution, yet as their places were immediately filled by peasant boys from the surrounding district, and as the teacher sent by the Patriarch to his school was a Protestant, and had received much of his training at the hands of the American missionaries themselves in Cairo, there was little cause for regret, but rather much room for satisfaction. And as the sounds of the Patriarchal thunder died away in the distance, the people of the town began to drop into the mission-house for conversation with the missionary on matters of religion, and to the services on the Sabbath; and although few had the spirit to declare openly for the new

faith, the hope of doing good in the city revived. How far it has been realized, and to what extent our description of this people is justified, may be inferred from the fact that notwithstanding efforts—the earnestness and vigor of which will be abundantly apparent before we have done—the number of citizens who have publicly professed their adoption of the religion of the Gospel, by sitting down at the Lord's table, is—one! In January last the membership of the mission church amounted to twenty-one, comprising seven families, and, with one or two exceptions transferred from the other stations, all were from the villages around. At the same time, evidence is every day showing itself that there is many a Nicodemus in the city, and there is very little doubt that were the way less obstructed by clerical curses, fortified by the power of the ruling authorities, no small number would range themselves under the standard of the Gospel.\*

In 1867 renewed attempts were made to break up the mission in Osiont, which were to some extent successful. Even after the opening of the Coptic school, that of the mission had enjoyed an attendance of between sixty and seventy pupils, but now the adverse attitude assumed by the government, and the virtual protection granted to the Coptic school, viz., in exempting its pupils from the conscription, drove away almost all the boys, so that during the winter the attendance did not average much, if any, above twenty. It was sad to see the machinery fitted for a large school employed on such limited numbers, and yet, if the reader will allow himself to be transferred for a day to the mission-house he will be abundantly satisfied that the work there carried on is, notwithstanding all drawbacks, both extensive and gratifying. In such a case he would scarcely have finished breakfast when the sound of first one bell, then of two smaller, would lead him to

\* Those who read the church papers will have observed that last summer (that of 1868) a very important work of revival went on in this town. When hope itself had been almost abandoned, and the human prospect seemed dark in the extreme, then the Divine Spirit seems to have taken up the work, and meetings for reading the Scriptures and prayer became the order of the night. On an average seventy and eighty people attended these meetings, although some were much more largely attended; the priests even were drawn into the stream, and the Coptic church made the place of meeting.

the window to see a number of young men taking their seats in an upper room, boys hurrying to the school-rooms below, and several girls slipping into an apartment of their own. These are the pupils respectively of the theological seminary, and the boys and girls' schools. Let us enter the first. Mr. Hogg, who is president, professor, and tutor, all in one, is in his seat, prayer is offered by one of the students, the roll called, and the work begins. The language is of course Arabic, and therefore you will scarcely understand it, but if you ask your interpreter afterward he will tell you that that man uses this difficult speech with the accuracy of a sheikh, the plainness of the people, and the perspicuity of a Scotchman, while if you know any thing of teaching you will not require any one to tell you that he has both plenty of materials and knows how to communicate them. You will wait in vain for "the lecture" of our Western halls of theology, so good but so weighty, so true but so old—but you will see the handling of a subject by a teacher who is resolved to make his audience understand it, and on the other hand the attention of students who are equally determined to be at the root of the matter in hand. You will notice no want of respect, but the absence of stiffness and formality will attract your attention—some of the pupils not hesitating to solicit an explanation of a passing difficulty and the preceptor as readily interrupting his prelection to satisfy himself by examination that he has so far been followed. And so the work will go on before you, in one department after another, through the avenues of Apologetics, and the Evidences, into the halls of Systematic Theology, as developed in the Bible History, or in the side walks of Hebrew reading and grammar—the last and not least important hour being occupied in the wide fields of their own—the Arabic language. For three and four hours a day, five days in the week, you may see this going on, and were it not for what is yet to come, you would wonder how any one man could even attempt, much less carry on such a work. I have seen a good deal of hard work in various departments, and many instances of the *perfervidum ingenium Scotorum*, but certainly what came under our notice in the mission-house of Osiont crowned our experience in this direction.

Simultaneously with the theological classes the boys and girls' schools have been going on, and from nine o'clock till five in the afternoon, with an interval in the heat of the day, the usual routine of elementary instruction is followed, prominence being given in both to religious instruction—the Bible being here, as we have seen it in the other schools, one of the chief text-books.\* In the girls' school the afternoon is largely devoted to sewing, knitting, and work of that kind.

In the evening, shortly after dark, the bell rings again, and a class of adults assembles, who are taught, according to their advancement, in reading and arithmetic.

An hour afterward the labors of a busy day are brought to a close by a meeting for prayer and exposition of the Scriptures. Mr. Hogg, who, by the way, has as likely as not been engaged most of the afternoon with visitors from the town or country around, presides, and when you see the attention of the audience, which often number forty men and boys, and rarely less than twenty, including the school-boys and students, but with a sprinkling of outsiders from the town, you scarcely wonder at the fulness of the exposition or the earnestness of the whole services. Indeed, you would sometimes be inclined to feel that for this meeting alone it were worth keeping up the mission establishment.

On Saturday there is a partial respite from labor; but on Sabbath the work of the Gospel goes on anew—service in church in the morning, Sabbath-schools in the afternoon, the meeting for prayer in the evening.

Your brief visit will thus have given you some idea of the work carried on here, although, if you could spend weeks or months in the midst of it, or in its neighborhood, you would leave, not only admiring the beauty of human power and talent, wholly devoted to a good cause, and convinced that, in the very nature of things, such labor cannot be altogether fruitless, but also with a deeper sympathy with missionary life, be-

\* That this is as much at the desire of the boys themselves, as dictated by missionary principles, is curiously illustrated by the words of a youngster, who, in complaining of some little ill-treatment he had received at the hands of one of the men about the house, concluded thus: "We have come here to learn about our Lord Jesus Christ, and is this the way we are to be used?"

cause a fuller knowledge of missionary trials. Mention has just been made of a class for adults. When this was opened, ten or twelve men at once joined, and entered into its work with equal delight and earnestness; but many nights had not elapsed when the never-failing "curse" drove them to desertion, all save three or four. And so at every step, this priestcraft interposes its blasting influence, and one scarcely knows whether to be more indignant at the men who exercise it, than impatient with those who are its subjects.

Were this opposition to Protestantism on the part of the church accompanied with any thing like positive effort to improve the condition of its members, or to reform the abuses within its own pale, there would be much less room for complaint; but when one sees the corruptions which have been growing for ages continuing unheeded, and the ignorance and degradation of the priesthood perpetuating themselves by natural generation, the difficulty is to restrain indignation within the bounds of propriety. It is true that in Osiout, they have opened a school, and by the favor of the government have overcrowded it with more than three hundred boys; but what then? If presence within the walls of a school-room were education, then this action on the part of the Copts would be matter of sincere gratification; but so long as matters go on as they were last year, the only fit illustration of their conduct is the fable of the cur among the hay. For what single teacher could cope with such a number of pupils, even were he willing to try? And what must be the condition of the many, when special attention to the few is dictated to the teacher both by interest and taste? In point of fact, the boys of the towns-people receive a fair education in the languages, but as for the rest, misrule and confusion reign supreme in the midst of them, and an occasional lesson in repeating portions of the Scriptures used in the services is the amount of their instruction. Indeed, were it not for the exemption from the government levies which attendance implies, the school would be half-emptied in a week, or rather, would never have been so filled.

As for the priests and their work, the writer had not sufficient intercourse with them to be able to detail how they

fill up their time, and considering their number—somewhere from twelve to fifteen—the narrative would probably, at any rate, be more tedious than edifying. The duties incumbent on them may however give some conception of their occupation and influence. The chief, of course, is the performance of the church service, a work entirely mechanical, even in respect to the recitation of the Scriptures or liturgy—the language being Coptic, no single word of which they understand—and the administration of the sacraments. The performance of masses for the dead, the services at funerals, and notably attendance in the houses where death has been, three days after the event, for the purpose of driving away the spirit—or ghost—which is then believed to return to its old habitation, and to be unwilling to leave it even for the realms of the blessed, and visitation of the church-yard at stated times to burn incense for the souls of the departed—are some of the official work which comes in to fill up the week-days, while the intervals are generally spent in begging visits among the flock, settling or inciting quarrels, and listening to gossip, the whole being performed under the—as the case may be—stimulating or soothing, strengthening or subduing influences of the arrack bottle.

And the bishop—for now as of old, Osiont is a bishopric—what of him? Originally a monk, he is of course still a bachelor. Small in body, he is equally weak in mind. All the attention he can afford for things outside, is devoted to the affairs of his extensive house property—in which the money his simple ways enable him to save from the contributions of his flock and fees of his office, is invested—the diocese and its management being left virtually, if not actually, in the hands of his factotum, the arch-priest, and his days and nights are spent in copying books. In this work he has attained great perfection, and displays wonderful taste, although it is stated as a fact that of many of the books on which he has labored for weeks and months he has not known a single word—this ignorance being mentioned, not as detracting from his reputation, but actually as a proof of his great ability and proficiency in the art of copying.

A very simple man is this bishop. Taken with sickness on

one occasion, he ate heartily of some cakes, rich with butter and sugar, which one of the daughters of his flock had brought to the house, and strange enough recovered forthwith. Stranger still however,—*post hoc ergo propter hoc*,—the eating of such cakes was at once adopted by him as an unfailing panacea for all the ills of Coptic flesh,—and no one could after that say a word of sickness,—no matter what—from small pox to typhus fever—without receiving this prescription. Another story is told of his simplicity. A member of his church presented him on a certain feast day with a piece of money in gold. “Only one piece and one so small,” was the ungracious reply. On the next feast day, which was not long in coming round, the same member brought the same amount, but this time in silver pieces, small in value and consequently considerable in number, and the thanks and benedictions which he received were as numerous and unctuous as before they had been scanty! We say again,—a very simple man, and one who, if he does little good, cannot do much positive harm.

There is something amusing in these things in themselves, but, alas, how saddening do they become in view of the masses around, so sunk as scarcely to know their degradation. There are, we have said, five thousand souls in Osiout calling themselves Christians, and this is the food on which they languish. There are many villages in the district around, some of them wholly Christians, and among them a large number of priests, all of them, with scarcely an exception, of the character already described. Is it strange then that a man, as enthusiastic as the Osiout missionary, should labor so much almost beyond human strength to disseminate the light of the Gospel, and especially train up an educated band of evangelists, or that the appeal should occasionally be heard in these Western regions for assistance in that work. That there is a crying necessity for instruction has surely been abundantly manifested,—that there is a growing desire for light is evinced in the parting entreaties of villages on being visited by the preachers, and that the providing of a native pastorate, is the only effectual way of meeting this want and gratifying this longing might easily be shown. In the mean time it is pleasing to be able to state that it is in great part owing to the liberality of Scotland that

the attempt has already been made in this direction. It is true that some years ago a class had been formed for the instruction of those whom it was thought desirable to prepare for the work of the ministry, but it was only in the spring of 1867, after Mr. Hogg's return from Scotland with subscriptions in his pocket to the amount of £500, given for the training of native preachers, that a theological seminary was formally opened, and the knowledge of this fact will be a sufficient excuse for giving a few details regarding it.

During the session of last winter, in which the writer had abundant opportunities of seeing and becoming acquainted with its working, there were fifteen students in attendance, forming a senior and a junior class. In the first were two men who had been monks in the Coptic Church; another had originally been also a Coptic monk, and afterward went over to the Roman Catholics, finally finding a settlement of his difficulties in the Protestant faith; a fourth, the brother of the last, had been parish priest of his village; a fifth had been a scribe; and four or five others much younger, and who had received considerable preliminary training in the mission schools, complete the section. The junior class again consists of still younger pupils, who are thus gradually being prepared for taking the places of their seniors by a thorough grounding in the history and prominent doctrines of revelation. In addition to these there is a number of young men, more or less advanced in their studies for the church, whom the exigencies of the field prevented attending during the winter, by requiring their services at other stations, but who are always carrying on their work of preparation under the eye of the missionary whose assistants they may be. In point of ability there is of course considerable difference among the students, and it is not surprising that even the best of them do not come up to the attendants at our colleges here. Habits of study are foreign to the national temperament, and in the case of those who have been monks, the great wonder is that after half a life-time of absolute inactivity of mind they have any aptitude at all for receiving instruction. To make scholars of such men would be an attempt as injudicious, as it must necessarily be futile, and

even were it likely to succeed it is very little desirable. Incomparably more important is it that they should be strong in the power of the Spirit, and fully equipped with the Divine Word, and it must therefore be a source of satisfaction to all concerned in the progress of the work that these men, old and young, display an amount of practical Christianity, and receive whatever tends to elucidate the Scriptures with an avidity which is too little seen nearer home. Suffering and sacrifice for conscience sake have in more than one case, at once tried and strengthened their character in this direction, and with the knowledge which their personal experience, and their thorough acquaintance with the wants of the people, much good may be expected from their future labors—conducted and regulated as these must for a time at least be under the eye of a missionary.

We therefore pass on from Osiout and its mission establishment, with a fervent prayer for the success of its works of faith and labors of love, the confident hope that if sufficiently supported, this theological seminary is destined to prove in a large measure, the channel of Egypt's regeneration, and the earnest recommendation of its interests to the continued attention, and even increased assistance of those who have already very tangibly declared themselves its friends. The third and final division of the subject respecting Upper Egypt will be deferred to another number.

---

ART. IV.—*Parables of the Kingdom.*—Matt. XIII.

It is remarkable that the author of Christianity does not appear to have made use of parables in his public instructions, till the second year of his ministry had considerably advanced. If the parables in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew are not the very first, they are certainly among the earliest examples of this method of instruction, as adopted by him. This seems to be made evident by the question which they drew forth from his disciples, "Why speakest thou unto them in para-

bles?" And the answer to that question, at the same time, seems to prove, that it was the great design of his parabolic teaching to initiate those to whom he was about to commit the work of establishing his kingdom, into what he styles "the mystery of the kingdom of God,"\* or to instruct them in its higher aspects. These parables, therefore, afford a fine illustration of the richness of that instruction by which the Apostles were trained and prepared for their work. Although they are often spoken of as unlearned fishermen, and in fact knew little of the culture of the schools, they were very far from being unfurnished men. Never had men such teaching before, or since.

The series of parables, recorded in this chapter, all belong to the same course of instruction, although three of them were addressed privately to his disciples, and all have reference to the same great subject,—the church or kingdom of God. They exhibit that kingdom in its varying phases, or according to its different degrees of development, from its foundation to its consummation. Accordingly, they are to a large extent prophetic; but, like many prophecies, they stand connected with the times and ministry of him by whom they were uttered, and have a continuous fulfilment in every age, to the time of the very end. The first depicts the kingdom in its universally difficult foundation. The second the intermixture of evil with good in it, and suggests the discipline or government suited to this necessarily imperfect state of things. The third depicts the extension in the world of this kingdom. The fourth a corresponding or simultaneous internal development or growth of spiritual life. Of the three addressed to the disciples privately, in the first, as if he would have them understand more fully "the mystery of the kingdom," the secret of his great interest in this lost world, our Saviour represents the kingdom to be gathered out of it as treasure hid in a field, for the sake of which a man buys the field itself. In the second, we have that kingdom no longer in mystery, but presented as developed in organic unity, under the figure of a costly pearl, and the great price paid for it. And in the last,

\* Mark iv. 11.

we have it, without spot or flaw, in its purification, perfection, and glorious consummation. Or to express the same more succinctly, we have in this series of parables: 1. The foundation; 2. The government, or discipline; 3. The extension; 4. The spiritual growth; 5. The preciousness; 6. The purchase; and 7. The final perfection of the kingdom of God.

#### THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER.

We have, first, the foundation or establishment of the kingdom, notwithstanding the utter failure of that word, which is the seed of the kingdom, in many instances, and its varying success in others. The effect of the word on some may be no greater than that of the seed, which falls on the hard, beaten road, which runs through, or along the side of the wheat-field, which is speedily gathered up by the birds; and its effect on others may be no better than that of the seed which falls on the thin layer of mould which just covers from sight the rocky strata, from which the moisture is soon exhaled, and the roots cannot strike deeper to find it; and, on others still, no better than that which falls on ground filled with the roots of thorns ready to spring up again, and out-grow, and choke the wheat. Yet the establishment of the kingdom cannot be defeated, for some of the seed falls into good ground, and brings forth fruit.

We have the first illustration of the establishment of the kingdom, in spite of all these drawbacks, in the ministry of the Saviour himself. A sower is highly figurative of a teacher of truth and preacher of righteousness. As the Author of our holy religion, he is to be set forth as the chief Sower of the seed. He expressly tells us, in the explanation of the second parable, that he that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man. The word as it fell from his lips was pure, uncorrupted seed, but its excellence could not insure its germination, and growth, irrespective of the character of the soil in which it was deposited, and the unpropitious influences of a fallen world. We have, therefore, in this parable, the results of the great Sower's proclamation of his own Gospel; and, so far, it is to be viewed as *historical*. In the multitudes who there stood before him, on the shore and the slopes of the surround-

ing hills, were doubtless to be found representatives of those various classes, who, through his preaching of the word, were brought into a relation to his kingdom. Our Lord's ministry was not altogether fruitless. Some of his hearers could be compared to fruitful ground. We probably fail to appreciate the full number of those, to be found at last, who will look to Jesus Christ alone, not only as the Author, but as the sole Instrument in their salvation. We are not authorized to suppose that the more than five hundred brethren,\* who were made the witnesses of his resurrection, constituted the whole number savingly blessed through his personal ministry. It was thus that the kingdom, or the new economy had its foundation laid, and the visible reign of the Messiah commenced.

But this parable, viewed as *prophetical*, has had, particularly in that part which respects the fruitfulness of the seed, or the success of the Gospel, since the ascension of the Saviour, and the day of pentecost, a much more complete fulfilment. We are not, however, to limit the fulfilment to any particular portion of it. It was clearly designed to prepare the disciples for the results of their ministry,—the frequent failure, in many instances, the inadequate success in others, which might otherwise have been inexplicable and discouraging to them. The fulfilment of this parable constantly repeats itself, not only in the preaching of Apostles, but in that of reformers, missionaries, and the humblest pastors. The record made of the results of Paul's ministry, in the last chapter of Acts, applies to all: "And some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not." As it has ever been from the very inception of the new economy, so we may expect it to continue to be; only we may anticipate less unfruitfulness, or that a greater degree of success will attend the word, as the period draws nigh for the triumph of the kingdom. The time may come, when instead of the apparent failure of three-fourths of the seed, the proportion may be reversed, and only one-quarter, or even less, may fail. And there even may be an intimation, in the numbers employed in the parable,—to express the various degrees of increase of the seed, the thirty, six-

\* 1 Cor. xx. 6.

ty, and a hundred,—that as the kingdom advances toward its consummation, there will be a constant tendency to higher degrees of success and rates of increase, until it settles down into the hundredfold as the permanent or prevailing law. The kingdom is established; and nothing in all the vicissitudes of earth and time, can defeat or postpone its predicted great and glorious end.

#### THE PARABLE OF THE TARES.

The Great Teacher still adheres to the sphere and nature of life immediately around him. But it is not now the ploughed field, with the sower pacing over it, casting everywhere broadly and evenly the same good seed; it is a field of growing or just ripening wheat, in which the good seed grows not by itself alone, tares are there also; something that resembles the wheat, but is useless and hurtful. The great truth which the Saviour sets forth from this is, that his visible kingdom on earth was not to be a perfectly pure society; and that the church cannot be thus pure, until the end come.

The general meaning of the phrase, “the kingdom of God,” or “the kingdom of Heaven,” is the spiritual kingdom of Christ, begun in the church on earth, and consummated in heaven. This general import of the phrase directs to its specific meaning here. It must necessarily be taken in its most enlarged sense, as it applies to the church on earth, in its mixed, imperfect state, represented by the sowing and growth of tares among the wheat, and to the church in heaven, in its purified and exalted state, when the tares shall have been gathered out from among the wheat, leaving a perfectly pure society.

Of this parable, as well as of that of the Sower, we have an authentic interpretation, from the lips of the Lord himself “He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man,” Christ himself. The “field” represents the world of mankind. The wheat or good seed “the children of the kingdom;” *i. e.* real Christians. On the apparent slight disagreement between this parable and the preceding in the use of the same symbol to signify different things [here the good seed being explained to mean *the children of the kingdom*, and in that, *the word of God*], it has been well remarked, that in *that* the word of

God "is considered more absolutely in and by itself, while here, it is considered after it has been received into the heart, incorporated with the man, as that which has brought him into the position of a child of the kingdom, and which is now so vitally united with him that the two cannot any more be considered asunder." \*

That part of the parable in which the servants are described as asking whether they should gather up the tares, with the answer, "Let both grow together until the harvest: and in time of harvest, I will say to the reapers, gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn," is designed to teach, for so it is explained by the Divine Author of the parable, that we are not to expect the church to be a perfectly pure and glorious society, till the Son of Man send forth his angels to "gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity."

The teaching of Christ, in this parable, is specially important in its bearing on the doctrine of the nature of the church. It exposes the error of the ancient Donatists, that the church, in its visible form and historic manifestation, must be one and the same with the true or spiritual body. The visible church embraces with true saints all those who make a credible profession of the true religion, with their children. Its bearing on the discipline of the church, arising from its present mixed imperfect condition, is no less important. No degree of carefulness on the part of the human guardians of the church will secure it against the admission and continued membership of some who make a false profession. As far as the doctrines which are professed are concerned, they may decide, for they have the law and the testimony for their guide. As far as the example is concerned, they may also be able to decide, for they have the precepts and morals of the Gospel for their standard of judgment. But further than this they cannot go. When we speak of the church as *visible* we mean that it is a body of professed believers, an external society, which falls under the notice of our senses. This visibility

\* Trench on the Parables.

consists in an organization as truly external as that of nations to which Christ has given the ministry, laws, ordinances, offices, and terms of communion, that is to say, governors, and rules of government. This government and discipline, it is made evident by this parable, must be conformed to that intermingling of evil with good, which is, for the present, permitted in the divine kingdom.

#### THE MUSTARD SEED.

The parables of the Mustard Seed and Leaven appear to have been spoken for encouragement, to show how the Gospel, despite all losses, hinderances, and drawbacks, will triumph in the end, and fill the world with the promised glory.

In the first of these, that of the Mustard Seed, we have the kingdom of God manifesting and unfolding its power outwardly, and this from the feeblest beginnings. The Mustard Seed was chosen, not because it is literally the smallest of all seeds, but because it was designed to illustrate the single point of expansion; and because of the proportion, or rather disproportion, between the minuteness of the seed, and the greatness of the plant. It grows and becomes not merely a shrub or bush, but a tree, so to speak, of a size and strength sufficient for the birds of the air to lodge in its branches. The kingdom of heaven, the Saviour meant to teach, will, in its increase, be like the growth of this seed. Its future greatness is not to be judged of by its slight beginnings. The Sinapi or oriental mustard is selected, not because it is the greatest among trees, or, strictly speaking, is a tree at all; but because it is the greatest among those vegetable productions, classed as herbs, acquiring such size and strength as to be a sort of tree among ordinary garden plants. Our Saviour did not liken his kingdom, at the beginning, to the acorn from which springs the oak, or the cone, which produces the cedar of Lebanon; he goes rather into the garden for the greatest among plants, than into the mountains or forest, for the lordliest among trees. Even in the Old Testament,\* with all its grandeur of figurative representation, the chosen emblem of

\* Psalm lxxx.

this kingdom is that of a vine, not towering up on high, but creeping along the ground, ascending only when it can find something deformed, dead, and dry, to hide beneath its verdure, and adorn with its living wreaths, yet filling the land and covering the hills with its shadow, and sending out its boughs even unto the sea, and its branches unto the river. All that Isaiah and his fellow-prophets had sung respecting the spread of the knowledge of the Lord, and the glory of the latter day, is concentrated by Christ in this brief parable; all their sublime visions and magnificent figures are wrapped up in this simple emblem of the Mustard Seed and the tree that grows from it. The tree has grown and already shot forth great branches in which the fowls of heaven lodge. The impatient may wish for some more sudden process, but we are to rest satisfied with the divine method,—that of growth, from beginnings however small, with a progress steady and sure, however slow.

#### THE LEAVEN.

The bearing of this parable is quite distinct from that which precedes it. There is in it additional teaching respecting the increase of the kingdom. Besides its external development, we have it exhibited as working secretly, and manifesting its power inwardly, by “the power which it possesses of penetrating and assimilating a foreign mass, till all be affected by it.” Leaven is a foreign element, distinct from the mass or lump in which it is hid, pointing to something in the divine kingdom which has a penetrating, assimilating power over that with which it is brought in contact. It is solely with reference to this power the leaven possesses, that its figurative sense is here to be interpreted. It might equally well be employed to represent evil, or that which is false, in its tendency to be diffused and liken things to itself, and is in fact frequently so used in the Scriptures.\* Inasmuch as leaven was not allowed to form any part of burnt-offerings, and it is used by our Saviour and the Apostle as figurative of evil, it has been strenuously maintained by some,

\* Matt xvi. 16; 1 Cor. v. 6, 7; Lev. ii. 11.

that in this parable it is used in the same sense; that is, points to that which is false and corrupt. This, of course, would make the parable teach that error is to prevail until truth is exterminated, or until the entire kingdom is leavened with it,—a striking example of the mistake of insisting on a fixed and arbitrary interpretation of the symbols or figures of Scripture. As leaven is used in bread for a good purpose, to lighten it, render it more palatable and wholesome, it becomes an apt and expressive emblem of the benign influence of the Gospel, in effecting salutary changes in human society. It is the kingdom of heaven which is like unto leaven. The diffusion of the pure Gospel, by its regenerating and reformatory power in a sinful world, and not the propagation of its corruptions, is the obvious and natural sense. Of the two parables of the mustard seed and the leaven, one was designed to be not so much the counterpart as the complement of the other, teaching that accompanying, and co-extensive with the outward manifestation and extension of the divine kingdom, there was to be an inward process of development and assimilation. One must be viewed as pointing to the outward, the other to the inward work of Christianity; or, one to the great visible effect, the other to the secret means. This is what these twin parables of the mustard seed and the leaven seem clearly to teach. Thus we may understand what Christianity will be, when the predictions of the prophets concerning the latter day shall have their accomplishment. These predictions are not all mere poetical drapery, or prophetic hyperbole. It would be too disheartening to believe with some interpreters, that these two parables of our Lord, while they predict (or one of them predicts) the visible extension of professed Christianity, predict at the same time (or the other of them predicts) the growth and diffusion of corruption, until it takes possession of the whole visible church. It may confidently be affirmed, that it is only zeal for an antecedent theory, which could suggest such an interpretation.

Our Lord, having concluded the parable of the Leaven, we are told that he sent the multitude away and went into the house. There his disciples gathered about him, and at their

request, he explained the parable of the tares of the field; and then, for their private instruction, uttered the remaining three parables, recorded in this chapter.

TREASURE HID IN THE FIELD.\*

According to the common interpretation, this parable relates to the personal appropriation of the blessings of the kingdom, or the eagerness with which men will seek to obtain them, when they come to know their value. "The field," according to this interpretation is the word of God, or as others explain, the church. The "treasure" hid in it is salvation. The "hiding" of it by the "man," when found, refers to his hiding or laying up in his heart the word, or the doctrine of salvation by Christ. And his "selling all" that he has, and "buying that field," to his willingness to count all things but loss for Christ, and to suffer the loss of all things that he may win Christ. Others understand by this hiding "a tremulous fear in the first moments that the truth is revealed to the soul, lest the blessing should by some means or other escape from it again; the anxiety that it may not do so, and precautions taken for this end." †

No doubt, very important truths may be exhibited in this way. But are these truths taught in this parable? There is no passage of Scripture in respect to which the great mass of commentators appear more entirely to have missed the real import. To make this appear, and to bring out the true meaning of this parable, and of the one immediately following it, that of the Pearl of great price, is the main object sought in presenting in this connected view, the parables of this chapter. A simple statement of some of the obvious objections to the common interpretation of the parable of the Hid Treasure will be sufficient to justify the conclusion that it cannot be the true one. 1. If "the field" be the Scriptures, what are we to understand by the buying of that field? and how do we distinguish the field from the "treasure" which it was the man's great object to possess himself of? Do the field and

\* See on this and "the Pearl of great price," "Brief Exposition of Matt. xiii.," by G. N. Darby, and "Waymarks, &c.," by J. Inglis, No. 4.

† Trench.

the treasure both represent salvation? 2. How can we reconcile the figure of purchasing salvation with the doctrine that salvation is all of grace? Where this figure is elsewhere used, only those who had no money are invited to come and buy, without money and without price. 3. If the field means the visible church, then what can the buying of it possibly mean? Does it mean merely that we are to make the privileges of the visible church our own? And how again, do we distinguish the field from the treasure hid in it? To make the field mean either the word or the church of God is to introduce confusion into this series of parables. It makes the Saviour in one parable represent the word of God by the seed which a man sows in his field; and in another, to represent that word by the field in which the seed was sown, and this, contrary to his own explanation found in still another part of this connected discourse, that "the field is the world." We must look, then, for another interpretation. And there is another so much more natural, and clearly more in consonance with the meaning of the other parables with which it stands in such close relations, that it is impossible not to be surprised at its having been so generally overlooked.

The parable is founded, as correctly noticed by those who fail to discover its true meaning, on what is commonly understood or known in law as *treasure-trove*; i. e., money, or other treasure found in the earth, or elsewhere, the owner of which is unknown. Instances of the finding of concealed treasure might be of frequent occurrence in ancient oriental countries, on account of the insecurity of the state of society; and it is not improbable that this parable has for its groundwork some recent case of this kind, well known to its original hearers. "This hypothesis is favored by the form of the original (*ὅν εὗρων ἄνθρωπος ἐκρυψε, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτοῦν υπάγει κ.τ.λ.*) in which the first verb is an aorist, *finding* hid (again), referring to what actually happened at a certain time, and thus determining the verbs that follow to be graphic presents, calling up the scene as actually passing, and not vague descriptions of what men usually do on such occasions."\* The treas-

\* J. Addison Alexander, *in loco*.

ure is represented as a lost or unclaimed possession ; there may be none of the heirs or representatives left of the man who buried it. But still, it is not intended to bring into view the absolute right of the case. "The notions of right current on such a question serve rather as a basis for presenting higher and spiritual relationships."\* The question as to the morality or immorality of the action of the man, who, after finding the treasure concealed it, keeping back from the owner of the field the knowledge of a fact which enhanced the value of his property, and then buying it, does not affect the teaching of the parable ; the point of comparison is to be found only in the *earnestness* of the man who found the treasure, to possess himself of the field.

It is important, in the first place, to have a distinct idea of the significance of the phrase, "the kingdom of heaven." It is found in Matthew alone ; but it is precisely what Matthew, elsewhere, and the other Evangelists, everywhere call "the kingdom of God." It refers to the approaching restoration or erection of the kingdom of Christ ; that is, to that heavenly condition of society, or of the church, which was to commence at Christ's first advent, and to be completed at the second. It denotes simply the reign of Messiah, or the new economy, sometimes with special reference to its inception, sometimes with reference to its progress, and sometimes to its consummation. This kingdom is said to resemble treasure hid in a field. Now, if by the treasure we are to understand salvation, or some aspect of a sinner's conversion, in what, possibly, can the similitude, here assumed, be said to exist ? In what sense could it be said that the reign of Christ is like a sinner's salvation ? There is no use of the phrase, "kingdom of heaven," or "kingdom of God" elsewhere, and no interpretation of it, however men may differ as to its meaning, which would justify this application of it.

We next inquire what we are to understand by the "field." In another part of this discourse, our Saviour, interpreting another parable, has distinctly told us that by the field is meant the world. Can we suppose that it has a different im-

\* Lange, *in loco*.

port here? When he was asked to explain the parable of the Sower he said: "Know ye not this parable? And how then, will ye know all parables?" questions that seem to imply that the allegorical or figurative words in which they are expressed, have some plain and natural method of interpretation. And in explaining his first two parables, he clearly intended to indicate the rules or laws by which his other parables are to be explained. Certainly, we are at least to take these two interpretations as examples or illustrations of the meaning we are to attach to terms repeated in other parables of the same discourse. What right have we, when the Saviour has just told us that "the field is the world," upon the immediate recurrence of the same word, to interpret it as meaning the Scriptures, or the church? It would introduce endless confusion and perplexity if, in one part of a discourse, what we have been told, and on authority from which there can be no appeal, means "the world" must be understood, when it next occurs, as meaning the word of God; and especially when we have been told, and by the same authority, and in the same discourse, that the word of God is represented by an entirely different figure, namely, the seed or wheat which a man sows in his field. The field, then, beyond all controversy, is the world.

And now what is the "treasure?" It is something of the highest value hid in the field; that is, it is something connected with this world, or of which this world is the sphere, not visible to the eye of sense, and which is some aspect of the kingdom of heaven, the kingdom or church which Christ came to establish, for "the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field." This kingdom is represented in this parable, as lying concealed or enfolded, in this lost world, like a treasure buried in the ground; it is the kingdom in mystery, *i. e.*, not in its development or unfolding, but as concealed from the eyes of men. It began to be revealed by the advent of him who was despised and rejected of men, and by his cross became to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness. The insolvent debtor or the hungry beggar might walk over, or lie down to sleep on the very spot beneath which riches lay concealed, and be wholly igno-

rant that that was within his reach which would afford him instant relief. Paul refers to this spiritual, undeveloped kingdom, when he speaks of "the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations but now is made manifest to his saints; to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles? (thus recognizing its œcumenical or world-wide character), which is Christ in you the hope of glory."\* It is this kingdom hidden, or in mystery, like the temple that lies in the quarry, or the statue in the unhewn block of marble, which is the treasure. It will appear again, when we take up the succeeding complementary parable, in a more developed and definite form.

The next point in the parable which claims attention, is that the field is purchased, for the sake of the treasure concealed in it, by "a man" who had discovered it. As the field is the world, it was subject to purchase on account of the sacred treasure it contained, the materials or elements of a glorious kingdom. And that the "man" here is allegorical or figurative, and not literal, might be inferred from the allegorical character of a parable, and the figurative sense of the other parts of this parable, throughout,—the treasure, the field, the finding of the treasure, and the purchasing of it; but more especially from the figurative sense of *man*, whenever introduced in this series of parables; as, for example, the sower in the first, the man that sowed good seed in the second, the man who sowed a grain of mustard seed in his field in the third, and the woman that hid the leaven in the meal. In all these instances, as the similitude is drawn from the ordinary sphere of life, human agents are introduced; and these human agents, in every instance, represent Christ, the head of "the kingdom of heaven." If we make the treasure mean salvation, and understand man in the parable as literally man, then we make the parable to mean that man discovers salvation for himself, and there is nothing answering to his blindness and ignorance on this subject, till taught of God. More than this; we make it teach that he purchases salvation for himself, or something else, the Scriptures or the church by which he secures salva-

\* Col. i. 26, 27.

tion,—and there is nothing in the parable which corresponds to his utter helplessness and spiritual poverty.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE.

There is a very noticeable similarity between this and the preceding parable, in that the groundwork of both is, that a man discovers something of great value and parts with all that he has to possess it. In the ordinary interpretation, the discovered pearl in the second, like the hid treasure in the first, is made to represent salvation, or the Saviour himself. The main difference, which it has been usual to point out between the two, is that in the first we have represented the conversion of those who find salvation without seeking it, or in whom there has been no preparatory work, as in the case of the woman of Samaria, or of Saul of Tarsus; and in the second, the conversion of those who find salvation after long and diligent search, represented in the guileless Nathanael, or in Nicodemus, the Jewish ruler. Of the one class, the Lord may say, "I am found of them that sought not after me," and of the other, "They that seek me shall find me." This may be all very true, very interesting and instructive, but have we any such teaching set forth in these parables? In regard to the first of them, this question has already been sufficiently answered. And almost the same objections lie against such an interpretation of the second.

It was addressed privately to his believing followers, and not to the multitude who might be supposed to stand most in need of such instruction as this interpretation supposes. It ignores the blindness of sinful men, and views them as capable themselves of appreciating what is true and excellent in religion, and of discovering it, nay, of discovering a Saviour for themselves; and then, what is more, of having the means of buying that Saviour, or an interest in his favor, by paying down a price, a *quid pro quo*, for what they receive. We do not mean to lay such doctrines to the charge of those who have held to the false interpretation of these parables, but only to rescue them from an interpretation which seems to lead necessarily to such a perversion of the truth.

What then is the true meaning of this parable? It differs

from that which precedes it in this, that in that the kingdom is likened to the treasure, or the object of value; in this the kingdom is likened to "a merchant-man seeking goodly pearls." It is founded on the great value which was attached to pearls in ancient times, the great care with which the pearl-merchant scrutinized them, as to whether they had any of those defects which would materially lessen their value, and the great price he would pay for a single pearl, if perfect of its kind. But the subject of comparison here is not so much the pearl as the merchant who buys it, not so much the thing purchased as the purchaser. In the former parable, it was not so much the man as the field containing the treasure he bought, or not so much the purchaser, as the thing purchased, which is brought into comparison. In that it was the buying of the world, for the sake of what it contained, which was made prominent. In this it is the divine Purchaser who stands out in prominent view. In that the kingdom in mystery, or as not yet separated from the world, is represented by hid treasure; in this the church of God, as consisting of those who are renewed, purified, and beautified by the Spirit, and thus made to differ from, and gathered out of the world, is represented by "the Pearl of great price." In the merchant-man seeking goodly pearls, we see Jesus, the Saviour of men, coming to seek and save the lost. This was the work he was engaged in when he uttered parables, when he performed miracles. In that merchant-man, selling all that he had, and buying the pearl of great price, we see JESUS, for the joy that was set before him, enduring the cross and despising the shame for the redemption of his church. Here is one who is not a poor impoverished creature, having nothing to buy with, or, with which so much as to pay his own debts. Here is one who was rich, with whom it was no robbery to make himself equal with God. He could pay the "great price." His divine dignity imparted an infinite worth to his making "himself poor," and of "no reputation." As in another parable, we see him like the good shepherd, who goes after the lost sheep, and when he finds it, lays it on his shoulder and brings it home,—seeking lost man in all the hopelessness of his guilt and misery, and when he

finds him, taking him in his arms, and bringing him to the safe inclosure of his fold; so here we see him in the same character as the Lover of sinners, though under a different emblem, that of a merchant seeking goodly pearls, these "goodly pearls" being emblems of immortal souls. These redeemed by his blood, and contemplated as an organic whole, brought together and all baptized by one spirit into that one body, which is his church, constitute the PEARL OF GREAT PRICE, the dearest of all created objects to him, the most excellent thing in all the universe, the very jewel of his crown, as the incarnate, exalted, reigning Redeemer.

It is thus made to appear that this instructive series of parables, on one of the most important and fundamental of all subjects, is not without a most distinct revelation of the redeeming love and work of Christ. Yet Trench thinks it worth while to mention this interpretation only for its singularity, and refers to Salmeron (*Serm. in Par. Evang.*, p. 66), and Drexelius (*Opp.*, v. i., p. 209), as having favored it.

#### THE DRAW-NET.

This concludes the series of parables in this chapter, which thus far have been shown to have a certain unity, natural order, and completeness. In the first, we have the establishment of the kingdom, through the preaching of the word. In the second, its imperfections, and the principles of government and discipline suited thereto. In the third, its external enlargement, or extension in the world. In the fourth, its internal growth, or increase in the vigor of spiritual life. In the fifth, the interest of the Head and Founder of the Kingdom in this world, for the sake of the kingdom hidden within it. In the sixth, the great price he paid for the redemption of his church or kingdom. And in the seventh, as we shall now proceed to show, its purification and consummation. Or, as a sort of duality of relation between the successive pairs of the six already considered, may be noticed the topics on which we have instruction in these parables, may be more succinctly stated thus: 1. The foundation and discipline of the kingdom; 2. The increase; 3. The preciousness; and 4. The perfection.

Many interpreters have been unable to discover any real distinction between the parable of the draw-net and that of the tares, and have considered them identical as to their great purpose or teaching. But while this, like that, recognizes the present intermixture of evil with good in the kingdom, the grand purpose of this is altogether distinct and entirely different from that. In that, it was the object to enforce the prohibition, not to attempt, before the harvest, or the end of the world, to separate the evil from the good, in the visible kingdom; but their future separation is the main point in this parable; or rather the purification of the kingdom, and then its final separation from an evil world. This, therefore, most fitly closes the series. It shows a grand result, a perfectly pure and un-mixed kingdom, evolved at last.

The imagery of this parable was no doubt suggested, as that of the first in the series had been, by what was then, or had just been, passing before the eye. From the boat, through a recess in the hill-side, our Lord had seen a sower going forth, on the adjoining plain, to sow. Now, from the house into which he had entered, which was probably situated on one of the slopes of the hilly shores, he could command a full view of the sea, and observe what was passing there. Fishermen—some, perhaps, who had been listening to the parables spoken in the hearing of the multitude—might be seen in the distance, letting down or already drawing their nets. The net here mentioned is the *draw* or *drag net*, a seine, (*σαγήνη*), a word borrowed almost directly, especially in its Anglo-Saxon form, *segene*, from the Greek word here used. As employed by modern fishermen, it is sometimes sufficient to sweep a broad extent of sea, or a bay in its entire width, or the mouth of a broad river, from shore to shore. It is leaded below, that it may sweep the bottom, or sink to a great depth, and supported by floats above. It is carried out in boats; and when all let down and fully extended, the ends are gradually drawn together, and it is brought to the shore, with all it contains. The fishermen then gather out the good, and cast the worthless away. To this, the parable says, the kingdom of heaven is like.

As in the preceding parables, the field represented the

world, and in that of the treasure hid in the field, we saw the kingdom prior to its separation, by the power of divine grace, from the world; in this, the sea represents the world, in which, before the ingathering, the people of God lie, as it were, concealed, and undistinguished from those who are not his people. The assembling of the constituent elements of the kingdom is represented by the casting of a net into the open sea by fishermen. The parable concluding the series touches, as well it may, the same ground of several of those that go before it. There is this difference: in the others, we see the work in its beginning or its progress; in this, in its completion. The agent that casts the net is kept entirely out of view. But as our Lord, when he called some of his Apostles, said, "I will make you fishers of men," we have no difficulty in understanding that ministers of the Gospel, and all who co-operate with them, or whom they represent, are the instruments employed. By the net, then, we are to understand the Gospel, in its ordinary ministrations and influences in the world. Or, it may be understood as including the visible church as one of the means, as indeed the great ordinance of God, to accomplish this ingathering.

But the main truth set forth in this parable, as before stated, is the purification of the kingdom, by a judicial act, and its consummation in glory. In the words with which the Saviour explains the parable of the tares, the gathering out or purification relates exclusively to the kingdom itself. In those which are appended, for the same purpose, to the parable of the net, the severance or separation is of the wicked from among the just; that is, there is this further idea, that after the kingdom has been purified from all imperfect elements, a complete separation or removal shall be effected between it and the wicked world, or these elements considered as now external to it. "Which, when it was full, they drew to shore." Whom are we to understand by *they*? We are expressly told, in the interpretation which accompanies the parable, that "at the end of the world the angels shall come forth and sever the wicked from among the just." When men have fully performed the part assigned them in publishing the great salvation, and offering forgiveness to the penitent and

believing, and the net is full, or all the purposes of God's grace are accomplished, then shall the angels come forth and perform their part as the executioners of Divine justice in effecting a complete separation of the wicked from among the just, and the eternal purification of the kingdom.

Then shall be realized what has so often been longed for, a perfectly pure society—and not till then. Then the vine will have no dead or fruitless branches. There will be no tares among the wheat. Faith will never again tremble; nor hope waver; nor love decay. Pure, in its freedom from all impure elements—pure, in the perfection of all its individual members, it will be pure, in its complete disjunction and separation from all evil external to itself. The statue has been taken from among the fragments and splinters, where it was wrought and polished, and been set up in the temple not made with hands. The diamond has been taken from the dust and smoke of the lapidary's shop, to glisten in the frontlet of the great High Priest of that temple.

---

ART. V.—*The General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, convened in the Brick Church, New York City, on Thursday, May 20th, 1869, at 11 A. M.

The opening sermon was preached by the last Moderator, Rev. George W. Musgrave, D. D., from Mark xvi. 16.

The Assembly then proceeded to the election of Moderator and Temporary Clerk.

Rev. M. W. Jacobus, D. D., Rev. Willis Lord, D. D., Rev. A. G. Hall, D. D., Rev. W. C. Anderson, D. D., and Rev. W. Blackwood, D. D., were nominated for Moderator.

Drs. Anderson and Blackwood were excused at their own request.

On motion of Rev. Dr. MILLER, it was

*Resolved*, That a majority of all the votes cast be necessary to a choice in this and all elections by this body.

On the first ballot for Moderator, Rev. Dr. Jacobus received

140 votes; Rev. Dr. Lord, 54 votes; and Rev. Dr. Hall, 63 votes.

The Moderator then declared that Rev. M. W. Jacobus, D. D., having received a majority of all the votes cast, was duly elected Moderator of this Assembly.

The Rev. R. K. Rodgers, D. D., grandson of Rev. Dr. John Rodgers, original founder of the church in which the Assembly met, was then unanimously elected Temporary Clerk by acclamation.

The STATED CLERK requested members having answers of Presbyteries to the overture on Re-union sent down by the last Assembly, and their action upon that subject, to present them without delay, that they might be properly classified. He had as yet received only about seventy-five answers, but was able to announce that the overture *had been rejected* by a large majority.

Rev Dr. MUSGRAVE offered the following resolution:—

*Resolved*, That a Committee of Conference consisting of five ministers and five elders, be appointed to confer with a similar Committee, if appointed by the other General Assembly now in session in this city, on the subject of the re-union of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church; to report during our present sessions, and at as early a day as practicable, what farther action, if any, should be taken on the subject.

The resolution was adopted.

On Friday morning, after announcing the Standing Committees, the Moderator also announced the following Committee under Dr. Musgrave's resolution of yesterday, for conference with a similar Committee of the New School body on the subject of re-union:—*Ministers*, George W. Musgrave, D. D., A. G. Hall, D. D., Lyman H. Atwater, D. D., Willis Lord, D. D., H. R. Wilson, D. D. *Ruling Elders*—Robert Carter, J. C. Grier, C. D. Drake, W. M. Francis, and Henry Day.

On motion of Rev. Dr. IMBRIE, it was made the first and second orders on the following days to receive and consider the reports of the Committees on the various Boards:—*On Monday*, first order, Board of Publication; second order, Board of Church Extension. *Tuesday*, first order, Board of Foreign Missions; second order, Board of Education. *Wednesday*, first order, Disabled Ministers' Fund; second order,

Freedmen's Committee. *Thursday*, first order, Board of Domestic Missions; and that 10 o'clock of each day be the hour for the first order named.

Rev. Dr. MUSGRAVE presented the following report from the committee appointed by the last Assembly, in accordance with the recommendation of the Philadelphia Presbyterian Convention, to meet similar committees from other Presbyterian bodies.

A meeting was held April 18, 1869, at the Mission House, 907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, of the following members of the respective committees appointed by the General Assemblies, in pursuance of a request by the Convention held in Philadelphia, November 6, 1867, viz.:—The Rev. Drs. John T. Pressly, David R. Kerr, and William Davidson, from the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church; the Rev. Dr. Zephaniah M. Humphrey, from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (New School); the Rev. Drs. George W. Musgrave and Alexander T. McGill, and the Hon. Robert McKnight, from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (Old School).

It was unanimously resolved that union among the different denominations represented is very desirable, if the way be clear. It was then resolved that the basis agreed on by the Philadelphia Convention, above referred to, be taken as a guide for the deliberations of this conference. Being altered and amended in several particulars, it was unanimously adopted in the following form, viz.:—

*Article 1.* The Old and New Testament Scriptures are acknowledged to be the inspired word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

*Article 2.* The Westminster Confession of Faith, as the same has been modified by the churches here represented, in its doctrines concerning the powers of the civil magistrate, together with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, shall be received and adopted, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.

*Article 3.* The United Church shall receive and adopt the Presbyterian Form of Church Government.

*Article 4.* (1.) It is the will of God that the Book of Psalms should be used by his church in his worship, to the end of the world. And the United Body shall, at the earliest practicable day, prepare as faithful and acceptable a version of those Psalms, as may be, for use in the churches. (2.) Any of the churches designing to use Psalms exclusively in the service of song, shall always have the right unchallenged to do so.

It was then resolved that these articles be submitted by the committees composing this conference to their respective Assemblies for consideration; and that if they receive the favorable action of the churches represented, the Assemblies be requested to appoint each a committee of five to meet at Pittsburg, Pa., on the first Wednesday of August, A. D. 1869, at 11 o'clock A. M., to take into consideration such further questions as may be necessary to be decided, in order to a formal consummation of the union of the bodies here represented.

The above is faithfully extracted from the Minutes approved April 18, 1869.

ALEXANDER T. MCGILL, *Secretary.*

On this subject the Assembly afterward took the following action :—

*Resolved*, That the Assembly accepts and approves the report, and recommends the continuance of the same committee to represent this Assembly in further consideration of the subject of the union of the churches represented in the Conference.

In this we heartily concur. We believe the benefits of the prospective re-union of the two great branches of the Presbyterian church would be greatly enhanced by incorporating the United, and other Presbyterians therein, as soon as the Psalmody, and, in some instances, other questions can be adjusted.

A communication was read from the New School Assembly, announcing that it had appointed a committee of five ministers and five ruling elders to confer with a similar committee from this body on the question of re-union. Said committee consists of Rev. W. Adams, D. D., Rev. J. T. Stearns, D. D., Rev. S. W. Fisher, D. D., Rev. J. B. Shaw, D. D., Rev. R. W. Patterson, D. D., and ruling elders Hon. William Strong, Hon. David Harris, Hon. W. E. Dodge, Hon. Jacob S. Farrand, and Hon. Daniel Haines.\*

#### THE BOARDS OF THE CHURCH.

Want of space compels us to refer only to such action of the Assembly in regard to the Boards as is outside the usual routine. The customary resolutions of approbation of the fidelity and efficiency of the several Boards were adopted, without charges or suggestions from any quarter, so far as we are advised, of negligence, unfaithfulness, or malfeasance in office. Various proposals were made and discussed designed to increase the resources and success of the departments to which they referred. Some of these, as also the general condition and prospects of particular Boards, awakened earnest and able discussion and called forth addresses of great eloquence, power, and unction. This was particularly true of the speeches on the reports of the committees on Missionary Boards, Foreign and Domestic. Large assemblies were quite electrified by these vivid

\* The further proceedings of the Assemblies touching re-union, we reserve for another article.

and stirring addresses. It is rare that any Assembly has a larger proportion of effective speakers lay and clerical.

Overtures were made to the Assembly asking it to instruct the Board of Publication to make various issues or editions of the Hymnal, Catechisms, &c., which were referred to the Board itself for decision. Parties who desire such issues would usually save themselves and the Assembly considerable trouble by sending their requests directly to the Board itself, to which the church has intrusted this work, to which the Assembly is quite sure to refer them, which is best informed regarding them, and is quite ready and sure to grant all reasonable petitions of this kind.

One overture called upon the Assembly to instruct this Board to grant the same discounts to Sabbath schools and churches as to booksellers. This request was granted by the Assembly. The subject is a very difficult one, and has two strong sides. If no special discounts are given to booksellers, their services in distributing the publications of the Board must be to a great extent lost. If similar discounts are not given to Sabbath schools, then we suffer from a dangerous and destructive competition with other publishers and publishing boards and societies which grant such discounts. The great publishing houses and societies are divided in opinion and practice on this subject. Our Board expressed its readiness to follow any decided preference declared by the Assembly in the premises. It appeared that the operations of the Board during the past year had been safe, efficient, and prosperous, that its periodicals deserve to have their increasing circulation still further increased, and that larger contributions are needed for the work of colportage.

Indeed the great want of all the Boards is increased funds supplied by the free-will offerings of the churches. The Foreign Board has been rescued from a crushing and almost fatal debt of nearly \$100,000, by a providential legacy of extraordinary amount, such as can scarcely be expected once in a generation. Otherwise it would have been forced to a severe and damaging retrenchment of its present agencies. Nor can it enter upon new fields or send into them the young men who are eager to go, unless the amount of yearly income is

greatly increased beyond the past year, legacies included. The Board of Domestic Missions, though relieved from recent embarrassment, is still compelled to keep its missionaries on a small, often a starveling allowance, and to decline sending new missionaries to openings of the highest promise. The condition of these two great Boards is typical. All are crippled for want of means. The remedy for this deficiency was therefore the great matter in relation to them that engrossed the attention of the Assembly. It came up in an able Report on Systematic Benevolence by Dr. Irving, chairman of a committee appointed by the Assembly of 1867 for this purpose. This document concluded as follows:—

Then what is needed at this juncture is: (1.) Such a full and active acknowledgment of Christian stewardship on the part of each communicant. (2.) Such a heartfelt interest and sympathy on the part of church officers that will seek to bring up all to duty. (3.) Such an intelligent and comprehensive system in each church that will embrace all within its communion. (4.) Such an efficient supervision of every church court that shall be felt in every congregation in connection with it. In view of these solemn truths, the committee recommend that the Boards shall make and send to each General Assembly a carefully prepared estimate as far as they can, which shall be on an economical, yet healthy basis, of the amounts needed to carry on their operations for the coming year; that on these estimates the Assembly shall annually take such action as shall bring them, with power and effect, before the churches for their knowledge, guidance, and active support. Also recommend that these estimates shall be committed by their authority to the Presbyteries, which shall not only consider the same, but shall take such control thereof, that they shall be laid before each church session within their bounds, with their sanction and impress, so that each congregation shall have an opportunity of contributing to the Boards, and shall be expected to embrace the same.

This plan involves church control and supervision on the part of every court, but wholly in the line of our own system. It brings responsibility before all, and keeps it just where it belongs. It spreads important information before our whole body at the commencement of the ecclesiastical and financial year. It gives a basis of action for both the people and the Boards, and it leaves the whole mode of collection, as to time and manner, to the wisdom and experience of each church, and it delivers the whole subject from any expedient contrary to the simplicity that is in Christ.

Dr. IMBRIE, chairman of a committee appointed by the Assembly of 1868, to report to this Assembly a plan of systematic beneficence, made a report recommending the following measures, which were adopted, viz. :—

1. The present rule requiring Presbyteries to report to the General Assembly is rescinded.

2. Makes it the duty of the Secretaries of the Boards and Committees to present before the General Assembly estimates of the wants of their Boards for the year.

3. Makes it the duty of the Assembly's Committee on Systematic Benevolence to apportion the amount upon the several Synods, whose duty it shall be to raise at least this amount.

4. Requires the Synods to apportion the amount to their several Presbyteries, requiring a detailed report from them; each Synod also to send a written report to the Assembly.

5. Each Presbytery to assign to each session its due proportion, and the amounts contributed to be duly reported.

6. The Session shall give all the people and Sabbath schools opportunity to contribute.

7. Constitutes the Rev. Drs. Irving, Schenck, and Robert Strong, of Albany, and the Elders A. McClure and Robert Carter, a committee to prepare a tract giving different plans of giving, and arrange to give it a wide circulation.

The Rev. Mr. PLUMLEY offered the following resolution :—

*Resolved.* That the present Committee on Systematic Beneficence prepare and send to each Synod and Presbytery the proportionate amount desired from them for the use of the beneficial schemes of the Church this year as presented by the several Secretaries.

The resolution was adopted, with the understanding that the amounts desired are as follows, viz. : Foreign Missions, \$310,000 ; Domestic Missions, \$250,000 ; Education, \$50,000 ; Publication, \$50,000 ; Disabled Ministers' Fund, \$40,000 ; Church Extension, \$90,000 ; Freedmen, \$85,000 ; total, \$875,000.

This is a great advance on all that has yet been done by our church. But shall it not be done ? Ought our great and opulent communion, containing single congregations, nay, individuals, that could give the whole, to hesitate a moment ? But it should not be done by any one church, or section of the church, exclusively or mainly. It is the work, duty, and privilege of the whole, in which all must share if they would not bring leanness into their souls. The great resources of the affluent should not only flow freely into this treasury of the Lord, but constitute also a reserve for those large donations which are required properly to endow the great institutions of charity, religion, and education, without which they cannot flourish, or perform their proper office in sustaining, defending, and replenishing the church itself. After all, the success of this and all other schemes for organizing and evoking the liberality of our people, depends, under

God, more upon the courage, fidelity, and tact of ministers and sessions in bringing every cause home to the mind and heart of every member of their congregations, than on all the schemes and machinery ever devised without them. All experience and observation exalt this to the authority of a grand induction, a universal law. Wheel may be added to, or displace, wheel. It is all to no purpose unless the living spirit be within the wheels.

The Board of Education held a semi-centenary meeting on Tuesday evening, May 25, which was addressed by Drs. McGill, Willis Lord, Beadle, and McCosh. The following resolution brings forward a proposition of great importance with reference to the equipment of our theological seminaries:—

*Resolved*, That the unprecedented developments of Divine Providence in this age, and the necessity of instructing and training those who are to be laborers in the coming harvest, seem to indicate to our theological schools the importance of founding in each a separate chair to Evangelistic Theology, the design of which shall be the instruction of students for the ministry, in those special portions of the Scriptures which relate to the aggressions of the church, in this latter day, upon the great systems of sin in the world; upon the duties of pastors, and other officers of the church, as relating to those subjects; upon the organization and operations of the various departments of the church's work, and upon the fields of usefulness, and nature of employments to which they may be called in the publication of the Gospel, and the communication of its blessings to the human race.

All this is in itself highly desirable. But room cannot be made for new chairs in our theological seminaries, without either overcrowding the students, or narrowing the work of existing Professors. The whole problem of successfully organizing the practical training of candidates for the ministry yet awaits solution. But it has so strongly seized the mind of the church, that we hope this solution may speedily be found.

Dr. MUSGRAVE was requested to continue to act as Secretary of the Board of Domestic Missions, the ensuing year.

#### THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

The Standing Committee on Theological Seminaries simply recommended the approval of the reports from Princeton and Alleghany. In regard to the Danville and Northwest Seminaries, a state of things was reported involving grave difficul-

ties and complications, upon which the Assembly felt that it was without sufficient light for a safe decision. It accordingly appointed committees *ad interim*, to repair to each institution, make thorough investigation, and report to the adjourned meeting at Pittsburg, in November. Dr. WEST resigned his chair in Danville; but on the request of the Assembly, and a vote to increase the salaries of the Professors, withdrew it.

#### THE SABBATH.

An earnest resolution was adopted, urging ministers and Christians to do what is possible to promote the observance of the Sabbath, and arrest its increasing desecration. A strong protest was issued by both Assemblies against the decoration of soldiers' graves, appointed for the last Sabbath in May, and the second during the Assemblies' meeting, and urging the substitution of another day for the ceremony. The effort was unsuccessful in regard to New York, but the day was changed in the adjacent cities of Brooklyn and Jersey City. In New York it fortunately proved a miserable failure, largely because contrary to the conscience of the Christian public. Such action is timely and needful. The Christian religion cannot outlive the Christian Sabbath, against which mighty and numerous foes now conspire.

#### JUDICIAL CASE NO. 4.

This was an appeal of the church of Greenville, Ill., against the Synod of Illinois. This church had appointed elders to serve for a limited number of years, and not for life. The proceeding was disapproved by Presbytery and Synod, and came before the Assembly on an appeal from the decision of the Synod. The appeal was not sustained.

The question here involved is not likely to be set at rest by this decision. The evils of being compelled to continue in office inefficient and unacceptable elders are so deeply felt, that the doctrine is gaining ground that, while the ordination of elders as of ministers, imparts permanently the rank of office, it ought not necessarily vest the right to exercise that office beyond the limits fixed by the pleasure of the congrega-

tion. Some churches in our own, and still more in the New School body, are acting on this principle. The (Dutch) Reformed Church elects elders to serve actively only for a year, although on great occasions, all who have ever borne the office, are recognized and called to act officially in what is called the Grand Consistory. We have not particularly investigated the subject, and we reserve it for further consideration. But we see tokens of an increasing demand for such action as will allow some sort of rotation in the eldership.

THE PRESERVATION OF AMITY BETWEEN THIS COUNTRY AND  
GREAT BRITAIN.

Judge RYERSON offered and supported resolutions on this subject, which, after an amendment suggested by Senator Drake, and accepted by the mover, were adopted as follows :—

*Whereas*, The existing state of feeling between this country and Great Britain is a cause of profound regret and grief to all who desire to maintain peaceful and friendly relations between those two great Protestant powers; and

*Whereas*, There are no causes of difference but such as ought to be peacefully agitated; therefore,

*Resolved*, That this General Assembly would earnestly exhort all Christians under its care to offer fervent prayers to Almighty God, that he would, by his Holy Spirit, so enlighten and influence the understanding and hearts, and would so guide and control the conduct, of the rulers and people of both these nations, that all matters of difference may be amicably settled, and a lasting peace preserved; and this Assembly would affectionately and earnestly appeal to the Christian people of Great Britain and Ireland to join in like supplications to our common Father in heaven.

*Resolved*, That a copy hereof be sent to the other General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, now in session in this city, with a most respectful request that they unite with us in our efforts to preserve peace between these two Protestant nations (a war between whom might, and probably would involve the whole civilized world).

Such expressions from our Christian bodies are now very timely, and we trust the assurances conveyed by them to British Christians in regard to the pacific desires of the Christians of the United States, will do something to soothe the national irritation which has been inflamed of late.

## TEMPERANCE.

Rev. Dr. KNOX, from the Committee on Bills and Overtures, reported

Overture No. 3 from the National Temperance Society, asking that all our ministers preach, on the last Sabbath of December, on the Christian duty of total abstinence from intoxicating drinks.

The committee recommend that the Assembly regard its former deliverances upon this subject as sufficient, and earnestly reiterate them.

In answer to the earnest pleas of various members for more decided action by the Assembly, Dr. Knox stated that, after deliberation upon this subject to a late hour last night, the committee concluded that this report was all that was necessary. The difficulty, in the minds of the committee, was in the verbiage of the overture. It requests preaching "upon the Christian duty of *total abstinence*, and not of *temperance*."

After inquiry it was represented, that the last deliverance was in the form of an elaborate paper, prepared by Dr. Elliott and adopted by the Assembly of '65, maintaining decidedly that total abstinence from intoxicating beverages is a Christian duty. Various amendments were moved. Many members, including promoters of total abstinence, earnestly objected to declaring total abstinence a duty, and the neglect of it a sin, as committing the Assembly to untenable and unscriptural ground. Others strenuously urged that no action short of this will avail to arrest the swelling tide of intemperance, with all its woes. The debate issued in the following action:—

*Resolved*, 1. That the Assembly hereby reiterates its former deliverances in favor of total abstinence, and especially that made at Pittsburg in 1865.

*Resolved*, 2. That our ministers be enjoined to preach on the duty of total abstinence from intoxicating drinks, as a beverage, on the third Sabbath of December next, or at any previous time which their convenience may suggest.

We find on examination that the Assembly of '65 gave two deliverances on the subject of Temperance—the one, with which we mainly concur, asserting the importance of renewed efforts on the part of ministers and good people to promote

total abstinence—the other, the paper prepared by Dr. Elliott, already referred to, which treats more especially of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages, and maintains the right and duty of the church to repress them by discipline and excommunication. With the argument of this paper we do not agree, but as this was not the point acted upon by the last Assembly, and we are crowded for space, we will not now undertake to discuss it. The real point is the apparent *unqualified* assertion of “the duty of total abstinence from intoxicating drinks as a beverage,” and the right of the Assembly to enjoin all ministers to teach this doctrine.

If it is meant that it is a duty simply because it is expedient thus to abstain from them in the present state of things, a duty, however, of which each one must be, as in all things indifferent, at liberty to judge and act for himself, and which cannot be lawfully enforced by church discipline, so that to his own Master alone each one stands or falls, that is one thing. We will heartily join in efforts to promote abstinence on this ground, even to the extent of supporting prohibitory legislation so far as the public will sustain it. But the moment it is maintained that *all* use of any intoxicating drink as a beverage is a sin *per se*, that our liberty herein is to be judged by another man’s conscience, that it can be hedged or fettered by church discipline, that we are called to abstinence by any obligations except those of love prompted by considerations of expediency, we say no; we give place by subjection, no not for an hour.

If it is in this sense a duty to abstain from using all such drinks as a beverage, then so to use them, to any extent, or on any occasion, is a sin. This is clearly unscriptural and anti-scriptural doctrine, and impeaches the morality of our blessed Lord. The wine of Scripture was surely fermented and capable of producing intoxication. Any other view incurs the just contempt of scholars and of all unprejudiced readers of the Word of God, who take the reasonable and obvious meaning which results from a fair comparison of part with part. It is therefore against the Word of God to teach such doctrine, or to command others to teach it.

It is equally hostile to the cause of temperance itself. In view of the immense increase of drinking and intemperance

among all grades of people in this country, the extensive and almost universal adulteration of liquors with poisonous ingredients, and the more acrid products of distillation, we are quite willing and earnest, by precept and example, to urge upon all the great importance of abstaining from all intoxicating drinks as a beverage; nay, as we have just said, we are quite ready to go as far as public sentiment will sustain it, in bringing legal prohibition to bear against the torrent of drunkenness which is spreading everywhere the wrecks of material, moral, and religious desolation. But we are not willing to found such a movement on principles which are directly antagonistic to the Word of God, and must therefore imperil and ultimately undermine any cause built upon them, while they impair that faith in divine truth which is the life of all morality and all religion. It was the introduction and wide adoption of the principle in question into the great Temperance Reformation a quarter of a century since, that contributed to the great reaction against that movement, the bitter and baleful fruits of which we are now reaping. The people and the growing youth were taught that it is a *sin* to taste any thing that can intoxicate, and were led by thousands to subscribe pledges of total abstinence *on this ground*. As they read their Bibles they found this principle contradicted by divine authority. They felt that they had been the dupes of an imposture and a delusion, and recoiled to the contrary extreme, from following a delusion, to the more or less unrestrained indulgence of their appetites. Shall we try the experiment over again and aggravate a curse already aggravated by it?

There is no region in which good men are more in danger of being misled by superficial and fanatical views, than in that wherein God hath called us unto liberty, at the same time charging us not to use our liberty as an occasion to the flesh, but by love to serve one another. We are left to our liberty as to dress, equipage, and general cost and style of living, so long as we are able to sustain it honestly and keep within the bounds of decency. And yet, as we shall soon find, our Assembly justly laid to the charge of the luxury and extravagance now in fashion, that they promote the present alarming growth of licentiousness, including the horrible crime of infan-

ticide! Does the enormity of drunkenness exceed this? And would it not be true that if people were to abstain from all ornaments and luxuries, they would greatly lessen the temptation to these crimes, and promote social purity, together with whatever is pure and lovely and of good report? What then? May the church interdict on pain of excommunication all use of ornaments and luxuries as a sin, in order to lessen the present fearful excess in them, and the direful consequences of which it is so prolific? No. This is an unwarrantable and dangerous interference with Christian liberty. It could never be carried out without putting Christianity in a straight jacket and rending our churches into fragments. Yet who can doubt that there is great sin in much of this luxurious self-indulgence, this costly ostentation, this "splendid misery and shabby splendor?" How ought the pulpit, the press, and all Christian teaching and persuasion, to beseech, persuade, warn, thunder against it? Yet if all this fail, can the church demand of her ministers to preach upon the *duty* of total abstinence from *all* ornaments and luxuries, because it seems as if such abstinence in Christian people would have some tendency to abate the dreadful evils in question? It is, however, none the less the clear duty of Christians to lay these things to heart: to deny the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, and to shun the appearance of evil; and of ministers to warn them thus to abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against their souls, on peril of losing these souls. But there is a range of liberty in the manner of doing it, for the use of which they are accountable, not to man, but to that Master to whom they must stand or fall. This is a fruitful theme, with manifold applications, which we have no room to follow further now, but which calls for a speedy re-discussion in the light of first principles.

#### DIVORCE AND INFANTICIDE.

This subject was brought before the Assembly, in a series of resolutions offered by Rev. Mr. Beer. The following paper reported by the Committee on Bills and Overtures was adopted:—

That it is with great pain we are constrained to admit the increasing prevalence in many parts of our country of unscriptural views of the marriage

relation, in consequence of which the obligations of that relation are disregarded by many, and separations of husbands and wives, and divorces for slight and unwarrantable reasons, are becoming more frequent every year. Nor can we shut our eyes to the fact that the horrible crime of infanticide, especially in the form of the destruction by parents of their own offspring before birth, also prevails to an alarming extent. The evils which these errors and crimes have already brought upon our country, and the worse evils which they threaten in the near future, make it imperative, as we believe, that the whole power of the ministry of the Church of Jesus Christ should be put forth in maintenance of truth and of virtue in regard to these things. Many causes have operated to produce a corruption of the public morals so deplorable; prominent among which may be mentioned the facility with which divorces may be obtained in some of the States, constant promulgation of false ideas of marriage and its duties by means of books, lectures, &c., and the distribution through the mails of impure publications; but an influence not less powerful than any of these is the growing devotion to fashion and luxury of this age, and the idea which practically obtains to so great an extent that pleasure, instead of the glory of God and the enjoyment of his favor, is the great object of life. It is therefore the duty of the Church of Christ to oppose, in every practical way, these and all other corrupting agencies and tendencies, and we especially urge upon all ministers of the Gospel, the duty of giving instruction to the people of their respective charges as to the Scriptural doctrine concerning the marriage relation. We warn them against joining in wedlock any who may have been divorced upon other than Scriptural grounds. We also enjoin upon church sessions the exercise of due discipline in the case of those members who may be guilty of violating the law of Christ in this particular. This Assembly regards the destruction by parents of their own offspring before birth with abhorrence, as a crime against God and against Nature; and, as the frequency of such murders can no longer be concealed, we hereby warn those who are guilty of this crime that except they repent they cannot inherit eternal life. We also exhort those who have been called to preach the Gospel, and all who love purity and truth, and who would avert the just judgment of Almighty God from the nation, that they be no longer silent or tolerant of these things, but that they endeavor by all proper means to stay the flood of impurity and cruelty. We call upon all to remember that marriage is honorable, not only in itself but in its ends. Therefore, those who seek to avoid the responsibility and cares connected with the bringing up of children, not only deprive themselves of one of the greatest blessings of life and fly in the face of God's decrees, but do violence to their own natures, and will be found out of their sins even in this world.

These views need no vindication. They are their own evidence to every unperverted mind. We are pained that a state of things exists which calls for such declarations and warnings on the part of our ecclesiastical bodies. But the proofs of it are abundant and fearful, and the action of the Assembly is timely and important. A motion was made that it be read from all our pulpits. This was wisely voted down.

Matters of such difficulty and delicacy must of necessity be left to the judgment and discretion of each pastor.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH SOUTHERN CHURCHES.

Overtures from the Presbytery of Philadelphia and some others, requesting the Assembly to open a fraternal correspondence with the Southern Presbyterian Church, with a view to ultimate re-union, were reported from the Committee of Bills and Overtures with the recommendation that such correspondence be entered upon with a hope of its leading to the interchange of delegates between the two bodies. This gave rise to animated and extended debate. Nearly the whole Assembly appeared desirous to initiate measures looking toward this consummation. A motion to lay the whole subject on the table was negatived by an almost unanimous vote. The great obstacle to action in the minds of members seemed to be an apprehended aversion to the measure on the part of the Southern Church itself, engendered by the antipathies growing out of the war and the action of the Assemblies of '65, '66, which many of those best informed believe still to survive in unabated intensity. On the other hand, it was urged that the surest way to overcome or soften these antipathies is to approach them with generous and magnanimous advances. The subject was at length referred to a special committee, A. A. E. TAYLOR, Chairman, which recommended and secured the following very judicious action:—

*Whereas*, The last General Assembly acknowledged the separate and independent existence of the Presbyterian Church in the Southern States, and enjoined upon all subordinate courts so to treat it, thus according to its ministers and members the privilege of admission to our body upon the same terms which are extended to ministers and members of other branches of the Presbyterian Church in this country; therefore,

*Resolved*, That this General Assembly hereby conveys its Christian salutations to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Southern States, and gives expression to its sentiments of Christian fraternity and fellowship toward the ministers and members of that body.

And as we inherit and hold with them the same ancient symbols of faith, the same forms of government and of worship, thus representing before the world the same sacred principles to which our common ancestors witnessed and which we have maintained together in the past; and especially since we occupy adjacent and in many places common territory, we deem it due to our one Lord, and to the

best interests of his kingdom on earth, to express the desire that the day may not be distant when we may again be united in one great organization, that shall cover our whole land and embrace all branches of the Presbyterian Church.

*Resolved,* That the Stated Clerk be directed to forward a copy of these resolutions to the Stated Clerk of the Presbyterian Church in the Southern States.

We can only echo these salutations and longings for a consummation so devoutly to be wished.

LITIGATION TO SECURE ECCLESIASTICAL INDEPENDENCE, AND RESCUE THE CHURCH IN ITS OWN SPHERE FROM THE DOMINATION OF THE CIVIL POWER.

The Commissioners of the various Presbyteries in Kentucky brought to the notice of the Assembly various decisions of the civil courts in Kentucky, affecting the interests of the churches in that State.

By the first of these decisions, the decrees of our ecclesiastical courts on purely ecclesiastical matters are subjected to the civil courts, and elders elected in accordance with the direction of the General Assembly are declared not to be elders.

The second decision rules the deliverances of the General Assembly during the late war, as to loyalty, freedom, &c., to be unconstitutional, and its condemnation of the Declaration and Testimony men is adjudged erroneous, null, and void.

The third is a decision of the United States Circuit Court, opposed to the above, affirming that the civil courts are bound to respect and enforce the decisions of all ecclesiastical courts, and especially those of the General Assembly on all purely ecclesiastical matters.

An appeal has been taken from the last decision to the Supreme Court of the United States, and it is needful that the Assembly should take measures to defend its rights. On this subject the following resolutions were adopted:—

*Resolved.* This General Assembly expresses its deepest sympathy for those churches in the bounds of the Synods of Kentucky which have become involved in expensive and harassing lawsuits, while faithfully complying with the orders of the Superior Judicatories of the church, and directs the Boards of Domestic Missions and of Church Extension, to afford them all possible assistance.

2. While the General Assembly fully recognizes its obligation to be in subjection to the powers that be, yet, so long as any thing can be legally done, it must

not and will not remain silent and inactive when its own rights and liberties, and those of the whole church, are put in peril by injurious decisions in the civil courts: it expresses its gratification at the decision rendered by the Circuit Court of the United States in the case referred to in the memorial, and it hereby appoints E. P. Humphrey, D. D., Edgar Needham, and Gen. James M. Harlan a committee to counsel and co-operate with the proper parties in the appeal which has been taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, and for the necessary expenses of said case in the courts to which it has been appealed said committee are authorized to draw on the Board of Publication for a sum not exceeding \$3,500.

The Rev. WM. J. MCKNIGHT of the Pennsylvania Presbytery said the Chief Justice of the State had decided that no person elected by this General Assembly can be or shall be allowed to exercise the duties of eldership in that State, because the action of the General Assembly at Pittsburg was unconstitutional. Under these decisions, the people, sympathizing with the South, will lay hold of and retain the property of the churches. But since the accession of the Declaration and Testimony men to the Southern Assembly, they will be the real parties, claiming all the property of the Presbyterian Church in that State. This is the farthest point toward the Gulf owned by this church, and will not this Assembly protect its own interests?

Dr. RODGERS moved an amendment that the appropriation to meet these costs be taken from the funds under the care of the trustees of the General Assembly.

Rev. Dr. MUSGRAVE conceived that this suit involved the foundations of civil and religious liberty, and affected the interests of every denomination in the land. He thought the trustees of the General Assembly had no funds which could be appropriated. He would not use any funds contributed to any specific purpose. But the Board of Publication was a publishing house, making money, and out of their profits they could appropriate this amount. The money should be put beyond contingency, and the churches may return it to that Board if necessary.

Senator DRAKE thought that the sum named was inadequate, and moved that the amount be increased to \$5,000.

Judge RYERSON approved of all that Dr. Musgrave and Senator Drake had said.

The Rev. Dr. SCHENCK was heard in behalf of the Board of Publication, so far as affected by the proposed measure. He conceived the Assembly had no moral right to use the funds contributed to publish books, &c., while the Assembly have the legal right to use these funds as they please. But it would not be good policy to devote these funds dedicated to a specific purpose to any other. The capital and its increase should be esteemed sacred. Teach the churches that the Board of Publication is a good fat hen, out of which a golden egg can be squeezed whenever the church pleases, and you establish a dangerous principle.

Dr. MUSGRAVE thought they could furnish this money, and the occasion is a momentous one, which may not occur again in a century. Once in 80 years we may do this thing. The spirit of the Covenanters still lives, and he hoped something would be done which will vindicate the rights of the church.

Dr. Rodger's amendment was lost. Senator Drake's amendment was adopted, and the whole report was then adopted.

There will be but one voice in our church on this subject, and that in favor of prosecuting this contest for its own independence, and that of all churches, to the very last. The only question respects the source whence the funds are to be drawn for the purpose. We would have greatly preferred a special collection for it. We trust that the Board of Publication will not be drawn upon for such matters, and to such an extent, oftener than once in a century. To make it a frequent and convenient resource for the pecuniary wants of the church, will not only invade a sacred trust, and cripple an important evangelical agency, but kill the bird that lays the golden egg.

MEASURES FOR GREATER UNION AND CO-OPERATION AMONG EVANGELICAL CHURCHES. MEETING OF THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

On motion, the Corresponding Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, Rev. S. I. Prime, D. D., was heard in behalf of the Association. He especially called attention to the indifference with which Protestants regard the progress of Romanism and infidelity. Already the Romanists have secured legislation by which they will receive \$300,000 annually of the school funds for the support of their schools in this city

alone. Unless Protestants wake up to the importance of this subject the whole educational system of this country, which has been its great glory, will be destroyed.

Rev. Dr. JOHN HALL offered the following resolutions, which were adopted:—

1. *Resolved*, That this Assembly has heard with great satisfaction that the Evangelical Alliance of the United States has invited a Conference of Evangelical Churches of this country to meet in the city of New York in the ensuing autumn, and a General Conference of Evangelical Christians in all the earth, to assemble in the same city of New York in the autumn of 1870; and it will unite its prayers with those of Christian people everywhere, that the Holy Spirit may guide their councils and lead to wise results for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom.

2. That the principles of the Protestant Reformation, identified as they are with the progress of religious liberty, education, and Christianity in the earth, are increasingly precious in our eyes, and we call upon our ministers and people to watch with jealous care the efforts of Romanism in the United States, and by the employment of all suitable means to resist the insidious attempts of Roman Catholics to obtain undue precedence in this country.

#### NATIONAL COUNCIL OF EVANGELICAL CHURCHES.

A communication was received from the General Synod of the Reformed Church, signed by the Rev. E. S. PORTER, D.D., President, and the Rev. D. DEMAREST, D.D., Stated Clerk, embracing the following plan for a General Council of Reformed Churches:—

*Whereas*, The constitution of the church confides to the General Synod the duty of "regulating and maintaining a friendly correspondence with the highest judicatories or assemblies of other religious denominations, for the purpose of promoting union and concert in general measures which may be calculated to maintain sound doctrine, prevent conflicting regulations relative to persons under censure of the judicatories of other denominations, and to produce concert and harmony in their respective proceedings to promote the cause of piety and religion;" and

*Whereas*, It is the conviction of this Synod that wholesome fraternal measures may be adopted for combining and unifying the Evangelical denominations in support of the common doctrines of Christianity, without involving any surrender of the distinctive features and individual characteristics of these denominations; and

*Whereas*, The doctrinal and governmental system of the Reformed Church is broad and catholic, presenting a basis on which general measures for the promotion of piety and religion may be prosecuted; therefore

*Resolved*, That the Synod hereby appoints a committee of three ministers and three elders, to present, in its behalf, to the highest judicatories and assemblies of other Evangelical denominations, at their next annual meetings, for their con-

sideration and adoption, the following plan of a National Council of the Evangelical denominations in these United States:—

1. Such Council shall have for its great object the concerting of proper measures for promoting, not organic, but fraternal union, for the maintenance of the common doctrines and ethics of the Christian Church, whose one Head is the Lord Jesus.

2. That its powers shall be simply advisory, and be exercised, not for the purpose of assailing what any denomination represented therein may regard as necessary for its welfare, but to secure concert of action for the furtherance of the Gospel, by diminishing sectarian rivalries and oppositions.

3. Such Council, when convened, may consider and recommend such general measures as may tend to give expression to the proper and essential unity of all who love the Lord Jesus Christ, whether in this or other lands, and draw them closer together in aggressive labors to bring the whole world into subjection to Christ.

4. The Council shall be a delegated body, and may consist of five representatives—three ministers and two laymen—from each Evangelical denomination acceding to this recommendation, but no denomination, as such, shall be held responsible in any legislative sense for what the Council may choose to recommend.

6. The Council shall meet, provided the higher judicatories and assemblies of sister churches accede to this suggestion, on the third Tuesday of October, 1869, in the city of New York, at 10 o'clock A. M., in the Reformed Church on Washington Square.

The President, Assessor, Stated Clerk of this Synod, with the elders, Robert H. Pruyn, Sanford Cobb, and Frederick T. Frelinghuysen, were appointed a committee to carry the above into effect.

The Assembly acceded to this proposal with great cordiality, and appointed the following delegates to said council, viz.: The Revs. J. B. Waterbury, D. D., Lyman Atwater, D. D., W. C. Roberts; Elders, J. T. Nixon and A. B. Belknap.

All will sympathize with the following extract from the address of Rev. Dr. TAYLOR, delegate from the Reformed Church to the Assembly, on this subject:—

“The last General Synod of our church adopted a paper proposing a ‘National Council of the Evangelical denominations of the United States, for the maintenance of the common doctrines and ethics of the Christian Church, whose one head is the Lord Jesus.’ As this document comes before the Assembly in official form, through another channel, I only allude to it here as an indication of the sentiment of the Reformed Church, and of her desire for that living unity and co-operation which the times demand, and for which our Redeemer prayed and yet waits, expectant upon his throne. A distinguished divine of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and perhaps her foremost scholar, when conversing on the Re-union of the Presbyterian Churches, said to me that he looked for the day when the whole Protestant Church would be compelled to unite in on

great league, or possibly in organic form, against the forces of the Romish and infidel antichrists. The General Council which has been summoned to meet in Rome at the close of this year may give the signal for this new warfare, and for closing up our divided ranks. Be it so or not, these wishes and anticipations are born of the Saviour's prayer, 'that they all may be one—that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.' An unbelieving world compels them for its own salvation. This question of questions in these General Assemblies, in one shape or another, forces itself upon all branches of the Christian Church.

"And while my own denomination is willing and anxious to stand in her lot, and as she interprets Providence, is not ready for organic union with sister bodies, this much I dare say—that when the royal mandate of her King is heard, her little division will at once fall in with the grand army. Until then she is waiting orders, ready to stand or to move, as the orders come.

"Yet this question, which is upon your hearts, also moves our own. Indifference would be treason to our common Lord. There is too much of good hanging upon it, and too much is imperilled by the disunion of Christians to permit us to slight it. If I may state a fact, drawn from the official service to which God has called me in another sphere, I bear witness before this General Assembly that oftentimes the Word of God is bound in its very circulation more by the unhappy sectarian jealousies and exclusive bigotries of conflicting denominations than by the banded infidelity of the ugly masses who trample upon our Sabbaths, and who perish in the shadows of our sanctuaries.

"Sir, the air is surcharged and vocal with this spirit of union among the churches, for the unity and defence of the faith once delivered to the saints. And in that great battle which is coming, rest assured that the Canons of Dort will never be turned against the towers of Westminster, and our old Belgic Standard will float in heaven's breezes with your banner of the Covenant, both of them red with the blood of our martyrs, and inscribed with the love of him who died for us all."

#### THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL.

Dr. Musgrave, Dr. John Hall, and Elder Martin Ryerson, were appointed, in connection with a similar committee from the other branch, to prepare an answer to the encyclical letter of the Pope.

#### JOINT COMMUNION.

In accordance with a previous resolution, the Assemblies united on Friday afternoon, May 31st, in celebrating the Lord's Supper at the Brick Church. The two Moderators presided. The venerable Dr. Spring, Rev. J. B. Shaw, of Rochester (N. S.), Rev. Dr. Taylor, of Cincinnati, (N. S.), and Rev. Dr. W. C. Anderson, of New Albany, Ind. (O. S.), took part in the impressive services.

The venerable Rev. Dr. De Witt, of the Collegiate Reformed church, pronounced the benediction.

After the usual greetings, farewells, votes of thanks, singing, and prayer, the Moderator, in accordance with a vote of the body, as more fully explained hereafter, adjourned the Assembly, to meet in the First Presbyterian church in Pittsburg, on November 10th, 1869, at 11 A. M.

---

ART VI.—*Proceedings of the late Assemblies on Re-union.*

THE late meetings of the New and Old School Assemblies, almost within speaking distance, on Murray Hill, New York City, will be memorable as long as the Presbyterian Church lives in this country, or the world. We need not say that this will be due, not to the many other subjects of moment handled and issued by these bodies, but to the measures adopted to effect their own re-union. This was the central and absorbing matter of interest to the Assemblies themselves, the great churches they represented, to other Christian bodies, the metropolis where they met, the country, and all Christendom.

As the delegates assembled, they found all the currents setting strongly in favor of the re-union so long the object of prayer and effort, of discussion and negotiation. In families, social circles, casual interviews, prayer meetings of elders and of the two Assemblies, in public worship on the Sabbath, the speedy consummation of the union was presumed and implied. This was so predominant, that all of a contrary nature seemed exceptional, and the offspring of individual idiosyncrasy. The very atmosphere seemed instinct and vocal with it. It was assumed that the basis of the re-union must be the simple standards common to the two churches. The only question open was, whether it should be immediately consummated by mere concurrent resolutions of the Assemblies, or delayed for Presbyterian ratification. Quite a majority of the delegates had been authorized by

their Presbyteries to pursue the former course, and were prepared to do it if it met with no formidable opposition.

It may not be amiss to revert for a moment to the causes which have induced so remarkable a change, amounting to a revolution, of feeling, in our own church at least, within a few years.

First of all, it is to be considered that few are left who were parties or witnesses to the strifes which culminated in the disruption of 1838. A large proportion of our people and elders, and still larger of our ministers, have even been born since that day. The controversies themselves of that period have for a long time nearly ceased. They have vanished from the publications, ecclesiastical discussions, and preaching of the day, and the two churches have been mainly absorbed in self-propagation and evangelic labor. Ministers and people of both bodies have seen and known each other mostly through the preaching and services of the sanctuary, in co-operative Christian work, or as represented in practical and devotional books and tracts. In these the hours of old controversies and disputes rarely protrude. Hence, with occasional exceptions, the younger generation are unconscious of differences which justify continued separation, and cannot believe that, whatever may have been in the past, there are now any underlying theologic antagonisms which justify it. Then the actual working off by the New School of Congregationalism, and Voluntaryism, and the undeniable improvement in the teaching and training of their Theological Seminaries, with its happy effects, have done much to reduce and eliminate the original causes of mistrust and discord.

So far, however, as actual movements toward organic re-union are concerned, these assimilating tendencies would probably have long lain dormant, without the late war and its consequences. It separated the Southern element from the Old School, and, abolishing slavery, abolished whatever causes of differences and continued separation were implicated with or aggravated by it. But more than this, in the thousand ministries of charity and evangelism, needed and evoked to assuage the miseries of the camp, the march, and the battle-

field, it brought the younger and zealous ministers and laymen of both bodies face to face, in common works of faith and labors of love for a common object which enlisted their deepest affections. They felt the attractions of Christian love, unmarred by any sense of doctrinal repulsions. And in a degree this influence was felt in bringing the great body of the churches into a closer co-operation, acquaintance, and sympathy, to ward off what they felt to be a threatened and common ruin. And the principle of political unity, for which the war was waged, withal promoted the feeling in favor of Christian union, and against ecclesiastical disintegration. Thus, soon after the outbreak of the war, the mind of the two churches began to exercise itself on the problem of re-union, and has been feeling its way toward that consummation ever since.

In aid of this has come the growing conviction of the importance of economizing strength and resources in missionary and other works of evangelization and charity, by preventing the cost of rival and mutually destructive enterprises where one is far better than two; of presenting a stronger front against the common foes of Evangelical religion—Romanism, Ritualism, and Rationalism; and to furthering so far forth the ardent longings of the Protestant mind for increasing unity.

The Joint Committee of Conference, the appointment of which was mentioned in our last article, after several sessions, alternately each branch by itself, and both together, unanimously agreed upon a plan to be submitted to the two Assemblies for approval, and, if so approved, to be overtured to the Presbyteries for ratification as therein stated. It is hardly necessary to say that, in some of its details, different members of the Committee would have preferred, some one, and some another addition, omission, or modification. This could not be otherwise with so large a number of men from two bodies that have been apart for more than a generation. Yet that points of this kind were so few is a matter of grateful surprise. But the meaning of an approval of the plan is not that he who accepts it would not prefer any amendments of it, but that, on the whole, as things are, he judges it better to accept

and adopt, than to reject it. Although familiar to our readers, we print it here for permanent preservation and reference.

### REPORT

*Of the Committee of Conference of the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church, meeting in New York City, Thursday, May 20, 1869.*

The Committee of Conference appointed by the two General Assemblies have attended to the duty assigned to them: and after a very free interchange of views, with prayer to Almighty God for his guidance, are unanimous in recommending to the Assemblies for their consideration, and, if they see fit, their adoption, the accompanying three papers, to wit:—

1. Plan of Re-union of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;
2. Concurrent Declarations of the General Assemblies of 1869; and
3. Recommendation of a Day of Prayer.

WILLIAM ADAMS, *Chairman.*

G. W. MUSGRAVE.	C. D. DRAKE.	JAMES B. SHAW.
A. G. HALL.	WM. M. FRANCIS.	W. STRONG.
LYMAN H. ATWATER.	JOHN C. GRIER.	DANIEL HAINES.
WILLIS LORD.	J. F. STEARNS.	WILLIAM E. DODGE.
H. R. WILSON.	R. W. PATTERSON.	J. S. FARRAND.
ROBERT CARTER.	S. W. FISHER.	JOHN L. KNIGHT.

HENRY DAY, *Secretary.*

*Plan of Re-union of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.*

Believing that the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom would be promoted by the healing of our divisions, and that the two bodies bearing the same name, having the same constitution, and each recognizing the other as a sound and orthodox body, according to the principles of the Confession common to both, cannot be justified by any but the most imperative reasons in maintaining separate, and, in some respects, rival organizations; we are now clearly of the opinion that the re-union of those bodies ought, as soon as the necessary steps can be taken, to be accomplished, upon the basis hereinafter set forth:—

1. The Presbyterian churches in the United States of America, namely, that whose General Assembly convened in the Brick Church, in the city of New York, on the 20th of May, 1869, and that whose General Assembly met in the Church of the Covenant, in the same city, on the same day, shall be re-united as one church, under the name and style of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, possessing all the legal and corporate rights and powers pertaining to the church previous to the division in 1838, and all the legal and corporate rights and powers which the separate churches now possess.

2. The Re-union shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and

adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; and the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity.

3. Each of the said Assemblies shall submit the foregoing basis to its Presbyteries, which shall be required to meet on or before the 15th day of October, 1869, to express their approval or disapproval of the same, by a categorical answer to the following question:—

Do you approve of the re-union of the two bodies now claiming the name and rights of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, on the following basis, namely:—"The re-union shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; and the Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity."

Each Presbytery shall, before the 1st day of November, 1869, forward to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly with which it is connected, a statement of its vote on the said Basis of Re-union.

4. The said General Assemblies now sitting shall, after finishing their business, adjourn to meet in the city of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, on the second Wednesday of November, 1869, at 11 o'clock A. M.

If the two General Assemblies shall then find and declare that the above-named Basis of Re-union has been approved by two-thirds of the Presbyteries connected with each branch of the church, then the same shall be of binding force, and the two Assemblies shall take action accordingly.

5. The said General Assemblies shall then and there make provision for the meeting of the General Assembly of the united church on the third Thursday of May, 1870. The Moderators of the two present Assemblies shall jointly preside at the said Assembly of 1870 until another Moderator is chosen. The Moderator of the Assembly now sitting at the Brick Church aforesaid, shall, if present, put all votes, and decide all questions of order; and the Moderator of the other Assembly shall, if present, preach the opening sermon; and the Stated Clerks of the present Assemblies shall act as Stated Clerks of the Assembly of the united church until a Stated Clerk or clerks shall have been chosen thereby; and no Commissioner shall have a right to vote or deliberate in said Assembly until his name shall have been enrolled by the said Clerks, and his commission examined and filed among the papers of the Assembly.

6. Each Presbytery of the separate churches shall be entitled to the same representation in the Assembly of the united church in 1870, as it is entitled to in the Assembly with which it is now connected.

*Concurrent Declarations of the General Assemblies of 1869.*

As there are matters pertaining to the interests of the church when it shall have become re-united, which will manifestly require adjustment on the coming together of two bodies which have so long acted separately, and concerning some of which matters it is highly desirable that there should be a previous good un-

derstanding, the two Assemblies agree to adopt the following declarations, not as articles of compact or covenant, but as in their judgment proper and equitable arrangements, to wit:—

1. All the ministers and churches embraced in the two bodies should be admitted to the same standing in the united body, which they may have held in their respective connections, up to the consummation of the union.

2. Imperfectly organized churches are counselled and expected to become thoroughly Presbyterian, as early within the period of five years as may be permitted by the highest interests to be consulted; and no other such churches shall be hereafter received.

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

4. The official records of the two branches of the church, for the period of separation, should be preserved and held as making up the one history of the church; and no rule or precedent which does not stand approved by both the bodies, should be of any authority until re-established in the united body, except in so far as such rule or precedent may affect the rights of property founded thereon.

5. The corporate rights now held by the two General Assemblies, and by their Boards and Committees, should, as far as practicable, be consolidated, and applied for their several objects as defined by law.

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

7. As soon as practicable after the union shall have been effected, the General Assembly should reconstruct and consolidate the several Permanent Committees and Boards which now belong to the two Assemblies, so as to represent, as far as possible with impartiality, the views and wishes of the two bodies constituting the united church.

8. The publications of the Board of Publication and of the Publication Committee should continue to be issued as at present, leaving it to the Board of Publication of the united church to revise these issues, and perfect a catalogue for the united church, so as to exclude invidious references to past controversies.

9. In order to a uniform system of ecclesiastical supervision, those Theological Seminaries that are now under Assembly control may, if their Boards of Direction so elect, be transferred to the watch and care of one or more of the adjacent Synods; and the other Seminaries are advised to introduce, as far as may be, into their constitutions, the principle of Synodical or Assembly supervision; in which case they shall be entitled to an official recognition and approbation on the part of the General Assembly.

10. It should be regarded as the duty of all our judicatories, ministers, and people in the united church, to study the things which make for peace, and to guard against all needless and offensive references to the causes that have divided us; and in order to avoid the revival of past issues by the continuance of any usage in either branch of the church, that has growth out of former conflicts, it is earnestly recommended to the lower judicatories of the church, that they conform their practice in relation to all such usages, as far as is consistent

with their convictions of duty, to the general custom of the church prior to the controversies that resulted in the separation.

*Recommendation of a Day of Prayer.*

That the counsels of Infinite Wisdom may guide our decisions, and the blessing of the Great Head of the church rest upon the result of our efforts for Re-union, it is earnestly recommended to the churches throughout both branches of the Presbyterian Church, that they observe the second Sabbath in September, 1869, as a day of fervent and united prayer to Almighty God, that he would grant unto us all "the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord," and in the new relations now contemplated, enable us to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace."

Much time and labor of explanation were saved by circulating the report in a printed form, among the members of the House, simultaneously with its presentation by the committee. It was presented to both bodies at half-past ten A. M., on Thursday, May 27; explained and debated through the day, and adopted at the close of the afternoon session by a vote of 286 to 9; in the New School Assembly, unanimously.

Before taking the vote the report was discussed by several members. First Dr. Musgrave, as chairman of our branch of committee and expositor of its views, made the great speech which our readers will find given in full in the next article.

Dr. GARDNER SPRING was unwilling to delay its consummation by reference to the Presbyteries. He thought that a refusal to consummate it here would be "flying in the face of the prayers of God's people." He had protested against ex-scinding the Synods and dividing the church. He now stood upon the verge of the grave. He wished to see the union consummated and die a member of the unbroken church. "If you postpone this union another year, I shall not live to see it, but shall die a member of a divided church."

Dr. THOMAS H. SKINNER, Jr., after suggesting some verbal amendments which he afterward became satisfied were unnecessary, said:—

"I was born and reared in the New School church. The first fourteen years of my ministry were spent there. I profess to know something of it. That there has been a change in it, and that that great body is *sound* as we count soundness, I believe. And had this matter been put off for fifteen years

longer it would not have taken six months to effect a union. The great trouble with that body has been that it has tolerated Taylorism. There is no question but that, in the first years of my ministry, I found much of it there. But now in the Union seminary there are such men as Smith, Shedd, and Hitchcock (to say nothing of my venerated father), between whom and the New Haven theology there is as much antagonism as between Princeton and New Haven. Most young men have gone out from that seminary with no love for the theology of New Haven. So far, then, as concerns the theology of that Seminary, it is sound. So also it is at Auburn as is known fulwell. And I can cheerfully testify the same of the theological professors recently introduced into Lane Seminary. The drift, therefore, in the teachings of the ministry of the New School body is not in a separate channel from ours, but in the same broad, deep channel. In fact, they *out-Princeton* Princeton itself. In this fact I think we have an argument for re-union that ought to settle the matter, so far as theology is concerned."

Dr. Skinner then stated some difficulties felt by him in regard to the possibility of such a succession as shall maintain the continuous life of the two bodies when merged into one, having special reference to the points made in the argument of Hovey K. Clark, Esq., in the *Presbyterian* of May 22.

Dr. SAMUEL MILLER regretted to be compelled to vote against the basis, although the best that had been proposed. He objected to allowing Congregationalists to sit in our church courts, even for only five years, and to the continued publication of the issues of the New School Publication Committee. In regard to the claim sometimes made, that the New School are more successful than we in commending the truth of God to men, he showed that statistics prove the contrary, that in every year but one since the division, the proportionate increase of the Old School has been much beyond that of the other branch, and then our theology is the best stimulus and support of efficient activity.

Judge R. S. KENNEDY argued that there is no ground for Dr. Skinner's difficulty in regard to the succession. There is no question that our body has the legal succession. The

courts have so decided. Our Moderator presides and organizes the New Assembly. We remain just as we have been. We have had two governments in this country—our own and the Confederacy. The latter came back to us, and it was all right. We remain as we were. It was our government then—it is ours now. And so the next Assembly, organized in this way, will be *our* Assembly. The New School come into it, and we throw our arms around them and receive them.

HENRY DAY, Esq., having been on this committee thought we ought to acknowledge our obligations to previous committees. He did not wonder at different opinions on this paper. He never knew a contract to be drawn involving \$30,000, that was not drawn over almost as many times as there were parties to it. Every part of the report had been thoroughly considered. It is easy to criticise and find fault. He could in three hours undermine this building. The best legal minds of the country had examined the question and given their opinion that there was no danger of losing a dollar. The question whether two such bodies can legally get together is determined by the fact that the law favors the unity of such bodies. Something has been said about loss of identity. When man and wife are joined together, do they lose their identity? No! The law recognizes the identity of each. And when the Assembly shall come together next year, the law says the Old School stands there in all its validity—the New School stands there in all its validity—they have things in common, yet each has its own identity, and no rights are infringed upon. The decision, in all such cases, is clear, and there can be no mistake about it.

It might seem, from the old basis, that we made no provision for the new Assembly. But here we have such provision. We have not *one* Moderator, but *two*. Lest some one should say the two Assemblies are not there, we have *two* Moderators. We make provision that the stated clerks shall declare who are members, &c. I think we have abundant provision, and I think the whole thing is legally done. But if it is not legally done, let the property sink into the depths of the sea. The warm-hearted people who are waiting for this union will give you tenfold more than you will lose.

The first requisite for union is—*do we want it?* The history of the past four years answers that effectually.

The next is—do you agree in polity and doctrine? We say so. But some say we do not understand doctrinal terms in the same sense. We laymen do not understand these terms, and a vast majority of the members of both churches do not understand them. Dr. Skinner, or any of the ministers here, might preach for months in a New School church, and the people would never know he was an Old School man.

Can we manage our property question? I have given you the decisions of learned legal gentlemen upon this point, which are sufficient.

And now—*we want this union.* The laity wants it; the church wants it. We want to get to work. Romanism and Ritualism are to be fought. Corruption stalks abroad through the land. We must meet these things. You owe this union to the cause of Presbyterianism. Other denominations are outstripping us. Methodists, Baptists, and Episcopalians are increasing faster than we are. We must come together and save ourselves. We need the balance-wheel of Old School Presbyterianism. We need men that will fit themselves to all conditions and go forth to work. The times call for action. I glory in the Presbyterian banner. Let us rally under it 700,000 Presbyterian men, earnestly doing battle for their Sabbath, their religion, and their Bible.

Rev. Mr. LAURIE objected to the basis because it affirmed the orthodoxy of the New School body. He read several erroneous passages from the writings of Mr. Barnes and Dr. Duffield on Imputation, Ability, and Atonement in proof. He also quoted the clause known as the Gurley Amendment in the former basis, together with the action of the New School Assembly at Harrisburg thereon; also from the address of the New School committee last winter, asserting that in adopting the simple standard, "the Presbyteries do not relinquish or deny the right to reasonable liberty in the statement of views," &c., in proof that the New School insists on the toleration of false doctrines in the united church.

Great impatience was manifested, and the Moderator ruled it out of order, that an attempt should be made to disprove

the orthodoxy of a body by excerpts from the writings of individuals, and these belonging to controversies now antiquated. We are glad, however, that Senator Drake and others insisted that the fullest liberty of speech should be given to every one who wished a hearing. Irrelevant or not, we should be glad to publish Mr. Laurie's speech in full, as the most thorough argument made on that side before the Assembly, if we had room to reprint the two and a half columns it makes in the *Presbyterian* of June 12. We reserve comment on its principal arguments for our summing up. One of its allegations of fact, however, was answered on the spot by—

Dr. A. G. HALL, of Rochester, author of the famous "Hall resolution," who coming from the midst of the excised Synods, where he had long, at great cost and sacrifice, and at times almost alone, been a champion of Old School principles, testified with great effect, both in the Committee of Conference and the Assembly. Mr. Laurie had asserted that the New School were the same now as in the days of the Barnes controversy. Dr. Hall emphatically denied this. He said there had been a complete revolution since that time and the days of the New Divinity and New Measure revivalists: and that the New School body in his region was now every whit as sound and orthodox as our own.

Rev. ALEXANDER McLEAN referred to Scotch obstinacy and to his being like Mr. Laurie, a Scotchman by birth. If we are to judge of bodies by individual cases, he could tell of Old School men who tolerated the theology of Andover. Will not our New School brethren then suspect our orthodoxy? As to those who deplore the prospective disappearance of the Old School church, he could only say that he desired not the continuance of the Old School church, or the New School church in separation, but the unbroken Presbyterian Church in the United States as our fathers left it to us. The showers of the Holy Spirit began to descend upon the Philadelphia Convention. They had been vouchsafed to union meetings ever since. The glorious consummation is now at hand. Coming from Buffalo he corroborated the testimony of Dr. A. G. Hall in regard to the orthodoxy of the New School bodies in Western New York.

Rev. Dr. ATWATER—I came to this Assembly in some respects settled, and in others dubious as to what was best, and as to what I should do. My mind was made up, (1.) That union, if accomplished at all, must be upon the basis of our standards, without qualification or explanation; and (2.) That the united church should be left free and untrammelled in the administration of those standards. Consequently I insist that it is not to be fettered by any thing said or done, or not done, in the past, by individuals or bodies in either branch, or compelled to go athwart its own conscientious judgment, as to what is the right interpretation and application of these standards. Again, I felt that any basis agreed upon here, or elsewhere, must be sent down to the Presbyteries for their approval or rejection. This I believe to be indispensable. I am confident that there are elements in this body, and in the other, that, by this course, will be made harmonious; but that would otherwise jeopard the harmony of the united body.

I was, I confess, in doubt whether the two bodies were ripe for union, but from all the manifestations that I have seen here, I believe now that if they are not ripe for re-union they are not ripe for any thing else. This appears from the action of the Presbyteries of the church, a vast majority of which have declared in favor of re-union on the basis of the standards pure and simple; and from the great unanimity in its favor which shows itself in this assembly, I clearly see that, with a basis free from all conditions offensive to the conscience, this re-union is the will of our church, and that whatever service we can do for the promotion within her of principles we hold dear, must now be done within and not without this movement: that whatever opinions we may hold as to what would be best in the abstract, must now conform to the logic of events, and the leadings of Providence and Spirit of God which it seems to me have brought our church to the very verge of this consummation. I conceive that I am called henceforth not to oppose the movement, but to co-operate with it, in guiding and assisting it to a safe and glorious issue. I therefore now heartily cast myself into it, and shall make every exertion to compass this result. In regard to the ripeness of the New School body for the re-union, while I could

desire a more complete assimilation in some parts and in some respects, yet, on the whole, the aspect is encouraging and hopeful. Almost immediately after the original division, some of their most extreme and divisive leaders and members went off to the Congregationalists. Not long after the body broke off their alliance with Congregationalism and Congregationalists, to maintain which was one great cause of their exodus from us. Then, after a sharp and long contest, they cleared themselves of their allegiance to voluntary societies, and came over to our ground of having church organizations to do church-work and propagate the Gospel. These causes of difficulty and discord which had so much to do with the original disruption are therefore now eliminated. The New School are thoroughly Presbyterian in polity.

The only element of discord and difficulty that remains—so far as it does remain—is that of doctrine. On this point I have long been happy to observe a change for the better going on among them, of which I years ago made a public recognition.\* I have known the Professor of Theology at Auburn all my public life as intimately as any other public man, unless the beloved and revered Professor of Theology at Princeton. I know his doctrinal soundness, and that his teachings very exactly follow our catechism. I am not surprised at the testimony we have heard as to the growth of orthodoxy in that region.† The publications of the Professor in the New York seminary show a theology quite antagonistic to that system known as New Divinity which had so much to do with rending the church. I am informed that the students from that seminary imbued with the doctrines there taught, obtain licensure without objection in our Presbyteries. If this be so, the doctrinal differences between them and us can hardly justify continued separation. I am glad to learn from Dr. Skinner that the same may be said substantially of the present Professors in Lane Seminary. Now the great moulding form-

\* See *Princeton Review*, October, 1863, pp. 609, 610.

† Dr. McCosh who attended the recent examinations in theology at Auburn and Princeton Seminaries, publicly said that he saw no material difference between the two, and he thought the two churches ought to be soon united.

ative forces which rapidly determine the doctrines of a church, are the training schools of its ministers. This accounts for the assimilation that has been going forward, and gives promise of its continuance. Although there may be reason to apprehend some friction here, until melted away by the perfect fusion of the two churches into one, yet, making full allowance for this, my hopes preponderate over my fears. And I shall not help to induce evil by prophesying evil.

The "Concurrent Declarations" greatly relieve the platform of union in my view. I felt the difficulty and danger of leaving the matters therein disposed of, to be settled after the union shall be effected. On the other hand, I felt the danger of making them a part of the basis or compact, and thus investing them with a sort of sanctity and perpetuity more inviolable than the constitution itself. The exigency is happily met by the present plan (the suggestion of which is due to our New School brethren), according to which these matters are to be proceeded with in a prescribed way, until good and sufficient reason appears for changing it. I could have wished some things in these articles different,—especially that all the theological schools of both churches had been put in the same relation to the united church. But this is impossible without waiting for legislation, which would delay the re-union beyond the present desire and purpose of the church. We may for the present be comforted in this matter by the evidence that has been adduced respecting the doctrinal drift of the seminaries of the other branch, and should any of them become fountains of doctrinal corruption, we are not utterly without refuge and remedy. The Assembly in that case can at least denounce and warn against them.

I have only to say, further, that I could readily suggest other amendments. But it is impossible for twenty men to frame a document in its turn to be passed upon by several hundreds, which can be on the whole acceptable to all, or most, without being in some details short of the wishes of many. All things considered, I do not think a better basis attainable and I shall cordially vote for the report.

Dr. WATERBURY thought it mattered little that some of us differ in minor points. All agree on the great cardinal points.

With the same standards and modes of worship, why should we delay the union. A cold chill came over him when it was proposed to delay the consummation for the approval of the Presbyteries, yet he would submit to it.

Rev. Dr. YERKES,—I do not rise, Mr. Moderator, to make a speech, but an explanation, in behalf of others more than of myself. I stand here one of the commissioners from West Lexington Presbytery—a Presbytery that has obtained some notoriety of late. We are said to be opposed to re-union upon any terms. This is not true. We have said that we desire to be united with all who are like-minded with ourselves. We have voted against the plans heretofore sent down to us, because we did not believe there was that harmony in doctrine between the two bodies which is necessary for a peaceable and prosperous union. This is our sincere and deliberate conviction. We believe there will be found roots of bitterness, that will cause great difficulty hereafter. We feel aggrieved that we have been misunderstood, and that the fewness of our numbers makes our influence of little consequence. If we are few, we have been loyal to the Assembly and the country; and because of this our numbers are small. If the Presbyterian Church shall, by a fair, deliberate vote, consummate the proposed union, there is nothing in the position of this Presbytery that prevents our going with you, if we see fit. I rejoice that this matter is to be submitted to the Presbyteries. I do not believe that you have the constitutional power to perfect a union without doing so. Our hope is that the basis be fairly submitted; and then, if it is acquiesced in by a majority of the people, we shall probably submit to it. If the General Assembly is the representative of the church, and the church is in the Assembly met, then we must submit.

What authority have you from Christ to unite with any body of men? I hold that we have no provision for it, and the only justification for it is found in the divided state of the church. And, therefore, we contend that there is a necessity for submitting this matter to the Presbyteries. I rejoice that it is to be submitted, though I cannot say I believe that the

time has come for a union of these two bodies. I hope, however, that I shall be found to be mistaken.

Here the debate closed. The vote on adopting the report was taken with the result already indicated. Dr. Musgrave and Robert Carter, Esq., were appointed a committee to announce this action to the New School Assembly. It was then

*Resolved*, That in pursuance of the foregoing action of this General Assembly, the Basis of Re-union now adopted is to be sent down to the Presbyteries for their approval or disapproval, and each Presbytery is hereby required to meet on or before the 15th of October, 1869, to express its approval or disapproval of the same by a categorical answer to the following questions:—

Do you approve of the re-union of the two bodies now claiming the name and rights of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, on the following basis, viz.:—The re-union shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received, and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; and the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our policy.

Each Presbytery is also hereby required before the 1st day of November, 1869, to forward to the Stated Clerk of this General Assembly a statement of its vote on the said Basis of Re-union.

*Resolved*, That the Commissioners of the adjourned meeting of the General Assembly, to be held in the city of Pittsburg, on the second Wednesday in November next, in addition to sending their action to the Stated Clerk of the Assembly, as already enjoined, be and hereby are instructed to bring with them certified copies of the action of the Presbyteries on the Plan of Re-union.

The above was also adopted by the New School Assembly.

#### GRATULATIONS FROM THE METHODISTS.

The Rev. L. H. King, D. Curry, D.D., and H. B. Ridgeway, D.D., appeared as a Committee from the Methodist Preachers' Meeting of the City of New York, and being introduced upon the platform, presented the following paper, which was warmly received:—

*To the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church, in session in New York:—*

DEAR FATHERS AND BRETHREN,—The New York Preachers' Meeting, composed of more than one hundred pastors of Methodist churches of New York and vicinity, have unanimously adopted the following Minute:—

*Whereas*, The General Assemblies of the two principal branches of the great Presbyterian family are now in session in this city, we take pleasure in sending to them our fraternal greeting and assurances of our Christian love and fellowship. We rejoice with them in the prospect of a speedy re-union of the two branches of their communion, and pray that their prosperity in the future may be even greater than it has been in the past.

We also express the deep conviction that the time has fully come when all Evangelical churches, forgetting the sad estrangements of the past, should come nearer together, and, united in heart, aid in maintaining throughout this land a sound morality against Sabbath desecration, intemperance, and all other forms of vice, and a pure religion against Rationalism, Ritualism, and Romanism.

We hope the day is near at hand when the most friendly relations will be established and maintained between the Presbyterian and Methodist Episcopal churches.

The Rev. L. H. King, D. Curry, D. D., and H. B. Ridgeway, D. D., were appointed a Committee to present this action to the respective Assemblies.

B. M. ADAMS, President.

New York, May 31, 1869.\*

ALEXANDER McLEAN, Secretary.

A congratulatory telegram was also received from the Welch Calvinistic body sitting in Ohio, which was warmly received and answered.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS.

The junior editor, who alone is responsible for this and the preceding article on the doings of our late Assembly, has already indicated, in the remarks addressed to that body, his conviction that, in the state to which things have now come, the course of wisdom and duty is, not to obstruct the formation of the union, but to assist and guide it to happy issue. Unless new and wholly unexpected developments should alter his judgment, he will accordingly vote for it, and advise others to vote for it, in the Presbyteries. With full appreciation of the difficulties which still keep in a different attitude fathers and brethren, for whose judgment and sincere convictions he has as high a respect as he ever yields to man, he will proceed to show why he sees nothing in them that should alter his purpose or that of the church. It is quite certain that if the proposed plan of union shall be sanctioned by the Presbyteries, of which he does not believe there is a reasonable doubt, the great body of those who may stand in opposition up to that time will acquiesce, and refrain from opposition

that will then be only factious. But he thinks that acquiescence in the union now, and upon the present plan, involves no inconsistency on the part of those who have strenuously opposed it on either of the preceding plans that have been offered to our acceptance. Nay, it seems a logical result of the ground which most of them have taken in conducting an opposition to them which, up to this point is generally conceded to have been salutary. Thus the language of this Journal after the Assembly of 1868 was:—

“The course for the Presbyteries is perfectly simple and honest. Vote against the basis, and state clearly the ground on which they are willing to stand. Then the responsibility will rest where it properly belongs, on the New School body. We are willing to unite upon the basis of our common standards, without explanations. If they are willing to take that ground, well and good. If not, the fault is theirs and not ours.”\* In another article, after counselling the Presbyteries to reject the same basis, it was said in italics: “*But let the rejection be followed by a request or overture to the next General Assembly to negotiate a plan of union, having for its doctrinal basis our common standards pure and simple.*”†

This voiced the general spirit of opposition to that basis. Several Presbyteries, including our own (New Brunswick), made just such an overture in accordance with this suggestion. And a vast majority of the Presbyteries, in rejecting the old basis, have signified their readiness to unite upon this. The New School have met them here upon the precise terms they have indicated, the basis of the standards without qualification or explanation. The very terms laid down by us have therefore been acceded to.

Is there then sufficient reason for our declining the union? We do not see it. And therefore we have no alternative but to follow the course we have marked out. Others may see differently. With the utmost respect for their opinions, conceding and to the last insisting on their right to differ, deprecating all fanatic intolerance and censoriousness in the promoters of this great movement, which would mar its glory, we

\* See *Princeton Review*, July, 1868, pages 472-3.

† Id., page 453.

do not see with them in this matter. We will now try to state in their full force the objections which some feel still require them to oppose or keep aloof from it, and some counter considerations which in our view neutralize their force.

It is objected that though the "standards without explanation" are the formal basis, yet they are understood by each of the contracting parties in a different sense; that these are therefore in reality adopting different bases; and hence, that the union from the start will contain in itself the seeds of disunion. In support of this view the following things are alleged: 1. The adoption by the New School Assembly at Harrisburg of Dr. Hickok's Report. 2. The Address of the New School Committee last winter maintaining that the omission of the Gurley and Smith clauses did not essentially alter the principles of the basis. 3. Some utterances of Dr. HERRICK JOHNSON and others in the New School Assembly, in New York, while advocating the adoption of the proposed Plan of Union. 5. The Hall resolution of a contrary tenor adopted by our body in 1868. We know little else of importance not involved in these, and we will notice them in their turn.

1. The feature in the Hickok Report that probably insured the rejection of the second basis by our Presbyteries was, that, instead of leaving it to the conscientious judgment of the courts of the united church, to determine what is and what is not essential to the system contained in our standards, it made whatever has been tolerated in either church the test, and required the united church to consider any thing and every thing of this nature as not impairing the essentials of that system. This report, however, was built wholly on the Gurley Amendment, which has therefore been dropped; dropped to the very end that the united church might not be fettered by these or any other restrictions upon its own free and untrammelled interpretation of the standards. This is the meaning of the change, not in form only, but in fact, in the understanding of all parties and openly expressed in committee, Assembly, the public press, everywhere, without a lisp, so far as we know, to the contrary. And we think that our New School brethren at length came to see the danger of

that amendment, as not only securing the liberty they wished to guard, but opening the door to a license they did not mean to bargain for. The compact is therefore in fact what it is in form. Our standards, our standards only, our standards freely administered by the united body, according to its own judgment; these are the beginning, middle, and end of the basis as to doctrine and polity—no matter what may be said, or who may say it, to the contrary.

2. But then it is asked was not the Gurley Amendment, thus eliminated, foisted in again, by the Address of the New School Committee last winter? Without stopping to discuss the exact exegesis of that paper, it belongs to a stage of the movement now outgrown. It was simply the opinion of those who published it at the time of publication. It was not even referred to in the final negotiations of the committee in New York, or in our Assembly, nor adopted, so far as we know, by the other Assembly—certainly not in any such way as to be brought by that body to our notice. There is nothing in this, therefore, that can in any manner qualify the reception of the standards as the guide of the united body—in this one meaning, viz.: the free judgment of the courts of that body, as to what is, and what is not essential to the system they contain. We plant ourselves here first and last and always. This position is impregnable. We do not mean, nor do we think the churches to be united mean, to be driven or seduced into any other. This does not mean the *ipsisima verba* theory of subscription on the one hand, nor a liberty to repudiate the Calvinistic system, or the essentials of it, on the other. On this subject we agree entirely with the view presented by Dr. Musgrave in his great speech we have to place before our readers, and deem it unnecessary to say more.

3. But do not the speeches of some members of the New School Assembly in favor of adopting the report, prove that they accept the standards in a meaning very different from ourselves? This is a fair question. Before meeting it directly, we premise, that at the worst, such speeches could not bind our Assembly or church, because 1, they were not communicated to us; 2, it was signified to our committee from Dr. HERRICK JOHNSON, and thence to the Assembly, that he and

others had been misrepresented in the public papers—a thing so common as to seem quite probable. Be this as it may, it is right and wise, before it is too late, to face the facts just as they are, evading nothing and disguising nothing, and see if they prove any formidable antagonism that will hereafter beget irreconcilable collisions, and rend the united church in twain. One divine, reputed eccentric and exceptional in his own church, expatiated on the merits of New England theology—a term in vogue to denote alike systems that have, as well as some which have not, been always freely tolerated in our church. We think it unreasonable to regard this as very serious, whatever we may think of its taste. Another had satisfied himself that the liberty he wanted, would not indeed, without some friction, be secured. But the main and significant thing was Dr. JOHNSON'S statement, that, though himself Old School in his theology, if it was understood that the advocacy of the views of Albert Barnes would not be freely allowed in the united church, “the plan of union would not command the votes of a dozen members or a half-dozen Presbyteries.” The first announcement of this produced some misgiving among us, until it was further announced that he had been misrepresented, and until cool reflection satisfied us that it did not necessarily imply the toleration of errors heretofore deemed intolerable, or condemned by the Assembly.

For, 1. It is settled beyond a peradventure and in the understanding of all parties, that no one whom the united church shall judge a rejecter of the essentials of Calvinism, can shield himself by showing that Messrs. Barnes, Beecher, Duffield, Junkin, Wilson, the *Princeton Review*, or the *Presbyterian Review*, or any other person or authority, living or dead, has said the like of what is objected to.

2. The belief that the advocacy of Mr. Barnes's sentiments will be tolerated, is mere matter of inference and opinion from the ascertained or supposed state of opinion and practice in the two bodies, and is not claimed to be founded on the express or implied terms of the compact. But, however, it arises, or on whatever it is founded, it is simply the opinion of those who entertain it. It may have arisen from extensive conference with ministers and members of our church, or

from what is claimed to be its known present practice. We have heard a prominent orthodox member of the New School body say, that after hearing many ministers of both churches, he should need a more latitudinarian basis to protect some from our body, whom he had heard, than any from his own. And we have seen enough to give at least a verisimilitude to the statement. If they judge that we now tolerate among us, what they expect will be tolerated in the united church, or even more, this is their own judgment, and unless they are wholly mistaken, the union will alter us little in this respect.

3. What is more important and decisive, however, on this head is, that Mr. Barnes has unconsciously but largely exercised the privilege of being inconsistent with himself. There are few topics on which he has uttered exceptionable views, on which he has not also in some form spoken in a very satisfactory manner. We do not yield to his colleague in our estimate of him as a man, a Christian, and an eminent minister and author. But, we presume, no offence will be taken if we say that systematic theology is not his forte: that it was easy for his prosecutors, by one array of excerpts from his writings to table a formidable list of charges against him, and for his defenders to claim and prove from another set of excerpts, that his views were not fairly represented by the charges, and that judged by these, he held doctrines not hostile to the system of our confessions. The New School never admitted that the charges against Mr. Barnes, on his trial, truly or fairly represented his opinions. In claiming that his opinions are to be tolerated, they do not therefore claim that the opinions charged against him are to be tolerated. Mr. Barnes made such representations of his views before the Assembly, to which he appealed his case, that as we are credibly informed, Dr. Junkin told him, if he (Mr. B.) would sign his name to it, he (Dr. J.) would withdraw his charges. If Mr. Barnes could thus set forth his views to Dr. Junkin, can they not be set in a light to the view of our New School brethren, at least, giving them a claim to be tolerated? Hence, on account of the want of system and harmony in Mr. Barnes's utterances, we have not referred to him or his

writings, as a test, in our attempts to define and prove what has been held or tolerated in the New School body. And we can perfectly understand how, while one man in that body would say not a dozen among them would vote for a union which would not tolerate the advocacy of his sentiments, another should say it was equally true, that not a half dozen men among them would vote his theology to be representative for the body. We think, therefore, on closer consideration, that this statement of Dr. JOHNSON, whatever we may think of its taste or propriety in the circumstances, need not alarm us. We think the following remarks of the speaker who closed the debate far fitter and more to the purpose.

Rev. A. W. COWLES, D. D., of Elmira, said he observed that the speakers assumed that the duality of the Assemblies will in some way be continued after the union shall have been consummated. It seemed to him that the figurative language used had tended to make an unfortunate impression. It is compared to a betrothal and a marriage, but close as this relation is, they are still two individuals as really as before. They may call themselves one, but their real personality cannot be lost. Now these Assemblies are to be literally one, and not two. There is not to be one who shall be the "conservator of orthodoxy," and another who shall be the "defender of liberty," there is not to be one who shall watch the other. We are to be united as one body in Christ our Head; we are not to be jealous of one another; we are not to call each other by the old names any more, or refer to former ecclesiastical difficulties in the spirit of distrust or suspicion. This is to be a real union according to the express language of the Apostle: "So we, being many, are *one body* in Christ, and every one members one of another."

And we may say the same of general references to other divines, from whose writings such "various modes of stating and explaining" the doctrines of the confession may be culled, that one set of excerpts might constitute a Calvinistic, and another an anti-Calvinistic creed. All this amounts to nothing, and is of no force and effect, till it is stated in explicit terms *what doctrines* they expect to have tolerated. And then it amounts to nothing, unless it is so said, as to be representative, and not merely individual or personal.

Are then the two bodies in such a relation to each other on these matters, that one is committed to tolerate a set of dogmas which the other is committed not to tolerate? This brings us to the Hall resolution as the pivot on which the whole question turns. Here is a specific and determinate

series of dogmas condemned by the Assembly of 1837, while the church was yet undivided, and by a nearly unanimous vote, to hold which we have unanimously and officially notified the New School Assembly, we should consider a bar to licensure and ordination in the united church. This action has not been revoked. Whatever may be said as to the degree or duration of its obligation, it may at all events be taken for a pretty fair revelation of the animus of our body, until evidence to the contrary appears. Does it then appear that the New School are on opposite ground in regard to that series of articles? Not certainly from any action of theirs since the adoption of the Hall resolution. And in the protest offered by some New School men at the time of their condemnation, they signify that, if these articles had been presented at a time and in a way to prevent false implications, all parties would have united to make this condemnation unanimous; and, further, to prevent misconception they take up each of the condemned errors in turn, and repudiating it, state what they conceive to be the true doctrine instead. This series of substituted articles was afterward adopted by the entire body in convention at Auburn, and constitutes what is called the "Auburn Declaration." On many of the points, and these leading points of Calvinism, such as election and decrees, it is quite satisfactory. Its faults with an occasional exception are rather in the way of defect, than of positive unambiguous error. But without pursuing this matter further, we think it sufficiently proved that the Hall resolution does not evince any necessary or probable antagonism between the bodies. We do not believe that one Presbytery in twenty of the New School body, would license men professing the series of errors therein specified and condemned. We have lately heard of the rejection of two candidates for licensure or ordination in the region of the excinded Synods, for unsoundness on some of the points there involved. Even the utmost latitude that we have heard of as being claimed by the extreme left in their body, is also claimed to be some "form of Calvinism." Whether justly in every case may be a question. But, we believe, the great body of their ministers may be ranged theologically in two classes.

1. Those who accept the doctrines of the standards so fully, that they would take them as stated in the Shorter Catechism, without qualifying a single sentence, and with very few and slight, if any, qualifications as stated in the Confession of Faith and larger catechisms; who would differ from us, if at all, only as theological teachers in our own church differ from us on the manner of the Imputation of Adam's sin; and who, if chary of the phrases "definite or limited atonement," would cordially agree with us in regarding it as a true and proper satisfaction to the divine justice, "sufficient for the whole world, efficient only for the elect."

2. We believe that the great body of them who could not go this length are still firm and true on the great Calvinistic doctrines of Divine sovereignty, decrees, election, perseverance, the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and entire dependence on him for it. We think the common use of terms among all Christians would pronounce this Calvinistic and opposed to Arminianism and Pelagianism. We further believe they hold to justification by the substituted obedience and sufferings of Christ, and to the fall of the whole race in and through the fall of Adam into utter corruption and universal sinfulness—although they might not be able to hold with us, or the *ipsissima verba* of all the standards here in every particular. We believe that all in the New School not included in these two classes are exceptional, whether persons or bodies.

We cannot feel that union with such a body on the basis of our common standards does not bode good rather than evil. With the nearly universal, strict, and complete conformity to the standards in our own the larger body, combined with the great preponderance of orthodox elements in the other, and the upward tendency in this respect which is dominant in it, we must believe and hope that the current of Calvinistic and Scriptural life in the united church will be so strong as to give a broader prevalence to that type of doctrine, and render all counter eddies transient and insignificant.

This is not a surrender *to* the New School nor *by* the New School. It is no surrender to unite upon their common

standards, and follow their convictions of duty, now that so many of the original causes of contention have been wholly or partially outgrown. Do we surrender our principles about Congregationalism, Voluntarism, or not allowing a latitudinarianism that shall impair the integrity of the Calvinistic system?

Nor does the Old School church die. As the continuation of the church of our fathers while yet undivided, it will still live in the same church once more undivided and enlarged by again clasping to her bosom the portion that was for more than a generation separated from her. The stream of her one life does not lose its identity by the influx into it of another branch, whether formerly divided from it by some obstacle after having been one with it, or always before having been separate and independent. It is only amplified into a broader and deeper channel, for a more vigorous life and a nobler work.

Is it said that this great movement is at best an experiment? So it is. Every great movement of the church forward is an experiment. But it is an experiment to which we are summoned by the leadings of God's Providence, and, as we must hope and believe, by his Spirit. Left to man it must fail. If its promoters are more lifted up with pride and self-sufficiency, than bowed in fervent prayer and conscious dependence, it will come to naught or to shame. Our only safety is to commit it to the guidance and support of the great Head of the church. He alone can carry it forward with that grand development for his own glory and the blessing of man to which we hope and believe it is predestined. With him we leave it. We thank God for the past and take courage for the future. In the present posture of this movement, its defeat in the Presbyteries would, we believe, be as disastrous as it is improbable. We therefore hail its prospective consummation.

ART. VII.—*Exposition and Defence of the Basis of Re-union.*

DR. MUSGRAVE'S speech in explanation and defence of the Report of the Joint Committee is so able and exhaustive, so representative and historic in its character, that we give it entire for preservation and future reference. With the author's approbation, we take the very complete report of it given in the *Presbyterian Banner*, except in a single head, which, for the sake of abbreviating, we take from the *Presbyterian*.

## DR. MUSGRAVE'S SPEECH ON THE NEW PLAN OF RE-UNION.

I have already, Mr. Moderator, made a very brief explanation of the character of the three papers submitted by the Joint Committee. But I wish to make a few additional remarks with respect to each of them consecutively.

The first paper, as you will notice is the Plan of Union, containing the basis on which it is proposed this union shall be effected. That basis is to be overtured to the Presbyteries, and is the only paper which will be sent down to the Presbyteries to be acted upon by them. This basis is our common standards—the Confession of Faith, including of course the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, agreeably to former decisions of the General Assembly, they being regarded as included in the expression, “our standards.”

## RE-UNION ON THE STANDARDS.

Now, sir, this is simple. We shall have but one question before us. Are we prepared to approve of the re-union of these two Assemblies upon the simple basis, the Confession of Faith, our common form of government and discipline, the doctrines and the policy which both of the branches receive and adopt? Well, sir, I am compelled to say that, much as I have desired this union for great objects and for the glory of God, I would never have given my consent to this union upon any other conceivable basis. My objection to all the overtures heretofore sent down was, that they add something to the standards, and, to say the least, they were

ambiguous, were liable to be differently construed, and, in my judgment, opened the door for the introduction of errors which no sound Calvinist will ever agree to indorse. Give us our pure, time-honored, Scriptural standards, and then we can all stand upon them as the rock upon which our fathers have ever stood, and upon which I pray Almighty God our successors will ever stand till the end of time. Now, sir, we have had a frank and a very kind interchange of opinions in the committee. We have been, as your representatives, allow me to say, faithful to the trust committed to us, loyal to Christ and to God's truth. We have said to coming men and Presbyterians that when we make the standards the basis of this union, we mean what we say—these standards, nothing else, nothing more and nothing less. We have said that we mean to maintain the system of doctrines taught in those standards, because we believe them to be according to God's Word, with constancy and fidelity. In other words, we meant and wanted to be understood that we never intended to allow brethren to impair the integrity of that system. If any such errors are propagated, those who are engaged in it must expect to be disciplined. We will maintain, God helping us, the purity of doctrines taught in our blessed Confession. That is distinctly understood, and I rejoice that in the preamble to one of the papers we distinctly announce that we recognize each other as sound and orthodox bodies, thus advertising to all the world that the reason why these two great branches of the church are to be united is because we believe each other to be orthodox and sound in the faith. So that it must be plain enough that a united church, founded upon our Confession, each branch recognizing the other as sound and orthodox, will never tolerate heresy. Why, sir, I have not changed my theological views and my conscientious convictions of duty in the least degree in regard to that, and though I may not live long, I will endeavor as in the past, by God's grace, to defend and maintain the purity of our doctrines. That is understood, that we receive the Confession sincerely, and that we mean to maintain and defend it.

On the other hand we have understood each other on the question of liberty. We have said to our brethren "You

have possibly misunderstood our branch. You, through some representations made in the papers by anonymous writers especially, have received the impression that the Old School church will tolerate no difference of opinion; that we are obliged, every man as before his God, to accept a certain theory; and that any man who undertakes to review, or to state or illustrate doctrines in any degree different from those of Princeton, for instance, is to be considered as a heretic and to be disciplined." Well, we have disabused them of that. We have said—"Brethren, there have always been shades of difference in the Old School church; and in a body of such intelligent and conscientious men, there must of necessity be differences of opinion." Why, sir, as long as men think at all—and may the day never come when one man shall think for all the rest—as long as men think, they will differ in some respects. Now, sir, we have said to them that we understand that there is to be allowed in this united church a reasonable degree of liberty; that men are not to be made offenders for a word; that we will not encourage persecution, or needless prosecution, if you prefer it, but will allow just such liberty in the united church as has been freely allowed in the Old School branch of the church. Well, that satisfied them. Now, sir, we understand each other. We are both sound, orthodox bodies, pledged to that old Confession, understanding each other that we mean to maintain it in its integrity; and, on the other hand, that we will allow all reasonable differences of opinion, that is to say, such differences as are consistent with maintaining the integrity of the system. No opinion is to be tolerated that would be subversive of our system of doctrine. Thus we arrived at an harmonious conclusion, and, so far as I could judge, every man in that Joint Committee agreed that this was fair and just, and I think it is. What more can we ask than that this basis should be our common standards, with this understanding between the parties, that it is not to be received insincerely, with reserve, that there is to be no toleration of material doctrinal differences, while a reasonable liberty will be allowed? I thank God that we have reached this result. Now I can subscribe to it, for one, with all my

heart ; and sir, I would be glad if the other Calvinistic and Presbyterian bodies would unite with us upon this same broad, solid, Scriptural basis.

#### WHY REFER TO THE PRESBYTERIES.

Why send down this basis to the Presbyteries? Why not consummate the union *here and now*? I think our committee were of the opinion, that, if it had been expedient, these two Assemblies would have the constitutional right to consummate the union at once. Though I have great respect for the opinions of others, God has so made me that I must do my own thinking. I believe the Assembly has the right to consummate this union at once, if it were best to do so. If you have in your basis the Smith and Gurley amendments, or any thing besides the simple standards, then I think the Presbyteries must approve. But here is no constitutional change, and we could unite by resolution, upon the basis of our common standards, as we did with the Associate Reformed body. But it is said that the Associate Reformed was a *small* body. Does the size of the body affect the principle? It is said also that that reference is unfortunate, because the union was *unhappy*. This is strange logic. What would you reply to one who should say that a certain marriage was *unlawful* because it was *unhappy*? It is also said that it is proper to consult the Presbyteries in a matter of so great importance. Has not that been done? Have not your Presbyteries said that they would approve, if you would omit certain amendments to the first or doctrinal article that *are* omitted? It looks very much like a quibble to say that the Presbyteries have not been consulted. Well, notwithstanding this, we thought it would not be expedient to consummate the union at once. It is said that thirty-one Presbyteries, some of them our largest and most influential ones, have said that it would be unconstitutional, or unwise, to do so, and have insisted that any new basis must be submitted to them before the union is perfected. We have thought it best to defer to them, and send this basis down. We did not want an inharmonious union—a contest, at the start, as to

the constitutionality of the matter. I am very sanguine in my hope that the great mass of these brethren will consent to come in, and give us a union that will promote the harmony and efficiency of the church. The submission of this basis gives these brethren what they call their right of approving or disapproving, and removes all causes of complaint on that ground. But while thus submitting this basis to the Presbyteries, we have felt that other interests should be consulted. Instead, therefore, of providing that the *next* Assembly should count the votes, and perfect the matter, we propose to adjourn.

We propose to adjourn the Assemblies—these Assemblies now sitting, to the month of November, giving the Presbyteries the opportunity of voting in October, so that next November, having received their answers, if they are favorable, as I doubt not they will be, then in November the Assembly can take such order as will enable the Assembly of 1870 to be an Assembly of the united church, making arrangements for the manner in which that Assembly shall be organized.

#### REASONS FOR TWO-THIRDS VOTE.

Well, now, sir, a word of explanation in regard to a change which perhaps you have noticed. Hitherto, we, the committees, have recommended that three-fourths of the Presbyteries shall be necessary to determine this question, and we seriously considered that point, and after the most mature deliberations it was thought, that under existing circumstances, and in view of the great interests involved, a two-thirds vote was more proper and judicious. It did not seem to us to be right to allow a minority of one-fourth to govern the church in the settlement of this grand question. Minorities have governed the world, the church of God; and, sir, in direct accordance with one of our fundamental principles, we thought a majority should govern. Why, sir, even with respect to constitutional changes, our government demands nothing more than a majority vote. It is not right that a small minority should control and govern the church of God. There are, sir, we also remark, some Presbyteries from which we do not hear, we know not from

what cause. It is not peculiar with respect to this question. Some have noticed it for many years. No matter what questions you send down to the Presbyteries, there will always be a number of them that will make no response; and, unfortunately, our government requires us to count them as dissenting. Now, sir, if I have been correctly informed, for I have been out of the house on these committees almost all the time during your proceedings, I cannot, therefore, speak, perhaps, with that accuracy that I might if I had been present and heard the thing; but I understood that some thirty Presbyteries sent up no report. Well, now, are all those thirty Presbyteries opposed to union? I don't believe it. I can't believe it. And yet, sir, in counting the votes, you must count them as dissenting. You can only count the votes for and against, and the question must be determined by the majority of the votes returned. Well, sir, that is a very grave consideration in this matter. If we could be certain that all Presbyteries would make a return, then, perhaps, it would not only be safe, but wise and proper to make it three-fourths.

But, sir, knowing that in all previous time many Presbyteries failed to send up a report; and even upon this question of union, that has so stirred the hearts of the great masses of our people throughout the length and breadth of the land, even on this grand question of union, thirty Presbyteries, if I am rightly informed, send no answer to your overtures—thirty-five the stated clerk tells me, and that increases the weight of my argument—thirty-five Presbyteries! As prudent men we thought it would not be judicious to measure the result by requiring a three-fourths vote, if all the Presbyteries should not be heard from. Not that if I were not certain that three-fourths of all the Presbyteries would not sanction this thing, I would seriously doubt whether the time had come for us to consummate it. But I felt, like my brethren of the committee—I felt unwilling that thirty-five negligent Presbyteries, or owing to the miscarrying of their responses, or to the neglect of their stated clerks, or from any cause, that thirty-five silent Presbyteries should turn the scale against the consummation of this blessed union. No, sir, we looked at it carefully and we thought that two-thirds is the proper number, and I trust

the Assembly will agree with us. Surely from what we know of the great heart of the Presbyterian Church, whose pulsations are felt in every section of our land,—surely if two-thirds of these Presbyteries say ay,—we ought to take it as the voice of God in his providence.

CONCURRENT DECLARATION.

Now, sir, in regard to the articles contained in the second paper, called the Declaration, &c., I have already stated to the Assembly that that don't form a part of the basis. They are not adopted, as I take it, nor a covenant, but they suggest to the Assembly what are suitable arrangements. I will not repeat what I have said, except to call your attention to that important distinction. They are not terms of the union. They may be annulled or modified, as any future Assembly may deem proper. We told our brethren that we were unwilling to tie the hands of the future church of God, and I for one was very decided upon that point; and I will say to you that I would have risked, yes, risked the failure of this union at the present time, rather than concede that these articles should be unchangeable, though I cannot foresee that there will be any necessity in the future to change them. I am neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet; but I think I have some little common sense, and I felt that it would be unsafe for us to imperil the future by trammelling the church of God, preventing it from exercising its liberty and from dealing with circumstances as they might arise in the providence of God. Sir, we were very decided and determined that those articles should not form a part of the compact, but that they should be suggestions and recommendations, in order that the Presbyteries should get an understanding between the parties. But, sir, it is due to fairness that I should say, and I repeat it now publicly, in order that it may have a response from this house, we did say to these brethren—"We will not consent to make these articles a covenant; we won't adopt them as a legal compact, binding upon the future; yet we are acting in good faith and as honorable men, and we say to you that we will not change them at any future time without obviously good and sufficient reasons." And I, for one, will feel bound in

honor to maintain those articles, so long as they can be maintained without serious detriment to the interest of the church of God; and I hope this Assembly will understand it so, in all honor and in good faith, when we have said that we proposed these arrangements, that we did not intend that they should be ephemeral, nor that we should take advantage of our numerical majority and allow them to conform to our peculiar interests and wishes. No, I told the brethren of the other side that they could trust my church; that they were men of honor and good faith; and if you ratified this thing, you would stand by it, and future Assemblies would stand by it, until, in the progress of events, some good and sufficient reason should exist for their modification.

SAFETY OF THE PROPOSED BASIS.

Now, sir, I have but a few more words. Perhaps I have already occupied too much time; but my apology is in my official relation to the committee. Permit me to say a few words in regard to the general subject. I believe that the basis we have proposed is perfectly safe for the church of God. If I thought otherwise, I would not advocate it, I would not consent to it. In my conscience and before God, I believe that the doctrines of our beloved church are safe on that basis. I believe that the whole body of the other branch are orthodox, in our sense of that word. That there are some men among them, as perhaps among us, whose theology neither you nor I could indorse, I admit; but if we wait to consummate this union until we are ready to indorse the opinions of every man, we will wait certainly until the millennium.

No, sir, there is no perfect church on earth. No matter how long you would wait; why, sir, you would never have it. I venture to say that if you would not organize this General Assembly until you were satisfied that every man—every minister and every ruling elder constituting your constituency—until you would believe that every man of them, clergymen and ruling elders, were perfectly orthodox, you would never have a General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church!

Now, sir, all that I cared for was that the law should be right; that if any opinions were propagated which seemed to us to be inconsistent with an honest subscription to our standards, we should not be obliged to try the man upon a Gurley law, or upon a Smith law, but upon the old law of our Westminster Confession. If the law is right, it is our fault if we don't justly apply it.

Well, sir, so much for that. I believe they are sound and orthodox as a body, just as I believe we are. I will not go into any detail here. Suffice it to say, Moderator, I have considered it my duty, as an individual, to satisfy my own conscience with respect to that vital point, not simply on account of my past personal history, and my public testimonies on this subject, but in the fear of God, and in order that I might discharge my individual duty to Christ and to God's people. I have carefully endeavored to satisfy my own mind with regard to that vital point. It would not be proper for me to state the process which I adopted—the methods, nor to detail the operations. All I shall say to my brethren is this: that with no undue prejudice for or against them, I have endeavored to inform myself as to the character of the other branch; and the result has been that I, for one, am satisfied that they are substantially sound, and that there is no material difference between us; and that, as to those points upon which we divided, thirty odd years ago, they have all passed away. We are no longer troubled with them, and they will not corrupt us.

#### CHANGE OF CIRCUMSTANCES.

Why, sir, the change of circumstances is almost radically entire. I will not enter into that, lest I should speak too long. There were causes in operation from 1828 up to 1838, which we had good reason to dread, and which were undoubtedly corrupting and revolutionizing the church of God. I have never said, because I have never felt, as some men have said and doubtless felt—I have never said that I regretted the part I took in that early conflict. Sir, were we to meet in the same circumstances, I would repeat, God helping me, the same conduct. I will rebuke heresy now, as I did then. I

would resist any attempt to revolutionize the Presbyterian Church and to make it Congregational. I will do it with as much vigor, if I have still left the mental and physical strength that I had thirty odd years ago; at any rate I would do it with all the power that God would give me.

Sir, the circumstances are different. We are not called upon to watch the Home Missionary Society and the American Education Society. We have not got to watch the notoriously unsound Congregationalists, who were undoubtedly at that time spreading sentiments which were grossly offensive to Old School men. Sir, that day has passed away. These brethren have their Committees of Missions, their Education and Publication Committees. They are prepared to consolidate them with our Boards, and to act together with us on ecclesiastical principles. Well, Voluntaryism has ceased to have any influence, as have also the unsound Congregationalists. And I qualify my remark always when I speak of the Congregationalists, because there are two classes of them; there is a class of Congregationalists who are orthodox, sound men, eminently pious men, whom I would welcome into the Presbyterian Church, for they are Presbyterians, as well as Calvinists in their views. Why, sir, such men I have no suspicion of. I will receive them with open arms to my heart. All I ask is for a man to be a good Calvinist, and a thorough Presbyterian, and a sound Christian, and I don't care from what quarter he comes, whether from the North, or the East, or the South, or the West. Somehow or other; I have such an affection for all the families of real Calvinists and Presbyterians, that I can take in all New England that is sound, all the Canadas, and Great Britain, and Ireland, and the whole world. Some men like to repeat that remark of Whitefield, that there will be no Presbyterians and no Methodists, etc., in heaven. Well, sir, I don't know any more about heaven than Whitefield did, as I have never been there. I don't know exactly what form of worship they have, but I have an idea that it will be Presbyterian. And, brethren, I will give you my reason. I don't say I never have expressed an opinion without thinking I had a good reason for it; but I think I have in this case, and the reason

why I think their worship will be like ours in heaven, is because I believe that our mode of worship is what God inspires; that we have the principles and the examples of the Apostles and Prophets; and as God inspires this simple form of worship here, I suppose he will approve of it there.

But certain I am of this, or more certain I should say, that we will all believe the doctrines of Paul, when we get to heaven. I believe what Augustine and John Calvin taught; but I would not like myself to say that we will all be Calvinists in heaven. But I will say this, that we will all believe in accordance with the revelation which God gave through the Apostle Paul, and by that I understand Calvinism; and therefore I think that we shall all have that system of doctrines in heaven. Why, sir, I have another reason for it, if this is not too much out of the way. No matter how much certain denominations may differ from us speculatively and when in controversy, if you just get them to pray—I don't mean in heaven, for you can't get there yet, but on earth—ask these good Methodist brethren to pray right after they have been talking about Calvinism, and if they don't pray Calvinism I will wonder. Well, get their hymns, and when they come to worship God in that part of the service, why some of the purest and best Calvinism that you will find anywhere you will find in some of their hymns. They don't know it by the name. Well, now, sir, I argue that the work of the Spirit must correspond with his teachings in his word. We have not the doctrines and the experiences of the saints in heaven; but we see the teachings and the work of God's Spirit on the minds and hearts of his people upon the earth.

#### NO VALID OBJECTIONS.

Well, sir, enough for that. I am satisfied that we can safely unite because we are orthodox, both of us, and I think too that we ought to do it, because we are agreed. Why, sir, a man ought to give some grave reason, and obviously good reason, why this union should not be effected, because it is so natural, it is so proper in itself; the parties are really at one—just as I hold that no man can reach forty-five

without being married, and be excusable, without a good reason; for a man ought to give a good reason. If it is not his fault he is not to blame. Well, now my logie on that subject is this. I premise that no man shows more folly than when he undertakes to be wiser than God. That is an axiom. Now the Almighty has said—"It is not good for man to be alone"—and therefore a man ought to have a good reason—a good reason, and so have some others of God's people. Well now, sir, it is not for me to publicly tell what Paul's reason was, or the reason of anybody else; but sir, there is the argument. Now I say that no man is justified in voting against this union, this marriage if you please, between these two parties, unless he has a good reason for forbidding the bans. Why, sir, if two were to come up here and want to be married, and somebody were to say, I object to it, wouldn't you, Mr. Moderator, ask him why? Certainly you would, and if he couldn't give a good reason, you would proceed. So I would take it. No man can vote against his own creed. We have fixed it so, I won't call it a trap, that a man must have a prodigious amount of moral courage, I won't say impudence, to vote against himself, against his own creed. Now, sir, if we put any thing else to it, he might object to it; but, sir, haven't you, before God and his church declared that you receive and adopt the Confession of Faith, for that is the creed.

#### THE ADVANTAGE AND THE DANGER.

The time has come when this thing ought to be settled, because it is proper and right in itself—and now I come to my last remark. I sometimes speak longer than I should. An old Scotchwoman was told that her new preacher read his sermons. She was told to go into the gallery and she would find it to be true. She did so, and sure enough she found that in the big Bible he had a little paper book, and when he came to the end she was fairly boiling over. When the minister remarked—"I will enlarge no further," she squealed out—"Ye canna; the paper is oot!" Now, brethren, it has never been my habit to read, and of course not to write, and I could tell you

some funny things about these pressmen who wanted to get a copy of the sermon that I preached. Why, bless your souls, said I, not a line have I written. But the press went and pressed me until, with the aid of an amanuensis, I filled up the heads. I am not in that predicament now, and therefore may talk too long. I will try to be short for the remainder of the time. I do not want this union simply because I think it is the will of God, and because I think it is safe, and proper, and natural; but I want it for the great work that we have before us. Now, in my official position, perhaps I have been able to appreciate this more sensibly than many of my brethren; for I have cries for help, pleas for men and means, in all quarters of this great land. Well, sir, it has been my duty to study the map of our country, and to keep myself acquainted with its moral destitutions, and oh, the weight that these things have upon our spirits! So much to do, so weak and so little power to do it with! In behalf of millions of souls, I implore you to combine your forces for the conquest of this land and the evangelization of the world! Oh, what a power there will be in this combination, not simply by real multiplication, according to our numerical strength. Why that is not the half of it. It is not that you are to have in one church so many more men and so many more dollars; but, sir, you are to have a spirit there, you are to have a faith there, you are to have an enterprise there, and energy, and courage, which are so much needed in this great work before us. It is not always the large army that is the most effective. It may be disorganized; it may be discouraged. Sometimes a much smaller host, united with mutual confidence, will attack and overcome the far larger force, by dint of discipline and spirit. Now, sir, I think that if this union is consummated, you will infuse a spirit of hope, of faith, of zeal, of renewed courage. All our ministers, all our elders, all our people, will have a heart; and that is what we want. They will have a heart to work, and there is no telling what good may be accomplished. Why, sir, there is not an infidel, there is not a Jesuit, in this land that would not rejoice at the failure of this attempt at reunion! They delight in our divisions; they lament our unions; yes, I have thought that I could trace the hand of a

Jesuit in many an article that I have read in the Protestant papers within the last thirty-eight years. Sir, you know what a Jesuit is, and therefore I need not describe him. But, sir, they dread the Presbyterian Church more than all others combined. One of their priests once said to me—"We *hate* the Methodists, but we *fear* you." Fear you! Now, sir, in order that you may give a blow to infidelity and Sabbath desecration, that you may give a check to Romanism, in God's name reunite these hosts, that you may do better in the name of King Jesus. Only let us guard, brethren, against one temptation. Just as sure as you live, if it promotes vanity, and ambition, and self-sufficiency, God will frown upon it. That is now about the greatest danger I apprehend. It is that if we consummate this union, we will feel proud and self-sufficient. Oh, that God would keep us from that spirit; that he would make us humble and help us to realize our absolute dependence upon him; and that he would give us the spirit of prayer after the union, as well as before it; that he would make it a blessing to the church and to the world! May God speed this happy work, and this year not close until this union is declared effected.

---

ART. VIII.—*The New Basis of Union.*

THE Senior Editor of this Review avails himself of the privilege, common to all his brethren, of stating, in a few words, his view of the present aspect of the re-union question.

1. The terms of union now proposed are greatly preferable to those heretofore submitted to the Presbyteries. So far as the basis of doctrine and polity is concerned, all we require of those belonging to our own church, is the adoption of our acknowledged standards. This is all we have the right to demand of others, whether individuals, Presbyteries, Synods, or larger bodies, proposing to unite with us.

2. The adoption of the standards without note or comment leaves the church perfectly untrammelled. It stands pre-

cisely as it has stood from the beginning. It is as free to exercise discipline for any departure from our system of doctrine and order, as it was from 1729 to the disruption in 1838; and from the disruption to the present time. The whole world, and of course our New School brethren, know what we mean by the words "system of doctrine;" and they know what we mean when we say that we cannot conscientiously consent to any doctrine being taught in the united church, which is inconsistent with that system. We do not, therefore, lower our standard; we do not renounce our principles in consenting to the proposed plan of union being submitted to the Presbyteries.

3. Nothing but the article thus submitted, viz., that the union shall be consummated on the basis of our common standards, is of any binding force, either legally or virtually; either morally or as a point of honor. If Congress pass a law which is of the nature of a contract, it binds its successors; because it is a principle of morals, and of the constitution, that a contract legally formed cannot be invalidated without consent of parties. But the resolutions, the opinions, the recommendations of one Congress, leave those which follow it, as free as if they had never been made.

4. As not only the General Assembly by an overwhelming vote, but a majority of the Presbyteries have expressed an opinion favorable to re-union on the basis of the simple standards, we think that all organized, formal opposition should cease. A majority has the right to govern. The question is submitted to the Presbyteries. Every one will have the opportunity to vote yes or no, as his conscience directs, and to give his reasons for his vote.

5. If two-thirds of the Presbyteries sanction the union on the terms proposed, every one should not only submit, but endeavor to carry it out in good faith; and do his best to render it successful.

6. The distinctive doctrines of Old School theology for which our church has so earnestly contended, are known in history as Pauline or Augustinian, although taught more clearly and solemnly by our Lord himself than by any of his prophets or apostles. Those doctrines lie at the foundation of the whole

system of redemption. They enter into all genuine Christian experience. They are essential to the purity and power of religion. They are believed by all Christians with the heart, even when rejected by the understanding, and denied with the lips. Every true believer is an Augustinian on his knees. When the Holy Spirit convinces a man of sin, he convinces him that he is lost, that he can no more save himself than he can raise the dead; that if delivered from the pollution and condemnation of sin, it must be by the supernatural and almighty power of God, exercised in the sovereignty of his love, and through the work of the Lord Jesus Christ as his substitute and surety, and by his prevalent intercession, without a shadow of merit or worthiness on his part. That such are the experience and inward convictions of every true Christian is proved by Scripture, by history, and by the common consciousness of the church.

7. It is of unspeakable importance that these doctrines should be upheld and inculcated by ministers of the Gospel and by all authorized teachers in the church. It is not enough that they have liberty thus to teach them. The salvation of men and the purity of the Gospel, in a great measure, depend on the official teachers of the church, being required to believe, profess, and inculcate those great truths. It is not enough that they should be included in the recognized standard of doctrine. Those doctrines are contained in the standards of the Church of England. But that church has ever been tolerant. It admits into its ministry the advocates of every form of doctrine from the Tridentine to the Rationalistic. The same is true of the established churches on the continent of Europe. It is true also in a great degree of the Episcopal Church in this country; no one of these churches stands out before the world as a witness for these doctrines. The effective influence of no one of them is given to their support.

8. The Presbyterian Church in this country, from its organization, has been the open and avowed advocate of these distinctive features of Augustinian theology. It has not only proclaimed them in its Confession of Faith, but insisted that they should be received and taught by all the ordained offi-

cers of the church. No church in Christendom is more tolerant and liberal as regards Christian communion. It receives as brethren and admits to its membership every sincere worshipper of our Lord Jesus Christ, however ignorant he may be. At the same time no church has been more strict in requiring its members to adopt and teach the system of doctrine which it professes. This is the historical character of our church, universally known and admitted. Fidelity to this strictness is of incalculably greater importance to the cause of Christ than any increase in numbers, wealth, or power.

9. The New School, also, as a church, has its historical character. It is tolerant or liberal. This is avowed. It is universally admitted. It tolerates forms of doctrine which the Old School have repeatedly and officially declared to be, in its judgment, inconsistent with the system of doctrine taught in the Westminster Confession. This is an unquestioned fact. It is not said that the New School, as a church, sanction the doctrines which the Old School condemn; nor that the mass of their ministers are not orthodox. It is only said, what they avow, that they are tolerant. They license and ordain men whom the Old School could not conscientiously receive into the ministry.

10. What is to be the character of the united church? Is it to be strict, as the Old School has hitherto been, or tolerant, as the New School? The Old School, as a body, say it is to be strict. The New School, as a body, say it is to be tolerant.

Three-fourths of our Presbyteries have twice decided that they cannot consent to the union if they are bound legally or in honor to be as liberal in the interpretation of the standards as their New School brethren have hitherto been. And the latter have as clearly declared that they can consent to the union only on the condition that the united church is to be as tolerant as themselves.

11. Under these circumstances, what ought to be done? Many of our Old School brethren will vote for the union on the ground of the principle stated in the second paragraph of this short article. They say that, as the standards are unaltered; as no condition is attached to them; no rule of inter-

pretation is prescribed; they accept the union as leaving the church just where it was; just as free in enforcing conformity to its doctrines, as it has been from the beginning.

Others will vote for it, because they think the time has come to adopt a more tolerant principle. They admit that the Old School church dies with the union; and that a more tolerant church takes its place. They believe that this course is indicated by the providence of God, and that it is best not only for the outward prosperity of the church, but for the cause of religion and of sound doctrine itself.

Others of us will be constrained to vote against the union, not because blind to its advantages, not because insensible to the spirit of brotherly love and charity, by which the movement seems at present controlled, but because we regard the strictness in interpreting the standards for which the Old School have always contended to be the "ark of the covenant" committed to our trust, which we are bound to preserve, and on the preservation of which our safety and usefulness as a church ultimately depend; and because we consider that principle to be endangered by consenting to the union, when those with whom we unite, and the public generally (so far as we can judge), consider that we surrender our palladium.

It is exceedingly painful to stand aloof from such a movement. We were in the Philadelphia Convention, and felt the full power of the spirit by which that assembly was pervaded. And had we been in either of the Assemblies recently convened in New York, we doubt not our hearts would have melted with the rest. Neither popular opinion, however, nor popular feeling, is the rule either of faith or practice. While constrained thus to dissent from a majority of our brethren, for whom we cherish undiminished respect and confidence, we still hope for the best. We earnestly pray that, should the union be consummated, it may produce not only a great increase of efficiency, but also of the power of religion and zeal for the truth. If the truth be lost, all is lost. Our numbers, wealth, and influence will avail us nothing.

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

*Chips from a German Workshop.* By Max Müller, M. A. New York, Charles Scribner & Co. 2 vols., 8vo, pp. xxxiii., 374, 402.

This is a reprint from the second English edition of this attractive and valuable collection of the author's miscellaneous papers, contributed to English periodicals at different times between 1855 and 1867. What could be drier than the suggestions of its title? Yet we are sure that no intelligent reader, though he be neither philologist, philosopher, nor theologian, can take up either volume without finding delight as well as instruction. The results of patient and prolonged study in many different directions are here brought to bear on many matters of living and constant interest. The student of language will be the first to feel the attraction of the author's name. But whoever is interested in the historical, intellectual, religious, social development of our race will find his knowledge enlarged, his thought stimulated, his sympathies widened, his narrow pride and prejudice rebuked.

Rich material is supplied to the student of mental, moral, and religious phenomena as presented in the literature and institutions of some of the noblest and most venerable nations and races of earth. And the direct and indirect suggestions of these attractive papers bear most directly on some of our most practical duties as well as on our deepest and loftiest beliefs. What has been and is the world's heathenism in its best types? What is the world's "feeling after" God? How are the races of India and China to be approached and won to Christianity? On many of the points developed by the author's profound and varied studies we are not competent to criticise him in detail. We gladly acknowledge our debt to him. We cannot sympathize altogether with the tenderness with which he comments on some of the doctrines, practices, and institutions connected with the heathenism of India, Persia, and China. There is too much of religious indifferentism to suit either our taste or our judgment. Yet, no doubt, our opinion on the theory of missionary duties, and our practice if we were in the field, might well be more considerate of some of the results of the author's research.

The volumes merit and will command the perusal and study of thoughtful and Christian men.

*The Gates Ajar.* By E. Stuart Phelps. 25th Edition. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co., 1869.

Why this 25th edition within a few months? First, the subject; then, the elements of power and attractiveness in thought and style; again, the truths which the book does seize and bring out felicitously; once more, the daring as-

sumptions and suggestions by which it attempts to minister to saddened and diseased spiritual states; and lastly, the devices of the publishers. To begin with the last, we could wish that the advertisements that have swarmed in our papers, secular and religious, had been somewhat less of the "patent medicine" cast. They suggest inevitably a spiritual nostrum to be administered to the unwary. And we regret to say that this adverse presumption is too much borne out by our careful perusal of the book. Whatever precious truths are conveyed in the author's work, whatever the power and beauty of conception and style by which they are communicated, it is not by these that the book makes its deepest and most abiding impression upon us. A stricken and rebellious spirit is guided to quietness, contentment, enjoyment, we cannot say health and truth, by views of the future life far more akin to the Elysium of the pagan and the Paradise of the Moslem, than to the spirituality of God's word. If such is heaven, the loftiest and lowliest in the church of all ages have been strangely misled by the guiding Spirit, and are much less celestial, in fact, than in their aspirations and imaginings. "Neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." What was true in those early days of the Apostle Paul, we believe to be still true. The authoress cannot for us look through the "Gates Ajar" into the city.

*Black Forest Village Stories.* By Berthold Auerbach. Translated by Charles Goepf. Author's edition. Leipzig & Holt, 1869.

This collection, first published in 1843, made the author's reputation in his own country, and has been translated into several languages. The stories are simple, homelike, spirited, and full of the elements of popularity and power. The translation is vigorous, but sometimes has put off too completely the German coloring required by the intensely German character of the scenes.

*The Villa on the Rhine.* By Berthold Auerbach. Author's edition. 2 vols. New York: Leipzig & Holt.

Auerbach has been for a quarter of a century not only a great favorite but a recognized power in Germany. His simple tales and his more elaborate stories equally illustrate his artistic ability, which appears alike in his descriptions of nature, the modelling and management of his characters, and the naturalness with which the problem of the story is evolved. Aside from the qualities that appear elsewhere, there are in this story many things that will insure a large circle of readers in this country. The characters are partly American, the scene partly here; American ideas, institutions, and experiences are deeply interwoven in the story. Its philosophy and religion we hope may never become American. Auerbach is recognized in his own country as one of the most powerful propagators of a pantheistic creed, and in this story the hero holds a faith in God "higher than that of those who imprison him in a book, a creed, a set form of worship." The Scriptures and their religion belong to an earlier and lower order than that in which the hero moves, as he carries his pupil through the development of reason, consciousness, knowledge to a power and a satisfaction quite superior to those that religion imparts. We have not so learned God or nature, and we would have those who seek in works of fiction a relaxation and refreshment on their guard, lest character and principle be impaired by these subtle poisons.

*Eight Years' Wanderings in Ceylon.* By Sir Samuel W. Baker. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1869; pp. 323, 12mo.

The great interest excited by the author's explorations of the upper Nile and its tributaries has led to this republication of an earlier work. The intelligent observer, the indefatigable worker, the graphic narrator appear here in an earlier and narrower sphere, and yet one of interest to many of our readers, and we know not where within the same space they can read to so good purpose of the isle of the "spicy breezes." We wait to hear a good report from the author in his new office as Pasha of Egypt, specially commissioned to suppress the slave trade on the upper waters of the venerable father of rivers.

*Great Christians of France: St. Louis and Calvin.* By M. Guizot. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1869; pp. 364, 12mo.

This is the fifth volume of the "Sunday Library," the successive volumes of which have been brought out in this country, by the above-mentioned enterprising firm, almost simultaneously with their appearance in England. Of all the volumes thus far issued this has perhaps the best assurance of a wide popularity. The veteran Protestant statesman of France here presents two of the four whom he designates "The great Christians of France." The other two, one a Catholic and the other a Protestant, are St. Vincent de Paul and Du Plessis Mornay. Both sketches are full of life and power. Not sympathizing fully with some of the distinguishing features of Calvin's doctrinal system, M. Guizot exhibits very effectively the goodness and greatness of the man and his work. The story of St. Louis is a gem in style, while perhaps a little overdrawn.

*The Old World in its New Face. Impressions of Europe in 1867-8.* By Henry W. Bellows. Volume I. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1868.

Few travellers in Europe see so much that is interesting, or describe so well what they see as Dr. Bellows has done. He did not content himself with the ordinary round and range of observation and inquiry. At any time his broad sympathies would have led him to look into every thing touching the present living interests of humanity; going abroad however so soon after his grand labors in the Sanitary Commission, even his interest in this class of observations was deeper and more intelligent. This volume is devoted mainly to France, Switzerland, and Germany. Nature, art, society, find in Dr. Bellows a very cultivated and appreciative observer, and his descriptions are admirable.

It is not unnatural that in dealing with morals and religion, Dr. Bellows, writing as he did for his parishioners, should be somewhat denominational. In this matter there is no disguise. The intense hatred of orthodoxy, especially of Calvinism, appears on every appropriate occasion. This is especially evident at Geneva, and only less so at Strasburg, Heidelberg, Berlin, Halle, and such other points as naturally bring up to mind "the Bibliolathy of Protestant orthodoxy," "the manifest incompetency of any Continental type of Protestantism to gain the affections or govern the wills of the people," etc. His panacea is American Unitarianism, for the "guidance" of which "the world is waiting." When we read his glowing description of his sect, "with a rational and historical faith that is evangelical in its origin and spirit," we think of the Music Hall and Horticultural Hall for its high places, and its unorganized, undefined, nondescript life of a whole gen-

eration. And when we find that the chief difficulty with orthodoxy is that it is "against the grain and spirit of the time," we think of the way in which the Saviour represented the natural mutual relation of truth and the world. We wonder whether Dr. Bellows himself stands in fact quite as squarely a Unitarian "of the historical and positive school" as he did in promise. Has he not at some critical junctures disappointed those who expected of him better things? Many of his observations and comments are however worthy of a respectful consideration.

Vol. II. of this interesting work, which has more recently appeared, we have not had the opportunity to examine.

*Jesus of Nazareth: his Life and Teaching; founded on the four Gospels, &c.* By Lyman Abbott. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1869; pp. xiv., 522.

This volume is neither intended nor adapted to supersede for scholars such books as those of Ellicott, Andrews, and Ebrard. It has more of the cast of narrative, and presents interwoven in the narrative the results rather than the processes of learned and critical inquiry. Every chapter gives evidence of careful study of the sacred text, of the best commentaries in a wide range, as well as of those works of travel, history, and archæology which can in so many ways contribute to the solid correctness and the vividness of the life scenes that pass before us. In dealing with disputed points the author shows much of a judicial cast of mind, appreciative of the grounds on which conflicting views rest, while decided enough in the enunciation of conclusions. We cite, *e. g.*, the discussion of the miracle at Cana, in chap. VIII., that of demoniacs in chap. XIII., etc. The ample and appropriate illustrations, so well executed, add materially to the attractiveness of the book. The church and the world are turning from many others that have been absorbing questions, to the person and the work of our Lord, and we welcome every devout, earnest, unassuming endeavor to bring him before men that he may speak for himself. Not indorsing every interpretation and inference incorporated in this narration, we give it our warm commendation.

*John Newton, of Olney and St. Mary Woolnoth. An Autobiography and Narrative.* By the Rev. Josiah Bull, M. A. London. The Religious Tract Society, 1868.

The principal value of this new life of Newton lies in the fact that it embodies large and important material not accessible to former biographers. A diary covering fifty-seven years, and a voluminous correspondence are here incorporated that have been available in no previous memoir. The cast of the sketch may therefore fitly be made mainly autobiographical. When we sing one of his hymns in the sanctuary the authorship is of far less account to us than the sentiment; in the closet the same hymn aids us more when we can connect it with the deep experience of the composer. The *Cardiphonia* is from the nature of the case more personal; its impressiveness is surely promoted by the most correct and life-like conceptions of the man whom the grace of God so blessed and made so rich a blessing. Christian biographies are among the choice treasures of God's people.

*Geschichte der Stadt Rom.* Von Alfred von Reumont. Zweiter Band; pp. xvi., 1268.

This volume follows after an interval of only a few months that which we noticed in January of last year. It continues the history of Rome though a period of nearly a thousand years, ending with the entry of Martin V. into Rome in A. D. 1420, after "the great schism." The grouping is clear and vigorous, the delineation attractive. The bibliographical, historical, and critical notes, the chronological and genealogical tables, add much to the completeness and value of the work. The typographical execution is worthy of Von Decker's famous press.

*Ten Years on the Euphrates; or, Primitive Missionary Policy illustrated.* By Rev. C. H. Wheeler, Missionary in Eastern Turkey. American Tract Society, Boston.

This volume exhibits the methods and results of missionary effort in a group of stations, of which Harpoot in Eastern Turkey is the centre, in which unusual success has attended the labors there put forth. To no part of the field occupied by the American Board has attention been more strongly drawn by the rapid growth of vigorous self-supporting churches, instructed and guided by native pastors. The policy pursued by Mr. Wheeler and his associates was, at the earliest possible day to organize a local church, committing to it the privileges and throwing upon it the responsibilities of such an organization, with the choice of its own pastor. Christian character has been developed, together with an energy and liberality most gratifying and hopeful. The theological schools are stimulated, and the whole church so recently gathered out of a corrupt and selfish Orientalism has become a recognized and aggressive power in the land. The missionaries themselves can make their small numbers far more effective when they are all at liberty to engage in the broader and more productive labors of their calling. The problem is one of the most important connected with the world's evangelization, and this little volume contains very valuable contributions toward its solution.

*China and the Chinese: a general Description of the Country and its Inhabitants; its Civilization and form of Government; its religious and social Institutions; its Intercourse with other Nations; and its present Condition and Prospects.* By the Rev. John L. Nevius, ten years a missionary in China. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1869.

We have given the title in all its fulness, that we may dispense with any analysis of our own. This volume, which has been simultaneously published in England, is not like the one just noticed, a contribution especially to our missionary literature. It is in this respect of no little value, nearly the last third of the volume being devoted to accounts, from a competent witness, of what has been attempted and what has been accomplished for the Christianization of this great empire. The larger part of the volume is designed to meet a broader desire to know more of this remarkable people in their general history and relations. The selection from the immense and bewildering mass of material is very judicious, the presentation skilful, the illustration ample and telling. The book occupies a very desirable ground between the drier and more elaborate works to which scholars and statesmen need access, and the lighter and unsatisfying works

which attempt to meet the public curiosity without adequate knowledge or judgment. We heartily commend it as the best book of its kind that has fallen under our eye.

*Captain Waltham. A Tale of Southern India.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee.

This is not a fiction, but exhibits in life-like portraiture the results of personal observation and experience among natives and foreign residents. The missionary work is here again brought before us, but in its processes rather than its results.

*Travel and Adventure in the Territory of Alaska.* By Frederiek Whymper. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1869.

The author, an experienced and competent explorer, has here made an interesting and valuable addition to our knowledge of our new territory. His own view and representation are somewhat consoling to those who had regarded this last acquisition of territory as of no other worth than that of one more step in the direction of our "manifest destiny." To the Christian reader, who reads to know of the moral condition and prospects of our race on all the continents and islands which Christ shall rule, it is sad to find here the same testimony as elsewhere to the corruption that has been carried by civilization into barbarism. And the difficulties that stand in the way of proclaiming salvation grow to an appalling magnitude when the missionary, beginning with the salutation, "Children of the forest," finds the interpreter rendering it, "Many little men among the sticks." Must he wait to become a Chinook, or a Malemute in range of ideas or style of expression, or must they be raised to a new plane of thought? The Lord will solve the problem, which among these lower tribes of our race is to us a most oppressive one.

*Adventures in the Apache Country, etc.* By J. Ross Browne. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

Mr. Browne's zeal as a traveller and his competence in description and illustration are too well known to need a new indorsement. The glory and shame, the processes and reactions of civilization, the simplicity and the pollution of barbarism, are here depicted by a most effective pencil.

*A Commentary on the Greek Text of Paul to the Galatians.* By John Eadie, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis to the United Presbyterian Church. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford & Co., 1869.

Dr. Eadie, by his previous commentaries on Ephesians and Colossians, has fully established his character as a learned, judicious, orthodox commentator. In the present volume his reputation is fully sustained, and more than sustained. There is a ripeness, vigor, and completeness in this work that are highly instructive and refreshing. We find no shirking of difficult passages, or of rationalistic assaults. The true sense is generally evolved, and all counter views are sifted with scholarly and logical thoroughness. The great doctrine of justification by faith, and its relations to the very springs of spiritual life, are of course fully evolved and cleared. The author does not confine himself to mere doctrinal expositions, or rest in orthodox abstractions. He luxuriates in the unfoldings

of the life of faith in the soul. Here he brings out the very pith and marrow of the Gospel, and the fulness of the Apostle's most interior meaning. The expository preacher and the careful student of the Bible will find this one of his most valuable helps.

*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul.* By the Rev. W. J. Conybeare, M. A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Rev. J. S. Howson, M. A., Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool. The only complete and unabridged edition. Two volumes in one. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 1869.

The admirable character and high value of this work have long been recognized by all competent students of the great Apostle's life and writings. It has already found extensive admission to the libraries of ministers and biblical students. It seems now destined to a much wider circulation. The appearance of two abridged and imperfect editions of the work, designed to command a wide sale among Christian people by their cheapness, has stimulated the original publishers of the complete work to bring it out at a very low price, so that all may obtain it complete, on terms as favorable as the abridgments of it. Of course there can be little hesitation as to which is to be preferred. The complete work, as it originally came from the hands of its authors, must be the first choice of all who have their "senses exercised to discern between good and evil." We wish and predict for so large and valuable a book that wide circulation to which its great merits and low price entitle it—a boon for which, in these days of dear books, the enterprising publishers deserve the thanks of the Christian public.

*Annual of Scientific Discovery: or Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art for 1869, Exhibiting the most Important Discoveries and Improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Biology, Botany, Mineralogy, Metallurgy, Geography, Antiquities, etc., together with Notes on the Progress of Science during the year 1868; a list of recent Scientific Publications; Obituaries of Eminent Scientific men, etc.* Edited by Samuel Kneeland, A. M., M. D., Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Secretary of and Instructor in Zoology and Physiology in Massachusetts Institute of Technology, etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Company, 1869.

This number of a most excellent Annual, gives a truthful account of itself in its extended title-page, which is prefaced with a fair engraving of that eminent scientist, James D. Dana. A glance at the varied contents of this book assures us that it furnishes an immense amount of useful knowledge, not elsewhere accessible to the ordinary student, and that it provides the best aids and facilities for such to post themselves in the latest discoveries of science, theoretical and practical. The multiplicity and variety of these discoveries in every field of physical inquiry are prodigious and amazing.

*Biographical Sketches.* By Harriet Martineau. New York: Leypoldt & Holt, 1869.

These Memoirs, or rather portraits, first appeared in the *London Daily News*. They are now gathered into a volume which is all aglow with the vigor, freshness, and sparkle of genius. Although these sketches are drawn by a woman's

hand, they are instinct with masculine power and robustness. They are high above the common-places of literature, and betray in every page a master hand. The characters described range under six heads: 1. *Literary*, including Miss Opie, Professor Wilson, Lockhart, Miss Mitford, Charlotte Bronte, Rogers, Croker, Mrs. Marcet, Hallam, Mrs. Wordsworth, De Quincey, Macaulay, Mrs. Jameson, Walter Savage Landor. 2. *Scientific*, Combe and Humboldt. 3. *Professional*, such as Bishops Bloomfield and Whateley, Lords Raglan, Denman, and others. 4. *Social*, Miss Berry, Father Matthew, Robert Owen, Lady Noel Byron. 5. *Politicians*, some dozen of them, ending with Lords Palmerston and Brougham. 6. *Royal*, including the Emperor Nicholas, Metteruich, etc.

*Elements of Political Economy.* By Arthur Latham Perry, Professor of History and Political Economy in Williams College. Fifth edition, revised and rewritten. New York: Charles Scribner & Company, 1869.

Prof. Perry shows himself at once well read in the literature of his department and at the same time an original and vigorous thinker on the subject. He presents his views clearly and forcibly in strong and pithy sentences. His principles are strongly Free Trade, which appears to have been gaining ground among the leading thinkers of New England. However this may be, and without any partisan view of our own in this controversy, we have been struck with the claim made equally by the advocates of both systems, not only that they favor the highest general prosperity and national development in general, but in particular, that they compass this result by promoting the division of labor and specialization of industry, thus giving the fullest scope for the advantageous exercise of the endlessly diversified gifts of men. We have heard strong protectionists say that the great merit of their system is, that it diversifies industry by sustaining occupations that could not live or thrive without protection. But says Prof. Perry, "Under a system of free exchange every man is allowed, under the stimulus of self-interest, to follow the bent of his own mind, to work away at those obstacles to the gratification of human desires which he feels himself best able to overcome; . . . therefore, since free exchange indefinitely multiplies in number and variety the services which men may render to each other," etc. etc. (pages 99-100). Each view has a side of truth.

In regard to the field of Political Economy which the author defines as the 'science of exchange, or what is exactly equivalent, the science of value,' he makes the following just and important observations respecting its relation to moral science:—

"Each of the two sciences, therefore, has a distinct basis and sphere of its own. The grounds of economy and morals are independent and incommensurable. Every science, however, has its points of contact with other sciences; and this is particularly the case with political economy in relation to moral science, and is the reason why the two have been sometimes confounded. The sound conclusions of the one are harmonious with the sound conclusions of the other. Both work together for the good of men and the amelioration of their condition. Their spheres, though distinct, nevertheless touch each other. Duty and interest lie alongside. The ultimate analysis of property, for example, will, as we shall see, lead the inquirer into the higher region of moral science. In legislation, also, the question is frequently at the same time an economical and a moral question. Dr. Wayland has observed that 'almost every question in the science may be argued on grounds belonging to the other.'"—Pages 37-8.

On the whole, the work is able, and will be consulted by those who seek to master the science. Without sanctioning all its doctrines, we think the discussions on value, price, and exchange especially valuable.

*Philosophical Papers: 1. Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Logic. 2. Reply to Mr. Mill's Third Edition. 3. Present State of Moral Philosophy in Britain.* By James McCosh, LL. D., formerly Professor of Logic and Metaphysics Queen's College, Belfast, now President of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1869.

These important discussions, having been previously published in separate journals, are now collected in a large pamphlet and given to the public by the Carters. They are all valuable. A particular analysis of the last, with copious extracts, was given in the second article of our April number for the current year, and must have convinced our readers of its importance and value. The second is a rejoinder to Mr. Mill's reply to Dr. McCosh's criticisms on his examination of the writings of Sir William Hamilton. Those who have followed this controversy between a sound and a destructive philosophy will be anxious to see its satisfactory issue in this rejoinder. The first is a valuable analysis of the Hamiltonian logic, involving some comparison of it with preceding systems.

*Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford.* By H. P. Liddon, M. A., Student of Christ Church and Chaplain to the Bishop of Salisbury. Third edition, Revised. New York: Scribner, Welford & Co., 1869.

These are in the best sense university sermons, by a preacher whose "Bampton Lectures" have won for him deserved celebrity, and proved his fitness to reason of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come" in the great seats of learning, and before an audience of scholars. As such they have not only a practical and homiletical, but a doctrinal and theological value. They vindicate the great principles of Christianity, of sin, redemption, grace, holy living, against the various forms of Naturalism, Rationalism, Positivism, and Pantheism, which they are called in these latter days to confront. They hold forth a broad and deep, intelligent and progressive Christian life, and show a mastery of the learning, logic, and philosophy involved, which, if misplaced before a popular audience, impart life and force to university sermons. His general drift is in the line of the higher theology of the Anglican church as given in her standards. And we observe that, like most Episcopal divines, he runs into baptismal regeneration. But he is far from being a formalist or, in the main, ritualistic. He also vindicates the supernatural truths, the spiritual faith, and the earnest piety of the Gospel.

*The Day Dawn and the Rain, and other Sermons.* By the Rev. John Ker, Glasgow, Scotland. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1869.

There are very few sermons that will bear printing, and few volumes of them that make any thing better than dull reading. They are, for the most part, made and fitted to be heard rather than read, and they require some originality, freshness, vivacity, eloquence, to attract readers enough to sell a single edition.

Unless they can put the familiar but infinite truths which constitute the staple of all true preaching in a form and garb which has something of the charm of genius, they are quickly forgotten. These sermons of Mr. Ker, a man heretofore unknown to us, have this merit. Those which we have read are of a high order, not merely in the sense in which those of the first grade of preachers usually are. They are original, suggestive, full of inspiring truths and seeds of thought, presented in an easy but glowing style. They abound in matter profitable and stimulating to ministers as well as laymen. They are not only able, but sound, and evangelical. But while they all converge around the cross, they often go beyond the range of ordinary topics, into broader and brighter regions of thought and illustration.

*Sermons.* By Charles Wadsworth, Minister of Calvary Church, San Francisco. New York and San Francisco: A. Roman & Co., 1869.

We could very truly and heartily say much of these sermons which we have just said of the volume of Mr. Ker, last noticed. The public well know Dr. Wadsworth's reputation as a preacher, and the crowds that press for years in succession to hear his sermons. No one can read these discourses without discovering the cause of it. They are instructive, evangelical, fervid, and alive with the freshness, glow, and inspiration of genius. They will certainly command and profit readers as well as hearers.

*The Increase of Faith.* Second Edition. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. New York: Scribner, Welford & Co., 1868.

This little treatise by Dr. William Lee, of Roxburg, first unfolds the nature of faith, and then shows that as a thing of life it must have growth, subjectively in the soul as extending through the intellect, the affections, and the will, and objectively with respect to the ever-widening range of truths and objects which disclose themselves to faith in its progressive development. The essential seminal nature of saving faith is defined to be trust in Christ for salvation. But as it grows it expands into broader views, more unwavering convictions, a surer trust, a deeper and purer love, a firmer purpose, a stronger devotion. As it is ever learning truth, it is also ever unlearning the crudities and imperfections which at first entered into and dwarfed or marred it. Various common fanatical errors in regard to the impossibility of the increase of faith, assurance being of the essence of it, are exposed and refuted. The book shows learning, judgment, practical and speculative theology, and fitness to impart valuable guidance to inquirers and Christians.

*Jesus in the Holy Mount.* By Joseph Sanderson, D. D. Published by the American Tract Society.

This is an attractive and quickening devotional volume, devoted to unfolding that great scene in the life of our Lord, the Transfiguration. It is rich in precious truth and holy unction.

*Before the Throne, or Daily Devotions for a Child.* New York: M. W. Dodd, 1869.

A neat little volume of appropriate devotional exercises for children.

The two following, which rank among the higher class of Novels, are from Leyboldt & Holt, who are beginning to take decided rank as publishers.

*The Gain of a Loss.* A Novel. By the author of the "The Last of the Cavaliers."

*The Fisher-Maiden, a Norwegian Tale.* By Bjornsterne Bjornson. From the author's German edition, by M. E. Niles.

*Marooner's Island; or, Dr. Gordon in Search of his Children.* By the author of the "Young Marooners." Philadelphia: Claxton, Reinsen & Haffelfinger. Macon, Ga.: J.W. Burke & Co., 1869.

A very interesting book.

*Marriage of a Deceased Wife's Sister, considered in connection with the Standards and Practice of the Canada Presbyterian Church; being an Argument showing that Scripture does not Forbid the Marriage.* By the Rev. John Laing, of Coburg. With a Reply thereto, by Rev. William Gregg, of Toronto, and some further remarks by Dr. Laing. Toronto: Adam Stevenson & Co., Publishers, 1868.

Those who wish a condensed view of the arguments on each side of this *quæstio vexata* will find them well put in this valuable pamphlet. We are happy to see that both parties agree that such marriages are objectionable and inexpedient. The only question in debate between them is in regard to the prohibition of them in Scripture, and whether the standards of the Presbyterian Church on this subject ought to be enforced against those who violate them. We have seen no reason to differ from the course of our own church on the subject, which, without sustaining appeals from the decisions of lower courts against those who transgress the standards in this particular, has done nothing to compel Presbyteries of another mind, to act in the premises.

*Utilitarianism as propounded by J. Stuart Mill, Alex. Bain, and others.* By Robert Watts, D. D., Professor of Theology, Assembly's College, Belfast. Belfast: C. Atchison, 12 Castle Place. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. Edinburgh: A. Elliott.

An able argument for the doctrine that "Holiness not Happiness, is the Ultimate Good." We are glad that Dr. Watts is proving himself so valiant for the truth, and so worthy of the high office to which the church in his native land has called him.

*Addresses delivered at the Inauguration of the Professors in Danville Theological Seminary, Oct. 15 & 16, 1868.* Frankfort, Ky.: A. G. Hodges, 1868.

We are glad to find from these addresses that the Danville Seminary, after the interruptions growing out of the war is again reorganized. These addresses bear the well-known and marked characteristics of their respective authors. Dr. W. L. Breckenridge for the Trustees, and Drs. Landis and West the newly elected Professors. In that of Dr. West we meet with those lofty strains into which he so easily runs. A vague fling, in a short

foot-note of Dr. Landis' Address, is made at something in somebody's "late Tractate on the Atonement," and about Nominalism and Realism.

*A Memorial of a Quarter Century's Pastorate. A Sermon preached on Sabbath, Jan. 3d and 17th, 1869, in the Presbyterian Church, Natchez, Miss.* By Rev. Joseph B. Stratton, D. D. Published for the use of the Congregation. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1869.

This is a memorial of a long and successful Pastorate that preceded and survived the desolations of the war in the midst of which it lay. It gives the career and achievements of the ever tender and faithful pastor among a confiding and affectionate flock, which, after being scattered by the war, have so largely returned and gathered under the lead of their former shepherd. As we read it, we can only regret that such ministers should be rent from our communion, and express the hope that the great re-union movement may not lose its momentum till it brings back the sundered churches of the South.

*Address delivered at the University of Pennsylvania before the Society of the Alumni, at their 119th Annual Celebration, January 18, 1869.* By Hon. George Sharswood, LL. D.

We find this address replete with wise counsels in regard to habits of study, and the proper method and limits of mental application such as we are accustomed to find in whatever Judge Sharswood publishes.

*A Sketch of the Life and Ministry of William T. Dwight, D. D., with an Appendix.* By Egbert C. Smith, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. Nichols & Noyes, 1869.

This is a just and beautiful delineation of the life and character of one of the ablest and noblest of New England's ministers of the generation just passed away; a son of the late President Dwight, and grandson of President Edwards, who proved himself not unworthy of so high a lineage. While his son-in-law, Professor Smith, has not exaggerated his virtues, he has nevertheless drawn a warm and life-like portrait, which bears the impress of true filial affection.

*The Malady and the Remedy.* A Sermon preached by Rev. George W. Eaton, D.D., LL. D., President of Madison University, May, 1868, on the Text, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the Sin of the World." New York: Lange, Hillman & Lange, 1869.

An eloquent exhibition of the orthodox and Scriptural view of sin and redemption.

*God Glorified on the Vessels of Wrath.* By George S. Bishop, V. D. M. New York: J. Inglis & Co., 26 Cooper Institute, 1869.

This high and difficult theme is strongly unfolded in this discourse. It has its place in the Divine Plan, and its presentation in public discourse with only the proportion, frequency, and emphasis it has in the Bible, is not unedifying. But it must be presented with its proper surroundings and related truths.

*Fenelon's Conversations with M. de Ramsai on the Faith of Religion, with his Letters on the Immortality of the Soul and the Freedom of the Will.* Translated from the French by A. E. Silliman. 1869.

We are greatly obliged to the author for this elegant pamphlet, so rich both in appearance and matter. Although the conversation with the Chevalier Ramsai is an argument against Deism, which substantially presents the Roman church as the only true alternative to scepticism, still it is instructive to see how this result was reached by one of the brightest ornaments of that church and of our common Christianity, while it is a comfort to know that such holy men may be in this apostate body with all its abominations.

The arguments of Fenelou for the immortality of the soul and freedom of the will, are full of interest. None who care for these things can fail to be interested in the reasonings of a mind so powerful, cultivated, and devout.

It is among the pleasant instances of the union of commercial occupations with letters, philosophy, and theology, that the translator is, if we mistake not, a retired New York banker.

*The Historical Magazine and Notes and Queries concerning the Antiquities, History, and Biography of America.* July, 1868. Morrisania, N. Y.: Henry B. Dawson.

Judging from this number, this periodical is a very important repository of the materials of American history. The number before us is edited by Dr. E. H. Gillett, and contains an exceedingly valuable historical sketch of the cause of civil liberty in Connecticut, originally delivered before the Historical Society of New York, but subsequently enlarged, by the same author.

*The Life of Samuel Miller, D.D., LL.D., Second Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, at Princeton, New Jersey.* By Samuel Miller. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, Nos. 819, 821 Market Street, 1869, vol. I, pp. 373; vol. II, pp. 562.

The life of a man so eminent for his excellence and his service, and who for so long a period occupied such important positions in the church can hardly fail, if delineated with even tolerable ability, to be of permanent interest and value. As the task has been executed with great skill, judgment, and good taste by the son bearing his name, it will, we trust, be cordially welcomed and extensively read. We do not propose in this notice, necessarily so brief, to dwell on the details of Dr. Miller's useful life, or to attempt any estimate of his character. So many of his former pupils and friends are still living, that any tribute of that kind to his memory would be a work of supererogation. They all remember him as an eminently holy man, under the habitual control of the Spirit of all Grace; as faithful in the discharge of all his duties; as zealous for the truth and order of the church; as laborious and untiring in his efforts to instruct, improve, and further the interests of his pupils; as in honor preferring others to himself, ever willing that he himself should be abased that they might be exalted. All who knew him intimately regarded him with reverence and love, and cherish his memory as a sacred trust.

These volumes are replete with valuable information respecting the progress of our church, during the past century, which gives it claims to attention beyond the interest which attaches to its immediate subject.

*Woman as God made her; the True Woman.* By Rev. J. D. Fulton (Tremont Temple, Boston). *To which is added Woman vs. Ballot.* Boston: Lee & Shephard, 1869, pp. 213 and 48.

This is an excellent book, written in opposition to the unfeminine and unseemly efforts so extensively and persistently made by certain women to turn the world upside down and inside out. If angels in attempting to change the sphere of their activity became demon, we shudder to think what women will become, if the present effort should be successful. Fallen angels are invisible, inaudible, and intangible. This unhappily will not be the case with transmuted women. When the change takes place, men will have to pray to be transferred to another planet. Mr. Fulton's book demonstrates the folly of the movement. But what can that avail? It must take its course; which cannot be long, or uncertain as to the issue.

*The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.* By Rev. Frederick T. Brown, D.D., Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, at St. Paul, Min. Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

The Scriptural doctrine of Inspiration is, in this tract, clearly stated, and ably vindicated.

*The Apostolical and Primitive Church: popular in its government, informal in its worship.* By Lyman Coleman, D.D., Professor in Lafayette College. J. B. Lippincott & Co., pp. 413.

This work of Dr. Coleman, like his previous works, on Primitive Christianity, is full of patient and discriminating research. The parity of the ministry and the simplicity of New Testament worship, are vindicated well and unanswerably, so far as the usages and sentiments of the early church are a standard, in the controversy with Prelacy and Ritualism. The condensation, so difficult in this field of investigation, is unusually perfect and attractive. And the beautiful volume is enriched with a rare and interesting chapter at the end, on the "Benediction," as an ordinance of Christian worship. We may differ from the author, in his conclusion that it is to be considered only a "brief prayer, etc.," believing that it combines with prayer the authoritative tone of preaching also; uniting at the close of worship, both the word as used, from man to God, and from God to man—making "you" instead of "us" the pronoun of its formula. Yet this chapter is a new and valuable contribution to the liturgies of the Christian Church.

Of course, in harmony with his preceding works, this volume is *Congregational* more than *Presbyterian*. And on the subject of Church Discipline, it is decidedly and elaborately Independent. The Presbyterian will search in vain for two of the *three* great features of his system—Ruling Elders and Church Courts. The simplification of a mere "voluntary association" is the whole conception of the church—one that we think defective essentially, in leaving out of view the divinely instituted nature of this society which makes a complex idea, that all the analysis of modern divines must fail to reduce to one definition. We prefer the Westminster Divines, in making two definitions: and still think that in the power of definition, they are yet unrivalled.

While therefore we cannot recommend this "Manual," as a text-book for theological students, on account of its congregational negations, and misappre-

hensions, we heartily thank the author, for the skilful and robust array, on his pages, against Prelacy and Ritualism, in their own selected field of contest.

*Foreign Missions; their Relations and Claims.* By Rufus Anderson, D. D., LL. D. Late Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. New York: C. Scribner & Co., 1869. 12mo, pp. 373.

The friends of Missions will heartily welcome the issue of this important though modest volume. It contains the results of the life-long experience of its venerable and honored author in the superintendence of the oldest, largest, and most successful of American Missionary organizations throughout almost the entire period of its existence. The views presented are in the highest degree cheering and hopeful; and the suggestions made are of the highest consequence, and worthy of the most attentive consideration. The course of lectures, in which this treatise had its origin, was first prepared for the theological classes at Andover. They were subsequently delivered by invitation at the Theological Seminary in this place, as well as at several other seminaries in the country. They were listened to by large and appreciative audiences, and with marked attention to the close.

*Companion to the Bible.* By Rev. E. P. Barrows, D. D., Professor of Biblical Literature. Published by the American Tract Society, New York. 12mo, pp. 639.

This volume contains a very clear and distinct view of the wide range of subjects of which it treats. It includes an exhibition of the evidences of revealed religion, a general introduction to both the Old and New Testaments, with an account of ancient manuscripts, versions and Scripture criticisms, a particular introduction to each book of the Bible, and an exposition of the principles of interpretation as applied to the Word of God. The author has in view not so much the wants of scholars and professional students as of intelligent Christians generally, who wish to gain some satisfactory and reliable information on these important topics without the need of resorting to large and costly volumes for the purpose. It is a field with which his studies and professional labors have rendered him familiar; and he has condensed a large amount of varied instruction within a very moderate compass. This fact, together with its evangelical spirit, and the soundness of its views will make it a very acceptable and useful volume.

We give the titles of the following books received too late for particular notice until the next number.

*Studies in Philosophy and Theology.* By Joseph Haven, D. D., Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1869.

*The Office and Work of the Christian Ministry.* By James M. Hoppin, Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in Yale College. New York: Sheldon & Company, 1869.

*The Gospel Treasury and Expository Harmony of the Four Evangelists, in the words of the Authorized Version, having Scriptural Illustrations, Expository Notes, from Approved Commentators, etc., etc.* Compiled by Robert Mimpriss. Two volumes in one. New York: M. W. Dodd, 1869.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

## ENGLAND.

IF the publications of the last three months were laid before our readers, probably no volume would engage the first attention of a larger number than Prof. Veitch's "Memoir of Sir William Hamilton," a fine volume (pp. x., 458, 8vo), published by the Blackwoods on the first of May. Prof. Veitch undertook his work by request of the family, and has amply justified the confidence that was reposed in him. His Memoir is an admirable exhibition of the life and character of the great metaphysician. Of course there are portions of the work fully intelligible only to the initiated in philosophical mysteries. Those parts of the Memoir are, however, so skilfully managed as not to repel the general reader, who will be attracted and abundantly rewarded in the perusal of this biography of one of the great men of the century.

Another book certain to secure interested readers, and to elicit no little discussion, is "Jesus in History," an anonymous publication, understood, however, to be from the pen of one of England's eminent lawyers. The object of the work is to exhibit our Lord and his teachings from the point of view of his contemporaries. It belongs quite decidedly to the liberal school.

Another work taking hold of subjects that deeply engage the public mind, is Mr. Mill's "Subjection of Woman." Two other memoirs, specially attractive, are that of W. S. Landor (republished by Fields, Osgood & Co.), by John Forster, who never fails to do his work well; and that of Dr. Malan, of Geneva, by one of his sons—a work that appeared almost simultaneously in French and English. Another smaller class of our readers will learn with interest of the publication of Vol. I. of Max Müller's "Sacred Hymns of the Brahmins," a translation of a portion of the Rig Veda, with ample explanations. The work will comprise eight volumes.

But we must condense and classify our somewhat long and varied list.

The abridgment of "Alford's Greek Testament" is out (American publishers, Messrs. J. B. Lippincott & Co.), and also his "Revision of the Authorized Version." A translation of "Tischendorf's Greek Text," said to be fairly executed, by Rev. Robert Ainslie, is also just published. The 12th edition of "Horne's Introduction" bears witness to its continued popularity in England. The translation, by Venables, of "Bleek's Introduction" will make accessible to English readers a work which, while not first in order of merit, has been for several years highly valued in the original, and, although posthumous, has reached a second edition.

Part of Ewald's Commentary on Isaiah (chap. i.—xxxiii.) has lately appeared in a translation by Rev. O. Glover; also an "Historical Exposition of Daniel the Pro-

phet," by Dr. W. H. Rule; "Lectures on Ruth," by Rev. A. C. Price; "The Gospel in the Law," an examination of the citations from the Old Testament in the New, by Rev. C. Taylor; a new edition of "John Wesley on the New Testament;" "Short Lectures on the Sunday Gospels," by Rev. A. Oxendon (Lord Bishop elect of Montreal); "Apologetical Lectures on St. John's Gospel," by Van Oosterzee (T. & T. Clark & Co.); "Christ the Counsellor," an exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, by Rev. J. B. Loughton; a revised edition of "Trollope on the Acts of the Apostles;" "Lectures Introductory to the Study of the Epistles of St. Paul," by W. Kelly; "Notes and Reflections on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians," by A. Pridham; and, "If the Gospel Narratives are Mythical, What then?"

Of a more dogmatic character are Bonavia's "Contributions to Christology;" Oxenham's "Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement" (2d edition); Sinkler's edition of the Apocryphal *Testamenta duodecim Patriarcharum*; a little treatise on "Miracles," by E. A. Litton, an esteemed author; H. Dunn's "Destiny of the Human Race;" Garbett's "Voices of the Church of England against Modern Sacerdotalism;" Girdlestone's "Dies Iræ—the Judgment of the Great Day;" Laforet (Rector of Louvain), "Why Meu do not Believe" (republished by the Cath. Pub. Soc.); Rothschild's "Letters to a Christian Friend on the Fundamental Truths of Judaism;" Perowne's "Hulsean Lectures on Immortality;" and Viardot's "Apology of an Unbeliever" (translated from the French). We have also an essay by W. W. English, on "Moral Philosophy, and its Relations to Science and the Bible."

Williams & Norgate have lately published Wright's edition of the "Syriac Text of the *Homilies of Aphraates the Persian Sage*," a work of the early part of the fourth century. The Clarendon Press has issued an edition (by Moberly) of "Beda's Ecclesiastical History." To the Ecclesiastical History of the earlier period belong Jenkins's "Age of the Martyrs;" Mullenger's "Ancient African Church;" Alies' "Formation of Christendom" (Part II); and Trevor's "Rome from the Fall of the Western Empire." Dean Colet's treatises on "The Hierarchies of Dionysius," with translation, introduction, and notes by Lupton, are published for the first time. On Ireland we have Bishop Wordsworth's "History of the Church in Ireland," in eight sermons,—and "The Light of the West," a sketch of Protestantism there. Dr. Waddington's "Congregational History from A. D. 1200 to 1567," and Dr. Halley's "Laneashire, its Puritanism and Nonconformity," are very valuable contributions to the history of dissent; and the same interest is defended in a volume of essays on Congregationalism, entitled "Religious Republics," by six different authors. Sir H. W. Moncrieff (Moderator of the General Assembly of the Free Church), gives us a small treatise on "Creeds and Churches in Scotland." In the continued debate on ecclesiastical matters in England, we have Maskell's "Present Position of the High Church Party. etc.;" Kettlewell's "Rights and Liberties of the Church;" Mountfield's "National Church;" Rev. T. R. Birks's "Church and State;" Dean Goodwin's "Sermons on Church Questions;" and in promise a volume of essays on "The Anglican Church" by representative men like Bishop Elliecott, Dean Hook, Prof. Burrows, etc. A second part of Pusey's "Eirenicon" is nearly ready. De Pressensé's "Church and the French Revolution" is lately translated (a republication and abridgment of which was noticed in January).

Of the volumes of sermons the most noteworthy are the "Sermons of Archbishop Leighton" (Vol. II. of the new edition of his works in process of publication by Longmans); T. Binney's "Weigh-House Chapel Sermons;" Church's "Sermons preached before the University of Oxford;" Davies' "Gospels and Modern Life;" Redford's "Apostolic Christianity and other Sermons;" a translation of "Four Discourses of Chrysostom, chiefly on the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus;" and a translation of some sermons of Dr. Coulin of Geneva, entitled "The Son of Man: Discourses on the Humanity of Jesus Christ" (republished by Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, in Philadelphia).

One of the publications of the Catholic Press (republished also by the Catholic Publication Society, in New York), is "The life of Father de Ravignan of the Society of Jesus." "The Life of Sarpi, the Venetian Counsellor, and historian of the Council of Trent," has also just appeared.

A new edition of "Hume's Essays" and his "Human Nature," each in two volumes, carefully edited, with prefaces and annotations will attract attention. The Hare Prize Essay for 1868 was on "The Greek Sceptics from Pyrrho to Sextus," by Norman Maccoll. In Philosophical History we have Prof. Moutagu Burrows, of Oxford, "Lectures on Constitutional Progress;" Burckhardt's "State of Civilization in Italy during the Renaissance;" a magnificent, illustrated volume on "Tree and Serpent Worship"—with Essays and Descriptions by James Ferguson, F. R. S.; Galloway's "Egypt's Record of Time to the Exodus of Israel;" and Piazzi Smyth's "Antiquity of Intellectual Man." Lecky's "History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne," is out, and is already republished in New York. A fresh contribution to English History at a critical juncture is supplied in Gardiner's "Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage," which is enriched by important documentary material from Simancas, Venice, etc. Matthew Browne's Chaucer's England is said to be a very interesting and valuable contribution to our knowledge of an earlier day. We catalogue also Vol. II. of Curtius "Greek History" (translated); Vol. I. of Ihne's "Roman History" (in press); "Travels of Fah-Iian and Sung-Yun, Buddhist Pilgrims, from China to India (400 A. D. and 528 A. D.), (see Vol. I. of Müller's "Chips from a German Workshop," for a criticism and estimate of similar works published in France twelve or fifteen years since); Helps' "Pizarro;" Gilbert's "Lucrezia Borgia, Duchess of Ferrara;" the Duc d'Aumale's "Military Institutions of France" (translated); A. Young's "Historical Sketches of the French Bar;" "Roma Sotterranea, archaeological and historical," prepared from De Rossi, by Rev. Dr. Northcote and Rev. W. R. Brownlow. A new life of De Foe has just been published, containing many new facts in regard to his later years, and a considerable number of works not before ascribed to him. Gibbon's Autobiography has just been republished.

In the department of Travel, three works of considerable worth and attractiveness from one field, are Earl Carnarvon's "Reminiscences of Athens and the Morea;" Tozer's "Researches in the Highlands of Turkey;" and St. Clair and Brophy's "Residence in Bulgaria." From Western Asia we have Freshfield's "Travels in the Central Caucasus and Bashan;" and from the far East Wallace's "Malay Archipelago" (republished by Harpers). From Africa, Walmsley's "Ruined Cities of Zulu Land" brings out strange traces of the presence of an ancient civilization. Chunder's "Travels of a Hindoo," shows us India as seen by native eyes.

## GERMANY.

The incident in the theological world of Germany, which has most arrested attention within the last three months, is the death of the distinguished Berlin Professor, Dr. Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg, which occurred on the 3d of June. Since he reached the age of twenty-one he has been connected with that University, and during the last forty of these forty-five years, may be recognized as a leader in the theological thought and debate of Germany. He was early delivered from the rationalistic inclinations of his boyhood, and through the pages of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, which he edited nearly forty-two years, and his more elaborate works, exegetical and illustrative of the Scriptures, had done more than perhaps any other recent theologian in opposing rationalism. His more important works are known extensively, through translations, as well as in repeated editions of the original: *e. g.* his Christology, Commentary on the Psalms, Contributions to Introduction to the Old Testament, Egypt and the Books of Moses, Commentaries on the Apocalypse, on the Gospel of John, Solomon's Song, and on Ecclesiastes, with some valuable monographs. His last commentary was on the prophecy of Ezekiel. Some of these works had undergone thorough revision, in new editions. The contributions of his own pen to the *Kirchenzeitung*, would amount to many volumes. His survey of the preceding year, in the opening number of each new volume, amounted at times to a treatise of considerable bulk. With this enormous literary activity, he was largely engaged in Ecclesiastical affairs; although his opposition to the union of the Reformed and Lutheran churches shut him out of official position during part of the time. He withdrew many years ago from the broad circle of Evangelical sympathies, and was an intense high church Lutheran, as well as a thorough and bitter conservative in politics. His intense convictions with his immense industry, and his large resources, made him a man of great influence. He was a prince among dogmatists, conciliating, apparently wishing to conciliate nobody. The late Professor Hupfeld, and Professor Ewald, were his pet antipathies, at whom he never lost an opportunity of hurling a bolt. The feeling was heartily reciprocated.

In the lecture room, the Professor was far from attractive in his style and manner, and yet left a deep impression on his large classes. A casual visitor would be amazed and amused at the excited style even of his exegetical lecturing, and would for a time lose not a little of the substance, in consequence of the idiosyncrasy of the speaker. He was announced for the present Semester, which opened April 12th, to give his three full courses, on Genesis, Methodology, and the History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Testament. But his work is done, and he has gone to walk in larger liberty of spirit, and to enjoy a gracious reward for the great service to which our Master had here called him. His place here must remain vacant.

---

Among the recent contributions to Exegetical literature, we mention Hirsch's Exodus (Vol. 2 of his Comm. on the Pentateuch); the 13th and 14th half-vols. of Bunsen's *Bibel-Werk*, containing Holtzmann on the Apocryphal books; vols. 2 and 3 of Ewald's "Prophets of the Old Testament" (in the second edition); Muchlau on the Proverbs ascribed to Agur and Lemuel (Prov. xxx. 1—xxxi. 9); Vogel's

monograph on Josh. x, "Sun, stand thou still, etc.;" Kautzsch on the passages of the Old Testament cited by the Apostle Paul; Haupt on the Epistle of John; Redslob on the canonical Gospels; Wittichen on the historical character of the Gospel of St. John; and Kurtz on the Epistle to the Hebrews. From Hitzig we have the first of two volumes on the History of Israel (which is to be continued to the capture of Masada, A. D. 72). The sixth volume of Tischendorf's *Monumenta Sacra inedita* has just appeared.

In the department of Dogmatics and the History of Doctrine, we have Nösigen's "Christ the Son of Man and Son of God;" Vol. 1, of Otto's "Practical Theology;" Volck's defence of Chiliasm; Paul on Kant's doctrine of the ideal Christ; Thiersch's monograph on the prohibition of marriage among near kindred; Vol. 2 of Schweizer's Dogmatics; a second edition of Alzog's "Outline of Patrology;" Part 3 of Schwaue's "History of Doctrines within the Patristic Period;" Stahl's "Natural Knowledge of God, according to the doctrine of the Fathers" (the last three from Catholic sources); Wuttke's "German Popular Superstition of the Present;" and a new (3d) edition of Müller's "Symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church."

We find among the recent announcements in Church History: Vol. I. of Czerwenka's "History of the Evangelical Church in Bohemia;" Hepp's "Constitution of the Evangelical Church in the former Electorate of Hesse;" Nagel's "Conflicts of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Prussia since the Establishment of the Union;" Krause's "Byzantines of the Middle Ages" (eleventh-fourteenth centuries); Baxmann's "Policy of the Popes from Gregory I. to Gregory VII.;" and part 2 of Mücke's "Life and Writings of Flavius Claudius Julianus" (Julian the Apostate).

We notice Part 1 of a new edition of Kliefoth's "Liturgical Essays;" Vols. II. and III., of "Rothe's Sermons" (posthumous); and Lauth's "Moses the Hebrew" (from two Egyptian papyri with hieratic inscriptions).

Two volumes have just been published of Imm. H. Fichte's "Miscellaneous Papers in Philosophy, Theology, and Ethics;" a new (fourth) edition of Ritter and Preller's valuable "*Historia Philosophiæ Græcæ et Romanæ*;" Rabbi A. Schmiedl's "Studies on the Jewish Philosophy of Religion" (especially among the Arabic Jews); Spir's "Inquiry after Certainty in the knowledge of Reality;" F. W. Krummacher's Autobiography; and a second edition of the very valuable work of Safarik on "The History of the Slavic Language and Literature, in all its dialects."

Among recent publications in Holland, our attention has been attracted to two or three:—Part 8 of Isaac da Costa's "*Bijbellezingen*," which treats of the period of Gospel history, from the imprisonment to the death of John the Baptist; the first of two volumes, by A. Kuenen, on "Worship in Israel, until the downfall of the Jewish State;" a second edition of Dr. Docdes' "New Testament Hermeneutics;" a University oration, by Dozy, on "The Reasons why the Culture and Civilization of the Mohammedans is impaired and corrupted beyond the Christian;" and one by Van Oosterzee, on "The Christian Religion as the Best Teacher of a Genuine Humanity."

## FRANCE.

In France the approaching Ecumenical Council, in its religious and civil relations, is exciting no little discussion, as also among the Catholics of Germany. Hefele's "History of Councils" is in process of translation from German into French, and Tizzani's "General Councils" from Italian into French.

We enumerate a few recent publications, religious or ecclesiastical in their character:—

Bouix, "Tractatus de Papa, etc.;" Bénard, "Le Christ et le Césarisme Moderne;" Loyson, "Le Carême d'après les Evangiles;" Dupuis, "De l'Origine de tous les Cultes;" Lehr, "Dictionnaire de l'Administration Ecclesiastique d'après l'Usage des deux Eglises Protestantes en France;" Rougemont, "La vie humaine avec e sans la Foi;" "Essai Critique sur l'Exode, par un Déiste;" Le Camus, "Préparation exégétique à la vie de N. S. Jésus Christ;" Michaud, "Morale religieuse;" Coignet, "La Morale indépendante dans son principe, etc.;" Guiol, "De la création dans ses rapports avec Dieu;" Pecaut, "Le Christianisme libéral et le miracle;" Theiner, "Histoire des deux Concordats, etc.; Tom. I, Le concordat de 1801;" Buisson, "Principes du Christianisme libéral;" Moreau, "L'Evangile et la Démocratie;" Arnaud, "La Révolution et l'Eglise."

Of a more philosophical and scientific character are: Ferri, "Essai sur l'Histoire de Philosophie en Italie au *xix* Siècle;" Quetelet, "Physique sociale;" Girard, "Le Sentiment religieux en Grèce d'Homère à Eschyle;" Patin, "Etudes sur la Poésie Latine;" Robert, "Les Théories logiques de Condillac;" Alliot "La vie dans la Nature et dans l'Homme."

In history and biography the French Press is as usual more prolific. Witte, "Recherches sur les Empereurs qui ont règne dans les Gaules au III Siècle;" Duc d'Aumale, "Histoire des Princes de Condé, etc.;" Cherrier, "Histoire de Charles VIII.;" Perrens, "Les Mariages espagnols sous le règne de Henri IV.;" Zeller, "Italie et le Renaissance;" Beauchesne, "La Vie de Madame Elisabeth, sœur de Louis XVI.;" Capefigue, "Isabelle de Castile;" Arnould, "Histoire de l'Inquisition;" Lescure, "Nouveaux Mémoires du Maréchal duc de Richelieu;" Merson, "La France sous la Terreur;" Du Tressay, "Histoire des Moines et des Evêques de Luçon;" Pages, "Histoire de la Religion Chrétienne au Japon;" Houssaye, "Histoire de Leonardo da Vinci;" Budé, "Vie de Jean Diodati."

# "THE CHRISTIAN AT WORK."

*A Large Monthly Journal,*  
DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF  
**AN AGGRESSIVE CHRISTIANITY**  
735 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Rev. J. B. WATERBURY, D. D., Editor.  
H. W. ADAMS, Publisher.

### Editorial Contributors:

Rev. JOS. T. DURYEA, D. D., Presbyterian.  
Rev. STEPHEN H. TYNG, Jr., Episcopal.  
Rev. GEO. LANSING TAYLOR, Methodist.  
Rev. W. I. BUNTING, D. D., Congregational.  
Rev. H. G. WESTON, D. D., Baptist.  
Rev. T. W. CHAMBERS, D. D., Dutch Reformed.

**TERMS:—Payable in Advance.**

*Single Copy, 60 cents per year.*  
*10 Copies, 50 cents each per year.*  
*25 Copies, 45 cents each per year.*  
*50 Copies, 40 cents each per year.*  
*100 Copies, or more, 35 cents each per year.*

### DEPARTMENTS.

MISSION-SCHOOLS AND INSTITUTIONS.  
EVANGELIZATION OF MASSES.  
YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS.  
PARISH WORK.  
SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.  
THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN COMMISSION.  
WOMAN'S WORK.  
NEGLECTED CHILDREN.  
THE OUTCAST AND FALLEN.  
PRAYER-MEETINGS.  
TEMPERANCE.

From hundreds of Testimonials we give the following from Jay Cooke:

H. W. ADAMS:—Send me one hundred copies of CHRISTIAN AT WORK, and three hundred copies of GOOD WORKS, last paper for one year, beginning with first number of Good Works. Send bill and I will remit.

Yours truly,  
JAY COOKE.

LETTER FROM BISHOP McILVAINE, OF OHIO.

CINCINNATI, Sept. 11th, 1868.

*Editor Christian at Work—Rev. and Dear Sir:* I received this week No. 6 of THE CHRISTIAN AT WORK. I had not seen the paper before. It seems to me just what is needed—Christian—and at work; Christ and his salvation—sinners sought and found—Christians laboring to bring the lost to Christ. He blessing and constantly saying—go out—call—bring—pray—I ever live to rescue and save. May God bless the paper and keep it ever wise and prudent, earnest and loving—catholic and protestant—devoted to the one end of saving sinners—and as part of that work resisting Popery.

I send a small contribution to the expenses of the paper, requesting that it be sent to me regularly.

Yours, very truly,  
CHAS. P. McILVAINE.

Single Copy mailed three months, for examination, on receipt of 10 cents.

Address,

**THE CHRISTIAN AT WORK,**

735 BROADWAY, N. Y.

## OUR ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE

OF

## SCHOOL

## MATERIAL,

For 1869 and '70,

REPRESENTS

## APPARATUS, BOOKS, CHARTS, GLOBES, MAPS, SCHOOL FURNITURE

*of several superior modern styles,  
and many other*

**"ARTICLES FOR EVERY SCHOOL."**

*Mailed on demand, with stamp.*

**J. W. SCHERMERHORN & CO.**

Publishers and Manufacturers,

14 Bond St., New York.

## Webster's Unabridged Dictionary.

10,000 Words and Meanings not in other Dictionaries.

3000 Engravings; 1840 Pages Quarto. Price \$12.

A DAILY COMPANION.—*Webster's Unabridged Dictionary* has been, in common with other great lexicons of the English language, one of my daily companions.

My testimonial to its erudition, the accuracy of its definitions, and to the vast etymological research by which it has been enriched through the labors recently bestowed upon it, can hardly be of much value, sustained as the book is in world-wide reputation, by so general an approbation; but I have no hesitation in thus expressing my sense of its merits.

JOHN L. MOTLEY.

BEST BOOK FOR EVERYBODY.—The new illustrated edition of Webster's Dictionary, containing three thousand engravings, is the *best book for everybody* that the press has produced in the present century, and should be regarded as indispensable to the well-regulated home, reading-room, library, and place of business.—*Golden Era.*

Published by G. & C. MERRIAM,

Springfield, Mass.







