

this would only plunge the doubter into deeper doubt. It is plain, therefore, that the tractlet of Mr. Scott defeats in a measure his object.

What, now, of the contents? The order of the topics is not the most perfect. The Church's *doctrine* and the Church's *government* should have been entirely separate, but they are not. The statements as to the Church and those as to the Presbyterian form of worship, instead of being at opposite ends of the work, would have been much better if beside each other. They are cognate subjects.

If we enter into details, the same defect is still more glaring. At the very outset the mind is burdened with an apology for a confession. These five questions would have been in better place if either in the introduction or in the appendix. Then there follows an explanation of the Presbyterian form of government. The statements in this section are condensed and correct. There are two exceptions, however. After proving from Scripture the Presbyterian form of government, the question is asked, "Did not Presbyterianism have its origin at the Reformation?" Well, if it began with the Apostles it could hardly begin with the Reformers. The answer would have been in better form in an addendum. Immediately thereafter one can hardly keep the face straight when he reads the question, "What do you think is to be the future of Presbyterianism?" and then the answer, "That being apostolic, it will become the dominant, if not universal, form of church government," savours of a sectarianism that should be scouted from the earth. What is the proof-text for so glowing a hope? It is found in Luke xii. 32. What connection this text has with the future of Presbyterianism we leave our readers to surmise. The passage would have had the same force when

in the mouth of a Baptist or a Methodist who argues for his form of government.

A synopsis of the Presbyterian faith is presented in the following five pages. The main doctrines are given; but the proof-texts are not so copious as they are in the larger Confession. The reader is surprised to find a slice of Arminianism in the treatment of election. It is true that one view gains clearness when in contrast with another. But if the Arminian doctrine be inserted at all, it should be in a footnote; and, besides, it is fairer to Arminians to give a larger summary of their doctrine. False conceptions arise from partial statements of any position; and the danger is only partly guarded against by the direction at the foot of the page, to "see the first five points of Arminianism."

The chief error of the section upon doctrine is that it mingles assertion and defence together. It conveys the idea that the writer is a pleader, that he is endeavouring to remove prejudice. For example: the question, "Do you not believe that Christ died to make salvation possible for all mankind, but confers it only on those who, believing on Him, seek forgiveness?" is out of order. The book would be endless if it told what Presbyterians do not believe. Again, the question "How do you explain the universal call of the Gospel with the limited atonement?" raises a hope that is only doomed to fall; the virtual answer is that it is not explainable. This mistake is most palpable in the treatment of the subject of Baptism. This topic occupies five pages out of fifteen. The question will at once suggest itself, "Is this subject so fundamental to Presbyterianism that it should cover one-third of a Confession?" Now, although the statement of the doctrine is clear, it is cumbered with arguments and