

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear
within the text. Whenever possible, these have
been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
						/					

THE
CANADIAN PRESBYTER.

AUGUST, 1858.

THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

The "old English Bible" maintains its place of authority in our Churches and families; but we doubt whether it is privately and habitually read by the present generation as it was by their fathers. Granted that the neglect of the Bible must be referred to its radical cause in the natural prejudice of every "carnal mind," and may also be traced in part to the influence of the multiplied books and periodicals of the day in diverting attention from the Book of Books. We are inclined, however, to recognise also the operation of another cause: the dissatisfaction which is felt with the present translation, and the uninviting dissection of the matter into small separate verses,—a treatment which no uninspired volume could have so long survived.

The question of a revision of the authorised version is much debated. It is no longer a movement of the Socinians to wipe out the evidences of Christ's Deity, and of the Holy Trinity; or of the Baptists to insist on a special rendering of one or two Greek words, that are words of life or death to their system; but an anxious inquiry among educated men in all Protestant Churches speaking the English language, whether the faults and solecisms of the present version may not be corrected without injury to those great characteristic excellencies which no competent judge disputes. It is a question on which every intelligent mind has or seeks to have an opinion, and the temperate discussion of which must promote the genuine interests of Scriptural Christianity.

On the threshold of the subject we are met by the alarmists, who raise their hands and voices in horror at the thought of changing the popular Bible. "Innovation! Latent here! Rationalistic criticism! Our Bible in danger!" By such outcries the ignorant and the timid are affrighted and most unjustly prejudiced. The men who raise these cries would have with equal zeal exclaimed against the present version itself, had they lived at the time when it was first projected to supersede the translations previously in use. We are not without a persuasion, however, that, above the din of mere unreasoning outcries, the calm voice of sound investigation and judgment will yet be heard, and that perhaps, speedily.

I. We assume as undeniable that a true reverence for God's Word requires us to use the most accurate and faithful version of the inspired original that we can obtain, whether that version be new or old. Granted, that a change proposed for trivial reasons should be discouraged, and that the reverential associations that gather around an old version are not to be lightly disturbed; but the interests of Sacred Truth are paramount in importance, and these interests require that the original Scriptures be rendered with all possible fidelity into the vulgar tongue for the use of English readers of the present day.

II. We venture further to say, that the authorised English version, with all its excellencies, is no longer a sufficient or satisfactory representation of the inspired Bible. We believe it to have been a wonderful production of sacred scholarship in the age when it first appeared, and can unite with its most ardent admirers in praise of its general fidelity, dignity, and strength. It has directed the faith and nursed the virtues of better men than we are. It has guided our fathers to the gate of heaven. But the God of the Bible has given to our generation greater advantages for ascertaining the exact words of the Book, and the accurate meaning of those words, than former ages possessed; and we seem to be constrained to take one of two courses, either to submit our present version to the capricious verbal alterations of individual expounders, or to endeavor after such an authorised and competent revision of the whole as may command the general confidence of the Church.

The following considerations appear to us to carry great weight :

1. The original text is now far more accurately known than at the period when the authorised version was produced. This remark applies mainly to the New Testament, of which some of the most reliable MSS. have been obtained since the era of the English translation. True, that the changes noted and adopted by the critical editors of the New Testament are generally of an unimportant nature; but if even ten are such as should be known to the English reader, there arises an uncertainty in the popular mind as to the authenticity of many texts on which great stress has been laid in religious controversy. No scholar is content to read the "textus receptus," because the scholar is perfectly aware that it was framed from an imperfect collation of Greek MSS., and, in some parts of the Book of the Revelation of St. John, without any old Greek MS. whatever. It is required by veneration for the truth and by justice to the unlearned readers of the Bible, that the English version should be made to correspond with the original, as determined by consent of the learned critical editors of England and Germany, or in cases where they differ, by the preponderating judgment.

2. Not only the text, but the meaning of the text, is more accurately ascertained now than in the reign of James I. of England. No disrespect is intended to the erudition of the period, or of the Divines whom that King appointed to prepare the version which is still "authorised." We merely state the fact, that the studies of the two hundred and fifty years which have elapsed since that period have not been unfruitful. Within the present century how marked the

improvement in lexicography! What fine critical acumen has been brought to bear on ancient writings, especially on the Holy Scriptures! What attention has been paid to correct philology, and to those questions of ancient geography, natural history, and Eastern antiquities, without a knowledge of which the Bible cannot be properly translated! It seems ungrateful to the Most High not to bring all the advantages of modern acquirement to bear on the rendering of His Word into the languages of the modern world.

As the matter now stands, Ministers of the Word are not infrequently embarrassed; on the one hand unwilling to shake the confidence of the public in the common version by frequently altering its meaning in reading or exposition; on the other hand unable conscientiously to read or preach as inspired Scripture what they know to be erroneously rendered, or to be expressed in forms of speech that have now come to convey an entirely different meaning from that which they bore two or three centuries ago. Is it fair to a congregation to read to them, "Our conversation is in heaven,"* when we know that the Apostle refers not to colloquy, but to his tenor of life as a citizen in heaven; or to affright many timid believers at the Lord's Table, by sternly announcing, as from the Bible, that every unworthy communicant "eateth and drinketh damnation to himself;"† though we see in the margin the more accurate expression, "judgment"; or to shock every mind by reading of the four heavenly Zoa, as "four beasts";‡ or to take no notice of the many cases in which an inattention to the force of the Greek article has obscured the sense; or to consent to the confusion of such terms as Devil and Dæmon, Hades and Hell, throughout the New Testament? We are confident that no evil, but unmixed good, would result from a revision and correction of such errors as these.

3. The insertion of words not authorised by the original text, printed in Italic letters, has long been a cause of dissatisfaction to the reader of the English Bible. The choice of Italic letters to mark the words as supplementary, has been unfortunate, since in all other publications these letters are used to distinguish words of special importance and emphasis. Moreover the Italicised words are either necessary to the rendering of the meaning of the original, or they are not. If they are, they have a right to appear in the translation, and ought not to be distinguished by any change of type. If they are non-essential to the translation, and partake of the character of explanation or commentary, they should have no place in the text, and fall within the province of the annotator and expositor. The vast majority of those in the authorised version are of the former class, and ought to be printed without special distinction, as part of the text. Yet those of the latter class, are more numerous than many suppose, and sometimes materially alter the sense of the original.*

4. The grossly indelicate expressions in various parts of our version of the Old Testament, ought to be altered, and may easily be altered without any unfaithfulness to the Hebrew text. Many of these are more offensive than the

* Philipp. iii. 20.

† 1 Cor. xi. 29.

‡ Rev. iv. 6.

* See Job xix. 25-26; Psalms xvii. 13-14, cxxxix. 16; Heb. x. 38; 2 Sam. i. 18.

original Hebrew expressions require. Their grossness did not shock the taste of the age when our version first appeared, as it disgusts the modern reader. We do not, therefore, so much attach blame, because of these words and phrases, to the venerable translators, as we insist that such modifications should now be introduced as will render all parts of the English Bible fit to be read in families and schools. Good and sufficient reasons can be given for the presence of expressions which seem to us gross and coarse, in the ancient Scriptures; but we can perceive no reason at all for the translation of such expressions into the most offensive forms of speech for the eye and ear of the modern English Christian. We do not wish to dwell farther on this point, but it is one that demands wise consideration, and speedy remedy.

The same observations apply, though with less urgency, to the forms of speech now reckoned ungrammatical that are not infrequent in the English Bible.

b. The mode in which the authorised version is usually printed is vexatious to the reader, and injurious to the sense. Every one competent to give an opinion declares that nothing could be more capricious and unskilful than the manner in which the text is sub-divided into chapters and verses; and we attribute to this unfortunate arrangement much of the current misapprehension of the meaning and tenor of Scripture, and much of the disinclination to read any long passage consecutively. Were the Bible uniformly printed in well arranged sections, sub-divided into paragraphs, as in some special editions it is now printed, the style of preaching and the habit of Bible reading would probably be changed to great advantage. No longer would sentences be taken as texts in the pulpit and treated of in entire separation from the paragraphs in which they lie. No longer would such sentences and parts of sentences be wrested to maintain dogmas, with which the context proves that they have no connection whatever. And no longer would the Bible be closed in the private room or in the family circle, or in the Church, at the end of a chapter which does not complete the sense or conclude the topic. The reading would continue till the end of the section, which should mark a natural stop. Another important improvement would be the printing of the poetical parts of Scripture in the form appropriate to poetry, with special spaces to mark the change of speaker in those Bible poems that take the form of dialogue and drama.

The only objection worthy of notice which we have seen or heard urged against the discontinuance of the present chapters and verses is, that a very convenient mode of reference would be lost, and especially that the quotations from Scripture in all the past religious literature could no longer be verified by the student. No doubt a considerable inconvenience might at first be felt; but it could be removed in part, if not in whole, by continuing to print the old divisions in the margin. In course of fifty years the entire inconvenience would be forgotten in the great satisfaction sure to arise from the new and more judicious arrangement now proposed.

III. In fact, the question of the advantage to be reaped from a revision of the authorised version scarcely needs to be discussed. The point questioned by

many is not so much the probable advantage, as the *feasibility* of such a revision in the present day. To some, for whose judgment we have much respect, the difficulties appear insuperable. But we should be glad to see these difficulties fairly stated and discussed. The chief inquiries involved are the following:

1. Can the authorised version be revised without a great and violent change? The answer may surely be given in the affirmative. What is the present version itself but a revision of that which was previously in use? One of the royal instructions under which the forty-seven translators acted was, in these words: "The ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit." If it was possible to revise the "Bishops' Bible" with so marked success in the 17th century, why should it be impracticable in the 19th century to revise King James's version? We do not plead for a new and independent translation. We have very little sympathy with those who decry the version in use for its antique cast and occasionally obsolete forms of speech. A new version vieing in style with the popular literature of the day we have no desire to see. But it is surely possible to make all such emendations as are absolutely needed, in harmony with the general tenor of the fine old version, not marring, but rather maintaining and increasing its antique dignity. It is well remarked in Hare's "Guesses at Truth,"—"We are bound to acknowledge it as an inestimable blessing, that our translation of the Bible was made before our language underwent the various refining processes, by which it was held to be carried to its perfection in the reign of Queen Anne. For in those days the reverence for the past had faded away; even the power of understanding it seemed well-nigh extinct. Tate and Brady's Psalms show that the Bible would have been almost as much defaced and corrupted as the Iliad was by Pope. The less artificial and conventional state of our language in the age of Shakspeare was far more congenial to that of the Bible. Hence, when the task of revising our translation, for the sake of correcting its numerous inaccuracies and of removing its obscurities, so far as they can be removed, is undertaken, the utmost care should be used to preserve its language and phraseology."

2. But if it were conceded that a revision is possible and desirable, who can be entrusted with a task requiring not only so much ripeness of learning, but also so much wisdom, judgment, and sacred skill? This is confessedly a question of considerable difficulty, and might with advantage be made matter of grave consideration and conference in the Churches.

The simplest and most feasible mode, as it appears to us, would be to entrust the revision to a commission of great Biblical scholars in Great Britain and Ireland. It is obviously desirable to obtain the co-operation of the faithful American Churches; but we are at a loss to see how they, or even the British Colonial Churches, could be included in the active promotion of this great work.

The age of Victoria is not the age of James I.; and it is doubtful whether a Commission for the revision of the English Bible should be called by Royal

authority and governed by Royal instructions or not. But were it once agreed and understood, that the British and Irish Protestant Churches, Non-Conformist as well as Established, should be represented on the Commission proportionally to their numbers in the community, the difficulty might easily be solved; for the representatives of the Church of England could be nominated by the Crown; those of the Presbyterian Churches by their General Assemblies and Synods; the Methodists by their Conference, &c. If it were prudent or fair to commit such a work as is proposed to any one of the Churches, we should not object to see it placed entirely in the hands of some of the accomplished Divines of the Church of England; and this notwithstanding the unfair handling of the terms *Episcopos* and *Presbyter* in our present translation. But it is obviously most expedient that all the orthodox Churches in the United Kingdom should unite in any steps toward the improvement of that version of Holy Writ to which they all appeal. This co operation would ensure general confidence in the revised version, and would also bring a wider scholarship to the execution of the task. The Alford and Ellicotts of the South would have no reason to despise the help of the Fairbairns and Eadies of the North.

We shall merely add, that no authority of Church or State should be used to enforce the general reception of a revised English Bible. The revised version should not be imposed, but merely allowed to be substituted for that now in use; and it would thus, without provoking hostility, gradually feel its way by its own merits, to the general approval of Protestant Christians everywhere who use the English language.

THE UNION QUESTION, AND THE CONFESSION OF FAITH ON THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.

The great stumbling block in the way of the Union of our Church with the United Presbyterian, is the question of the civil magistrate's relation in his official capacity to the revealed Word of God. Our respective views on this point have not yet been brought into harmony, or at least we have not yet found a form of expressing them in which we can heartily agree. For the clearing of the question it might not be amiss to review the doctrine of the Church regarding it, as that is recorded in her authorised standards.

The question is after all not in itself a very broad one; it may have very wide and important relations and bearings, but doctrinally it may be numbered among the lesser constellations of our ecclesiastical system.

The question is not, let it be noted, concerning the Headship of Christ over His Church as the associated fellowship of true believers. We rejoice to think that on this doctrine we have no debate with our brethren of the United Presbyterian Church. They would as strenuously as ourselves resist any encroachment upon the absolute supremacy of Christ within His Church. On this question we are prepared cordially to unite. On no practical application of it are we aware that any disagreement exists. All that the Confession of Faith says regarding it, we mutually and without explanation accept. To argue, therefore, this part of the doctrine of Christ's supremacy is needless. Let us give God thanks that we can so far walk together as brethren.

When, however, we come to consider the claims which Christ makes on nations as regards their public policy and legislation, we here find a divergence of opinion to some extent—or at least an apparent divergence—that is sufficiently operative to hinder our co-operation in the meantime as one Church. That we may clearly understand our own position as regards this question, let us enquire what is really the teaching of the Confession on this point of doctrine. We find it in the first place affirming in chap. viii. that Christ is "heir of all things," and that the Father "put all power and judgment into his hands"; but these passages can only by implication or inference apply to the subjection of the magistrate in his official capacity to the authority of God's Word. The xx. chapter is further very explicit as regards certain duties which the magistrate may discharge in relation to moral or spiritual offences. In the fourth clause of this chapter it is declared that—

"They who upon pretence of Christian liberty shall oppose any lawful power or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God. And for their publishing of such opinions as are contrary to the light of nature; or to the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning worship or conversation; or to the power of Godliness; or such erroneous opinions or practices as either in their own nature or in the manner of publishing or maintaining them, are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the Church; they may lawfully be called to account and proceeded against by the censure of the Church and by the power of the civil magistrate."

This article appears to allow the magistrate a considerable power in regard to questions and offences of a religious kind, and perhaps may be understood to sanction an interference with what in these days is acknowledged to be the liberty of conscience. No one denies that any person offending in the particulars stated in the article, may and ought to be proceeded against by the censures of the Church of which he is a member; but that for *all* these reasons he may and ought to be proceeded against by the power of the civil magistrate, few will admit to be either just or scriptural. When, however, this clause is looked at with the explanation given of it and universally accepted by us, much, if not all that at first sight appears to be objectionable will be removed. Dr McCrie in the appendix to his discourse on "The unity of the Church," states one form of this explanation and defence in the clearest and ablest manner. He says—

"Now this does not say that all who publish such opinions and maintain such practices as are mentioned, may be proceeded against or punished (if the substitution of this word shall be insisted on) by the civil magistrate; nor does it say that any good and peaceable subject shall be made liable to this process simply on the ground of religious opinions published and practices maintained by him. For in the *first* place, persons of a particular character are spoken of in this paragraph, and these are very different from good and peaceable subjects. They are described in the former sentence as "they who oppose lawful power or the lawful exercise of it," and "resist the ordinance of God." The same persons are spoken of in the sentence under consideration, as appears from the copulative and relative. It is not said "Any one for publishing," &c., but "they who oppose any lawful power, &c., for their publishing," &c. In the *second* place, this sentence specifies some of the ways in which these persons may become chargeable with the opposition mentioned, and consequently "may be called to account," but it does not assert that even they must or ought to be prosecuted for every avowed opinion or practice of the kind referred to."

This is, we believe, a very generally accepted explanation of the clause in question, and deprives it at least of the appearance of intolerance or persecution. We are by no means sure that it is exactly grammatical, or that it altogether removes the objection that may be urged against it. We think that the learned Dr. misses the description of the certain persons who may be proceeded against by the Church and the magistrate. He says they are such as "oppose lawful power," &c. Now it appears to us that they are such as "upon pretence of *Christian liberty*" (whether they oppose lawful authority or not) publish opinions or maintain practices contrary to the light of nature, to the known principles of

Christianity, or such as either in their own nature or in the manner of publishing them, are destructive to the external peace and order of the Church—such persons may, notwithstanding their *pretence of liberty of conscience*, be proceeded against by the Church and the magistrate. The meaning of this clause will therefore be that *any one* doing the things specified shall not, on the plea of conscience, be permitted to escape the just censure of the Church for *these* their sins, or the just punishment of the civil power for *these* their crimes. The object of this clause is evidently to guard liberty of conscience from abuse, to repel the objection that it permits lawless license either in matters religious or civil; and so far as the general doctrine which it embodies is concerned, the judgment of our day is at one with that of the Westminster divines. But we feel constrained to object to the specifications of civil offences which the clause contains, even with Dr. McCrie's explanation, and would rather generalise its particulars into such a form of expression as that they may be consistent with the present universally accepted views of civil and religious liberty. We cannot in these days admit that *any class* of persons may or ought to be punished by the civil power for publishing opinions or maintaining practices simply because they are what may be deemed "contrary to the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation, or to the power of godliness." Neither can we sanction a law that would subject *any class* of persons to punishment for opinions or practices published or maintained which might be thought "destructive of the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the Church." We do not understand the Confession to use these terms in any sense that would require this, or that could be regarded as sanctioning persecution for conscience sake. In our resolutions of 1854 we solemnly declare that we "do not understand the passages relating to the duty of the civil magistrate as teaching or sanctioning the persecution of individuals for conscience sake; principles which the Synod heartily disclaim," &c. We would, therefore, as we have said, rather generalise the particulars of this clause, and say that they simply mean that persons doing the things specified, even on the plea of liberty of conscience, expose themselves to the censure of the Church, and if in the doing of them they disturb the peace and good order of society, or invade the liberties of the Church, they further expose themselves to civil pains and penalties. If any one says that the clause in question means more than this, or that it sanctions compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion, then we say, that not only do we not accept it in that sense, but we repudiate such an interpretation of its terms.

But, having cleared our way through this rather difficult passage of the Confession, and seen what it is understood to teach, we find that it says nothing about the civil magistrate's duty in relation to the Word of God. It treats certain actions and forms of actions as *crimes*; that is, as destructive of the good order of civil society; and on this ground it declares that the persons guilty of them may be punished by the civil magistrate. Now, there is nothing in this open to debate. Both parties acknowledge that *crimes* or violations of public law or right lie within the proper jurisdiction of the civil magistrate; and that too not because they are sins against God, but because, whatever else they may be, they are sins against civil society. We have therefore, so far, found nothing in the Confession that directly bears upon the duty of the civil magistrate in his official capacity to recognise the obligations of the revealed Word of God.

We turn now to the 23rd chapter of the Confession. Here we find it represented that "God, the Supreme Lord and King of all the World, hath ordained civil magistrates to be under Him over the people." This is in terms of that Scripture which says "The powers that be are ordained of God." This article,

let it be noted, plainly declares that civil magistrates are ordained "to be under God"; that is, to be subject to his authority; and that too primarily "for his own glory," and secondarily "for the public good." Now, let it be further observed, that the terms "civil magistrates" in this sentence do not refer simply to individuals, personally considered, as members of civil society, irrespective of their official character and standing. They must be understood to refer to the official representatives of corporate civil society. The functions they are, in virtue of their position, to perform, are such as can only be discharged in an official way. Their public acts are not personal or individual, but official and national. The laws which they devise and execute are the nation's laws. On behalf of the nation, they declare war, and make peace. When, therefore, it is said that the civil magistrate is *under God*, this must surely be understood of him in his official and representative character. We cannot see how any other interpretation than this can be put upon the terms of this article.

What further, let us ask, does the Confession mean by the terms "under God over the people for his own glory?" Do they not fully declare the absolute supremacy of God over the nations of the world, and the duty of the nations by their official representatives to recognise and submit to this supremacy? How is it possible to escape from such a conclusion as this? We know of no Presbyterian Church that has attempted to alter or modify, either by amendment or explanation, this plain doctrine of the Westminster standards. The American Churches leave these terms intact, and the proviso of the United Presbyterian Church does not affect them in the least.

We would further say, that if the civil magistrate, in his official capacity, is bound to recognise and submit to the supreme authority of God, it must necessarily follow that the Word of God—the Bible, the only revelation of the Divine will—must be that by which, in all his procedure, he is to be guided. It is only by acting according to the principles and precepts of the Word in the administration of civil affairs, that the magistrate can recognise or submit to the supreme authority of God. For accomplishing the ends for which he is appointed, as the representative of the nation, namely, the civil welfare and peace of society, this clause makes it incumbent upon him to see that all his procedure is not only not contrary to, but is in accordance with, the principles of God's Word. It is not by this argued that the magistrate should make the Bible a civil or a criminal code. It is neither designed nor fitted for such a use. No such claim is put forth by the Confession. The office of the magistrate is based upon the natural principles of right and justice, which include "natural religion, whether more imperfectly understood without revelation, or more fully explained in the Bible." "But then," says Dr. McCrie, "it is observed, that religion and morality, in all the extent to which they were contained in the law of nature, are taken into the system of Christianity." Government must, therefore, henceforth be conducted, not according to the dim and dubious light of nature, but according to the principles of Christian morals, as these are taught in the Holy Scriptures.

It might be no difficult task to draw inferences from the doctrine we have now stated that would appear to militate against the full civil and religious liberty of the subject. But we decline to accept or to be held responsible for inferences even of a possible or probable kind that might be drawn from our position. We hold that the doctrine of the Confession in relation to civil affairs, as understood by us, is both reasonable and scriptural; and we are much mistaken if any true Presbyterian will be found to deny it. It is the doctrine of every Presbyterian Church with which we are acquainted, and we might also say of every Christian Church. It runs like a golden thread through the whole of

our testimony as a Church; and we hope, for the sake of society, that the day will never come when the Church will cease to teach and to declare that civil government should be conducted according to the principles contained in the revealed Word of God.

But let us see what further the Confession teaches in regard to the civil magistrate.

The *second* clause of this same chapter further asserts that Christians "may lawfully accept and execute the office of a magistrate"; and, for the maintenance of the commonwealth, they "may lawfully, *now under the New Testament*, wage war;" &c. Here is an explicit statement, incidentally made, it is true, but still declaratory of the principle contained in the first clause of the chapter, that the magistrate is "*now under the New Testament*"; and that, recognising its authority, he may lawfully wage war. This is worthy of note.

The *third* clause is, however, that concerning which most difficulty is felt. It declares in the *first* place that the civil magistrate has nothing whatever to do in the Church; he must not assume to himself the administration of sacraments or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven. To this declaration none but Erastians of the English Episcopal type will take the slightest objection. The government of the Church is totally distinct both in its means and ends to that of the State, and the one must not intrude itself into the domain of the other. But, as the Church has something to do with the welfare of human society; and, without seeking to interfere with the administration of its affairs, she may yet in her own way reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, and may legitimately instruct the State in matters pertaining to godliness and morals. So, on the other hand, the Confession goes on to state that the magistrate has certain authorities and duties about (*circa*) sacred things. It in fact declares that he should concern himself *about* the preservation of the Church's unity and peace; *about* the keeping the Word of God pure and entire; *about* the suppression of blasphemies and heresies; *about* the preventing and reforming of all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline *about* the settlement, administration, and observance of all the ordinances of God. *About* all these things the Confession says that he "has authority, and it is his duty to take order." And, as he cannot do all these by his own unaided power, it is therefore further declared that "he hath power to call Synods, to be present at them and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God."

Now, it may safely be said, that no Presbyterian Church in these days would coin such a clause as this; modern divines would certainly describe the duty of the civil magistrate about sacred things in very different terms. It cannot be denied that the Westminster Fathers had different views from us on these points. They had not so tender a regard for the wild fancies of fanatics as modern political economy vauntingly professes, nor did they pay much respect to the *religious* liberties of the profane and ignorant. They would have very much respected the sagacious advice of the Scotch dominie to the Duke of Wellington for the pacification of Popish Ireland, namely, "*the lawse and the Testament.*" In all these matters it may be questioned whether they were not wiser than the moderns. We are sure they would have ridiculed the hypocritical pretence of our Indian government of respecting the religious abominations of Hindoos and Mohammedans on the plea of liberty of conscience. Take them all in all, the Fathers had as just views as their children have of the powers and prerogatives of the Church and State. But whatever their views were in the framing of this clause, we yet consider its terms capable of an interpretation consistent with the liberties of the Church and the subject. To do our fathers justice, we must say that they were no lovers of persecution, and no favourers of tyranny.

They achieved the liberties which we now enjoy; with a great price they purchased the civil and religious freedom which we now inherit. Let us, therefore, honor their memories. It will be observed that they very cautiously, in this article, describe the duty of the magistrate. "It is," say they, "his duty to *take order*," &c. Now, these words, "take order," are a technical and ecclesiastical phrase. They do not imply the use of physical coercion, but only that he may or shall use his utmost endeavour in his place and station, according to the wholesome laws of the commonwealth, for the ends specified in the clause. They grant no arbitrary power to the State, but only inculcate the exercise of the magistrate's constitutional prerogative for the maintenance of the welfare of civil society; by, on the one hand, executing the wholesome laws against public offenders and criminals; and, on the other, by inviting the Church to use its prerogative of teaching, persuasion, and censure, in order that ignorance, irreligion and vice may be suppressed, and true piety promoted. If the clause concedes to the magistrate power to call Synods, this is to be understood only when the "Kirk is not settled or constituted in point of Government," or "when the Kirk is corrupted and all things out of order," an illustration of which may be found in the calling of the Westminster Assembly itself. But this does not imply that Synods are not to meet, except on the call of the magistrate. In the 31st chapter it is expressly provided that "the ministers of Christ, of themselves by virtue of their office, may meet together in such Assemblies." Further, in the clause under consideration it is allowed that the magistrate hath power "to provide that whatever is transacted in ecclesiastical Synods be according to the word of God." This does not, however, imply that he has or ought to have any veto upon their decisions. He may provide that their transactions be according to the will of God, by securing to them perfect liberty of speech and action, and defending them against any violence or coercion. Probably the word "provide" was never intended to mean more than this; and, viewed in relation to the other parts of the Confession, it may fairly be interpreted as not implying anything else. Understood in this way, we can see no difficulty in subscribing to our Confession. We do not think that these magisterial powers or prerogatives, so interpreted, are in the slightest degree Erastian or inconsistent with the teaching of Scripture. There may, however, be tender consciences, or simple-minded Christians, who cannot see with our eyes or inwardly digest the strong meat upon which we can feed. For their sakes, we often wish that the terms of the Confession were less dubious, or our explanations of their meaning were less recondite and more obvious. We could almost advocate the adoption, bodily, of the Confession and Constitution of the O. S. Presbyterian Church of the United States. While in our judgment these abate nothing of the royal prerogatives of Christ, they certainly qualify the prerogatives of the civil magistrate about sacred things. With this half-formed wish we do not expect that our high conservative friends will sympathise. They would, we fear, rather stand alone among the glories of the past than hazard a movement such as this, even though it should promise to realise the glories of the future Church. We regret their inflexibility, but hope that the day is at hand when we shall see eye to eye, and, with honest endeavor for the glory of God, mutually strive to remove every hindrance to the triumph of the Cross.

From this survey of the teachings of the Confession, it is evident that the Churches which accept of it as their Confession have a doctrine respecting the duty of the civil magistrate; and the doctrine unquestionably is, that, in his official capacity as the representative of the State or nation, the magistrate is under God; and, in the administration of all the affairs that properly lie within his jurisdiction, he is bound to take the Word as a light to his feet and a lamp to his path. In the execution of this duty he is to respect and maintain true liberty

of conscience; to restrain and suppress, by the strong arm of power, all licentious and wicked practices, under whatever pretence committed; to guard and defend the just liberties and prerogatives of all sections of the Church, and generally in all his procedure, to have a supreme regard to the glory of God.

This is what we have always considered to be the doctrine of our Church, and of other Churches holding our Confession. The exceptions taken to some parts of the Confession by the United Presbyterian Church since the year 1823, do not, in our judgment, touch this doctrine. If they do, they must be stretched to an extent never contemplated by their authors. The Testimony of that Church published by authority of the Synod in the year 1831, in its "Doctrinal Statements against error and immorality," under the 12th head, "concerning the relations of Church and State," explicitly declares the very doctrine in question. After stating in the preamble the chapters of the Confession which relate to the power of the civil magistrate, and the acts of Assembly and Synods by which these were ratified and explained, the first and second clauses go on to say:—

"1. Religion, abstractly viewed, is essential to the well-being of society, and to the efficient exercise of civil government; and is, therefore, the concern of legislators and civil rulers, as well as all others, in their several situations."

"2. The Christian religion, as might be expected from its Divine origin and intended universality, is the best calculated for promoting the interests of civil society, and, therefore, deserves the countenance of the civil powers. As it is their own interest and duty to embrace it, so they ought to favour its introduction among their subjects. And, where it is introduced, it ought to have the control which belongs to it over the formation of laws, the administration of justice, the swearing of oaths, and other matters of civil jurisdiction."

After reading these sentences will any one say that the United Presbyterian Church has no doctrine on the duty of the civil magistrate? From her historical and doctrinal Testimonies, it can, we believe, be shown that she has more fully stated this doctrine and more clearly defined the limits of its application than any other Presbyterian Church in Christendom. We were therefore surprised to find in the *Canadian United Presbyterian Magazine* for July, the editor, Professor Taylor, stating that "*the Church, as an organised body, has no doctrine on that subject to declare;*" and further, that he places this question of the civil magistrate, which has been fraught with practical results so momentous to the Church of Christ, in the same category with the doubtful point "respecting the perpetual virginity of Mary." Surely Dr. Taylor means something different by the words "duty of the civil magistrate," from what has hitherto been understood by our respective Churches in their discussions on the question of Union. We would like the Dr. to tell us plainly what he here understands by the "duty of the civil magistrate." Is it the same as that stated in the 1st and 2d clauses of the 23d chapter of the Confession, and the 1st and 2d clauses of the 12th section of the Testimony. If it is something different from that, will he tell us what it is that he means? We have hitherto been understanding "the duty of the civil magistrate" to mean, in terms of our resolution of last Synod, "*his obligation in his official capacity to acknowledge and obey the revelation of God's authority in His inspired Word.*" Dr. Taylor cannot but know that this has been our mutual *usus loquendi* as regards these terms. We deem it therefore something quite new, as we believe many of the Dr.'s brethren will also deem it, to be informed that the United Presbyterian Church "has no doctrine on the subject to declare." We, in this Magazine, have hitherto been taking it for granted that she had a *doctrine*, and that that doctrine was identical with our own. The evidence besides, which we can adduce, and have adduced on the point we deem more cogent than the incautious dictum of Professor Taylor. We will not therefore give up our belief that the United Presbyterian

Church has a doctrine on the subject of the duty of the civil magistrate, until she herself, by her Supreme Court, will say that she has none. If she has none we have then no common standing point on which to negotiate union. Our negotiations in the past have not been concerning the *doctrine* but concerning the expression of our mutual beliefs respecting it, and the harmonizing of our views in regard to its applications. But if it is now to be declared that our brethren have no doctrine on the subject, the ground is at once taken from under our feet, and Union becomes an impossibility. The very letter to which Dr. Taylor's remarks are appended, contains a very plain statement of the doctrine. "Who," says the writer, "ever doubted that the magistrate is bound to obey God's law both in his private and official capacity?" An explicit declaration of this kind is the profession which we would have liked the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church to have made, and which we hope in some form or other she will yet make. A *full profession* has never been asked from her by us; understanding by a *full profession* an explicit declaration of agreement on all the possible applications and practical bearings of the doctrine in question. In regard to these the exercise of mutual forbearance is, we have been supposing, both warrantable and proper. The *Canadian Presbyterian* cannot be accused of any want of liberality or of forbearance regarding the differences which confessedly exist between the two Churches. We have clearly apprehended these differences from the very beginning, and have, we think, taken an accurate estimate of their character and bearings. We have, too, frankly declared, with a freedom which some of our own brethren did not always sympathise with, that we saw nothing in these differences to hinder the immediate and cordial union of the two Churches.

Dr. John Taylor says that it lies with our Church "to determine whether they can dispense with a full profession on this point." Now we have in many ways been saying that we can dispense with a full profession on the bearings and applications of the doctrine relating to the duty of the civil magistrate. Our Synod cannot surely be accused of silence on this matter. We have never hesitated to state the points regarding which we can and cannot exercise forbearance. Our position is clear as light. The *doctrine* we cannot as honest men give up. It is registered in unmistakable terms in the venerable Confession, and we have accepted it *ex animo*. From this *doctrine* we will not move a peg. But regarding the application of this doctrine to the disputed questions of Church Establishments, Sabbath Observance, the Bible in the Common Schools, and others of less importance, we have agreed, in so far as we differ, to exercise a cordial and frank forbearance. We would like to know whether Dr. Taylor agrees in this statement of our position, and whether he will accept of it in terms equally plain with ours. We can't help saying, without meaning any offence to the Dr., for whom we entertain a brotherly affection, that his language, to which we have been referring, is very Protean. We can't lay hold of it. It slips through our fingers. We think that one sentence is all right, and we are glad; but by and bye another sentence makes the former appear all wrong, and when we come to the conclusion we find the whole transformed into negation. We greatly regret this, for such a way of treating this important subject will greatly retard, if it does not also render impracticable, the union of the two Churches. We have never found plain speaking do any harm. It begets confidence and leads to friendship and affection, but all reservations, hypercautious evasions and non-committals, are irritating and perplexing, and destructive of confidence and affection. We have, therefore, striven to avoid such a mode of treating the question at issue, and shall be delighted to find that we are met by our friends in a similar style, even if their wit should be somewhat highly seasoned with salt.

EDUCATION IN CANADA EAST.

It is scarcely creditable to the Department of Public Instruction in Canada East, that the latest authentic information accessible on a subject of so great importance, should be supplied by the Superintendent's Report for the year 1856. The country had some right to expect that the returns and report of the year 1857 should, ere this time, have been published. In Governmental departments there appears to be an inveterate tardiness of action, such as would ruin the conduct of private affairs. We hope that this will be amended in the future; for a "circumlocution office," so much complained of in England, is quite intolerable here.

The most prominent feature of the present system of Public Instruction in Canada East is the emphatic recognition of the religious diversities of the people. A deep line bisects the whole system, distinguishing not so much French from British, as Roman Catholic from Protestant. The Normal Schools are three in number—two Romanist, and one Prote-tant. The Boards of Examiners are divided according to the same arrangement. The Diplomas and Certificates given to teachers specify the religion which those teachers profess. The schools also nowhere correspond to the character of "common schools," as usually found in Canada West; but are divided into majority and minority schools. The result is, that, both in town and country, the young people of the two competing religious creeds are educated apart, and grow up without mutual sympathies, strangers to one another. We do not here discuss the propriety or possibility of altering the system; we only point out the nature of that system, and the results it must produce, as bearing with much significance on the prospects, political and social, as well as religious, of that part of the Province to which our present paper refers.

Over this double and complex system one Superintendent presides. The office is at present filled by a French Canadian gentleman of considerable experience in public life, and of cultivated literary taste—the Hon. Pierre J. O. Chauveau. We may not complain that, in a country where the Church of Rome greatly predominates, the superintendence of Public Instruction should be entrusted to an intelligent layman of that communion. We give M. Chauveau credit for a patriotic spirit, and a power of administration more vigorous than was formerly known in the department; we perceive also the delicacy of his position as a Roman Catholic administering the educational affairs of Protestants as well as Romanists, and have no desire to join in any captious criticism of his acts. It is absolutely necessary, however, that the Hon. Superintendent beware of exciting any suspicion of partiality or subserviency to the dominant Church, and show himself just and even jealous in guarding the sacred rights of minorities.

An immense power is wielded by the Superintendent, who is a thorough Bureaucrat. He makes his authority felt by every scholastic municipality, withholding the public money if his regulations are not observed, and even having the right to impose special assessments for the payment of scholastic debts. He selects and distributes, at the public cost, such prize-books as he pleases. He also is entrusted with the distribution of the annual appropriation of £22,000 for "superior education," granting £200 to one College, and £500 to another, according to his judgment. Nominally indeed he reports to the Governor in Council, but really the power is in his own hands.

The individual importance of the Superintendent is all the greater because of the delay of the Government to appoint a Council of Public Instruction. The Provincial Act of Parliament, 19 Vict., cap. 14, (year 1856), gave authority to the Governor to appoint such a Council, and prescribed the duties and powers

of the Council in reference to Normal and Common Schools, Boards of Examiners, school books, charges against teachers, &c. We are somewhat curious to know why no steps have been taken toward the constitution of the Council thus carefully provided for by law.

It is beyond doubt, that the desire of education is rapidly on the increase among the French Canadians. Their growing willingness to pay school-fees is a sure proof of this. Still, the remuneration given to teachers in many parts of the country is a mere wretched pittance; indeed, in some remote parishes, so low as to be almost laughable. For example, we are informed the Official Inspector that at St. Alexandre the teachers' salaries vary from by £10 to £27; at St. Fabien, £10 to £12; and at Mont Carmel, a teacher whom the Inspector praises is found to enjoy an annual allowance of £8! One of the results of this parsimonious system is, that a vast number of the elementary schools are committed to young inexperienced girls; while no provision is made for the furnishing of these schools with proper books and apparatus. There is no uniformity in the choice of school-books; and there is in general no thorough training of the pupils even in such books as they have. All that we have witnessed and heard of the elementary education throughout Canada East leads us to think it very defective in those very elements with which it professes to be occupied, as reading, spelling, grammar, arithmetic and geography. Indeed this remark applies with too much truth to schools of more pretension than those called elementary. The art of distinct, correct, and well accented reading seems to be very insufficiently taught; and the *spouting* of a few orations or poems, at the annual examinations, we regard as a very poor substitute for the art and habit of good reading by the scholars at large.

Such "superior education" as exists in Canada East is found in connection with the McGill University at Montreal, and the Laval University at Quebec. Besides these there are numerous Colleges, chiefly conducted by Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, and divided by the Superintendent into two classes: the Classical, and the Commercial Colleges. With these are also grouped the academies, corresponding to the grammar schools of Canada West. The "academies for girls" are generally conventual schools.

The Inspectors of Schools are loud in praise of the Curés in the rural parishes, and the Religious Orders, whose educational zeal has become a conspicuous fact within the last ten years. The education of the Roman Catholic youth is more and more engrossed by ecclesiastical persons, male and female. Here we find the Jesuits—there the Brothers of Christian Doctrine—here the clerks of St. Viateur—there the Brothers of St. Joseph—here the Sisters of La Providence—there the Sisters of the Congregation of Notre Dame—here those of Jesus-Marie—and there again those of Ste. Croix. To facilitate the employment of the members of these orders or communities, the law expressly, and as we think very improperly, exempts them from the examinations to which all other teachers receiving the public money are obliged to submit.

The books read in schools are generally taken from a collection published by the "Brothers of the Christian Doctrine." A little volume entitled the *Devoir du Chrétien* is a great favorite. It is reported as read in 1442 schools; while the alphabet and spelling-book are only used in 1253. The catechism of the Church of Rome is taught in 974 schools, the Psalms of David in Latin in 936 schools; while the Bible or the New Testament is read in no more than 506, and these situated in the Protestant districts, or dissentient schools scattered over the French Parishes.

The whole number of educational institutions in Canada East is given as 2019 in the year 1856, an increase of 50 on the previous year. The pupils are returned as 142,141 in the year 1856; in 1855, they numbered 127,058. The Superintendent estimates that there remain "153,819 children between the ages

of five and sixteen years of age who receive no instruction whatever,"—a sufficiently melancholy statement.

The statistics of education in Montreal and Quebec are interesting, but the Report warns us that their strict accuracy cannot be relied on. In Montreal, the Protestant college and schools contained in 1856, 3379 pupils. The majority of these schools were private adventures, receiving no aid from the public funds. In the same year, the Roman Catholic colleges and schools of Montreal had 6769 pupils. Of these pupils the vast majority were boys in the "Friars' Schools," and girls taught by the Nuns of the Congregation of Notre Dame. The Protestant statistics of Quebec seem to be carelessly taken. There is a general return of 3014 pupils under instruction; but if this be accurate, the return from Montreal must be considerably beneath the truth. There cannot be a doubt that the Protestants of the latter city are more numerous by at least fifty per cent. than those of the former. The Roman Catholic schools of Quebec (as well as Montreal) were visited by the Superintendent in person, and found to contain 5176 pupils.

One of the more pleasing features of the educational system of Canada East is the prosperity of the Normal Schools instituted in the year 1856. The McGill Normal School, at the close of its session a few weeks ago, furnished forty new teachers, trained for their work, and now ready to enter on engagements. With two exceptions, these are all young women; it being very difficult to induce young men of intelligence and ambition in this country to devote themselves to a profession so shabbily remunerated as that of school-teaching. The Jacques Cartier Normal School has also closed its session, and sends out thirteen trained teachers. These are all males, and French Canadians—the institution not receiving any females. The Laval Normal School at Quebec trains teachers of both sexes; but the number who have completed their course in the present year we are unable to ascertain.

We shall not weary our readers with further details; and merely add a few sentences on the feeling of Lower Canada Protestants toward the system of Public Instruction as now in operation. It cannot be concealed that their feeling is one of half-smothered suspicion and dissatisfaction. Believing the Superintendent and the great majority of the Inspectors to be zealous Romanists, and observing that they diligently court the favor and consult the pleasure of the Bishops and Priests, the Protestants dislike the whole tone and aspect of the department, as bent on strengthening and perpetuating the ecclesiastical control of the Lower Canada population by the Church of Rome, and treating those who are not within the pale of that church with scant justice and barren courtesy. Confident of his influence, the Popish Bishop Bourget of Montreal actually presumes, in a recent pastoral letter, to warn the School Commissioners, under pain of excommunication, not to harbor or permit to be read any books written by heretics or not sanctioned by the Church. Many influential Protestants, we are aware, are so much dissatisfied with the past and present *regime* that they are anxious to obtain a formal separation of the Protestant educational interests of Canada East from the Roman Catholic, and the appointment of a distinct Protestant Superintendent.

To such a course, however, there are serious objections on the score of public policy—objections which it is unnecessary now to mention. Our own impression is, that, at least for the present, the Lower Canada Protestants ought not to agitate for a rupture of the present system, but to show their superior enlightenment in largely multiplying and liberally sustaining their own colleges and schools; at the same time maintaining a strict and vigilant eye on the conduct of the Department of Public Instruction, and on the equity and impartiality of the Hon. Superintendent. It is also an obvious right to claim the appointment

of a Council of Public Instruction according to law; in which Council the Protestants may be fairly represented, and by which their just share of influence may be guaranteed and secured.

It is abundantly obvious, that, in order to secure anything, the Protestants of Canada East must avoid dissension and jealousy among themselves, and heartily combine and co-operate for the common good. Happily there is a general desire to maintain unity of action; and we trust that this feeling may not be disturbed by an assumption of precedence by the ecclesiastics of any one Protestant community. With this view, we would utter a timely warning against a practice which seems to gain ground—the putting forward, on public occasions, of an Anglican Bishop in sole pre-eminence, as if he were a dignitary recognised by all Protestants. Presbyterians cannot consent to this practice, recognising as they do no precedence and acknowledging no superiority whatever in a prelate; and fearing also that any precedence, now allowed in courtesy or good nature, might hereafter be claimed as an admitted right. Of course the churches most influential in the community ought to have place and weight in educational matters; but any special official recognition of prelate *grandeeism* is offensive and unjust to the non-prelatic churches which are not the least influential, and must injuriously disturb the harmony of the Protestant cause in a country where such harmony is of manifest and urgent importance.

VOLUNTARIYISM OF THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO THE HEADSHIP OF CHRIST AND THE AUTHORITY OF THE STATE.*

Twenty years ago, the word voluntariyism was used chiefly in connexion with the question about obtaining funds for the support and extension of the Church, and generally employed to denote the method of free will offerings by the Church herself, in contradistinction to the method of national taxation by civil enactment. But nowadays it is very commonly viewed as covering the whole liberty of the Church in its relation to the Supreme Authority of the Lord Jesus Christ and the subordinate authority of Civil Government, which it may well enough be permitted to do.

This voluntariyism mankind are apt to confound with libertinism, and to regard as inconsistent with legitimate order. Bayle seemed to regard it so; and his opinion is at present not uncommon. Nor is it a wrong one, if voluntariyism means libertinism. But why should the Church of Christ be prejudiced by the tendency of party-rage to change the reference of the words and represent the advocates of a most holy principle as the abettors of infidels and atheists? The Church of the Redeemer is properly called voluntary. Liberty both internal and external is one of her most distinguished ornaments. "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion, rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." Ps. 110. 1, 2, 3. "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Gal. 5. 1.

What shall we say then? That Church voluntariyism is against the Headship of Christ? Certainly not; for Christ is its foundation and his word the written constitution by which it is defined and diffused. Let us but establish his authority in our conscience and inscribe his word on our will; or rather, let Him do

* We insert the above Communication as a temperate statement of the writer's opinions; but are not to be understood as coinciding in all those opinions, or as presenting the paper to our readers in the character of a satisfactory treatment of the great subject on which it bears.—Ed.

these great things in us, and then we shall do what we will in obedience to his laws. Choice shall be duty. To talk of Christian Voluntarism as if it were hostile to Christ and his word, is self-contradiction, which one should not seem to be guilty of. The authority of our Lord as expressed in his word and asserted by his Spirit is the very rock, on which the voluntarism of the Church stands. If we go off that rock we cease to be the voluntaries of Christ and fall from grace.

Are we at war with the legitimate power of Civil Governments, whom the Head of the universe has sanctified to us by his command to be subject to them, and whom he has admonished, as they care for their own safety, to serve Him and work for the good of his Church? We are not. We contend most loyally and most religiously for Civil Governments. Only as we hold ourselves bound not to be too burdensome to them, so we tell them in the name of the Lord, both theirs and ours, that they have no right to obtrude upon us either their power or their property for purposes which He has not placed within their official province, having provided that they shall be accomplished by his Church herself, in her proper capacity, not through the laws of Gentile Lands any more than through the law of Jewry, but "through the righteousness of faith." We look directly to the fountain-head for both power and property to support and extend the Church, the same as the Apostles did, and tell the Civil authorities that they are not permitted to come between us and the providence of the Son of God. We can do without their tutelage or their interference. Let them mind their own business, and secure the political rights of all their subjects, and they shall do well. Roman Catholic bishops themselves affirm that the Civil authority and the ecclesiastical are distinct and independent. Well; let them be distinct and independent, in their constitution and action. Let each obey the laws prescribed to it by the universal Judge. And, then, like good friends, they will maintain the liberty and help the prosperity of one another; for the Author of both is the God of order and peace, not of confusion.

A UNITED PRESBYTERIAN.

MINISTERIAL CALLS.

(From the *Presbyterian Expositor*, edited by Rev. Dr. Rice, Chicago.)

Settled pastors often receive calls from other churches; and in many instances, the question respecting a change of the field of labor, becomes painfully difficult and perplexing. The fact that God has called a minister to labor in a particular church, is no certain proof that his life is to be spent there. Evidently, however, if a pastor has gone to the field he occupies, under Divine direction, it is neither wise nor safe for him to leave it for another, except under the same guidance. The interests of two churches, and his own usefulness and peace of mind, are involved in the question of the acceptance or rejection of a call. For he cannot expect the Divine blessing to attend him, if he leave the field to which God called him, in order to occupy one to which He has not called him, nor if he remain where he is, whilst God is calling him to another point.

With us the question of a change of location has been again and again one of very great practical moment; and our conversation and correspondence with ministerial brethren, together with what we have known of the action of Presbyteries on such questions, have convinced us, that the subject has by no means received the attention which its great importance demands; and that the principles by which such questions ought to be decided, are not well understood. To do justice to it, would require a volume, instead of a single article. The leading points, however, may be briefly presented.

I. We begin with the truth, that it must be the earnest desire of every faithful minister to employ his time and talents to the greatest advantage for the cause of Christ. The conversion of sinners and the edification of believers are the leading objects to be accomplished by the Christian ministry. Both of these are embraced in "the perfecting of the saints, the work of the ministry, the edifying of the body of Christ," (Eph. iv. 12.) Most assuredly the faithful minister will receive his reward, whether success attend his ministry or not; but every such minister must intensely desire his labors to be crowned with success. Indeed, we are clearly authorized to expect that our labors will not be in vain; and, therefore, the promise is, that "they that turn many to righteousness, shall shine as the stars, for ever and ever," (Dan. xii. 3.)

Different men have different gifts. One may be better fitted to preach to the impenitent, and his success may be mainly in the conversion of such; whilst another may find his chief usefulness in the edification of believers. A third may be specially fitted for some executive department of the church's evangelical operations. But every one called of God to the ministry, may be useful in the work; and the aim and the prayer of every one should be for the highest possible degree of usefulness. Every question respecting a change of location, then, should be considered and determined in view of this principle.

But ought not the pastoral relation to be permanent? When a minister has accepted a call, and has been installed as pastor of a church, ought he not to consider himself settled for life? Beyond a question, if the decision is to be made between a transient and a permanent ministry, the latter must have the preference. The Scriptures say nothing directly upon this particular point; and, therefore, our judgment must be formed on general principles. Those principles conduct us to the conclusion just stated; but we are not under the necessity of adopting either of these extremes.

The question as to the permanency of the pastoral relation, must be decided partly in view of the mental peculiarities and attainments of particular ministers; and partly in view of providential circumstances. There are some ministers who ought not to change their fields of labor, unless under extraordinary circumstances. They are men of well balanced minds, remarkable for sterling integrity, consistent piety and prudence, but whose pulpit powers are but moderate. Unable to make a strong impression upon the multitude, they do not attract a crowd; but they acquire an influence in a community, as good and wise men, by their attention to the poor, their visits to the afflicted, their judicious counsels, &c. This influence is of comparatively slow growth; but it is constantly growing, and in the course of years it becomes very extensive. Many persons, not particularly interested on the subject of religion, attend upon their preaching because they have learned to respect and admire them out of the pulpit, and they are profited by their scriptural discourses.

Such ministers have much to lose by changing their field of labor. They are like men who, by close attention to business, have gradually, in the course of years, acquired a good capital, on which they are doing a fine business, and who, if they remove to another place, leave almost the whole of their capital to begin business, as it were, *de novo*. They must again go through the same course of labor for a series of years, in order to gain the influence they had in their former field.

There is another class of ministers whose usefulness requires frequent changes. They are men of strong impulses, but whose minds have not been, perhaps could not be, disciplined to close study and patient investigation. What they know they can present attractively, pointedly, powerfully; because they preach with strong emotion and with great fluency. They make effective appeals to the sympathies of men, to their consciences and their hearts. They have an eloquence some-

times more polished, sometimes less so; but it is the eloquence of intense feeling. Some of this class of ministers excel in the illustration of their subjects by well told anecdotes. But their emotional nature is too strong for the intellectual. It hurries them to conclusions with but slight examination; or it leads them to gather up the results of other men's investigations, rather than to depend upon their own. They are not didactic or systematic preachers; and being very dependant upon their animal spirits or frames of mind, their efforts are extremely unequal; and being unable, in consequence of the limited range or rather superficial character of their knowledge, "to bring forth things both new and old," in the course of a regular ministry, they soon wear out. They draw large audiences at first, but cannot hold them. Many who greatly admired their first discourses, feel disappointed that, after a time, they rarely deliver any more such; and their large congregations dwindle; whilst even those who continue, desire a change. From home, they preach to the multitude; at home, they preach to almost empty pews.

Such men are better adapted to the work of *Evangelists*. Their strongest impressions are made at first. They lose influence by attempting to labor long in the same place. Whitefield, wonderful as were his powers as a preacher, could not have sustained himself as a settled pastor, for any length of time. Dr. David Nelson, author of "The Cause and Cure of Infidelity," was a preacher belonging properly to this class. He entered the ministry late in life, without having pursued a regular course of theological study. He was a man of vigorous, but undisciplined mind, and very strong impulses. By rapid steps he reached his conclusions. His discourses had very little system; but under the influence of strong emotions, he presented his thoughts with extraordinary clearness, point and power. We have seen a crowded audience moved by his irresistible eloquence, as the trees of the forest by a mighty wind. But as in the case of all such men, his efforts were very unequal, and as a regular preacher, he would often fall greatly below the standard of his first discourses. Rev. David Tod, late of Mississippi, was a man of the same class. He never had any taste for classical studies, and was licensed and ordained without having taken the full course of study prescribed in our Book. He was a man of no more than ordinary talents; but he was a Christian of ardent piety and lovely spirit; and although he was far from being an orator, he had very considerable fluency as a speaker. Wherever he went, he knew nothing "but Christ and him crucified." In private intercourse as well as in the pulpit, his warm heart poured forth the rich truths of the Gospel, the power of which he had felt in his own soul. It is not at all surprising that his labors were much in demand, and that they were remarkably attended by the blessing of God. Such men as these could not fail to be more or less useful as settled pastors; but their success would be incomparably greater, either as *Evangelists*, or with pretty frequent changes of location. Their peculiar gifts fit them for a most important department of ministerial labor, which cannot be so efficiently performed by any other class of ministers. The Church greatly needs a much larger number of them.

There is a third class of ministers, who, as to their cast of mind, stand between the two classes just described; in regard to whom the question of a change of location should be decided according to circumstances. They are men of vigorous intellects, whose course of study has been sufficiently thorough, and whose pulpit powers are such, that they can well sustain themselves as permanently settled pastors, or can rapidly gain an influence in a new field of labor. Such men, it is true, have much to lose by a change; for whatever may be their power to attract audiences and to hold them, it still requires time for them to gain that place in the affections and confidence of their people, which is the effect of the varied intercourse and labors of pastoral life. Yet the fields of labor to which

they are called, may be so much more extensive than those they are occupying, as to more than compensate for this loss. Or they may be called to occupy positions which, though not more important, require a kind of labor for which they have peculiar qualifications, whilst others may be found to succeed them in their present fields. In other words, in the case of one of these ministers, the two places between which he is called to decide may be equally important; and yet it may be much more easy to find a man qualified to fill the one he is occupying, than the one to which he is called. In either of these cases, a change is not only proper, but desirable. The late Dr. Alexander was an eminent example of the class of ministers of whom we now speak. Equally acceptable as a minister amongst the plainer or the more educated class of people, able to gain an influence rapidly and to keep it permanently, he might have been a settled pastor in the same church for life; and yet he found himself called of God from Virginia to a church in Philadelphia, and from that to the Theological Seminary.

II. Having made these remarks concerning that phase of the question, which relates to ministers themselves, we proceed to state the principles which, as it seems to us, should control them in encouraging or discouraging calls, and in the acceptance or rejection of them.

1. When a minister has accepted a call, under the clear conviction that it is from God, his evident duty is, to throw himself into the work there with his whole heart, and look no further. Most assuredly, if God has called him to that field, he has a work for him to do there. How extensive that work is, or how long it will take to do it, he cannot possibly know. Certain it is, however, that his Divine Master says to him—"What thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." This he cannot do, so long as he does not feel fully identified with his people, and is in fact hoping and looking for an opportunity to leave them. The servant of God, it is true, must ever be ready to hear a call from Him, and to see the openings of His providence; but he may be very sure, that when he shall have finished his work in the field assigned him, the call to another will come to him without his seeking it. Difficulties he may have to contend with; but faith can overcome great difficulties. It moves the arm that moves the universe. A believing, earnest, prayerful ministry is "mighty through God, to the pulling down of strong-holds." To come and go only at His call, is the happiness of the faithful minister. In all ordinary cases, then, the call should come *unsought*.

2. A call cannot be regarded as providential unless it be either to a wider field of usefulness, or to a field equally wide, in which the peculiar talents of the pastor are specially needed; or unless it be from a field he finds himself incapable of occupying properly, to one better suited to his talents and attainments, or to his state of health. Since it is the duty of every minister to desire and seek the greatest possible degree of usefulness; it is not probable, perhaps not possible, that God will call any one from a field where he is doing good, to one where he will do less good. And since a change of location, except in cases already mentioned, is always attended with some considerable loss of influence, at least for the time being; the new field should offer considerably greater prospects of usefulness, than that which the pastor is called to leave for it.

The comparative importance of different fields of ministerial labor, is to be estimated in several ways. There may be a larger population accessible at one point than at another. One position may be more commanding than another, offering the opportunity of exerting an influence over a wider territory. One church may offer more effective co-operation with the pastor than another. One position may better suit the peculiar talents of the minister than another.

And then, in the church in which a minister is settled, there may be dissatisfac-

tion with his labors, which, should he continue, is likely to extend, and to cause distraction and division. It is doubtful whether a minister ought ever to permit a church to become divided, on the mere question of retaining him as pastor. If a party should desire to get rid of him, because they hold erroneous views of doctrine, or of any point in morals, fidelity to the truth might require him to resist them. Or if charges injurious to his moral character were made, he must defend himself. But in cases where neither of these things is involved, but where a respectable minority strongly desire a change; it is rarely, if ever, wise to remain and allow parties to be formed. For such divisions very generally result in great alienations, in the rapid decline of the spirituality of the church, and in the ruin of the pastor's usefulness. We could mention a church in a neighboring State, in which two parties were formed, the one—a minority—desiring the pastor to resign; the other desiring to retain him. The feeling between the parties became extremely bitter, defying all efforts of the Presbytery to settle the difficulty, until at length, the church was, by a rather high-handed measure, dissolved and re-organized; and in the re-organization several of the dissatisfied party, not willing to re-enter on the terms fixed by Presbytery, were left out. Even then, the parties were found still existing, and withering the prosperity of the church, for ten years after the excellent pastor had left. We could mention another church which, though in number and wealth very influential, in the course of several years, was almost destroyed in the same way. Wherever the fault may lie, it is certain that when such difficulties arise, the pastor's usefulness is at an end; unless, indeed, the dissatisfied party will withdraw, and organize another church—a thing not unfrequently done in our larger cities. In smaller towns and country places, this cannot be done; and therefore the injury resulting from such differences is the greater and more permanent. But when there is the appearance of such divisions, a field in itself more contracted, may prove to be a much wider field of usefulness for that minister; and if he will leave in time, he may save the church from permanent trouble, and himself from much mental suffering and loss of usefulness. In accepting a call to a church, we have always insisted upon it, that the session should at once candidly inform us, if they perceived any dissatisfaction arising.

The new field offered to a settled pastor, then, may offer much greater prospects of usefulness, because better suited to his peculiar talent; or because of a larger accessible population, or because of its being a more commanding position, or because of the state of things in his own church.

3. The question whether a call is to be regarded as providential, depends very much upon its *unanimity* and *cordiality*. The difficulties and discouragements of pastors are sufficiently numerous and great under the most favorable circumstances. They therefore greatly need the united prayers and support of their entire churches; and their peace of mind and their usefulness depend very much upon their securing them. Probably it ought not to be required that the whole church giving a call should actually prefer the man elected to every other individual whose name may be before them; but we are not going too far when we say that there should be *general acquiescence* in the call. If there be positive opposition to the pastor elect, the circumstances must be extraordinary which would render it wise for him to accept. The objections may be entirely groundless; yet the mere fact that there is a number of persons in the church who are not willing to receive the Gospel at his mouth, will produce an unhappy effect upon his spirits. Besides, there is no certainty that they will not seek to alienate others, and to undermine his influence; and whenever any difficulties arise, there is a party ready to throw their influence against him. Meanwhile his admirers are likely to become alienated from the others; and *vice versa*. In

such a state of things, the church cannot be expected to prosper, nor the pastor to be either useful or happy. One of the best evidences that God calls a minister to a particular church, is that He has made them willing to receive him.

We go further, and insist that the call should not only be unanimous, but cordial. A church sometimes takes a minister who happens to be before them, because they do not know that they can do better, although they receive him rather coldly. There is a vast difference between the position of such a pastor, and that of a pastor received to the hearts of the people, as a blessing God has sent to them. In the latter case, the same amount of labor will be attended with far greater results than in the former; whilst the encouragement the pastor has to labor, and his comfort in his work, are incomparably greater. It would certainly be most unwise for a pastor to leave a people whose confidence and affections he enjoys, to take charge of a church in which he meets but a lukewarm reception. No ordinary circumstances can justify such a change. But if a call comes unsought; if the field offered is, for the pastor, all things considered, a considerably wider field of usefulness than the one he occupies; and if it be unanimous and cordial; there can be little doubt that it comes from God, and ought to be accepted.

4. The evidence would be more conclusive if it should appear that the call was the result of earnest prayer for divine direction. Real blessings, and especially great blessings, are ordinarily bestowed on individuals, on families, and on churches, in answer to importunate prayer. If, therefore, God is sending a faithful pastor to a people, it is reasonable to expect that they will be led often and earnestly to the throne of grace to plead for the gift. It is a great privilege for a minister to go to a people who have gone to their heavenly Father to ask for a Pastor, and who will recognise in him an answer to their prayers.

5. It is hazardous for ministers of advanced age to change their fields of labor, unless their peculiar gifts fit them for evangelists. They may have deeper piety than at an earlier period; but they have not the enthusiasm nor the mental elasticity they once had. And whilst to the people amongst whom they have long labored, they are strongly attached, they do not so readily form new attachments. Still more, the young people who have been accustomed from infancy to see them in the pulpit and at their homes, may love and venerate them far more than they would a younger man; but they will not be able so readily to make the acquaintance and enlist the feelings of the young in a new field of labor. The call, therefore, should be a very clear one, to justify a settled pastor in changing his location, when he has passed his fiftieth year.

We do not forget that a call must come to a settled pastor through his Presbytery. Still, most churches will, as indeed they should, correspond with ministers whose services they desire to secure, in order to ascertain their views before proceeding so far as to make out a call; and if the principles in view of which such questions ought to be settled were well understood; in almost all instances in which the call ought to be declined, answers could be given, which would prevent the delay and disappointment incident to the regular prosecution of it. For when such a correspondence is opened, the way is prepared for the pastor, without indelicacy or impropriety, to make all necessary inquiries, to confer with his own Session, and to consult with those of his brethren whose opinions have weight with him. And it cannot be admitted, for a moment, that any minister of right feelings would encourage the making out of a call which he expects to decline. To do so, would be to trifle with the interests of the church of Christ, from motives utterly unworthy of a Christian minister.

WORDS OF THE WISE.

COMFORT IN TRIBULATION.

(From Christopher Sutton's "Disce Vivere," A.D. 1626.)

The world and the tempter both boast of giving pleasures unto carnal men, but come to the performance, and these pleasures are very torments; Christ promiseth tribulation in the world, but come to the inward man, and there we find a world of joy. The root of the tree is bitter, but the fruit is pleasant; Christ promiseth rest; you shall have rest, but it is rest unto your souls; not worldly rest. His burden then it is by love, and we are made strong by grace: a burden, this is wont to unburden sinners. He that sets us in this journey knows what is fittest for passengers, and therefore we may endure with comfort these outward adversities when they come: we must not cast away the nut, for the bitterness of the rind. Happy leprosy was it that made Naaman worship the God of Israel in his heart. The Prophet David saith, it is good for him to have been in trouble: if thou wert not troubled, perhaps thou wouldst not devoutly have called upon God, thou wouldst not have worshipped God, thou wouldst not have known God. The sharp storms of the winter they make the trees bare, for a time they stand as dead, yet there remains still life in the root. In like manner, afflictions of the world make the members of Christ seem desolate, and the stormy winds of persecution scatter abroad the leaves of worldly prosperity, yet there is life in the root, there is faith and joy in the heart. It is otherwise with the wicked, and the joy of worldings; they think felicity to consist in abundance of riches, in pleasures, in glory, and such like; all this is but outward and momentary, like a little sunshine in winter, for one fair day it hath oftentimes ten foul, and such a number of troubles as almost the former pleasures are dashed and vanish to nothing. When men see storms in winter they do not much wonder at it, and why? winter is a time of storms; so in this life we should not think much to have tribulations at a time of tribulation.

The godly have indeed often outward adversities, but such joys within, as if all adversities were nothing, and this principally cometh to pass by Christ His means; for whatsoever He touched, He did sanctify it, and therefore hunger, thirst, persecution, they are not now so grievous, but work all for the good of the faithful. The waters of Marah, which were so bitter that none could drink them, Moses but casting in the wood that God appointed him, they became sweet; the crosses of the world were grievous until Christ His cross was put in amongst them, now their taste is altered. A strange sight was it in times of persecution, to see a few lambs to overcome a multitude of wolves by no other weapons than patience and faith, "and to rejoice," as Tertullian saith, "in the midst of torments." Wonderful is to hear how St. Paul, endued with grace from Christ, doth even challenge and provoke tribulation and anguish and hunger; yea, life and death, as if he would speak like a man of courage to all the adversities of the world: "Shall you all separate me from the love of Christ?" No, you shall not; thereby teaching us to be so constant, that nothing should separate us from the love of Christ.

Another reason which our Saviour useth to comfort his Disciples against tribulations is, "I go to prepare a place for you," and therefore be of good hope. Moses, to stir up the people in times of their distress, speaks unto them after this manner: "The land you go to possess is not as Egypt, but a champion country, and goodly to enjoy, which the Lord visiteth with the early and latter rain." We have a promise of a better land than ever Moses promised: "In My Father's house are many mansions." The journey was long and wearisome for Jacob, a weak and feeble person as he was, yet by reason of inward joy he had conceived in his heart, he well endured it. "Be it," saith St. Austin, "that we have not temporal deliverance from troubles, this showeth that we do not embrace the Christian religion for the commodities of this present world, but for the joys of a life to come, which will make amends for all." The benefit of a calm is best welcome after a storm; liberty is wont to be most pleasant after a time of bondage: "You shall sorrow," saith our Saviour, "but your sorrow shall be turned into joy," your sorrow, not every one's sorrow, but yours, who have abidden with Me in My temptations, therefore I appoint unto you a kingdom.

 POETRY.

SUMMER HYMN.

Hark! earth begins her matin hymn;
 The wide expanse of hill and plain,
 The river, and the mountain breeze,
 Uniting swell the glad refrain.
 Day, throned upon the eastern heights,
 From herb and flower bids incense rise,
 To mingle in the azure heaven
 With nature's wordless harmonies.

All things—the insect world around,
 The squirrels peeping from the shade,
 The birds that warble on the boughs,
 The herds amid the sunshine laid;
 All living things, and all beside,
 Thy works, whate'er their form may be,
 Varied by Thy creating hand,
 Are one, O God, in praising Thee.

Nor Father! let Thy latest born,
 The chosen object of Thy care,
 Contemn the universal hymn
 That nature raises everywhere.
 For blessings of the opening year,
 For spring and summer's sunny days,
 And for the harvest's promised store,
 Accept, O Lord, our grateful praise.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE PRINCETON REVIEW. July, 1858.

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW. July, 1858.

In the present scarcity of good new books, we turn with peculiar zest to the valuable Quarterlies before us. The last number of the *Princeton*, however, is scarcely so interesting or able as usual. The article which has struck us most favorably is one on the "Historical Value of the Pentateuch," which furnishes in brief a lucid *resumé* of the best information on the subject.

The *British and Foreign* is avowedly an original publication only in part, and enriches its pages with some of the most vigorous articles that appear in the American religious periodicals. The best paper, however, in the number now received is an original by (as we suppose) the Editor, Principal Cunningham, of Edinburgh. It discusses the great Theological question of "Calvinism and Arminianism" in a review of the recent literature of the subject by Whately, Faber, Mozley, and others. We give the conclusion of the article, regretting our inability to find space for the whole:—

"We are unwilling to quit this subject without some reference, however brief, to the objections by which the Calvinistic doctrine of election has been commonly assailed. The leading practical lessons suggested by a survey of the controversy for guiding men in the study of it, are such as these:—1st, That we should labour to form a clear, distinct, and accurate apprehension of the real nature of the leading point in dispute, of the true import and bearing of the only alternatives that can well be maintained with regard to it. 2nd, That we should familiarise our minds with definite conceptions of the meaning and the evidence of the principal arguments by which the truth upon the subject may be established, and the error refuted. 3rd, That we should take some pains to understand the general principles at least applicable to the solution (or rather the disposal, for they cannot be solved) of the difficulties by which the doctrine we have embraced as true may be assailed. And 4th, That we should then seek to make a wise and judicious application of the doctrine professed, according to its true nature, tendency, and bearing, and its relation to other truths, without allowing ourselves to be dragged into endless and unprofitable speculations in regard to its deeper mysteries or more intricate perplexities, or to be harassed by perpetual doubt and difficulty. A thorough and successful study of the subject implies the following out of all these lessons, and this conducts us over a wide and arduous field. It is on the first only of these four points we have touched,—one on which a great deal of ignorance and confusion seem to prevail. Of the others, the most important is that which enjoins a careful study of the direct and positive evidence that bears upon the determination of the main question on which the controversy turns. The strength of Calvinism lies in the mass of direct, positive, and, as we believe, unanswerable proof that can be produced from Scripture and reason, confirmed by much that is suggested by experience and the history of the human race, to establish its fundamental principles of the foreordination of whatsoever comes to pass, and the real and effectual election of some men to eternal life. The strength of Arminianism lies not in the direct and positive evidence that can be produced to disprove Calvinistic foreordination and election, or to establish anti-Calvinistic non-foreordination and non-election, but mainly in the proof, that God is not the author of sin, and that man is responsible for his own character and destiny, and in the inference that since Calvinism is inconsistent with these great and admitted truths, it must be false. This view of the state of the case shews the importance of being familiar with the direct and positive evidence by which Calvinism

can be established, that we may rest on this as an impregnable foundation. But it shews also the importance of being familiar with the way and manner of disposing of the plausible and formidable difficulties on which mainly the Arminians found their case. These difficulties, that is, the alleged inconsistency of Calvinism with the truths, that God is not the author of sin, and that man is responsible for his conduct and fate, lie upon the very surface of the subject, and must at once present themselves even to the most ordinary minds; while, at the same time, they are so plausible, that they are well fitted to startle and to impress men, especially if they have not previously reflected much upon the subject. We can do nothing at present in the way of producing the direct and positive evidence in support of the Calvinistic doctrine; but a few brief hints may help a little to shew that the difficulties attaching to it, are, though not admitting of a full solution, yet by no means so formidable as at first sight they appear to be, and at any rate furnish no sufficient ground in right reason for rejecting the body of direct, positive, unanswerable proof by which the fundamental principles of Calvinism can be established. The following are some of the most obvious yet most important considerations bearing upon this matter, that ought to be remembered and applied, and especially that ought to be viewed in combination with each other, as parts of one argument upon one important topic.

1st, When the same objections were advanced against the same doctrines as taught by the Apostle Paul, *he* manifested no very great solicitude about giving them a direct or formal answer, but contented himself with resolving the whole difficulty into God's sovereignty and man's ignorance, dependence, and incapacity. "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?" He knew that the doctrines were true, because he had received them by inspiration of the Holy Ghost; and we know that they are true, because he and other inspired men have declared them unto us. This should satisfy us and repress any great anxiety about disposing of objections based upon grounds, the full investigation of which runs up into matters, the full comprehension of which lies beyond the reach of our natural faculties, and of which we can know nothing except from the revelation which God has given us.

2d, It is utterly inconsistent with right views of our condition and capacities, and with the principles usually acted upon in regard to other departments of Christian theology, as, for instance, the doctrine of the Trinity, to assume, as these objections do, that we are entitled to make our actual perception of, or our capacity of perceiving, the consistency of two doctrines with each other, the test or standard of their truth. We do not pretend to be able to solve all the difficulties connected with the alleged inconsistency between the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism, and the truths that God is not the author of sin, and that man is responsible for his character and conduct, so as to make their consistency with each other plain and palpable to our own minds or the minds of others; but we cannot admit that this affords any sufficient reason why we should reject one or other of the doctrines, provided each separately can be established upon competent and satisfactory evidence.

3d, The difficulties in question do not apply to the Calvinistic system alone, but bear as really, though not perhaps at first view as palpably, upon every system of religion which admits the moral government of God, the prevalence of moral evil among his intelligent creatures, and their future eternal punishment. Indeed, it is easy to shew, that in truth the leading difficulties connected with every scheme of doctrine, virtually run up into one great difficulty, which attaches, and attaches equally, to them all, viz., the explanation of the existence and prevalence of moral evil; or what is practically the same question in another

form, the exposition of the way and manner in which God and men concur (for none but Atheists can deny that in some way or other they do concur) in forming men's character, and in determining men's fate. This subject involves difficulties which we cannot in our present condition fully solve, and which we must just resolve into the good pleasure of God. They are difficulties from which no scheme of doctrine can escape, and which every scheme is equally bound, and at the same time equally incompetent, to explain. Men may shift the position of the one grand difficulty, and may imagine that they have succeeded at least in evading it, or putting it in abeyance or obscurity, but with all their shifts and all their expedients, it continues as real and as formidable as ever. Unless men renounce altogether, theoretically or practically, the moral government of God, the prevalence of moral evil, and its eternal punishment, they must in their explanations and speculations come at length to the sovereignty of God, and prostrate their understandings and their hearts before it, saying with our Saviour, "Even so, Father, for so it hath seemed good in thy sight"; or with the great apostle, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed to him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen."—(Rom. xi. 33-36.)

THE SINLESSNESS OF JESUS: AN EVIDENCE FOR CHRISTIANITY. By Dr. C. ULLMANN. Translated from the Sixth German Edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1858.

This is a work partly of an apologetic, partly of a dogmatic, nature, and was peculiarly adapted to the demands of German thought at the time of its first appearance. We welcome it in English as one of the most beautiful productions of Germany, as not only readable for an English public, but as possessing, along with not a few defects, many distinguished excellences. The character of Jesus, in its merely human side, has seldom been so felicitously delineated, whether we regard him as the realisation of what humanity was designed to be, or as the source of life to his people. The task which the author imposes on himself is to present not doctrinal statements, which would have been imperfect enough in his hands, but the new ethical formation which the kingdom of God was destined to exhibit. According to Ullmann, the kingdom of God is only a self-manifestation of the person of Christ. The main question of Christianity is thus viewed as being occupied with the person of Christ, and with our personal relation to him.

While we welcome this work as furnishing in many respects a full and vivid exhibition of the ethical perfection of the historical Christ, it must not be concealed, that it labours under grave defects. And to these we must in a few sentences advert, in order that its wants may be supplemented, and with a view to make it more available to the English reader.

Its defects are of a more general, and of a more particular nature. With regard to the more general, the author, while successfully maintaining the actual sinlessness of Jesus, commits himself to the position, that the possibility of sinning must be presupposed in Jesus, otherwise the temptation of our Lord would amount to nothing more than a mere Docetic semblance. He maintains that Jesus was sinless throughout, but not impeccable. This argues a very defective view of the incarnation, if, indeed, Ullman holds it in any true or proper sense of the word. Every one whose theological opinions rise to an adequate conception of the incarnation, must not only hold that Christ was sinless, but that he was beyond the susceptibility or hazard of sinning. It is possible, indeed, to

put this point in a too mechanical way, and to lose sight of all those sustaining motives that come into play in our Lord's humanity amid his conflict with temptation. But beyond the sinless perfection of his humanity must be seen the sustaining influence of the Divine nature, and the plenitude of the Spirit, supplied by the hypostatic union; and the Church, accordingly, has always placed the sinlessness of Jesus in connection with the supernatural conception on the one hand, and the real incarnation of the *Logos* on the other, maintaining that there was no Achilles-heel in which he could be pierced. All this, however, Ullmann passes over in silence. He ignores it wholly. Another defect of a more general nature is, that Ullmann makes no reference to the sinlessness of Christ as constituting, and intended to constitute, in part, our imputed righteousness. He supposes Christ to be only the source of life and that the followers of Christ enter at once into a participation of that life.

Besides these more general defects, there are others of a more particular nature, connected with our Lord's temptation and his cry of desertion on the cross, with the whole idea given of the Old Testament ethics, &c., &c. But on these we have not room to dwell.

With these remarks, we warmly recommend this beautiful work as eminently fitted to diffuse, among those who pursue it, a higher appreciation of the sinlessness and moral eminence of Christ. The work has been blessed already, and may have its use also to an English public. The translation is happy, and correct rendering of the thought, though occasionally free.

OUR CHRISTIAN CLASSICS: READINGS FROM THE BEST DIVINES, WITH NOTICES BIOGRAPHICAL AND CRITICAL. By JAMES HAMILTON, D.D. Vols. I. and II. London, 1857: James Nisbet & Co.

The plan of this work, which is issued in numbers, is to present a series of the most powerful, beautiful, and interesting passages from the whole succession of our greatest writers on religious subjects, down from the earliest times. The field to be gleaned from is thus the noblest and the richest in our language, when estimated by a reference to the powers and talents of the authors, as well as the importance and grandeur of the subjects on which their minds were exercised. And this age could not have furnished a more accomplished guide, a more delightful companion, with whom to traverse this field, than Dr. Hamilton. His notices of the different epochs and of some of the most eminent authors are many of them in his very best style, rich treats, real jewels. We have never seen, and could scarcely conceive the idea of, a book that would more fully than this one realize the description of "apples of gold in pictures of silver."

The first volume gives specimens of our religious literature down till the Restoration, including contributions from the Anglo-Saxon and Præ-Reformation periods, from the age of the Confessors and Martyrs, the Elizabethan era, the period of James I. and Charles I., and finally the Civil War and the Protectorate. This last period is introduced by Bishop Hall and wound up by Richard Baxter, who, taking in the notices of them by the Editor and the extracts given from their works, occupy more space than any two other names in this volume. The second volume comprehends the period from the Restoration to the Revolution, including, however, some whose literary labours commenced during the Civil War or the Protectorate, Owen, Milton, Bunyan, Flavel, Howe, several of the later and minor Puritans, followed by several of the great glories of the Church of England, Jeremy Taylor, Thomas Fuller, Isaac Barrow and Bishops Pearson and Patrick. A collection of the choicest extracts from the writings of these men, culled, grouped, and presented to us by such a man as Dr. Hamilton is surely a great treasure. Let all who can, acquire the possession of it, and make it a companion.—*British and Foreign Evang. Review.*

SUMMARY OF INTELLIGENCE.

ECCLESIASTICAL AND MISSIONARY.

VANCOUVER'S ISLAND AND NEW CALEDONIA.—The discovery of gold on the Fraser River will in all probability have the effect of filling the territories named with a large population. Already thousands have proceeded thither from California. It is of urgent importance that the truth of the Gospel and the influences of the Church of Christ should be brought to bear on the settlers. We are aware that the Church of England is represented in Vancouver's Island, and her clergymen there will be multiplied. We have heard that missionaries are immediately to be sent from the Wesleyan community in Canada. It is our earnest hope, that the Presbyterian Church of Canada may also do her part in this great field of labor which Providence has so remarkably opened up. Why not send one or two ministers of prudence and ability, to visit, not the Red River Mission only, but Victoria, the capital of Vancouver's Island, and report to the Synod fully on the religious state and claims of the Great West within the British possessions?

VAUDOIS SYNOD.—The annual meeting of the Synod of the Waldensian Church took place at La Tour on the 18th May, and continued in session for four days. M. Meille, Italian pastor at Turin, was elected President. The proceedings were in harmony with the ancestral character of this Church as a witness for the truth. The Synod was addressed by the Rev. Dr. Stewart of Leghorn, and Rev. A. H. Burn Murdoch of Nice, on behalf of the Free Church of Scotland; also by the Rev. Mr. Day, a clergyman of the Established Church of Ireland.

SPANISH PROTESTANTS.—A most interesting movement has taken place among the Spaniards at Gibraltar. Under Senor Rouette, a good Spanish congregation has been formed, and a petition was forwarded to the last Free Church General Assembly, praying that he might be ordained as their pastor. The Assembly joyously granted such a petition, Senor Rouette having been long well known, and having suffered imprisonment and banishment for the truth's sake.

PLYMOUTHISM ON THE CONTINENT.—The interests of Protestantism in some parts of the Continent of Europe are seriously injured by what we would call the pest of Plymouthism or Darbyism. Everywhere the Plymouthists shew the same propensity, to undermine all church order, and to proselytise, not the ungodly, but those who are already in communion with some organized Church. In the North of Italy, they are favored by the "Nice Committee," which draws its funds from England, and chiefly from evangelical ministers and members of the Church of England! Thus sustained, they are said to interfere very improperly with the Piedmontese Mission Stations of the Church of the Vaudois. In Hungary, they have lately appeared, taking the name of "Nazarenes," and protesting against every church organization.

Let Canadian Protestants give no countenance to this spirit of disorder, which is peculiarly apt to appear and spread in countries where Popish tyranny has long prevailed!

DR. AND MRS. LIVINGSTONE.—A letter has been received at Hadley, from Mrs. Livingstone, dated Cape Town, May 19, 1858, in which she says: "You will be glad to hear that the people Dr. Livingstone left at Tete are still waiting for him. How delighted they will be to see him again! I think the expedition will have reached the Zambesi by this time." Dr. Livingstone has been obliged to leave Mrs. Livingstone behind, as she suffered so dreadfully from sea sickness that it was doubtful whether she could reach the east coast alive. She intends proceeding with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Moffatt, to his missionary station at Kuruman, and thence hopes to rejoin her husband on the Zambesi some time next year.—What with the boers and the natives, South Africa is in a dreadful state. The former are destroying all the missionary stations, and one poor missionary's wife is described as flying to the mountains in the middle of the night, with all their children, "and that in the time of snow." At the meeting at Cape Town in honor of Dr. Livingstone, the Rev. Mr. Moffatt, who was one of the speakers, entered into a history of his missionary labors in South Africa, and referred to the salutary influence which he had exercised over the once potent Africaner, and the now renowned Moselekatze,—an influence which he hoped to turn to good account in respect to the expedition to be undertaken by Dr. Livingstone; and he expressed a fervent hope of having the pleasure, at no very distant day, of shaking hands with the Doctor and the members of his expedition in the vicinity of the Zambesi River.

JAPAN OPENED TO MISSIONARY EFFORT.—The Rev. Mr. Syle, American missionary in China, in his journal for November, makes this entry: "23d—Received a letter from one of the gentlemen aboard the 'Portsmouth,' just arrived at Hong-Kong from Japan. It is to the effect that after July 4, 1858, there will a possibility of residence for American citizens at Ha-Kodaqi. Other communications have been received to the same effect; but the writers, one and all, lay stress on the necessity of sending prudent men there as missionaries."

MISSION TO JEWS AT GALATZ.—On the 6th July, the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh set apart the Rev. Theodoro Meyer, lately Hebrew Tutor in the New College, as a missionary to the Jews at Galatz, in the Danubian Principalities.

PASTORAL LETTER OF THE POPISH BISHOP OF MONTREAL.—A literary and patriotic society, styled "L'Institut Canadien," possesses in Montreal a miscellaneous library for the use of its members. The Popish Bishop, after various ineffectual attempts to coerce the Institute, has issued a long letter in which he threatens excommunication if the library is not implicitly submitted to him, to be expurgated as he shall see fit. He explains the manner in which heretical books are condemned at Rome, and their names inserted in the "Livre de l'Index"; and claims the most absolute supervision over books possessed, read, or sold in his diocese. The conclusion of the Pastoral is in the following maudlin style:—

"It must be here remarked, that it is not we who pronounce this terrible excommunication, of which it is question, but the Church, whose salutary decrees we make known. But in our tender solicitude, we cry as loudly as possible, that 'there is an awful abyss': to you, then, to keep from it, and woe to those who fall into it.

"O Mary! preserve, through your divine goodness, all and each of your dear children from such a misfortune. To do so, throw the eyes of your mercy on this letter, which we have written under your inspiration. Because you are in the Holy Church of God an ever-burning lamp, *lampas inextinguibilis*. We have written this letter but for the honor of your admirable Son and his divine religion. Now it will bear its fruit if you will be pleased to bless it; and you will bless it without doubt, because you are the sceptre of the orthodox faith, *sceptrum orthodoxæ fidei*. This is what we will not fail asking all the days of our life, and particularly in this fine month of May, just beginning. Please accept as a reparation of all the blasphemies preferred against the true Religion, of which you are the guardian and the mother, all the ardent vows, all the fervent prayers, all the sacred chants of all the souls, during this month, which, for all your devoted servants, is a season of delicious rejoicing, and as the common cement of a happy eternity. Ah! that we were allowed to see you, to love you in that eternity, —the object of all our sighs!

"The present Pastoral Letter shall be read in all the Churches wherein the Divine Service is performed, the first Sunday or Holiday after its reception."

DEAN TRENCH.—The "Theological" Department of King's College, London, has just sustained a severe loss by the secession of Dr. Trench, the Dean of Westminster, who, at the close of the late Easter Term, tendered his resignation of the Chair of Divinity occupied by him. His successor is not yet spoken of.

UNITARIANISM IN ENGLAND.—At the recent gathering of the chiefs and leading supporters of Unitarianism in the metropolis, one fact insisted upon, and pointed out as an advantage and recommendation of modern Unitarianism, was, that "it offered an avenue of escape for members of every religious community, and an asylum for free thought to everybody that was in search of one." And this is now exactly the characteristic of the denomination. Socinians of the Priestley and Belsham stamp are still to be found in its ranks; but these are a minority: and the rest comprise all shades of doubters on the doctrines of Original Sin, the Divinity of Christ, and the Atonement. While the belief of some of the admirers of the amiable Channing diverges but very slightly on those points from the orthodox creed, there are others, still coming under the general name of Unitarians, whose belief in any of the verities of the Christian religion is of the flimsiest kind possible,—they are best described as Freethinkers. The leaders of the body exult in the fact that Unitarianism has no shibboleth, and protest against any particular dogmas being set down by which it may be tried; and when sometimes one of their preachers attempts to state the creed of Unitarianism, it necessarily consists of a vague sentiment, capable of being construed at the pleasure of the hearer. It is at present a loose, unfixed, and shifting thing, proud of its chameleon hue and its Protean powers. But though such pains are thus taken to enlarge the net, and make its mouth wide enough to receive, and its meshes narrow enough to hold all fish

that offers, it does not appear that the result has been any increase of adherents: on the contrary, there are abundant proofs that the body is on the wane. At the annual meeting—where, of course, the best face would be put on all that related to their affairs—there was no exultation over past success, no sanguine anticipation of future triumph; but some regret that Unitarianism had not yet done its work; and mourning over the fact, that they had but forty churches in Ireland, and in Scotland only five. But the organ of the body, the *Inquirer*, only a fortnight ago, boldly broke ground, and admitted that defections from their midst were now become so numerous that it was no use concealing the fact. "Year by year," it says, "our congregations grow weaker,—often in numbers, more often still in social influence and relative importance. It is but a short time since the treasurer of one of our institutions assured us that the denomination to which we belong is gradually changing its character altogether, and that he now drew his subscriptions from a lower grade in the great middle class. Or if we take individual congregations, we find the same result; and Wakefield, Exeter, and Norwich are but individual examples of a universal rule. Liverpool has doubled and trebled its population, and the three Unitarian congregations, which existed at the beginning of the century, barely maintain their ground, either socially or numerically."—*Patriot*.

PRIZE ESSAY.—The Home and Foreign Record of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (Old School) contains an offer of a prize of \$200 for the best essay on *Religion in the Family*.

OPENING OF COOKE'S CHURCH, TORONTO.—A new Presbyterian church has been opened for Divine Service in Toronto; the Rev. Dr. Blackwood of Philadelphia, and the Rev. Wm. Ormiston of Hamilton, officiating in the services of the day. The pastor is the Rev. Wm. Gregg, formerly of Belleville. The name given to the church is not euphonious, but it is intended as a compliment to the Irish orator and divine, the Rev. Dr. Cooke, of Belfast.

KNOX COLLEGE BILL.—The act of incorporation for this College, having passed both houses of the Provincial Parliament, has received from the Governor General the Royal assent, and become law.

LITERARY.

NEW BOOKS.—It is an unusually dull season with the publishers, and few new books of importance are announced.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark of Edinburgh advertise the third edition of *Principal Fairbairn's Hermeneutical Manual*, in 2 vols. 8vo., price 18s.

The same publishers have also issued a new translation of Dr. Ullmann's treatise on the "Sinlessness of Jesus," which we have noticed elsewhere.

A Memorial of the American Mission at Futteghurh, and of the martyred Missionaries, is in preparation by the Rev. J. Johnston Walsh, who was for many years stationed at Futteghurh. The volume will be published by Joseph M. Wilson, Philadelphia.

EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.—A Royal Commission has been issued, "to inquire into the present state of popular education in England, and to consider and report what measures, if any, are required for the extension of sound and cheap elementary instruction to all classes of the people." The members of this commission are the Duke of Newcastle, Sir J. F. Coleridge, the Rev. W. C. Lake, the Rev. W. Rogers, Goldwin Smith, Esq., N. W. Senior, Esq., and Edward Miall, Esq.

SCOTTISH UNIVERSITY REFORM.—A Government Bill has passed the House of Commons, and will undoubtedly become law, effecting great changes and reforms in the Universities of Scotland. The King's and Marischal Colleges of Aberdeen are to form one university,—the King's College only to retain a Faculty of Arts. The patronage of Town Councils is taken away. Principals are no longer required to be clergymen. Twelve Commissioners are appointed, with large powers, to carry out the provisions of the Bill. They are the Duke of Argyle, the Earl of Aberdeen, the Earl of Mansfield, the Lord Justice General, Sir William Gibson Craig, Bart., the Lord Justice Clerk (late Lord Advocate Inglis), Lord Ardmillan, William Stirling, Esq. of Keir, James Moncrieff, Esq., Alexander Hastie, Esq., A. M. Dunlop, Esq.