

Presbyterian Banner

THE PRESBYTERIAN BANNER
Publication Office:
GARRATT BUILDING, FIFTH ST.,
PITTSBURGH, PA.
ADVERTISEMENTS
SQUARES (10 lines or less), one insertion, 60 cents; each subsequent insertion, 40 cents.
A Square per quarter, \$1.00; per half year, \$1.50; per year, \$2.50.
BUSINESS NOTES, 10 CENTS.
DAVID MCKINNEY & CO.,
Proprietors and Publishers.

Is it the Duty of the Church to Educate, at her own cost, every young man who the Holy Spirit calls to preach the Gospel.

If, as has been seen in our last article on this question, it is the duty of the Church (embracing her entire membership,) to preach the Gospel to every creature; and if, as was further seen, it is her duty to do this through the chosen-ordained agency of men who are called to the office of the ministry by the Holy Ghost, it must be manifest, that the question placed at the head of this article is reduced to very narrow limits. If the positions embraced in this statement are valid, then the question of duty must lie between the entire Church and the individuals singled out by the Holy Spirit, and called to the work of the ministry. The question given to the whole Church, and no less unquestionably implied in the call to the execution of this commission, given to the individual. As the work of preparation involves not only labor, but cost, the question is, Who is to bear it—the young man, or the Church? Against the former conclusion, and in favor of the latter, there are many weighty reasons:

The class of men chosen for the work of the ministry, is not a class of men who are called to serve him in the Gospel of his Son, should bear the burden of the work of preparation. What was true of the membership of the Church at Corinth, is true of the ministry. To them, with singular appropriateness, the language of the Apostle to that Church may be addressed: "I see your calling, brethren, now that ye are called, many of you are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are; that no flesh should glory in man's presence. It is just as true of the ministers of Christ as it is of the private members of his Church, that it is not the wise, or mighty, or noble, who are called. The venerable Dr. Alexander, whose observations as an instructor of candidates for the ministry, through a long life, must give great weight to his opinion on this subject, in a sermon preached near the close of his life, advanced and sustained the proposition, that the Gospel is not only preached to the poor, but by the poor. Indeed, so prominent is this fact in the history of the Church, that we are persuaded few will call it in question. From the call of the fishermen of Galilee to this day, the Master has drawn his ambassadors chiefly from the poor. It has been by the poor that his Gospel has been preached.

In this feature of his policy, as the Administrator of the economy of redemption, we have a clear intimation of his will, as to whether the cost of preparation should be borne by the Church, or by the individual. By this course of procedure in calling his ambassadors, he shuts the Church up to the necessity of providing the means requisite to the preparation of those whom he calls, or of refusing to fulfill her great commission. By laying upon his Church the obligation to preach the Gospel to every creature, he does not mean to call to, and qualify for the work, and then calling those who are not able, through lack of means, to qualify themselves, he places the Church under the manifest necessity of supplying the means, or of proving recreant to her trust. When a young man of this class appears before a Presbytery, and the Presbytery, after due examination, satisfied that Christ has called him to preach the Gospel, it is at that point they refuse to receive him as a candidate. Is there a Presbytery in Christendom that would refuse to receive a candidate, whom they believed to be called, because he was destitute of the means of obtaining an education? Why this were to revolutionize the policy of the Divine Administration, and transfer the honors of a place on the embassy of reconciliation from the poor to the rich, and to wrest, so far as man can, the keys of the kingdom from the hands to which Christ has committed them. Such a position could not be taken except on the assumption that wealth is a condition of admission to the ministry. And if this ground is taken, and the divinely-ordained rule of vocation, which was established on the shore of Genesaret, remain unrevoked, then must the great majority of those who are called to the ministry be excluded from the harvest-estate.

2. The readiness of the Church to sustain candidates for the ministry, implied in that prayer which, in obedience to the command of her Lord, she is ever presenting before his Throne of Grace. In beseeching him to send forth laborers into the harvest, she professes her readiness to do all in her power to cooperate with his providence and grace in sending forth those whom he may call. She places no restrictions around his will, either as to numbers or means. She asks no questions, but saying, "Take thou thy gifts, for he upon whom thy choice is fallen: cannot bear the cost of preparation." If the Church is now, "for the first time in her history, either under the Old Testament or the New, to take the position, that she is not to bear the expenses incident to the preparation of her ministry, she is certainly under all the obligations which can be imposed, and she cannot impose, in the most sacred of all transactions, to express, in unequivocal terms, when she bows before the Lord of the harvest, the conditions on which she is willing to receive an increase of laborers. Let her not ask as if she were willing to submit to the wisdom of her Lord all questions relative to persons and means, and then, as if she had reserved to herself the right of challenge, except from the list of his appointments, to select those who are to be called to the ministry, and to educate themselves. On the principle that it is not the duty of the Church to educate those whom Christ may designate as his ambassadors, that prayer which was placed upon the altar of incense by her great High Priest, cannot be offered any longer without modification. Instead of simply asking laborers, she must, in conformity with

the principle, that those who are called are bound to bear the cost of their own preparation, pray the Lord of the harvest to call and send forth wealthy laborers into his harvest.

Justice demands that the cost of preparation be borne by the Church. If it be said that such questions are too sacred to be determined on such principles, we would refer those who have any doubts to the argument of the Apostle in support of the temporal claims of the Christian ministry, 1. Cor. ix. He appeals to the customs of men, and argues from the fact that the husbandman, and the soldier, and the shepherd, and even the very oxen which tread out the corn, are rewarded for their labor, that the ministers of Christ ought to be rewarded for theirs. It is true the Apostle is here simply laying the basis of an *argument*; the conclusion of which he advances interrogatively, "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we reap your carnal things?" But in laying the foundation of his argument on the principle of work and wages, he sanctions and authorizes the application of the principle of justice between man and man, in the settlement of all questions which may arise between the Church and her servants, in the advancement of the kingdom of their common Lord. The question between the Church and her candidates, during their course of preparation, belongs to this class. As the duty of preparation is upon both, by virtue of the general commission and the specific call, the question is, By which of the parties—the candidates of the Church—shall the cost be borne?

There can be but one answer to this question. The Society, and not a few of its members, ought to bear the cost incident to all its operations. The Church, as an organization for the evangelization of the world, as the Apostle argues, is not to be regarded as exempt from the operation of this principle. In order, therefore, to prove that it is not the duty of the Church to bear the expenses incident to the preparation of her candidates for the work of the ministry, it is necessary to show that her commission to preach the Gospel to every creature, does not lay upon her the obligation to provide the means, or that the ministry is not embraced in the means. We are persuaded, that when a Christian man finds himself driven to the necessity of establishing either of these positions, he will prefer abandoning his opposition to the sustentation of candidates for the ministry.

In these remarks we have had reference to candidates who are not possessed of the means necessary to their support during a course of preparation. We wish it to be understood, however, that we do not base the Church's obligation, in this matter, upon the incidence of her candidates. We have argued the will of the Master from the temporal circumstances of those whom he is wont to call to the work of the ministry; but we would be very far from resting the claims of the future ambassadors of Christ upon their present poverty. Had it been our purpose to advocate the cause of Christ's poor, we might have appealed simply to the benevolence of his people. But the cause in hand is the cause, not of the poor, but of men whom Christ has designated, and whom the Church has recognized, as his servants, to execute the great commission committed to her trust. So long as the Church is responsible for the execution of the commission, so long must she be held responsible, not simply on principles of benevolence, but on the principle of justice, for the sustentation of those who are preparing to execute it.

The full development and application of this principle are so important, that we shall devote another article to the subject in the next number of the Record.—*Home and Foreign Record.*

Making a Fuss in the Pulpit.

A little girl not three years old was taken to church by her mother. Annie was a dear child, very smart for her age, and appeared very attentive to the preacher during the exercises. On returning home her mother asked her, "Well, Annie, did you hear the preaching?" "No, mother," was her prompt reply. The question was varied, and her reply was still the same. "Did you not see Dr. M. in the pulpit, up high?" "Yes, mother." Curiosity was awakened to know the child's ideas of the exercise. So her mother asked again: "But what was Dr. M. doing up there?" "With the greatest promptness and composure, she said, "Why he was just making a fuss."

Now, perhaps, she was not far wrong, in her infantile judgment. There is not a little of pulpit performance, that is well described by her graphic phrase. I know the preacher on that occasion; he is usually not a smasher in his elocution, and would not knock a pulpit Bible to pieces in a lifetime. He must have been doing something extra, on that day—aiming, possibly, at a special impression.

But there are more ways than one, of making a fuss in the pulpit. Besides the vociferous declamation and the athletic performance—what Cowper calls "the attitude and stare, and start theatric"—much of the *fine-preaching* comes fairly under this head. Highly polished elegances of style, or, just as much, gossams of tinsel brightness; sentences flowery with violets, and roses and hollyhocks, and sparkling with the splendors of noonday effluence, make a sermon very fine, there is no doubt of it—equal to a pretty fair novel; being the lack of interest in the story. But, after the fuss is over, what are its results? Whose conscience is awakened? Whose mind is enlightened or guided? Attractions that draw attention to the truth are valuable, however simple they may be; while those which draw the mind away from the truth, however splendid, are pernicious. There is a picture, by the celebrated Paul Veronese, which has puzzled artists; he has placed the principal figure in the shade, and sacrificed, of course, the general effect to a whimsical effort to display his exquisite skill in the subordinate features of the piece. What he did with design, is often done in the pulpit. I trust unattentively, by putting God's truth and man's Saviour in the background, scarcely visible through the preacher's tinsel clouds and blooming shrubbery.

A great proportion of the so-called *deep preaching*, is but making a fuss in the pulpit. It seems to be deep because, like a well, it is dark. Not one person in five, in a common audience, can afford to be profoundly thoughtful.

qualities—simplicity and clearness. It is hard, to sit through a sermon, in doubt whether we are getting the sense out of it; but the additional doubt, whether there is any sense in it, with a stronger leaning to the negative side, is any thing but an improving exercise. I think it is told of the Persons, that they esteem the speech of the greatest, which is most difficult to understand. It must be the speakers and not the hearers who have this opinion. Besides, for the purposes of pulpit discourse, almost correct; and criticisms on the Greek or Hebrew text, although sound, are unprofitable. Many a person has derived benefit from Owen's book on Justification, who would be able to make little out of his learned "Exercitation" on the canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

One of the most common and most illusive ways of making a fuss in the pulpit, is what may be called the *Dictionary method*. It is really astonishing—perhaps it is intended to be so—to see what power in polysyllables some men possess! Nor is the English language alone at their command. The Apostle's doctrine on the subject of "unknown tongues" requires review and adjustment to our times. It is exceedingly embarrassing to a minister, desirous of leading a people in the way of knowledge, to think that he is not understood; if he have this fear, he will spurn the suggestions of vanity, and help the infirmities of his flock by speaking more plainly. What, to an educated Christian man, is the senseless praise of his "great latin"!! Like Dean Swift, "I defy any man to prove that I am bound, by any law of God or man, to understand the meaning of such words as *phenomena*, &c."

There is some fuss made in the pulpit, in the way of *common-place* preaching; or, rather, the repetition of the same things over and over again—the only variety being, like that in the Indian's dinner, the *coronatus* in a big dish, and *macintosh* in a little dish. Paul's rule was, "Leaving the principles," or elementary truths, "let us go on to perfection." And his preaching of "Christ, and him crucified," embraced all the themes of theology. Growth in knowledge is auxiliary to growth in grace, and the minister should lead his disciples in both. God's Word is his text-book; but bringing forth things new and old, is something more than putting new texts to old discourses.

We have captured quite a number of rebels in this division of late, and with them we can probably buy back our men who have been so very unfortunate as to fall into rebel hands. Some deserters that have come into our lines lately, say there is quite a widespread dissatisfaction among the soldiers of the rebel army, and many of them would gladly desert if they could get an opportunity. A few more victories on our part will doubtless increase the dissatisfaction there until there will be a rebellion within a rebellion. God-speed the right!

I send you a copy of a paper published at this place, which indicates very strongly, among other things, the permanent establishment of the United States Government upon this continent. The health of our army here is much better now than it was for several weeks after the division landed last Fall. Our regiment—the 76th—has been the healthiest regiment in the whole division. We have now but six in the hospital, and there are no dangerous cases among them. The sickly season is just about commencing again, and it remains to be seen how our soldiers will endure a Southern climate.

Yours, faithfully,
B. L. AGNEW.

EUROPEAN CORRESPONDENCE.

Railway Statistics—Speculations as to Peace or War—Tracts for Prisons and People—The Bishop of Oxford and the Layman—Flood for 'Doubt'—The 'Negative' School, and Mr. Spurgeon's Sermon—A. P. Russell's Paper—An 'Editorial' of 1862, and the Modern Evangelicalists.
LONDON, March 14, 1862.

OUR RAILWAY SYSTEM presents facts and figures which are very remarkable. The Directors of railways rule an army of 100,000 men, control a capital of £250,000,000, and receive an average of £28,000,000,000. The number of railway journeys now taken, gives an average of six for every man, woman and child in the United Kingdom. The price of food, especially as to the London supply, is wonderfully affected by railways. West of England gardeners forward their early fruits to Covent Garden; Scotch farmers forward their beasts to the metropolitan market, and their hind quarters of mutton to the Newmarket market; and while the Londoners enjoy light and airy pastures, they are brought to London, in a year, the Norfolk railways often dispatch as much in a fortnight. During last year, 12,000,000 cattle, sheep, and pigs made railway excursions, besides 250,000 horses, and 350,000 dogs. Some 90,000,000 tons of merchandise and minerals are conveyed, for which the owners pay a bill of £35,000,000.

The London and North-western Railway extends from London to Carlisle; from Peterborough to Cardiff, and from Leeds to Holyhead. It includes more than 1000 miles of railway. Its total capital account is nearly thirty-seven millions sterling. Its rolling stock includes 972 locomotives, 1,972 passenger carriages, 1,048 guards' breaks, horse boxes, travelling post-offices, and carriage trucks. If a train were made exclusively of North-western engines, it would extend eight miles; if in front of them the passenger carriages were placed, the train would extend beyond Harrow and nearly to Pincher; and if the guards' breaks and goods trains were added, it would extend from London to Northampton, 67 miles. The revenue of this one Company last half year, was £2,300,000, or at the rate of £35,200 a week; £12,600,000 a year, or £525,000 a week; and last night, and seven days a week, though it is well pleasing to find that the North-western has reduced its Sunday traffic almost to a minimum.

Other statistics are on the same colossal scale. On the various lines of British and Irish Railways, there are 8000 locomotives, worth between £2000 and £3000 each. These engines consume half as much coal as the engines of the North-western. They supply all Liverpool. There are more than 15,000 passenger carriages, and 180,000 goods trucks. The engines and vehicles have cost some £35,000,000. On an average, 100 miles of railway require some six miles of engines, carriages and trucks, to work it; and if all were collected together, the engines would reach to Brighton to London; the carriages to be with trucks of all kinds, the train would extend to Aberdeen, 600 miles. Upwards of 10,000 trains run every day, an average of 7 start every minute, and nearly 4,000,000 railway trains run last year. The trains, passenger and goods, travelled altogether more than 100,000,000 miles.

More than 200 new railway bills will be brought under the consideration of Parliament this session, and among the projects of the day is that of a submarine, wrought iron tube line, twenty miles long, from Dover to Calais. A large ventilating shaft is proposed to be fixed in the centre of the Channel, and the laying of the tubes is to commence on both sides of this

point. Wrought iron boxes, filled with stones on each side of the tubes, are to keep them in their place, and over them a ridge of stones or chalk, is to be raised, 40 feet in height. It is estimated that the cost would be £12,000,000, and that the railway would bring Paris and London within 7 or 8 hours of each other. The project however will not be endorsed.

PEACE OR WAR is being discussed, in connexion with the Fort Donelson victory. At first it was thought that the South would submit. Messrs. Neill Brothers, of Manchester, issued a circular, which leads to despondency among merchants, and also affects the Money Market.

THE "TRACTS FOR PRISONS AND PEOPLE," written by clergymen and laymen of the "Negative" and anti-dogmatic school, are still being circulated and read. Tracts No. 6 and 7 are now before me as I write. The first is by a layman, J. M. Ludlow; the second by that strange phenomenon, the Rev. F. D. Maurice. The two papers form one pamphlet, pp. 42, duodecimo size. The subject is, "The Sermon of the Bishop of Oxford, on the Revival, and the Layman's Answer." The former is the Layman's "Dialogue on Doubt," and Mr. Maurice's "Morality and Divinity." The "Interlocutors" in the dialogue are "Gray" (a safe man), and "Williams" (a plain-speaking man). The "safe man" is rather timid in his utterances, and of course, the plain speaking man does the giant's business, demolishing the Bishop, and the "safe" man, Dr. Wilberforce, is reproved for saying that "doubt" is to be thrown from your mind just as you would instantly cast from you "a load of lead"; his highly wrought picture of the "doubter's death" (when he quotes from the Book of Job, "Yes, the light of the wicked shall be put out," &c.), is set down as exactly parallel in the style of pleading to that of those three friends of Job, against whom God's wrath was kindled. "There is," says Mr. Ludlow, "the same hardness and want of sympathy with one of the most acute, I would almost say, one of the most sacred of human miseries; the same use of threats and bullying to crush struggles which need rather the tenderest help." Now—even supposing that the High Church Bishop and the "safe" man, Dr. Wilberforce, were granted—skepticism is worthy of "tenderest help"—surely poor Job was no skeptic, and the fault of his friends was speaking truth as applicable to him, as a hypocrite and an enemy of God, which, as an upright and true man, did not desire to have fastened like a label of infamy, upon him. The Bishop of Oxford himself, speaks of those doubts, which, instead of being the resource of evil, are the trouble of "holy souls" which, "whether the result of a peculiar constitution of body or of mind, or the fruit of an unhappy training, or the bitter consequences of past sin, are unbidden, and need the tenderest care, and the most diligent and most loving discipline." But the Layman says that there is assigned doubt which none of these assigned causes account for, and he instances, Asaph (Psalm lxxiii.), Jeremiah (cxli, xiv, Lam. iii.), and Christ himself, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" and therefore he says: "When we can once enter into the reality of that awful mystery, the Son of God, we shall feel that, to try to stifle doubt by death and terror, is to crucify the Lord afresh." When this language is closely examined by a sound and well-taught mind, and when the real cause of Christ's *Desertion* on the cross by the Father, and of that Eclipse of his sun is remembered, it can hardly fail to shock, as it almost approached the borders of blasphemy, to compare it with "the death-bed terrors" of a dying infidel. The crucifixion is called in connexion with "the whole life," that inward passion of doubt, "as justifying the golden lines of the poet:

"There lives more faith in honest doubt,
Believe me, than in half the creeds."

And thus the Layman goes on to lament "the absence of positive faith among our young men," (to which a righteous doubt is exactly correlative,) and maintains that the prevailing evil of the age is not doubt, but rather the prevalence and multiplication of lay beliefs in the easily credible; or again, either the credible or incredible, so long as neither makes much demand on men's heart and conduct." In fact, "this state of mind is closely analogous to that which was exhibited in the multiplication of gods at and after the Christian era, when all received beliefs, set loosely on men, and they were always ready to receive new ones with the old, or instead of them, so long as the change required was one of form or name, and not of substance, or of the life itself." In such a state of mind, it is added, "a setter up of a new philosophy, as the setter forth of strange gods, is sure of a curious hearing. He who simply seeks to unveil the name, the nature, the purpose, and will of the Unknown God and Father, is treated as a mere babler."

In the foregoing extract you have a strange union of presumption of spirit and of inconsequence of argument. First of all, our new Rationalizing Schools claim to be doing the work of an Innocent Paul amid the temples of Athens. But is it to be the evangelical spirit of this age that of Fraser, who proposed to add the image of Christ to those of the gods already worshipped in the Pantheon? Do we endorse every new religion, or even some that call themselves Christian? No; we leave that to the school of Theodore Parker of Emerson, and of their Socinian and Rationalizing followers, who all consider "modes of faith" as detestable; endorse "Jehovah, Jove, and Lord," as alike the Father of all; who set up and worship in a common Pantheon, Mohammed and Jesus Christ. "Received beliefs," amongst us imply the death of a *read sin* offering—the "restitution of the dead," and of its application by the priest on his throne; in a word, all that Paul preached in his day, as a distinctive truth, *dogmatic* undoubtedly in its "formulas."

And so the "Layman" ends his shallow tract—without for one moment recognizing the existence of objective truth at all, and in the kind of conceited, contemptuous, and unchristian spirit, which is the mark of his own Church, which in a layman is bad, but in a clergyman, still retaining his emoluments and status, and arguing that it is right and lawful to do so, is intolerable.

And so "Gray," the man of straw, the "safe man" is made to inquire, "And what do you think all this will lead to?" and "Williams" replies: "I think the issue must be precisely the same in the nineteenth, and probably the next century, as it was in the first and following centuries—the fall of all the new philosophic idols" (are not Maurice & Co. the only philosophic party in their eyes?) "as of the old religious ones, before one whose name is King of Kings and Lord of Lords." Alas! for the cause, the glory, and honor of our glorious King, if these traducers of his *true and proper work* of obedience unto death "*super homin*," for us, and in our stead, are to be his recognized champions and defenders.

But now let us hear "No. II."—"Morality and Divinity," by Mr. Maurice. As many of your readers know, Mr. Maurice, although removed from his Professorship in King's College, London, retains a *London living*, and this although he denies the real substitution of Christ, regards all men as already redeemed and reconciled, and looks upon Christ's *self-sacrifice* as the means of saving the world, or in other words, making men holy and happy forever. As for the judicial character of God, he practically ignores it, and denies the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked. Mr. M. begins his "Morality and Divinity" by referring to a Layman's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, "The Suppression of Doubt is not Faith." The author of that pamphlet said that Dr. Wilberforce, being a Bishop, was "bound to maintain all that a dogmatic Church declares, by her authority, to be matter of faith." But then, "I am a Layman, and shall be content to preserve the objective truth by which we live." This "religious truth" is "the Christianity delivered in the Sermon on the Mount." The Church's "terminology," her "Creeds and Confessions," stand on a very different footing. This is the style of this new school. *Precept* is "religious truth," not dogma, as the Bishop is so reluctant to do. Lord himself would be content to do, for he claims that he came to "give his life ransom for many;" and as for Paul, to say nothing of Calvin, Luther, and the Fathers and Founders of the Church of England, they went away by the very fact of contending for dogmas, from "the Christianity of the Sermon on the Mount." The shallowness of this need not be exposed. The total influence of the dissemination of doctrine from this style of the time, is Socialism may well be pronounced accordingly. It dwells on the Sermon on the Mount; quotes from it about the two men who built their houses respectively on the rock and the sand; extracts the passages beginning, "Judge not," &c.; and then adds: "These are not words which have passed away. They do not belong to the myths which a religious criticism annihilates from the Gospel." The italics are Mr. Maurice's; but they bring out his peculiar views, his ignorance of what Evangelicalists teach as to duty, and the ideas cherished and sedulously propagated against the teaching of great facts in connexion with God's work for and in man.

Maurice, indeed, goes a little farther than the "Layman" in that he discovers the Fatherhood of God in the Sermon on the Mount. Nay, he admits that mere moral teaching will not operate on men; that when that style has been adopted, hoars have cared as little for the preacher as the gentleman; and that the success of both Puritans and Methodists was owing to the fact that they "both ascended into the Divine region." And one would think that he had got the experience of Thomas Chalmers, after his conversion he preached Evangelical truth, and when he saw this produced the fruit which before had been totally wanting when he only spoke of the morality of the Sermon on the Mount.

"That which changed John and Charles Wesley from rather formal Oxford Divines into messengers of life to colliers and ruffians, was the discovery by their own minds of the heart of God in the Sermon on the Mount. Nay, they showed their own heart beneath all their respectability and devotion; who showed them a Deliverer from that evil; who showed them that he was not less a Deliverer for the most disreputable and the most ungodly."

And so "Gray," the man of straw, the "safe man" is made to inquire, "And what do you think all this will lead to?" and "Williams" replies: "I think the issue must be precisely the same in the nineteenth, and probably the next century, as it was in the first and following centuries—the fall of all the new philosophic idols" (are not Maurice & Co. the only philosophic party in their eyes?) "as of the old religious ones, before one whose name is King of Kings and Lord of Lords." Alas! for the cause, the glory, and honor of our glorious King, if these traducers of his *true and proper work* of obedience unto death "*super homin*," for us, and in our stead, are to be his recognized champions and defenders.

But now let us hear "No. II."—"Morality and Divinity," by Mr. Maurice. As many of your readers know, Mr. Maurice, although removed from his Professorship in King's College, London, retains a *London living*, and this although he denies the real substitution of Christ, regards all men as already redeemed and reconciled, and looks upon Christ's *self-sacrifice* as the means of saving the world, or in other words, making men holy and happy forever. As for the judicial character of God, he practically ignores it, and denies the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked. Mr. M. begins his "Morality and Divinity" by referring to a Layman's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, "The Suppression of Doubt is not Faith." The author of that pamphlet said that Dr. Wilberforce, being a Bishop, was "bound to maintain all that a dogmatic Church declares, by her authority, to be matter of faith." But then, "I am a Layman, and shall be content to preserve the objective truth by which we live." This "religious truth" is "the Christianity delivered in the Sermon on the Mount." The Church's "terminology," her "Creeds and Confessions," stand on a very different footing. This is the style of this new school. *Precept* is "religious truth," not dogma, as the Bishop is so reluctant to do. Lord himself would be content to do, for he claims that he came to "give his life ransom for many;" and as for Paul, to say nothing of Calvin, Luther, and the Fathers and Founders of the Church of England, they went away by the very fact of contending for dogmas, from "the Christianity of the Sermon on the Mount." The shallowness of this need not be exposed. The total influence of the dissemination of doctrine from this style of the time, is Socialism may well be pronounced accordingly. It dwells on the Sermon on the Mount; quotes from it about the two men who built their houses respectively on the rock and the sand; extracts the passages beginning, "Judge not," &c.; and then adds: "These are not words which have passed away. They do not belong to the myths which a religious criticism annihilates from the Gospel." The italics are Mr. Maurice's; but they bring out his peculiar views, his ignorance of what Evangelicalists teach as to duty, and the ideas cherished and sedulously propagated against the teaching of great facts in connexion with God's work for and in man.

Maurice, indeed, goes a little farther than the "Layman" in that he discovers the Fatherhood of God in the Sermon on the Mount. Nay, he admits that mere moral teaching will not operate on men; that when that style has been adopted, hoars have cared as little for the preacher as the gentleman; and that the success of both Puritans and Methodists was owing to the fact that they "both ascended into the Divine region." And one would think that he had got the experience of Thomas Chalmers, after his conversion he preached Evangelical truth, and when he saw this produced the fruit which before had been totally wanting when he only spoke of the morality of the Sermon on the Mount.

"That which changed John and Charles Wesley from rather formal Oxford Divines into messengers of life to colliers and ruffians, was the discovery by their own minds of the heart of God in the Sermon on the Mount. Nay, they showed their own heart beneath all their respectability and devotion; who showed them a Deliverer from that evil; who showed them that he was not less a Deliverer for the most disreputable and the most ungodly."

All this is true about the Wesleyan leaders, but it is not all the truth. They dealt with conscience; they spoke of sin leading to the "wrath to come," and that "wrested eternal of a judgment day—an eternity of retribution and by the terms of the Lord." They roused men's fears and so made precious the Hiding Place. This Mr. Maurice and his school do not preach; God is *paternal*; that is the Revelation; his justice inflexible, that "will by no means clear the guilty," except by a real sin offering, they scout as old-fashioned terminology. "And so the old-fashioned terminology," both as to the leading into the Divine region, and as to the New School never soars.

According to Mr. Maurice, Christ's prayer, "That they may all be one in us," "does comprehend all Churches whatsoever, the members of all schools and sects whatsoever, their positive principles whatsoever. What we want is a ground in the name of the Eternal God, which shall embrace all, and at last subdue all to itself. We cannot draw lines like those of the Evangelical Alliance, which shall cut off the whole Latin and Greek Churches." So that all Paul's denunciations and anathemas of "any other doctrine than that we have preached," was quite unwarranted, for the teachers were *professionally Christian* teachers. Arius was as truly embraced in the fold as Athanasius, which denounces the "blasphemous fables and dangerous secrets" they are simply "judging," and the "drawing of lines," and so of the corrupt Churches of the East. If he said that *within* these Churches God has a people—a true Church—then it would be true, and the barriers would not be broken down, set up (by Apostolic example), by the Reformers, nor would truth be sacrificed and souls imperilled by false and fatal charity.

The inference drawn from the whole matter by Mr. Maurice, is, as usual, for the toleration, by the Church of England, of every shade of opinion. He declares that upon this depends "the fate of England!" And he trusts, therefore, that the Anglican Episcopate, and the Anglican clergy, will earnestly consider what their spiritual foundation is—whether it is an authoritative document of an everlasting Name. Accordingly he admits that there are "oppos-

ing truths" in the Articles, "none of which we can afford to lose;" he deprecates all "prosecutions," (of the Essaysists,) "as equally exposing our formularies to contempt by their failure or success." Bishops are entreated not to enforce their individual "notions and opinions" for "what regards the Revelation of God is *their*" (the Bishops') revelation—that God is asking them whether they can truthfully, whether they trust their own notions or opinions." Nay, if they don't do thus, and not let things alone, "our National Church will perish!" And surely every honest man, or every man not blinded by the absurd theory of a Maurice and his school, which hates nothing but Evangelical teaching, and hugs every form of so-called Christianity, such terms as part and parcel of the Christianity of the Church Catholic—will say, "Let the National Church perish!" if truth and error, light and darkness, grand facts and mythical fables, are thus to be confounded, and "Truth on her eternal throne is to be trodden as a fool!"

RATIONALIZING PREACHERS talk much in these days of "objective truth" and "subjective truth." The Baptist Magazine, (one of whose editors is Mr. Spurgeon, and in a review of the *Record* bears his stamp), thus ridicules this fashion and style of teaching:

"Glancing at the table of contents of the volume before us, we feel no elevation of our expectations when we read chaps. i., ii., and iii.—Grace Objectively Considered; chaps. iv. and v.—Grace Subjectively Considered. We remark interjectively that, considered objectively, such terms are adjustively to be described as the offspring of a theology, which is treated most rejectively by all sound divines, and is only received by those whose minds are comparatively bewildered, and are therefore trajectoryly impelled into an admiration of a jargon which, speaking conjectively, was invented projectively to propagate injectively a philosophy which could set disjectively to the Gospel of Christ. We subjectively remark, that we are often trajectoryly impressed with the mischief which, subjectively, such barbarisms work to the simplicity of our faith; we counter-projectively exhort all men to treat, 'objectively,' 'subjectively,' and all such rubbish, in the style known as 'jectively.'"

And so "Gray," the man of straw, the "safe man" is made to inquire, "And what do you think all this will lead to?" and "Williams" replies: "I think the issue must be precisely the same in the nineteenth, and probably the next century, as it was in the first and following centuries—the fall of all the new philosophic idols" (are not Maurice & Co. the only philosophic party in their eyes?) "as of the old religious ones, before one whose name is King of Kings and Lord of Lords." Alas! for the cause, the glory, and honor of our glorious King, if these traducers of his *true and proper work* of obedience unto death "*super homin*," for us, and in our stead, are to be his recognized champions and defenders.

But now let us hear "No. II."—"Morality and Divinity," by Mr. Maurice. As many of your readers know, Mr. Maurice, although removed from his Professorship in King's College, London, retains a *London living*, and this although he denies the real substitution of Christ, regards all men as already redeemed and reconciled, and looks upon Christ's *self-sacrifice* as the means of saving the world, or in other words, making men holy and happy forever. As for the judicial character of God, he practically ignores it, and denies the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked. Mr. M. begins his "Morality and Divinity" by referring to a Layman's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, "The Suppression of Doubt is not Faith." The author of that pamphlet said that Dr. Wilberforce, being a Bishop, was "bound to maintain all that a dogmatic Church declares, by her authority, to be matter of faith." But then, "I am a Layman, and shall be content to preserve the objective truth by which we live." This "religious truth" is "the Christianity delivered in the Sermon on the Mount." The Church's "terminology," her "Creeds and Confessions," stand on a very different footing. This is the style of this new school. *Precept* is "religious truth," not dogma, as the Bishop is so reluctant to do. Lord himself would be content to do, for he claims that he came to "give his life ransom for many;" and as for Paul, to say nothing of Calvin, Luther, and the Fathers and Founders of the Church of England, they went away by the very fact of contending for dogmas, from "the Christianity of the Sermon on the Mount." The shallowness of this need not be exposed. The total influence of the dissemination of doctrine from this style of the time, is Socialism may well be pronounced accordingly. It dwells on the Sermon on the Mount; quotes from it about the two men who built their houses respectively on the rock and the sand; extracts the passages beginning, "Judge not," &c.; and then adds: "These are not words which have passed away. They do not belong to the myths which a religious criticism annihilates from the Gospel." The italics are Mr. Maurice's; but they bring out his peculiar views, his ignorance of what Evangelicalists teach as to duty, and the ideas cherished and sedulously propagated against the teaching of great facts in connexion with God's work for and in man.

Maurice, indeed, goes a little farther than the "Layman" in that he discovers the Fatherhood of God in the Sermon on the Mount. Nay, he admits that mere moral teaching will not operate on men; that when that style has been adopted, hoars have cared as little for the preacher as the gentleman; and that the success of both Puritans and Methodists was owing to the fact that they "both ascended into the Divine region." And one would think that he had got the experience of Thomas Chalmers, after his conversion he preached Evangelical truth, and when he saw this produced the fruit which before had been totally wanting when he only spoke of the morality of the Sermon on the Mount.

"That which changed John and Charles Wesley from rather formal Oxford Divines into messengers of life to colliers and ruffians, was the discovery by their own minds of the heart of God in the Sermon on the Mount. Nay, they showed their own heart beneath all their respectability and devotion; who showed them a Deliverer from that evil; who showed them that he was not less a Deliverer for the most disreputable and the most ungodly."

All this is true about the Wesleyan leaders, but it is not all the truth. They dealt with conscience; they spoke of sin leading to the "wrath to come," and that "wrested eternal of a judgment day—an eternity of retribution and by the terms of the Lord." They roused men's fears and so made precious the Hiding Place. This Mr. Maurice and his school do not preach; God is *paternal*; that is the Revelation; his justice inflexible, that "will by no means clear the guilty," except by a real sin offering, they scout as old-fashioned terminology. "And so the old-fashioned terminology," both as to the leading into the Divine region, and as to the New School never soars.

According to Mr. Maurice, Christ's prayer, "That they may all be one in us," "does comprehend all Churches whatsoever, the members of all schools and sects whatsoever, their positive principles whatsoever. What we want is a ground in the name of the Eternal God, which shall embrace all, and at last subdue all to itself. We cannot draw lines like those of the Evangelical Alliance, which shall cut off the whole Latin and Greek Churches." So that all Paul's denunciations and anathemas of "any other doctrine than that we have preached," was quite unwarranted, for the teachers were *professionally Christian* teachers. Arius was as truly embraced in the fold as Athanasius, which denounces the "blasphemous fables and dangerous secrets" they are simply "judging," and the "drawing