

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1863.

No. IV.

By Rev. Dr. Schaff

ART. I.—*The Anglo-American Sabbath.*

1. *The Anglo-American Theory of the Sabbath.*

THE Sabbath, or weekly day of holy rest, is, next to the family, the oldest institution which God established on earth for the benefit of man. It dates from paradise, from the state of innocence and bliss, before the serpent of sin had stung its deadly fangs into our race. The Sabbath, therefore, as well as the family, must have a general significance: it is rooted and grounded in the physical, intellectual, and moral constitution of our nature as it came from the hands of its Creator, and in the necessity of periodical rest for the health and well-being of body and soul. It is to the week what the night is to the day—a season of repose and reanimation. It is, originally, not a law, but an act of benediction—a blessing and a comfort to man.

The Sabbath was solemnly reaffirmed in the Mosaic legislation as a primitive institution, with an express reference to the creation and the rest of God on the seventh day, in completing and blessing his work,* and at the same time with an additional

* Prof. Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture*, Vol. II. p. 120, (second edition, 1858,) makes the remark: "It seems as if God, in the appointment of this law, had taken special precautions against the attempts which he foresaw would be made to get free of the institution, and that on this account he laid its foundations deep in the original framework and constitution of nature."

By Lyman Stewart D.D.

ART. III.—*Witherspoon's Theology.*

THE Rev. George Duffield, D. D., of Detroit, Michigan, makes the following statement in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, for July, 1863. It occurs in the article entitled "Doctrines of the New-school Presbyterians," on page 598.

"The writings of Drs. Hopkins, Bellamy, Emmons, Dwight, Woods, Taylor, and other New England divines, have had more or less influence among both the Old and New-school Presbyterians. But few, if any, have had greater authority, or done more to put a distinctive stamp upon the theological views of New-school Presbyterians, on the subject of regeneration especially, than the renowned, learned, and patriotic Dr. John Witherspoon, President of Princeton College, and a member of Congress and signer of the Declaration of Independence."

This novel and interesting piece of intelligence can hardly fail to attract attention. For its novelty is surpassed only by its importance. Writings which have exercised a commanding and decisive influence in moulding the "distinctive" principles of so large and influential a body of Christians, certainly deserve, and if this be true of them, will unquestionably receive, an attention which for the last half century has not been accorded to them. It will assist in understanding the import of the foregoing statement, if we quote, for the benefit of our readers, some passages from Dr. Witherspoon's works, on the points chiefly controverted between Old and New-school Presbyterians, and from their peculiar views regarding which, the latter receive their distinctive characteristics. We therefore ask attention to Dr. Witherspoon's views of some leading issues between the two schools.

1. *Of Original Sin.*

One great difficulty with many of our New-school brethren has been in reference to admitting the federal headship and representative character of Adam; the consequent imputation of his sin to his posterity, whereby they are reckoned to have sinned in him, and are treated and punished accordingly, so that their abandonment, on the part of God, to depravity and

corruption, is the penal effect of that sin. On these points Dr. Witherspoon uses the following language:

“It appears that Adam, in the covenant of works, was to be considered as the federal head and representative of the human race, as he was then the natural head. By the manner in which the human race was to descend from him, the punishment inflicted upon him must of course descend to them.” *Witherspoon's Works*, Vol. IV., p. 93.

“As to the effect of Adam's sin upon his posterity, it seems very plain that the state of corruption and wickedness which men are now in, is stated in Scripture as being the effect and punishment of Adam's first sin, upon which it will be sufficient to read the Epistle to the Romans, chapter five, from the 12th verse and onward. And, indeed, when we consider the universality of the effects of the fall, it is not to be accounted for any other way, than from Adam's being the federal head of the human race, and they sinning in him and falling with him in the first transgression.”

“The first and chief of these effects is the corruption of our nature—that man now comes into the world in a state of impurity or moral defilement.” *Id.*, p. 96.

In Vol. I., p. 262, he asserts, “that all the posterity of Adam are conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity.”

“Now that all mankind are by nature in a state of guilt and condemnation, is evident from the whole strain of the Holy Scriptures.” Again: “Thus I have laid before you what the Scripture teaches us on the sinfulness of our nature, including all the posterity of Adam, without exception.” *Id.*, p. 411.

“That we are, by nature, in a state of sin, alienated from God, transgressors of his law, and liable to his wrath. If this were not the case, a *Saviour* would not be necessary; *salvation* would be a word without force, and even without meaning.” *Id.*, p. 455.

It is thus put beyond all doubt, that Dr. Witherspoon held and taught that Adam was the federal head of our race; that, as such, his descendants sinned in him, and fell with him, in his first transgression; that his sin is therefore so counted their sin, that they are regarded and treated as having committed it; and that in punishment of this sin, they are abandoned of

God, and, as a consequence, are all born in a state of moral defilement, which is, in this manner, the punishment of this sin. That this affords the only solution of the universal corruption and degradation of our race, inasmuch as it is the penalty and effect of Adam's first sin.

2. *Inability.*

It is not denied nor questioned, that our New-school theologians have found most formidable difficulties in accepting the doctrine of inability, in the sense of a real inability, irremovable by the sinner's own powers. This is the real issue. Does the sinner labour under an inability to do works spiritually good, which divine power only can remove? Holding the distinction of natural and moral ability and inability, decides nothing in this behalf, because these terms are used by different men in different senses. Some mean by natural ability, plenary ability, in the full Pelagian sense; others mean, a partial, or gracious; an Armenian, or Semi-Pelagian ability. The orthodox, however, use it, if at all, simply to denote the natural faculties of understanding, desire, and will, which are essential to moral agency and responsibility, and belong to man, as such, whether unfallen, fallen, or renewed by grace. So, by moral inability, the former class mean merely an aversion or unwillingness which the sinner can remove by his own will. The old Calvinists mean by moral inability, that indeed which characterizes fallen man; but still that which is real, which the subject of it cannot, while the Almighty power of God can, remove. The question is not, then, whether Witherspoon held to this distinction of natural and moral ability. Turretin recognised it also, so far as there is truth in it. So far as Old-school Presbyterians have objected to it, they have been influenced by the convenient ambiguity of these terms, under which plenary Pelagian ability has so often disguised itself as a phase of inability. But what did Witherspoon hold? He says:

“From this metaphor, ‘EXCEPT A MAN BE BORN AGAIN, HE CANNOT SEE THE KINGDOM OF GOD,’ and other parallel expressions in the holy Scriptures, we may learn that the change here intended is SUPERNATURAL. When I say it is a supernatural change, I mean that it is what man cannot by his

own power effect without superior or divine aid. As we are 'by nature' in a state of enmity or opposition to God, so this is what we cannot, of ourselves, overcome or remove. The exercise of our own rational powers, the persuasion of others, the application of all moral motives of every kind will be ineffectual, without the special operation of the Spirit and grace of God." Vol. I., p. 126.

"Do you give credit to the Scriptures? Do you form your opinions without partiality or prejudice from them? Then you must receive it as truth that man, in his natural state, can do nothing of himself to his own recovery, without the concurrence of superior aid. If there is any meaning or propriety in Scripture language, we must yield to this. What more could be said than this, we are 'dead' in sin? What more incapable of action than one who is entirely deprived of life?

"But lest there should be any remaining exception, the thing is asserted in plain and explicit terms, without any metaphor, by the apostle John, from our Saviour's own mouth: 'No man can come to me except the Father, who hath sent me, draw him.'" Pp. 127—8.

"Let us therefore settle it in our minds, that though we are of ourselves utterly unable to produce a change in our hearts, 'nothing is impossible with God.' He first made them, and he is able to reform them. On a conviction of our own inability, one would think we should but the more humbly and earnestly apply to him who is all-sufficient in power and grace. The deplorable naturally helpless state of sinners does not hinder exhortations to them in Scripture; and therefore takes not away their obligation to obey. See an address, where the strongest metaphors are retained, the exhortation given in these very terms, and the foundation of the duty plainly pointed out. 'Wherefore he saith, awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.' From which it is very plain that the moral inability under which sinners now lie, as a consequence of the fall, is not of such a nature as to take away the guilt of sin, the propriety of exhortations to duty, or the necessity of endeavours after recovery." *Id.* p. 134.

3. *Regeneration.*

While Dr. Witherspoon's views of inability are involved with his views on regeneration, so as either to intimate or express them, yet there are one or two points of great perplexity to our New-school brethren, on which he declares himself explicitly, and which therefore deserve attention.

Dr. Duffield, in the article from which we quoted the introduction to our remarks, says of the New-school Presbyterian, that when called "with Dr. Owen and the old Calvinists to speak of original or indwelling sin (moral corruption) as a *principle*, or SOMETHING which *has the efficiency of cause*, and which exists in man *anterior to any acts performed by them*, he demurs and resists such a trespass on his liberty in Christ." P. 590.

And yet it is one of the illustrations furnished by this, as well as other like efforts, of the inherent, self-affirming power of the truth, that in the next page but one, Dr. Duffield gives the following as an authoritative expression of New-school doctrine. "We say of men in general that they are sinful; because of the manifestation of SOMETHING wrong or sinful in the state of mind and heart, the passions, affections, habits, and purposes *which determine* their choices and conduct." The italics and small capitals are ours.

This intense repugnance to the idea of a principle in the soul, back, and causative of, acts whether sinful or holy, he manifests, not only as related to original sin, but to the effect of regeneration in the soul, in implanting a principle of spiritual life. He says, "This is the theology of Old-school Presbyterians on the subject, who talk of implanting or infusing into the soul a principle of spiritual life." P. 595.

What says Witherspoon "on the subject?"

"Regeneration, then, is communicating this new principle, and giving it such force as it may obtain, and preserve the ascendancy, and habitually govern the will." Vol. I., p. 138.

"But regeneration consists in the principle being implanted, obtaining the ascendancy, and habitually prevailing over its opposite." P. 149.

"Another excellent and useful evidence of regeneration, is the sanctification of natural and lawful affections. There are,

perhaps, few either more sure or plain evidences of real religion than this. Regeneration does not consist in giving us new souls, new faculties, new affections, but in giving a new tendency and effect to those we had before. There are many persons to whom we bear naturally an affection, and it is far from being the design of religion to destroy this affection; but to regulate it in its measure, to keep it in its proper channel, and direct it to its proper end." P. 159.

We are very sure that many of our New-school brethren understand sufficiently, that an inward moral disposition or principle means a state of the moral faculties, involving facility and aptitude for, and tendency to, a given sort of exercises; that men have moral dispositions or principles, by nature, such as are sinful, or lead to acts of sin; that, by regeneration, these are taken away, and holy principles or dispositions, (that is, an inward state disposing to holy exercises,) are implanted in their place. Many of them so express themselves, in accordance with reason, scripture, their own experience—all fact. What else can be meant in scripture by "the heart of stone," and "the heart of flesh," the "new heart," the "new creature," the "good tree," and the "corrupt tree," the "old man which is corrupt according to deceitful lusts," and the "new man which, after God, is created in righteousness and holiness"? We confess that few things have amazed us more than the formidable embarrassments in which another class of our New-school brethren find themselves involved, when they come to deal with facts so simple, so obvious, and fundamental; especially, when they cannot discuss consecutively this and correlate topics, without inadvertently expressing or implying what they array in spectral horrors on almost every page! Can it be denied that there is a "SOMETHING" in the state of the soul, by nature, which distinguishes the unregenerate from the regenerate? and a "SOMETHING" supernatural wrought in the soul in regeneration, which distinguishes the saint from the sinner? or that this something, in the former case, is a disposition to sin; and, in the latter, a disposition to holy living? or that this disposition is a moral disposition or principle? Why then, such toilsome mystification of the subject, as if all this involved some "physical," in the sense of "material," quality;

or required for its removal or production the interposition of something styled "physical omnipotence," in distinction from pure and simple Divine Omnipotence? Is not the following analysis of the nature of "principle," as given by Edwards, simple, clear, incontrovertible?

"This new spiritual sense, and the new dispositions that attend it are no new faculties, but new principles of nature; I use the word principles for want of a word of more determinate signification. By a principle of nature in this place, I mean that foundation which is laid in nature, either old or new, for any particular manner or kind of exercise of the faculties of the soul; or a natural habit, or foundation for action, giving a person ability and disposition to exert the faculties in exercises of such a certain kind; so that to exert the faculties in that kind of exercises, may be said to be his nature. So this new spiritual sense is not a new faculty of understanding, but it is a new foundation laid in the nature of the soul, for a new kind of exercises of the same faculty of understanding. So that the new holy disposition of heart that attends this new sense, is not a new faculty of will, but a foundation laid in the nature of the soul, for a new kind of exercises of the same faculty of will."—*Religious Affections*, Sect. 1.

4. *Divine Justice, and Christ's Sufferings as related to it.*

One of the radical questions in issue respects the nature of that justice in God which punishes sin, and is displayed and vindicated by Christ's death. Is it mere benevolence, or what some writers call "general justice," meting out rewards and penalties solely on principles of expediency, for the benefit of the universe, and providing for the remission of sin on the same principles? Or is it distributive justice, an unalterable disposition to allot to each one his due—his "just recompense of reward," and inflexibly visiting upon sin its merited penalty, either in the sinner's own person, or that of an accepted substitute? Dr. Witherspoon says:

"When we consider the controversy about the justice of God, and what it implies, we shall see the greatest reason to suppose what is called his vindictive (vindicative—vindicatory) justice, v. 12, or disposition to punish sin, because it truly merits it,

even independently of any consequence of the punishment, either for the reformation of the person, or as an example to others. The idea of justice and guilt carries this in it, and if it did not, there would be an apparent iniquity in punishing any person for a purpose different from his own good." *Works*, Vol. I., p. 105.

"God is merciful, but he is also just. And as there is nothing more inseparable from the idea of sin and an accusing conscience, than merited punishment; so there is nothing more essential to the idea of justice in God than a disposition to inflict it. This the Scripture everywhere declares, and the conscience of the guilty, who dreads his Maker's presence, ratifies the truth." Vol. I., p. 475.

The next question is, were Christ's sufferings strictly in satisfaction of divine justice demanding inexorably the punishment of sin?

Says Dr. Witherspoon,

"The covenant promises Christ, the Mediator, to make satisfaction to divine justice, by his sufferings and death." Vol. IV., p. 112. This is in a lecture, the whole object of which is to prove the reality and necessity of such satisfaction.

Were Christ's sufferings penal? New-school divinity denies this. It pronounces them a mere governmental expedient, to promote the highest welfare of the universe—a symbolical manifestation of God's abhorrence of sin. But it strenuously denies that they are penal. What says Witherspoon?

"Now, Christ appears in Scripture as 'the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world;' as 'giving his life' for his people; as 'bearing their sins in his own body on the tree.' And indeed every expression is used that could well be imagined to signify a propitiatory sacrifice, an atonement for sin, or the punishment of an innocent person in the room and stead of the guilty." Vol. IV., pp. 270—1.

"The second question upon the satisfaction is, whether it was just and proper to admit the substitution of an innocent person in the room of the guilty? This is what the Socinians combat with all their might. They say it is contrary to justice to punish an innocent person; that God must always treat things as they really are, and therefore can never reckon it a

proper atonement for sin, to punish one that never committed any sin. Before I state the reasoning in support of this fundamental doctrine of the gospel," &c. Vol. IV., p. 105.

These passages need no comment.

5. *Justification by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to the Believer.*

The difficulties of our New-school brethren with imputation, whether of Adam's sin or Christ's righteousness, are too familiar to need repetition here. It is easy to show that Dr. Witherspoon was a stranger to them.

"And therefore he raised up for them a Saviour, Jesus Christ, who, as the second Adam, perfectly fulfilled the whole law, and offered himself up a sacrifice upon the cross in their stead; and that this his righteousness is imputed to them as the sole foundation of their justification in the sight of a holy God, and their reception into his favour." Vol. I., p. 43.

"Another circumstance in the plan of redemption through Christ, which will afford matter of wonder to the celestial spirits, is the free justification of sinners, and their acceptance with God, through the imputed righteousness of Christ. If it appears astonishing that God, who distributes favour and punishment with most perfect equity, should punish the innocent, it appears equally so, that he should show favour to the guilty; that he should forgive their sins, accept their persons, and visit them with his loving-kindness, and all this for the merit and obedience of another." Vol. I., p. 514.

In his charge to Mr. Archibald Davidson, as one of the ministers of Paisley, Scotland, he says:

"It is ordinary to meet with serious persons who complain much, that from many pulpits they hear little or nothing of the doctrine of the grace of God, that the grand and leading truths of the gospel are either flatly contradicted, or kept entirely out of view, or something else substituted in their place. I am far from saying that this is indeed the case. On the contrary, I tremble to think that it should be but barely possible; for all these doctrines are clearly contained in the Confession of Faith, which every minister in Scotland has subscribed.* If there-

* And no less, at this present, every minister of the Presbyterian Church of the United States.

fore there be any among us who doth not preach the doctrine of original sin, of Christ's imputed righteousness, justification by free grace, the necessity of regeneration and the operations of the Spirit, he is guilty of perjury of the worst kind, for which I know no excuse." *Id.* p. 347.

6. *The Value and Extent of Christ's Atonement.*

On this subject Dr. Witherspoon sets forth his views under three heads, which we shall now present to our readers. In regard to the first and third, there is little controversy among Old and New-school, or other evangelical Christians. In regard to the second, God's design as to the extent of the atonement, or the persons for whom Christ died, our New-school brethren avow a most vehement and unrelenting antipathy to a definite atonement, and particular redemption. We have only to say, that (exegesis aside,) the following views of Witherspoon are essentially coincident with our own, and those of Old-school Presbyterians generally.

"1. The obedience and death of Christ is of value sufficient to expiate the guilt of all the sins of every individual that ever lived or ever shall live on earth. This cannot be denied, since the subjects to be redeemed are finite, the price paid for their redemption is infinite. He suffered in the human nature, but that nature intimately and personally united to the divine; so that Christ the Mediator, the gift of God for the redemption of sinners, is often called his own and his eternal Son: Rom. viii. 32, 'He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him freely give us all things?' Such was the union of the divine and human nature in Christ, that the blood which was the purchase of our redemption, is expressly called the blood of God. Acts xx. 28: 'To feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.' This is the great mystery of godliness, God manifested in the flesh, in which all our thoughts are lost and swallowed up.

"2. Notwithstanding this, every individual of the human race is not in fact partaker of the blessings of his purchase; but many die in their sins, and perish for ever. This will as little admit of any doubt. Multitudes have died who never

heard of the name of Christ, or salvation through him; many have lived and died blaspheming his person, and despising his undertaking; many have died in unbelief and impenitence, serving divers lusts and passions; and if the Scripture is true, he will at last render unto them according to their works. So that if we admit that the works of God are known to him from the beginning of the world, it can never be true, that, in his eternal counsels, Christ died to save those, who after all that he hath done, shall be miserable for ever. 'He is a rock, his work is perfect.' His design never could be frustrated; but, as the apostle Paul expresses it, Rom. xi. 7, 'The election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.' But,

"3. There is in the death of Christ a sufficient foundation laid for preaching the gospel indefinitely to all without exception. It is the command of God, that this should be done. Mark xvi. 15, 'And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.' The effect of this is, that the misery of the unbelieving and impenitent shall lie entirely at their own door; and they shall not only die in their sins, but shall suffer to eternity for this most heinous of all sins, despising the remedy, and refusing to hear the Son of God. Heb. x. 26, 27, 'For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.' Let us neither refuse our assent to any part of the revealed will of God, nor foolishly imagine an opposition between one part of it and another. All the obscurity arises from the weakness of our understandings: but let God be true, and every man a liar. That there is a sense in which Christ died for all men, even for those who perish, is plain from the very words of Scripture: 1 Tim. iv. 10, 'For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe.' 1 Cor. viii. 11, 'And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?' Thus it appears that both in a national and personal view, 'Christ is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for those of the whole world.'" Vol. I., pp. 479—481.

Dr. Duffield shows his confused, self-contradictory conception of the views of Old-school Presbyterians, on this, as elsewhere, throughout the whole circle of points known as old Calvinism, in the following representation:

“This Old-school view of the definite nature of the atonement is felt, by many besides the New-school, to throw embarrassment in the way of the free and universal offer of salvation in the preaching of the gospel. It is but just, however, to say, that all Old-school Presbyterians do not deny the indefinite nature of the atonement. Some believe and preach its availability for all, affirming its infinite sufficiency, as in itself adequate to the whole human race, though not designed by God to be actually applied to all.” P. 624.

The ground on which *some* of our ministers are thus relieved from the charge of throwing “embarrassment in the way of the free and universal offer of the gospel,” applies to all. This ground is said to be their holding to the “infinite sufficiency” of the atonement for all men, in itself considered, although it is “designed” only to be applied to the elect. But this ground of exemption from this charge applies to all the ministers of our church—the exceptions, if any, requiring no notice. They do not limit the atonement as to its intrinsic sufficiency, or the universality of its offer in good faith to all men; but solely as to the design of its application. It is in this design as to the persons for whom this atonement was intended, and in this alone, that they hold it to be definite. And in this sense, those described by Dr. Duffield, as well as others, do “deny the indefinite nature of the atonement.”

After the published declaration from so high an authority, that Dr. Witherspoon had so largely moulded the theology of New school Presbyterians, we have felt that an exhibition of his doctrines on the cardinal points in issue between us and them, was imperiously demanded. All know the celebrity and authority of his name, while few have access to his works, which are now, unfortunately, nearly out of print. It is enough for us to say, that while we do not undertake to be sponsors for all that Dr. Witherspoon or any other man has said on theological subjects, his theology is radically and essentially that of Old-school Presbyterians, and of the Catechisms and Confessions

common to both branches of the church. This we think has undeniably been made to appear. And it would be a great gratification to us, if we could in justice to the truth, leave our summation of the whole matter here, without any qualifying statement to mar this delightful appearance and foretokening of doctrinal concord.

We are bound, however, in candor to say, that the type of theology advocated by Dr. Duffield, and by him represented to be that of New-school Presbyterians as a body, is widely dissonant from ours and Witherspoon's, notwithstanding all the moulding influence over his communion, attributed by Dr. Duffield to the latter. Indeed, if Dr. Duffield has done justice to his brethren, they are further from Dr. Witherspoon's theology than we had the happiness to believe, before reading his article. He stands very nearly on the precise ground of the New Divinity theologians a quarter of a century ago. He not only retains their peculiarities and innovations very nearly intact, but most of their injurious prejudices and misconceptions of Old Calvinism. He also revives and makes prominent the partisan views and feelings in regard to the causes and incidents of the disruption, and the course of the Old-school relative thereto, which have so long lost their life and power, and disappeared from the stage, that, on being now arrayed before us, they appear less like living things than as ghosts of the departed. We do not think the cause of truth or charity will gain by our reëntering a field of by-gone controversy, which is without any living issues, doctrinal, ecclesiastical, or practical, and can yield little fruit but crimination and recrimination. At all events, we can well afford to waive all correction and refutation of minute historical errors, when, in regard to all the great issues involved—the mixture of the Congregational with Presbyterian discipline by the famous "Plan of Union," and doing the church-work of missions and ministerial education by voluntary societies, instead of ecclesiastical agencies—they have been led substantially to our ground, and repudiate them almost as strenuously as ourselves. Of course, this eliminates a great cause of difference between us, which would obstruct the way to future union.

And we would fain hope, nay, we confidently believe, that

the doctrinal differences between us are narrowing down more than would appear from Dr. Duffield's representations, honest and well-intended as they doubtless are. We do not doubt that, with reference to the conflicts of thirty years ago, Dr. Duffield is a representative champion of the New-school, and so speaks by authority. But twenty, or even ten years, often bring about momentous changes. How has it been with the ecclesiastical questions to which we have adverted? And may it not have been so, in greater or less measure, in regard to doctrine which is apt to sympathize more or less with ecclesiastical order? The opinions which are gaining ground in any communion, may be largely determined by the doctrinal proclivities of its younger ministers. The formative forces and deep under-currents which determine these, sometimes elude the notice of the veterans, who live largely in the conflicts of a previous generation, in which they were leading actors. Certainly, unless we are greatly mistaken, the type of doctrine now working into the minds of the younger ministers of the other branch of the church, is quite different from that which led to the trial of some of its great leaders for heresy in past days. We must remember that a race of ministers is coming upon the stage who were then unborn. The representatives and guides of their opinions speak in a different dialect from these former leaders. Some among them have published to the world their emphatic rejection and able refutation of some of those doctrinal innovations, which were of such potent efficacy in rending our church in twain. We need not be more explicit now and here. He who runs may read. We may advert to the undeniable fact, that the two oldest and largest theological seminaries of the other branch of the church have each selected a professor from our own body, whom we were reluctant to spare.

For these and other reasons, we trust that Dr. Duffield is an inadequate expounder of the doctrines now rising to the ascendancy in the New-school body. We hope the doctrinal divergence between the two bodies is less than his paper would indicate. But it is no less certain, that his article proves that things are not yet ripe for re-union, and that, for the present, peace and amity will be best preserved by remaining as we are.

We trust that it will not always, or even long, be so. But union will be delayed, or frustrated as to all good effects, by attempting to force it prematurely. It will yield only an abortion, or an Ishmael, instead of the real child of promise.

By J. Addison Alexander D.D.

ART. IV.—*Micah's Prophecy of Christ.*

THE quotation contained in the sixth verse of the second chapter of Matthew is admitted, on all hands, to be taken from the first verse of the fifth chapter of Micah. As to the Greek and Hebrew text, there is no doubt or dispute. The only emendations which have been proposed are purely conjectural. Venema, for example, proposes to omit the words γῆ Ἰούδα, on account of the unusual and difficult construction; and Fritzsche, instead of τοῖς, reads ταῖς ἡγεμόσιν, agreeing with πόλεις understood, and meaning *among the chief cities of Judah*, in order to avoid the supposed incongruity of calling Bethlehem *the least*, ἐλαχίστη, i. e., ἐλαχίστη πόλις, *the least town*, among the *princes* or *governors* of Judah. But these emendations are entirely unnecessary. The γῆ Ἰούδα, which distinguishes the Bethlehem here meant, from a place of the same name belonging to the tribe of Zebulon,* is elliptically used, in accordance with a common Hebrew idiom (בְּיַהֲרֵם יְהוּדָה,) and with our own, when we connect the name of a town with that of the state in which it lies, without an intervening preposition, as in *Princeton, New Jersey*. As to the other case, the explanation of the seeming incongruity, if indeed so slight a solecism needs an explanation, is, that the address is to the town of Bethlehem, not as such, or on its own account, but in allusion to the person who was to come out of it, and who is therefore here compared with the *princes* of Judah, though the adjective agrees in gender with the town itself.

But though the preliminary questions are thus easily disposed of, when we come to compare the quotation with the

* Joshua xix. 15.