

THE

Reformed Presbyterian and Covenanters.

VOL. VI. FEBRUARY, 1868. No. 2.

IN WHAT LANGUAGE WAS MATTHEW'S GOSPEL ORIGINALLY WRITTEN?

BY D. M'ALLISTER.

THREE opinions have been broached and more or less widely entertained among Biblical scholars as to the original of the Gospel according to Matthew. One is, that the Greek text is the original. Another sets forth that this gospel was first written in Hebrew, or more accurately speaking, Syro-Chaldaic, the vernacular language of the inhabitants of Palestine in the days of the evangelist. The remaining one seeks to reconcile the two preceding views by assuming a *double* original—an inspired and independent gospel in each of the above languages. In weighing the testimony adduced in favor of these different opinions we will take them up in reverse order.

I. *The theory of a double original.* This, though supported by such names as Bloomfield, Olshausen and Thiersch, who, accepting a Hebrew original, are still loth to part with the Greek, bears upon its face the stamp of a shift made to avoid a difficulty. True, instances of an author writing a work in two languages are not unknown. Josephus, for example, as he himself tells us, wrote his History of the Jewish Wars originally in Hebrew, and subsequently translated it into Greek. But such cases are not parallel to the one in question; for in all of them the second performance is essentially, and even formally, a *translation* of the first, whereas the theory under consideration is that Matthew wrote his gospel in two entirely independent forms, first in Hebrew, afterward in Greek, the latter *not* a translation of the former, and both alike inspired.

No satisfactory reason can be given why this particular book of Scripture should be signalized by a double original and a reduplicate inspiration. Other portions of the New Testament were primarily intended for Jews though designed also for Greeks. Why, then, should there not be a double original for them as well as for the Gospel of Matthew? The other gospels were no less liable to omissions and interpolations than this. What special call, therefore, could there be

**ADDITIONAL REASONS FOR WITHDRAWING FROM THE ASSOCIATE
SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.**

Continued from Dec. No. 1867, page 345.

5. THE Synod is chargeable with the unwarrantable exercise of ecclesiastical power. (1) In merging one presbytery into another without consulting the wishes of the presbytery merged, or giving it any notice of that despotic measure; it being opposed to the order of the church to act on any matter affecting the integrity of a presbytery at the same meeting at which it is proposed, except by consent of parties. Minutes of Synod, 1865, pages 44 and 50; Book of Discipline, page 48.

(2) In sending a commission into the bounds of Clarion presbytery, "to visit the presbytery, with authority to settle all matters of difficulty presently existing in the bounds of that presbytery; particularly to inquire into the conformity of the members of the congregations of Unity, Clintonville, Rimersburg, and New Brighton, to the Standards of the Associate Church." Minutes for 1866, p. 58. This commission was sent into the bounds of presbytery, not to assist it, but to act independent of it—to do its work, and that too without its consent. This was robbing the presbytery of that rightful jurisdiction which is given to it in the Book of Discipline, and placing this jurisdiction in the hands of those who had not a right to exercise it—not even allowing the presbytery to act in conjunction with the commission; if indeed, they had been so lost to a sense of duty as to do so. But they were sent "especially to inquire into the state of the congregations above named, and to exercise discipline over them." Thus this irresponsible commission was empowered to usurp the jurisdiction of the session, though the Book of Discipline says "to this court (the session) belongs the whole management of the spiritual government and discipline of the congregation over which they preside," page 10. The session is responsible, for they are regularly ordained and installed to exercise government and discipline in a particular congregation. The commission is neither ordained nor installed to exercise these powers in a particular congregation, and of course the session cannot tamely yield up their jurisdiction into the hands of intruders, without proving recreant to the trust committed to them at their ordination. Neither can a presbytery, without a flagrant violation of their ordination vows, yield up their jurisdiction into the hands of intruders—who were never ordained nor installed to exercise jurisdiction over it, or the sessions over which it presides. Before a presbytery or session can be deprived of that jurisdiction which the Book of Discipline gives them, they must be convicted of such maladministration as to forfeit their jurisdiction over their respective charges. But neither the presbytery nor sessions of the congregations above named had ever been convicted of maladministration; yet the Synod treated them as though they had; she does not seem to discern the difference between being suspected of maladministration and being convicted of it.

But the commission never became a commission in fact, but only on

paper. The persons appointed to constitute this commission suffered the time appointed by Synod (the 1st of Sept. 1866) to pass by without convening, and then the person (Rev. Wm. Ballantine) appointed as chairman of the commission, assumed the responsibility of appointing another day, some two months later, for convening and constituting the commission. But neither did they meet on their own appointment.

And, because the writer wrote sundry letters to the convener of the commission, endeavoring to show that the appointment of the commission was unconstitutional, and ought not to convene, nor be submitted to, he is held guilty of the very grave offense of resisting the commission, and resisting the commission was regarded a resisting of the Synod.

Now, if Mr. Ballantine is equal to the commission and the commission is equal to the Synod, then to resist Mr. Ballantine is to resist the Synod, because things that are equal to the same are equal to each other. But the fact is, Mr. Ballantine is neither the commission nor the Synod, and to resist him is neither to resist the commission nor the Synod. And he could be invested with no authority at all until after the commission had constituted, and where there is no authority there is none resisted. Mr. B. was manifestly over sensitive about *maintaining* that authority which he had never *obtained*. But he did, without the commission constituting, assume the authority of citing the pastor of a congregation, and his congregation, to appear before a tribunal that possibly might have an existence at some future day.

This citation did not specify any charge against either pastor or people. It was manifestly the design of the chairman of the commission to hunt—to inquire after charges against both pastor and people when they would appear before him; and then to exercise the powers of a presbytery in judging the pastor, and the powers of a session in judging the people, in utter disregard of all church order, as set forth in the Book of Discipline, page 56, which says, “process against a minister must always commence before the presbytery of which he is a member, unless for an offense committed in the presence of a superior court, &c.” Again, page 10, “To this court (the session) belongs the whole management of the spiritual government and discipline of the congregation over which they preside.” Thus it is manifest that such an anomalous and monstrous tribunal has no jurisdiction over either a minister or congregation, and if not, they owe it no subjection, but on the contrary are bound to resist its highhanded encroachments on the jurisdiction both of the presbytery and session. The effect of the exercise of this unlawful authority is to set aside the lawful authority both of the presbytery and the session. It does not follow, that because ministers and people are bound to be subject to lawful, that they are bound to be subject to unlawful authority—it is not true that it is a duty to be subject to unlawful authority, under protest.

Mr. Sawyer, the clerk of the presbytery that suspended the writer, in a letter addressed to the writer, Aug. 29, 1866, says, “I have come to the conclusion that it is my duty to prosecute my protest (against a decision Synod refusing to sustain his reasons for the non-fulfillment of appointments,) vigorously, and if I cannot get redress the Synod will

have to go on without me. I cannot with freedom submit myself to the authority of the Associate Synod, thus carrying on a course of defection. The appointment of the commission that is soon to meet to settle all matters in the bounds of the Clarion Presbytery, I look upon as a despotic exercise of ecclesiastical authority; and altogether of a piece with the riding commissions of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. A synod has no right to send a commission into the bounds of a presbytery, to act independent of the presbytery. Such tyrannical proceedings as these cannot but create disgust and disaffection among the best friends of the Associate Church."

(3) The Synod exercised a power not warranted by the laws of the church, in commencing process against the writer for an alleged offense, "not committed in her presence, nor while she was in session," page 56. The Synod is the proper tribunal before which to try all offenses of ministers committed in her presence, for the minister is then under her jurisdiction, and not under that of the presbytery, for no one can be under the jurisdiction of two courts at the same time; but as soon as the Synod adjourns the minister falls back under the jurisdiction of the presbytery, and then the jurisdiction of the Synod ceases, and all such cases as may arise from one meeting of the Synod to another fall under the jurisdiction of the presbytery, and to this rule there can be no exception, for "process against a minister must *always* commence before that presbytery of which he is a member, except for an offense committed before a superior court," page 56; and page 81, it is said, "No judicatory has any jurisdiction over any church member or minister who is under the jurisdiction of any co-ordinate judicatory, * * and that (process) which is without authority, or *right of jurisdiction*, must be null and void from the beginning." Again, the Synod violated the order of the church in taking up and issuing the case in the absence of the accused, and in specifying neither time nor place, when the case would be taken up and tried, and I was told that a spectator insisted that the Synod would not take up the case in my absence, stating that the accused would be present in a few minutes. This same person states that the case was taken up and issued in ten minutes; thus affording the accused no opportunity for self-defense.

(4) The Synod is chargeable with the tyrannical exercise of authority, in placing W. R. M'Auley, a licentiate, under the jurisdiction of the Presbytery of Northern Indiana, while the Book of Discipline places him under the jurisdiction of Clarion Presbytery; to try him for an alleged offense, said to be committed in the Presbytery of Clarion, and which first became public in that presbytery; and the Book of Discipline says, "process against a licentiate must either commence before that presbytery in whose bounds the scandal charged was said to be committed, or in that presbytery where it first became public," page 56. Then the Book of Discipline places W. R. M'Auley fairly under the jurisdiction of Clarion Presbytery, because the offense charged was said to be committed in that presbytery, and it was in that presbytery that it first became public.

And when he is under the jurisdiction of that presbytery, he can be under the jurisdiction of no other; for it is said, page 81, "no judi-

atory has any jurisdiction over any church member or minister who is under the jurisdiction of any co-ordinate judicatory; * * and that (process) which is without authority, or right of jurisdiction, must be null and void from the beginning;" or that judicatory which is without the right of jurisdiction has no moral force in any of its acts.

Then the proceedings of the Presbytery of Northern India, in the case of W. R. M'Auley, are to all intents and purposes null and void. The right of jurisdiction is absolutely essential to the validity of any judicial act, either in church or state. The question of the right of jurisdiction must have precedence of all other questions, and until that question is satisfactorily settled, no other question ought to be entertained. Then, the Presbytery of Northern Indiana not having the right of jurisdiction, its decision ought to be held and treated as null and void.

(5) The Synod exercised unwarrantable power in instructing the Clarion Presbytery to "suspend the dispensation of sealing ordinances, in the congregations effected by these reports (of being pro-slavery Democrats), until after the investigation." Minutes for 1867, p. 27. Though it is true that a pro-slavery Democrat ought to be suspended, yet, according to the Book of Discipline, it is wrong to suspend for trial, until "a prosecution for scandal appears unavoidable," p. 62, or until there are a responsible accuser, and responsible witnesses, or until the court itself is shut up to the necessity of becoming prosecutor, until by crying fame, "some particular sin or sins is distinctly specified," p. 45, and until they know "that there is a probability of prosecuting it to conviction," same page, or until they have responsible witnesses, or reliable testimony of some kind. Though crying fame said there were persons in the bounds of the presbytery who were guilty of the sin named above, yet this sin had not been distinctly specified against any particular individual, with a probability of prosecuting it to conviction; and when the presbytery had fulfilled their mission, and had gone through their investigation or inquest, they were able to report no such cases as were supposed to exist. Again, the Synod acted disorderly in ordering the presbytery to go into congregations to exercise discipline, because the Book of Discipline says the *whole* management of the spiritual government and discipline in the congregation belongs to the session, p. 10. Two courts cannot have jurisdiction over the same congregation. It is certain that the session has the right of jurisdiction, and it is equally certain that the presbytery has not this right. And the Synod cannot, without the arbitrary exercise of power, either take this jurisdiction from the session, or give it to the presbytery.

For a just cause, the *presbytery* may take away the jurisdiction of a session, but it cannot assume this jurisdiction; but it may order the election, ordination and installation of another session, and may authoritatively order this session to take up any cases that call for the exercise of discipline.

Then there are two general reasons why the writer has withdrawn from the communion of the Associate Synod of North America. 1. Because she has set herself for opposing, instead of maintaining and

promoting sound doctrine; she opposes, instead of maintaining and promoting the present truth—the great truths, that Christ, the Mediator, “is the Governor among the nations,”—that all nations are bound to take his word as the only rule of faith and obedience,—that they are bound to enter into a covenant with God to receive his testimony, embrace his promises, believe the doctrines, practice the duties, observe the ordinances, and maintain a testimony in behalf of truth, and in opposition to error. 2. She, in the exercise of government and discipline, is chargeable with overturning, instead of maintaining the order of Christ’s house.

And the undersigned, being fully persuaded that the Associate Church of North America has thus corrupted the doctrine and order of the Church of Christ, feels himself morally bound thus to withdraw from the communion of said Synod, and will hold and regard all acts of said Synod against him to be null and void.

JOHN M’AULEY.

SANCTIFICATION.

A RIGHT to heaven, and meetness for heaven, are two things entirely different in Christian experience. They are related respectively to the doctrines of justification and sanctification. By the former, sin is pardoned, and the person of the sinner accepted through the imputed righteousness of Christ received by faith; by the latter the power of sin is overcome, and its pollution washed out through the imparted righteousness of Christ received by faith. “Christ is made of God to us both righteousness and sanctification.” 1 Cor. 1:30.

Justification is an act; sanctification is a work. Both are divine operations. Of the former believers are the objects, of the latter they are the subjects. The former is a divine act concerning them changing their state; the latter is a divine work within them changing their nature. By the former they are freed from bondage to the law as a covenant of works; by the latter they are conformed to the law as a rule of life. Both are fruits of the death of Christ. “We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sin.” Eph. 1:7. “The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.” John 1:7.

It may be helpful to some of God’s people who are groaning under the burden of sin, and longing for deliverance, if we trace the connection between the death of Christ and their sanctification. A clearer view of this may change the sad wail, “O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death!” into the joyous exclamation, “Thanks be unto God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

It must never be forgotten that sanctification comes to us solely through the atonement of Christ. “Ye are washed, ye are sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus.” 1 Cor. 6:11. Overlooking this, and seeking to obtain holiness through other channels, is one cause why believers make so little progress and have so little enjoyment. We can much more easily see that an act that respects us, as its object, is wholly of grace, than that this is the case also in a work that is wrought