

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXIV.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXXIII.

ARTICLE I.

AN EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN RECENT ASSAULTS ON PHYSICAL SCIENCE.

Theological Education. A Memoir for the consideration of the General Assembly of 1866, in Memphis. *Central Presbyterian*, Oct. 3, 10, 17, 24, and 31, 1866.

Memorial from the Rev. Robert L. Dabney, D.D., on Theological Education. Presented to the General Assembly at Mobile, May 21st, 1869.

Syllabus and Notes of the Course of Systematic and Polemic Theology taught in Union Theological Seminary, Virginia. By R. L. DABNEY, D. D. Published by the Students. Richmond: Shepperson & Graves, Printers. 1871.

A Caution against Anti-Christian Science. A Sermon on Colossians ii. 8. Preached in the Synod of Virginia, October 20, 1871, by ROBERT L. DABNEY, D. D. This sermon is printed by request of Lieutenant-Governor John L. Marye, Major T. J. Kirkpatrick, George D. Gray, J. N. Gordon, F. Johnson, and others, elders of the Presbyterian Church. Richmond: James E. Goode, Printer. 1871.

The "Memoir" on Theological Education published in the *Central Presbyterian* as intended for the consideration of the Memphis General Assembly, was not brought to the notice of that body; but in a somewhat modified form was presented as a "Memorial" to the General Assembly which met at Mobile in

VOL. XXIV., NO. 3—1.

Here we obtain the idea of causation, which lies at the foundation of all reasoning and philosophy. We get it from consciousness, observation, and experience. We find the cause of works of art in man. We then search for a cause of all the effects which we behold in nature and in the human soul. We conclude that these effects were produced by a rational, allwise and most powerful Being. We are thus conducted by investigation and reasoning to a great first cause, which is God.

In the language of Thornwell: "Unless, therefore, our reason is a lie, there is a God who made us and ordained the order which constitutes the beauty and glory of the universe. These heavens and this earth, this wondrous frame of ours and that more wondrous spirit within, are the products of his power and the contrivances of his infinite wisdom. External nature, to reason in her normal state, becomes an august temple of the Most High, in which he resides in the fullness of his being, and manifests his goodness to all the works of his hands. Nothing is insignificant, nothing is dumb. The heavens declare his glory. The firmament showeth his handiwork. The day elicits from the countless multitude of beings revealed by its light a tribute to his praise; and the night, with its array of planets, suns, and adamantine spheres wheeling unshaken through the void immense, utters a sound which is audible to every ear and intelligible to every heart. Science, when it has conducted us to God, ceases to speculate and begins to adore. All the illustrations which it has gathered in the fields it has explored are converted into hymns, and the climax of its inquiries is a sublime doxology."

ARTICLE V.

THE FAMILY IDEA OF THE CHURCH.

God has always had a visible kingdom upon the earth. He has never given up our race to the possession of the enemy, but has always reserved to himself a people to serve him.

The essential principles of the organisation of this kingdom have

always been the same. His infinite wisdom has prevented him from making any mistakes in the manner of its constitution. He has never, therefore, been compelled to change.

The kingdom has ever had the same sovereign, Jehovah; the same subjects, the families of his professed people; the same rule of government, the divine will; and the same essential privileges, symbolised in sacraments, justification and sanctification. "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism."

In consistency with this unity, there has been a progress, an unfolding of principles, a development of plan. It has always been, however, in entire harmony with the original, germinal idea. This development is seen in the sovereign of the kingdom. He is first revealed to us as God, either as essentially considered or as the father. When the fulness of the time was come, the Son manifests himself as the head over all things to his Church. Finally, the Spirit is revealed, under whose blessed regency it is our exalted privilege to live.

The law of the kingdom has not changed, but has been greatly developed from its original form. This is strikingly seen in the Sermon on the Mount. The law always said: "Love your neighbor." Its highest form was manifest in the New Commandment of the Master, "That ye love one another, *as I have loved you.*"

The privileges of the kingdom, as enjoyed by us, are, in all essential respects, just the same that Adam, and Abel, and Enoch possessed. But justification and sanctification, with the blessing that flow from them, are to us more explicit and less implicit than they were to them. They have grown wonderfully in the manner of their revelation to us.

The same truth is illustrated in the divinely ordained conditions of reception into the kingdom. Faith in God has always been the essential requirement. Since the fall, this trust must be a penitential one. Since the incarnation, it must be a contrite faith in the Son of God, as the vicarious, atoning Saviour of the soul.

So, lastly, we find the essential unity developed in the subjects.

of the kingdom. The Church was originally patriarchal, then national, and now universal. This is, however, but an evolution. The germ is the family. First, we have the individual patriarchal family. It then expands into a nation of families. It has finally grown into a race of families.

THE FAMILY IS THE GERM, THE INTEGER, THE MODEL OF THE
LORD'S CHURCHLY KINGDOM.

In the antediluvian period, this is seen in the original Church planted in the family of Adam, and perpetuated in the families of Seth. Cain showed himself to be without faith, a murderer and a liar. He was a subject of the rival kingdom of Satan. Seth was "appointed," as Eve believed, in the place of faithful Abel to continue the "royal generation." In the fifth chapter of Genesis, we have given to us the census, by families, of the "sons of God," or the true subjects of his kingdom, from which the lineage of Cain is excluded.

The patriarchal period was but a continuation of the antediluvian. The family of Noah is the connecting link. Ham and Japheth are excluded, God promising to "dwell in the tents of Shem." In the eleventh chapter we have another catalogue of the families of the faithful, in a direct line from Shem to Abraham, "the father of all them that believe." To him, in a solemn covenant, Jehovah grants all the privileges of the Church, guaranteeing them to him and to his seed after him. So it comes on down in a regular line in the families of Isaac and Jacob. Ishmael, the children of Keturah, and Esau are all rejected.

The Jewish period is now ushered in. All of Jacob's sons, with their families, are accepted. These having grown into a people, numbering six hundred thousand armed men, the simple patriarchal system was not sufficient. They needed a development of the idea to organise the separate families into a general assembly, a national Church. But the family idea is by no means abandoned. It is retained in all its integrity. Here we see the individual families organised, as before, into patriarchates. The patriarchates organised into the twelve family tribes.

We see the elders still ruling as heads of the families ; the general assembly being composed of seventy elders representing the patriarchal presbyteries of the nation. We see the passover, a national a religious, a family institution. We see every proselyte either incorporated into a family, through which he holds his connection in the Church, or, if himself a head of a household, bringing his family with him. We see Canaan, the type of the blessings of the kingdom, owned and inherited, as an inalienable right, by families. Add to all of these pregnant facts, the curses denounced by Jehovah upon the apostate families, Jer. x. 28 ; Zech. xiv. 17.

In the days of the patriarchs, the Church was wrapped in the swaddling bands of its infancy. During the Mosaic dispensation, it passed the immature and formative period of its youth. Upon the day of Pentecost, it first attained its majority and entered upon its divinely ordained mission to subdue the world to its Lord. No longer merely patriarchal, no longer merely national, it proclaimed itself the universal kingdom. In this enlargement, the germinal idea is not destroyed. It simply receives a wider field for its manifestation. The Church is now a race of families, or, at least, is seeking to become so. That this is now the primal form of the Church will appear from several considerations. Peter, commissioned to inaugurate the new dispensation, tells us plainly, on the day of Pentecost, that God had neither forgotten nor abrogated the original family covenant. Acts ii. 39. We are expressly told that whole families were at once admitted into the Church, as in the typical cases of Lydia, the Philippian jailer and Stephanas. What is, perhaps, more striking to some minds than these significant facts, we read in several places of family churches, as the family church of Aquila and Priscilla, Rom. xvi. 5, and 1 Cor. xvi. 19, the family church of Nymphas, Col. iv. 15, and the family church of Philemon, Phil. 2. Finally we recall to mind the gospel as announced to Abraham, under the present dispensation being fulfilled, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

It is surely an important fact in this connection to recall to mind that for twenty-five hundred years, nearly one-half of the

entire history of the race, the Lord had no other Church or kingdom except as it existed in the individual families of the chosen generation. Each enlargement since that day has been of a character not to interfere in the least with this original form of the Church. The Mosaic and Messianic dispensations present to us the Church, no longer as isolated, independent families, but as organised into a symmetrical government with the family as the unit of integration. We believe that when our Lord shall clothe Zion with her millennial glory, this sin-stricken race of ours will be found to be composed, from Dan to Beersheba, of happy Christian households, from whose hearthstone altar there shall daily arise the incense of the morning and evening sacrifice.

Every Christian family has all the essential elements of a Church of Christ. It has the head of the Church as its acknowledged Sovereign. It has the divinely revealed constitution of the Church as the law of the household. It has all the citizens of the kingdom, father, mother, children, servants. It has the divinely recognised official element of the Church, in the father, who combines in himself the several ministries, of instruction, of ruling, of worship, and of providence. It celebrates statedly the several services of the Church, consisting of instruction, prayer, and praise. It enjoys all the privileges of the Church, the sacraments and the more glorious realities that are signified by them.

Every particular congregation is an organised aggregation, divinely warranted, of a number of family churches. So the Master looks upon it, and so should we regard it. Where God's people associate themselves together for the purposes of public worship, they come not into union as separate individuals. Their individual connection with the kingdom is through the family. This is their private, personal tie to the Church. So far as their own spiritual interests are concerned, there is a sense in which this connection is all that is necessary. But man, the Christian, lives not for himself alone, nor simply for those of his own immediate kindred. He sustains sacred relations to his neighbors and to the world. Growing out of these wider ob-

ligations, he is led to form, by God's permission and command, parochial, provincial, and national ecclesiastical associations.

The first of these is the parochial, for Christian efficiency in the immediate vicinage. This is not, *de jure*, an association of individuals. It is a congregation of Christian families, "of professing Christians, with their offspring, voluntarily associated together for divine worship and godly living." It represents in itself and controls the families which compose it. The provincial assembly is a gathering together of representatives of the particular congregations. The national body is made up of representatives of the provincial; and the ecumenical, which is yet to be, will represent the several national assemblies. It is a system divinely perfect, adapted to an individual, a family, a neighborhood, a province, a state, a nation, or a world.

The family is the integer of the Lord's kingdom, the organised Church upon the earth. This is, if we mistake not, a pregnant fact. Let us observe a few truths which legitimately issue from it:

I. The *citizens* of the kingdom are *all* those attached to the *Christian household*, father, mother, children, servants.

The Bible is pervaded with this truth. In the Eden Church, Adam and Eve, the original pair, constituted the worshippers. The covenant there made, and there, alas! broken, was a family covenant, embracing the race in its issues, whether of life or of death. The protevangelion announced that the seed of the woman was to bruise the serpent's head. This sanctified every child issuing from a pious parentage; for, whether male or female, who could tell whether it would not prove to be the mother of the expected Deliverer, or the very Messiah himself?

Cain, Abel, and Seth, were all included in the kingdom, until the first born, by transgression, fell, and was, by God himself, expelled.

We find that when the race apostatised to such a degree that justice demanded its destruction, the seed corn of the perpetuated Church was found in a single pious family. So not only the "perfect" Noah, but his wife and children also entered the ark—the symbol of the Church of the redeemed.

When Lot, as another typical case, was rescued from Sodom, his wife and daughters (it seems that he had no sons) were included in the gracious plan of deliverance with himself. All of them, but two daughters, having despised the privilege, were left to the consequences of their own infatuation.

In that memorable transaction recorded in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, we have a most solemn renewal of God's gracious covenant, formerly made with Adam and Noah, as the natural heads of the race. The race, having now twice, with almost entire unanimity, rejected the privileges of this promise of the Father, he wisely determined to reject it, and to select for himself a spiritual seed to serve him. So Abraham was called from a land of idolatry, separated from his apostate kindred, and constituted by Jehovah the spiritual head of the elected race. To him as such the promise was made, which constitutes the covenant of love, whose gracious provisions we, his spiritual children, this day enjoy. To Abraham, the Lord said, as many as eight times during this particular transaction, that the covenant was not with him as an individual, but that it embraced "Sarah, his wife," "his seed," "those born in his house," and "those bought with his money."

When the "seed" had grown into a nation; when it had been hardened in the slavery of Egypt; when it had been rescued from its bondage and had been subjected to a further disciplinary education in the wilderness, and was now ready to enter the promised land; there occurred, as given by Moses, in the twenty-ninth chapter of Deuteronomy, another typical transaction. Let him describe it: "Ye stand this day, *all* of you, before the Lord your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, your *little ones*, your *wives*, and thy *stranger* that is in thy camp, from the *hewer of thy wood* unto the *drawer of thy water*: that thou shouldest *enter into covenant* with the Lord thy God, and into his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day."

When we examine the teachings of the New Testament, there are three passages, any one of which indicates clearly that this original constitution was not changed. When the mothers

brought their infants to the Lord, he not only rebuked those who forbade them to come, he not only took them into his arms to symbolise their participation in the blessings of his grace, but moreover made the distinct statement that the divine or *heavenly kingdom was composed of such little ones*. In this passage, as in all others, the kingdom of heaven is the Church of the Lord upon the earth.

Again, as we have already observed, Peter, ushering in the new dispensation with his inaugural address, announced to those, who had been reared in the family churches of the old economy, that the promise was still to them *and to their children*.

Equally significant with these is the teaching of the inspired theologian, as given to us in the seventh chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians. He says: "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else, were your children unclean; but now are they holy." This is a clear assertion, that *the faith of either parent makes the family a sacred household*. It consecrates, ecclesiastically, the other parent and the children.

II. *All the members of the Christian household, being citizens of the heavenly kingdom, are entitled to the enjoyment of all its spiritual privileges.*

These privileges are of two well defined classes:

1. Legal. By the transgression of the law, man made himself liable to its penalties. He became guilty. As such, he was condemned to the forfeiture of God's favor, and to the suffering of his eternal sovereign displeasure. This is surely a severe "bruising of his heel." The "seed of the woman" was to recover this by "bruising the head" of the destroyer. This was done, as we know, by the infinitely gracious act of substituting himself for his offending people, receiving the justly awarded penalty vicariously upon his own person, and procuring for them a legal righteousness which would meet the utmost demands of the holy law. All this is accepted by our offended Sovereign, as having been done for us by our representative, and, in virtue of it, a legal sentence of *justification* is rendered in our favor, by which we are absolved from all penal demands, and.

completely restored to a state of legal righteousness in the kingdom of Jehovah.

2. Moral. By justification, the legal status of the elect is made one of perfect innocency. Against them justice can have no claim. Indeed justice is pledged to their fullest protection in every legal right. But the elect are still personally sinful, depraved. Justification, in itself, does not affect their personal character, but only their legal standing. But God's perfect government cannot endure the paradox of legal righteousness and moral depravity in its citizens. So the heart in being justified is also regenerated and made the indwelling of the sanctifying Spirit, by whose purifying influences it is to be made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.

Thus legal and personal holiness are the two great privileges of real citizenship in the kingdom of heaven.

These belong, of right, to every member of every Christian family. We say this simply, because the King has said it, with all the solemnity of a covenanted royal promise. He said it to Abraham, with repeated affirmations, "I will be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee." He wrote it with his own finger on the stony tablets of the Sinaitic covenant, "I am a jealous God, keeping mercy for thousands of generations of them that love me." He commissioned his servant Peter to announce authoritatively on the inauguration day, "The promise is to you and to your children." He directed the apostle of the Gentiles to declare that he regarded the children of pious parentage as holy. Upon these declarations, we reäffirm that all the inestimable privileges of citizenship rightfully belong to every member of the godly household.

They are theirs of right; are they theirs in actual possession? This is quite another question. My father may leave me an inheritance of wealth, but I may refuse or neglect to claim it. If we mistake not, this is just what a vast number of God's people are constantly doing. Fathers and mothers are enjoying the privileges of citizenship, a justifying and sanctifying righteousness. The same belong to their children as a promised blessing from the Master. These parents, however, either refuse to

believe it, or neglect to claim it for their children. They have no realisation of the sanctity with which God regards the family covenant. Their offspring are to them but as the issue of 'the uncircumcised Philistines. They seem to think that justification and regeneration are impossible in infancy; that their little ones must be suffered to grow up with God's curse resting upon them, with unchecked depravity within them, until, after some years of service to Satan, they shall be converted to the Lord. We believe nothing of the kind.

But, on the contrary, it is our faith, that if believing parents would precede the very conception and birth of their children with a consecration of them to the Lord; would, upon their introduction to the world, solemnly renew that dedication, and, in faith, claim for them the blessings of the covenant, that every one of them would be legally justified and morally sanctified from its mother's womb, and thus never have an experience outside of the covenant of grace. We devoutly believe that the only reason this is not true in every case, is due to parental delinquency in failing to claim the divinely promised spiritual birthright of the child.

This is the Lord's chosen way to perpetuate and extend his Church. It is a growth from within, like the mustard seed. It may, here and there, pick up one and another, according to the election of grace. But the regular, normal mode of increase is through the multiplication of Christian families, the blessings descending from generation to generation in an ever-growing ratio.

III. The members of the family church are entitled not only to the spiritual privileges of the kingdom, but also to those *ordinances* in which they are symbolically set forth.

Those spiritual blessings we have already learned are a legal justification, through the vicarious satisfaction rendered to the law by our Saviour, and a moral sanctification wrought within the soul by the purifying Spirit. These gracious gifts were enjoyed by the family of Adam and by every pious household since.

On account of the soul's connection with a material body, man has ever needed the aid of an outward symbolism to embody and bring sensibly before him spiritual realities. While a few may school themselves to such habits of abstract thinking that to them these outward aids are not so essential, to the mass of believers they are indispensable. These sensible signs of spiritual truths are known as sacraments.

They are, and always have been, of two great classes, corresponding to the spiritual blessings which they are designed to typify. There are sacraments of atonement or justification, and there are sacraments of purity or sanctification. The information which God has given us of the patriarchal age is quite limited. We know that the organisation of the Church was confined to the family, and that the mode of worship was correspondingly simple. There were undoubtedly sacramental rites of both classes.

1. Of justification, there were the *rainbow* and the offering of bloody *sacrifices*. Abel's firstling represented to him the Lamb of God, his own vicarious substitute. In the shedding of its blood, he saw God's plan of saving sinners, by laying their sins upon a sinless, suffering substitute. In this way, his justification through faith in Christ was symbolised to him and to every patriarchal Christian.

2. Of sanctification, there were *washing* and *circumcision*; the former probably, Gen. xxxv. 2, the latter certainly, Gen. xvii. 10. Both of these rites were typical of moral purity; for in each the putting away of the filth of the flesh clearly figures the cleansing of the heart.

In the Mosaic or Jewish period, the Church passed through the most complicated stage of its existence. Its system of ceremonialism was gorgeous and extensive. In it we find a reference to the legal and moral phases of redemption. One set of ceremonies brought before the Jewish mind the atoning Messiah. Another set forth, with equal vividness, their need and the assurance of spiritual renovation.

1. The legal or justifying sacraments were the numerous.

bloody *sacrifices* and the yearly *passover*. These ceremonies were not only foolish, but cruel, if they did not embody some essential spiritual truth.

2. The moral or sanctifying sacraments were, as in the patriarchal age, *circumcision* and divers *washings*.

The sacramental changes made in passing from the patriarchal to the Jewish age were, as we perceive, very slight. The principal difference lies in the multiplication and public administration of the sacraments already given.

That these ordinances were religious, and not civil, is seen from the fact that they antedate the incorporation of the Church with the Jewish nation. It is manifest, moreover, from repeated and clear statements of the Scriptures.

1. As to the sacraments of justification, sacrifices and the passover, a few passages will suffice. The former were offered by religious priests, and are constantly styled "offerings unto the Lord." The latter, at its original institution, Exod. xii. 11, is called the "Lord's passover." Deut. xvi. 2, they are directed to "sacrifice the passover to the Lord their God." 1 Cor. v. 7, 8, is quite explicit, "For even Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us."

2. As to the sacraments of sanctification the proof is no less clear. There is no question as to the washings. They were manifestly religious lustrations. As to circumcision, there is no difficulty in showing it to be a religious ceremony. It was the seal of a religious covenant between Abraham and Jehovah, Gen. xvii. 11. It is constantly used with reference to its spiritual meaning, Deut. x. 16, and the people of God are exhorted to "circumcise the foreskin of their heart. Deut. xxx. 6, the promise is given that "the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, that thou mayest live." It is frequently so used by Jeremiah iv. 4; vi. 10; ix. 25, 26. Col. ii. 11, is a similar passage, "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." Rom. iv. 11, puts the question beyond dispute. Abraham "received the sign

of circumcision; a *seal of the righteousness* of the faith which he had yet, being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised." It is, however, not at all essential to our argument to prove circumcision a religious rite. In fact, it would relieve a partial difficulty, could it be shown to be wisely national.

In the present Messianic dispensation, there is simplicity of organisation and of worship. The sacramental element is retained, but not in the profuse abundance of the preceding period.

1. There is now but one sacrament of righteousness or justification, a sacrificial feast, the *Lord's Supper*, in which the broken bread and poured wine evidently set forth Christ as sacrificially crucified amongst us. It is a ceremony of great simplicity. 2. There is also, for this period, but one sacrament of holiness or sanctification, washing or *baptism*.

The change from the former periods is more apparent than real. The original sacrament of justification was the bloody sacrifice. To this was added, in the middle period, the paschal feast, which contained, however, the sacrificial element. The final form of the sacrament is a sacrificial feast, a figurative though not real sacrifice. This final change was doubtless made for two sufficient reasons: (1). To accommodate the sacrament to the more spiritual and simple economy of the gospel; and (2). To do away with the shedding of blood, as the great Antitype has already shed his blood for the remission of our sins. The sacrament is no longer prophetic, it is now commemorative. *The essential sacrificial idea is found in all its forms.* So it has always been substantially the same.

The original sacrament of sanctification was doubtless washing. Its appropriateness and the generality of its practice in the different forms of religion which have prevailed among men seem to point to this fact. Religious washings prevailed in ancient Egypt, Greece, and Rome. The earliest mention of it in the Scriptures is in Jacob's injunction to his family church after his return to Canaan. As a part of the preparation, suitable to the consecration of God's altar at Bethel, he bids his family to wash themselves. There are other cases recorded before the introduc-

tion of the Sinaitic dispensation. Circumcision was introduced as an additional sacrament of purification in the renewal of the covenant with Abraham, and was accordingly practised during the last four hundred years of the patriarchal dispensation.

During the Mosaic period these two sacraments were continued unchanged, perhaps except in the frequency of the religious washings.

When the "last days" were ushered in, circumcision was dropped, and, in accordance with the simplicity of the gospel, instead of the "divers baptisms" of the old economy, we have a single washing as the perpetuated sacrament of holiness. The change, therefore, from the beginning has not been great. Indeed we may say that we have the moral sacrament now just as Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Moses, enjoyed and practised it. It has *always been the use of water upon the body to symbolise the purification of the soul*. Circumcision was a more bloody episode in the economy of the kingdom.

Under all dispensations, these sacraments, of both classes, have been the common privilege of the entire Christian household, father, mother, children, and servants.

The sacraments of the patriarchs were sacrifice and washing. There was no limitation of either to parents or to children to the exclusion of each other.

The sacraments of the law were sacrifice and the paschal supper for one, and washing and circumcision for the other. There is no question as to the legal sacraments. Though it is probable that the father usually sacrificed for the family, yet it is certain that the whole household partook of the sacramental supper. Of the moral sacraments, washing was administered to all, indeed to the very house itself and its furniture. Circumcision however was limited to the male portion of the Church. This is a seeming exception to our italicised statement above. It is, however, only apparent. The sacrament of justification was administered in one of its forms, the supper to the entire family. So the sacrament of sanctification in one of its forms, washing was administered to the entire household.

Just here the question arises, Why were women not circum-

cised? The reason commonly given is, that they were not physically adapted to it. This is perhaps not true; for we know that some African races, Abyssinian Christians, and Mahomedans, have practised female circumcision. The great prophet of Islam says that it is an "ordinance for men, and honorable for women." At any rate, this answer is not fully satisfactory, because the question recurs, Why did God appoint a sacrament for his Church, of which only one-half of the race could partake?

We may not fully understand the reason, God often does things which are to us incomprehensible. We know that for all his acts he has a sufficient reason, though we may not be able to discover it. The following thoughts suggest themselves: 1. According to the Scriptures, as we have already seen, man is the head of the woman and her representative. 2. This sacrament was an outward symbol of inward purity. The important fact was the inward state, from which woman was not debarred. 3. The important, and to our mind satisfactory, consideration is, that there was another sacrament of sanctification, under the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, when circumcision was practised. Every religious lustration was a sacrament of holiness. Of these women participated. Women did not *personally* partake, ordinarily, of sacrifice, one of the sacraments of justification; nor of circumcision, one of the sacraments of sanctification. They *representatively* participated in both; and they personally partook of the other two sacraments, the passover for justification, and washing for sanctification.

In the present period of the Church, there is, as we have seen, but one sacrament of each class, the sacrificial supper for righteousness, and washing for holiness. Both of these are certainly as old as Moses. It is morally certain that they are both, in spirit, as old as Adam. Since the days of Sinai, at least, these have been recognised family religious sacraments, of which up to the time of Pentecost, at any rate, the entire household partook.

We now assert that they are *still family ordinances*, of which it is both the privilege and the duty of every member of the

Christian household to partake. The following facts collected from what we have already said, are to us determinative of the question:

1. From the giving of the law to Pentecost, no one doubts the admission of all to the paschal supper, and to the baptisms of the old economy. Where is the passage in the New Testament, which, either directly or by fair implication, forbids a continued family participation? It cannot be found.

2. Matth. xix. 13-15. Our Lord here declared that the citizens of the Messianic kingdom are children. If children are such, they surely should have the privileges of citizenship.

3. Matth. xxviii. 19, 20. This is the great commission announcing the fundamental principles of the new economy soon to be inaugurated. In it, the Master directs his apostolic servants to disciple the nations. In this work two things are necessary. He gives them in their order. (1). Baptise them into the name of the Trinity. (2). Teach them. Such is the true conception of the Church's growth. Baptise the children, and then teach them the Christian doctrine and life.

4. Peter was the master mason to lay the corner-stone of the Christian temple. In that corner he put, by the divine direction, this foundation-stone, "the promise is unto you and to your children."

5. In several places, we are told that upon the faith of the head of the household, the entire family were baptized as in the Church.

6. The interesting passage, 1 Cor. vii. 14, is of decisive importance. It clearly teaches the sacredness of the Christian family, and, by necessary implication, their right to all the privileges of the Church.

7. Finally, in consulting the records of the Church, we find that from the earliest days, from the apostolic age, the sacrament of sanctification, at least, was administered to all the family.

These facts ought to leave no reasonable doubt on the mind of the candid and intelligent, that the sacraments belong to the family Church, and are to be administered to all of its members.

A special question suggests itself here for careful examination, Ought the entire Christian family to partake of the Lord's Supper?

The creeds and the practice of the Christian world answer this question in the negative, and the following reasons are usually given for the judgment:

1. The supper requires for its proper participation a spiritual preparation, to which the young child is not adequate. 1 Cor. xi. 28. To this, however, we might suggest: (1). The requirement of self-examination is made only of those who are capable of meeting it. So it was of circumcision and the passover, under the old economy. There was for adults a spiritual preparation necessary for the proper reception of all the Old Testament sacraments. This, however, did not forbid their reception by children. (2). Such a principle would forbid baptism also to infants. A spiritual preparation for this is clearly required in the Scriptures. Acts ii. 38. Before Philip would baptize the eunuch, he required him to confess that he believed with all his heart.

2. The sacraments were not universally participated in, under the old economy. Women were not circumcised. Women and children did not, as a usual thing, sacrifice. As some of the old sacraments were partial, so one of the new may be.

With reference to this, we must not forget that women and children partook, in some form, of both classes of the sacraments, those of justification and those of sanctification. If the women were not circumcised, they engaged in religious washings, which were, symbolically, the same. If the women and children did not ordinarily sacrifice, they did partake of its sacramental equivalent, the passover.

Under the present dispensation, there is but one form for each sacrament, and so it would seem that all should partake of both.

3. It is further urged that the supper is too solemn an ordinance to be lightly celebrated. It must not be made a common family meal. This was the very mistake of the Corinthian Church. 1 Cor. xi. 20-22.

This is certainly true. It must not be made an ordinary meal. Its religious character must never be forgotten. Children of

irregular, immoral lives should not partake. By such conduct they forfeit their birthright privileges under the covenant, as Cain and Esau and many others did. The same, however, is true of adult communicants. Let the same tests be used for each, so far as applicable.

In addition to what has already been said, there are certain other considerations, which render it probable that the Christian world may have made a practical mistake in its position of exclusive adult communion.

1. We can conceive of no objection against family participation in supper, which does not equally lie against family baptism.

2. The supper is, as we have seen, but a continuation of the passover. Of it, the entire religious household partook for fifteen centuries. Where is the authority for the exclusion of a part of the family now? We cannot find it.

3. The ground of the admissibility of children to the sacrament of justification is the same as that upon which the sacrament of sanctification is administered to them. In either case, it is not on the score of their personal merit, but upon the gracious promise of God to the *faith of their parents*.

This, as we know, is the reason why we can administer the sacraments to the children of believing parents only. Faith is undoubtedly required for their proper reception. But God, in his love, accepts the faith of the representative head of the family, so long as the child is legally represented by its parents.

He, moreover, graciously promises that those spiritual blessings, which are thus sacramentally set forth, shall be given to the children of parents, who have hearts to ask it and to look for it.

4. The whole family idea of the Church seems to lead to the same conclusion.

The Christian world, it is feared, has lost sight of the family idea to a great degree. Our Christianity is not sufficiently private and domestic. It is too exclusively public.

5. The practical effect of the exclusion of our children from the supper is, in its influence on parents, to cause them to regard their offspring as spiritual aliens, and thus to weaken the sense

of parental responsibility; in its influence on the children to deprive them of a powerful stimulus to duty.

With both parents and children, baptism is a thing of the past. They need the moral stimulant of the perpetual, regularly recurring sacrament, the supper.

Before entering upon our fourth point, there is another question as to the sacraments, upon which this discussion sheds to us a convincing light. It is one of the vexed questions of Protestantism; a point which, we venture to say, has assumed in our theological literature a far greater than its Scriptural importance; a point which has awakened much uncharitable feeling, and has wasted much precious time. It is the particular manner of administering the sacrament of sanctification. The Scriptural doctrine seems to us quite simple:

1. It is a sacrament, an outward rite symbolising a spiritual truth.

2. The truth symbolised is the regenerating, sanctifying work of the Spirit.

3. The symbol is the use of the purifying element upon the body.

4. The manner of its application, as to quantity of water used, part of the body to which applied, attitude or action of the body when administered, is a question of no essential importance whatever. Several modes were doubtless practised under the old economy. The ablutions of the priests usually consisted doubtless in a bathing of the entire body. We are told that the molten sea, which is estimated to have held over twenty thousand gallons, was for this special purpose. 2 Chron. iv. 6. In addition, they were accustomed to wash their feet and hands only in their frequent approaches to the altar. Exod. xxx. 18-20. To ceremonially purify an unclean vessel, contaminated by a dead animal, it was required to be soaked, as it were, in water. Lev. xi. 32. In the purification of the leper, his clothing and himself were to be thoroughly washed, and the water of purification was to be seven times sprinkled upon him. Lev. xiv. 7. In the consecration of the Levites, they were to shave themselves, wash their clothing, and the water of purifying was to be sprinkled

upon them. Num. viii. 7. For general ceremonial uncleanness, a water of separation was prepared by the use of the ashes of a red heifer. It was "a purification for sin," we are told. This was to be sprinkled upon persons, tents, and vessels, as a sacrament of cleansing. Num. xix.

5. As a symbol of the Spirit's work, any mode usually practised is proper, though pouring of the water seems the most appropriate.

IV. The *government* of the kingdom is a patriarchal or presbyterial and representative one.

1. The administration of government, civil and ecclesiastical, is by the great King committed to the father as the head and representative of the family. To the original pair this fact was announced in the sentence passed by Jehovah Elohim upon Eve, "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

The original covenant was made with Adam; it was renewed with Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as the legal contracting parties representing those who were brought under its obligations and made the inheritors of its promises.

The inheritances of the tribes in Canaan were assigned to them "according to their families," and the families were designated by their legal representatives, the patriarchal head. The only exception to this proves the fact very clearly. The males in one branch of Manasseh's descendants became extinct in Zelophehad. This was true at the time of the division. As the allotment was made to the males, it seemed as though this branch would be cut off from its proper inheritance. To prevent this, a special exception was made in its favor; so that, as there was no patriarch to represent them, the heritage passed immediately to the daughters.

The sacrificial offerings were made by the father, not for himself alone, but as the recognised agent acting for his entire household. All the exercises of public worship were performed by the father. Every first born male, the natural head of his family, was consecrated to Jehovah. This claim we understand to be based in the Lord's proprietorship in the entire race, of

which these were the most fitting types. Every male was required to make a solemn presentation of himself three times every year before the Lord in his tabernacle or temple. This was not an individual transaction. It was a vicarious act, the adult males representing the females and minors.

To illustrate how the entire family was regarded as represented in its head, observe the awful history of Achan. In the first place, notice how he was discovered. The tribe was first designated; then the first patriarchal branch; then the next subordinate family division; then the particular household; and, finally, the individual culprit. It shows most clearly the family organisation of society. Now note the punishment of the criminal. It was a dreadful execution by stoning and burning. In it Achan was not alone involved. In the head, the whole family was considered to have sinned, and so "his sons, and his daughters" suffered the same direful punishment.

The supremacy of the husband and father is, in strong terms, re-affirmed in the New Testament. "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church."

2. In the human administration of the divine government in the Church there are several distinct ministries to be filled. If we mistake not, they may be all comprehended under four heads: 1. The ministry of *instruction*. 2. The ministry of *worship*. 3. The ministry of *authority*, or ruling. 4. The ministry of service, or of the *tables*.

We have already seen that these ministries are all filled by males. Let us observe the special arrangements for the three dispensations of the Church.

The *patriarchal* period stretches from the creation of Adam to the rearing of the tabernacle in the wilderness, over twenty-five hundred years. Nearly one-half of man's existence upon the earth. During all this time, there was no organisation of the Church outside of the elect patriarchal households. The Church was the family. The family was the Church. There was, so far as we are told, no combination of these family churches into congregational churches.

The several ministries of the Church, teaching, worship, ruling, service, were all lodged in the patriarchal head of the family. He was Jehovah's chosen agent for the exercise of his authority and for the communication of his truth. He was the leader of the worshippers in presenting their devotions upon God's altar. To him pertained the duty of providing the necessaries for the service of the Lord.

The *Mosaic* economy extends from the wilderness to Pentecost, a period of about fifteen hundred years. The Church was now organised into tribes and into a nation. The primal family organisation was not abandoned. It was retained in its integrity, and made the basis of the development into a broader association. We still have the family Church, the family government, the patriarchal ministry.

As these families were grouped into tribes, and the tribes further generalised into a nation, there were introduced officials to correspond to this enlargement. We find, in addition to the patriarchal ministry, a tribal and national ministry. For the offices of instruction, we find a line of *prophets*. For the priestly functions of worship, we see the *family of Aaron*. For the ministry of discipline or authority, we have an assembly of seventy *elders*, as the chief council, with subordinate, local, patriarchal presbyteries. For the ministry of the tables, to provide for the public worship, we find the *Levites*, of the three families of Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, and the Nethinims.

During this dispensation we see a separate class of officers for each function of the Church's ministry.

It should be observed, moreover, that these officers of all classes, were patriarchal presbyters or elders.

Under the *Christian* dispensation, the Church has received a still further enlargement. It is no longer tribal, or even national. It has become general, it belongs to the race.

This fact has modified its administration. Contrary to an *a priori*, superficial judgment, it has simplified rather than complicated its economy.

As in the prior development, the family organisation is not abandoned. It is yet retained, and made the foundation for an

organisation which is to include the race. The family churches with their legitimate officers are the integers of the universal Church.

The families are now classified into congregations. The congregations are collected into presbyteries. The presbyteries are arranged into synods. This generalisation may be carried on till it becomes co-extensive with the race.

In its present dispensation, the Church has but two classes of officers to discharge all of its necessary ministerial functions. The first class are known as pastors, teachers, ministers of the word, ambassadors, bishops, elders, preachers, etc. The others are called deacons.

The elder, the bishop, and the pastor are one and the same officer in the New Testament economy. The first title is the designation of rank or authority. The other two are expressive of the duties pertaining to the office. That the office is one is manifest from the whole tenor of the New Testament, as well as from several special passages. In the well-known charge given by Paul to the officers of the Ephesian Church, recorded in the twentieth chapter of the Acts, they are officially styled *elders*, and as such are enjoined to discharge their *episcopal* and *pastoral* duties. All three terms are thus used with reference to them.

Again, the epistles of Timothy and Titus, which give detailed instruction as to the Constitution of the Church, contain also special directions as to its officers. In the third chapter of the first pastoral to Timothy, the two permanent offices of the Christian Church are designated as those of the bishop and deacon. There is no mention of any other. Shall we conclude that the office of the elder was not to be recognised as permanent? No. Because it is specially spoken of in other places, as 1 Tim. v. 1, 17, and Tit. i. 5. The elder then must be regarded as a bishop or as a deacon. 1 Tim. v. 17 shows him to be a bishop.

We may ask: Is there any distinction recognised amongst this class of officers? None except that which obtains among officials of co-ordinate rank. We learn from the inspired records that each Church, like the Jewish synagogue, had its presbytery

of elders. See Acts xiv. 23; xx. 17; Titus i. 5. In the passage already quoted, 1 Tim. v. 17, they are apparently divided into two sections: 1. To rule simply. 2. To rule and to labor in word and doctrine. As the Jewish synagogue had a presiding officer over its bench of elders, so the present parochial presbytery has a superintending pastor, who stands among them *primus inter pares*.

We must say, as we pass, that we do not think that our form of government presents these officers in an entirely unexceptionable way. It makes the bishop or pastor a different officer from the ruling elder. Chaps. III and V. We know no authority for this in the inspired Constitution. It further has the appearance of degrading the elder's position by not including him seemingly in the necessities of a quorum. Chap. X., sec. 7. Again, it is to us quite questionable whether it was proper to join the ruling elder and the deacon in the same formula for installation and ordination. The right place for the elder is with his co-ordinate, the chief pastor. Chap. XIII.

The functions of the religious ministry we have already ascertained to be four: Instruction, worship, authority, and service. Which of these pertain to the eldership, and which to the diaconate? The ministry of instruction; the ministry of worship, the ministry of authority all belong to the elder.

The ministry of service, or, as it is perhaps better known, the ministry of the tables, belongs to the deacon. It is his province to serve, or provide for the table of the Lord, the table of the congregation, the table of the chief pastor, and the table of the poor.

The Church as a private organisation has its home in the Christian family. It works upon the public through parochial, provincial, and national assemblies. The father combines in himself all the functions of the religious ministry in the domestic private Church. The elders and deacons are officers of the public organisation. How are they chosen?

1. They should be family presbyters. One of the special qualifications divinely required for the proper filling of each

office is the headship of a family and the judicious discharge of the duties growing out of that position. 1 Tim. iii. 2, 4, 5, 12.

2. In our judgment, they should be chosen by the family presbyters of the congregation of the vicinage. Any limitation of the privileges of suffrage, either in Church or State, is very unpopular in these days. We have our convictions, and these we must express whether shared by few or many. We will briefly give the reasons of our belief upon this point.

(1). God, in his infinite wisdom, has made man the ruling element in society. This he has distinctly stated in the early and the late revelations of his will. He then is the repository of God's authority upon earth, whether in civil or ecclesiastical society. It is a high honor, but involves a dread responsibility.

(2). There are direct and positive prohibitions of all public presentations on the part of woman. She is required to be silent in the Church; she is not permitted to speak; she is not suffered to teach, nor to exercise authority. 1 Cor. xiv. 34-35; 1 Tim. ii. 11-12.

(3). The representative idea runs through the divine economy. Adam represented his posterity. Christ represents us, his people. The tribe of Levi represented the other tribes in religious worship. The whole system of Church government is representative. The parochial presbytery represents the electors of the congregation. The district presbytery represents the parochial presbyteries. The general presbytery represents the provincial presbyteries. So the father, the husband represents his family church, and is its divinely appointed elector in the constitution of the congregational Church. The parochial presbytery thus represents the family churches of the congregation, the integers of the ecclesiastical organisation.

The writer of the present article was criticised as having a tendency to congregationalism, because in a pamphlet published by him some years since on our *Church Constitution*, he took the ground that the people of God were the fountains of power in his Church. These critics asserted quite triumphantly that all ecclesiastical rulers represent the great Head of the Church,

as the supreme source of authority. This assertion is most assuredly true, but does not at all affect the position of the writer. Authority has its divine and its human aspects. All authority in the State is representative of the King of kings—this is its divine phase. In a republic, it is exercised in the name of the sovereign people—this is its human relation. All power in the Church is legitimate only as it bears the seal of the only King in Zion—such is its divine aspect. All power in the Church, the King has committed to those family heads, whom he regenerates and thus qualifies for citizenship in his kingdom. All ecclesiastical authority, therefore, in its human phase, is patriarchal, presbyterial, popular, representing the individual converted electors of the commonwealth of Israel.

Gathering up the results, we have found the family the integer, the model of the Church. From this generic truth we have obtained several special ones. All members of the Christian family are members of the Church. All members of the Christian family are entitled to the spiritual privileges of the Church. All members of the Christian family are entitled to the sacraments of the Church. Finally, the government of the Church is patriarchal, presbyterial, representative.

NOTE.—The article on the Law of the Tithe, the first part of which appeared in the last number of this *Review*, proved to be too extensive to be completed in the present number. The author, preferring not to wait for this comparatively slow process of publication, has had the entire article printed in pamphlet form. Those of our readers who desire to see the remainder of this able and learned discussion, we would refer to the writer, the Rev. A. W. Miller, D. D., Charlotte, N. C.—EDITORS S. P. REVIEW.