

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

VOL. XXXVI.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXXV.

ARTICLE I.

PROFESSOR WOODROW'S SPEECH BEFORE THE
SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

Moderator, Fathers, and Brethren:

It affords me, notwithstanding the peculiar circumstances which surround us to night, no little pleasure once more to meet with the Synod of South Carolina. It is not the first time that I have enjoyed the pleasure of addressing this body; many years ago I met with you in the dark time that tried men's souls. And therefore I come to you as no stranger. At that meeting, Moderator, I had the satisfaction of communing with my brethren touching the interests of the same Seminary which is occupying so much of your attention at this time. We had been broken and blasted by the fortune of war; we were in the deepest depression, and despair well-nigh filled every heart: and under these circumstances we came together to consider what we should do for our beloved Church. Stout-hearted as is my brother and father who is sitting there before you [Dr. Adger], wrapped up in the Theological Seminary as its venerated Chairman, the Rev. Dr. Howe, so much loved by all—wrapped up in the Seminary as he was—even they were ready to give up all, to retire, the one to his farm in one direction, the other to seek a home in another,

means nothing more to him than that there are men always that will be saved, and may be relied on, hence, to teach a vital Christianity). So, on the other hand, the Bible is perfect, as is attested most of all by its moral teaching, and this is his exact position when he asserts that we sell the book when we go back in our Silliman complaints, and give Princeton a praise for writing the tract which most completely reasons things away.

JOHN MILLER.

ARTICLE V.

OUR FOREIGN MISSIONARY POLICY.

There is manifestly a difference of opinion among earnest men as to our Church's policy for conducting foreign missions. There is also an extensive dissatisfaction with the provisions made in our Constitution for ordering and pushing this urgent work. The reasons for this dissatisfaction have frequently been presented to the Church, are familiar to ministers, and pertain more to what is not said, than to what is said, in our Book. Propositions are pending, and movement is now on foot, for making additional provision to meet questions that have recently sprung into positions of importance.

This, therefore, seems to be the time, if ever, for the writer to lay before the Church some opinions towards which his mind has been inclining for several years, and which have now become convictions. The object of this article is not polemic, but didactic; a sincere effort shall be made to regulate its style by its object.

We purpose calling attention to certain fundamental principles of Presbyterianism, and then severely following them out to practical results. This course should give us the best methods of conducting foreign missionary work. For the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism, if scriptural, must lead to the best methods of "preaching the gospel to every creature." Careful

study of these principles will doubtless suggest to the reader, as it has done to the writer, important changes in both our Constitution and our plan of work, changes more important than any yet proposed, but not dangerous to the health and vigor of the Church. It is claimed by some, and conceded by others, that some amendment should be made to our Constitution. The only question between them and the writer is, What amendment or amendments shall be made?

Before proceeding to speak of changes particularly, we would submit two or three remarks upon the general subject of amendments. 1. No amendment should be made which is inconsistent with fundamental principles of Presbyterianism as expressed in our Constitution. 2. Any amendment may be made which is consistent with these fundamental principles, provided they add something to the strength and certainty with which the Church prosecutes her missionary work. 3. Any custom that has worked reasonably well in a past condition is to be venerated and not lightly changed; but if under new conditions a change is proposed which offers reasonable certainty of results better and larger than the old, the adoption of the new method is not irreverence towards the old.

It is unnecessary for this article to discuss what all concede, the Church's call into the foreign field. It may, however, remind the reader that the providential call which is borne from across the seas and the continents, is bursting upon us with an urgency akin to that from Macedonia, which fell upon the ears of the Apostle to the Gentiles. Hence the importance of equipping the Church most thoroughly for responding most vigorously to the loud demand.

What are some of the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism that should guide us in efforts to determine the most vigorous policy that can be adopted for our foreign missionary work? We answer:

1. The unity of the Church, as a body whose head is Christ. See Confession of Faith, Chapters 25, 26, 30, 31.

2. "The Church is governed by various courts in regular gradation which are all nevertheless Presbyteries, as being composed

exclusively of presbyters. These courts are Church Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and the General Assembly." Form of Government, Chapter V., Section 1, Pars. I., II.

3. "All church courts are one in nature, constituted of the same elements, possessed inherently of the same kinds of rights and powers, and differing only as the Constitution may provide." Form of Government, Chapter V., Section 1, Par. III.

In these statements it is expressly declared that all church courts, viz., Session, Presbytery, Synod, and General Assembly, are the same in nature, in elements, and in inherent powers and rights, that any difference in them is made by the provisions of the Constitution. Whatever one court may inherently do, any other court may inherently do. If one may ordain officers, each of the others may ordain officers. If one may organise churches, so may all the rest. If one may send out evangelists, so may all the others. If one may exercise discipline, so may each of them. If one may conduct foreign missions, so may all.

4. But, "for the orderly and efficient dispatch of ecclesiastical business, it is necessary that the sphere of action of each court should be distinctly defined." Form of Government, Chapter V., Section 1, Par. IV.

Here is our warrant for distribution of power among the courts; and the rest of this Chapter is occupied in making the distribution among them.

Observe that this distribution is declared to be necessary upon *grounds of order and efficiency*, not upon any specific warrant or requirement of God's word. The ordinary judgment of the rulers of God's house is the arbiter of the necessity for the particular distribution already made, or proposed, in the interests of order and efficiency.

It will not be denied that, when the Constitution was originally framed, no provision was distinctly made, or policy prescribed, for conducting missionary operations outside of the Church. When it was adopted by the Presbyterian Church in this country, the Church was not awake to the importance of foreign missions. When our standards underwent revisions, still no ample provision was made for enlargement beyond its then present borders.

The spirit of conservatism still reigned, and only the most general provisions were made for preaching the gospel and founding the Church in "the regions beyond."

In the distribution more power was put into the hands of Presbytery than of any other court. The power of organising churches and ordaining and installing pastors and evangelists, and of setting them apart to particular work, and original jurisdiction over ministers, was lodged in Presbytery to the exclusion of other courts. This power, and whatever is distinguishing, belong to Presbytery, and not to other courts, in virtue of the distribution of powers made by the Constitution. Presbytery has no reserved powers. It has no more of reserved powers than any other church court. Its powers in our system are granted and limited by the Constitution as those of each of the other courts are. Under this distribution Presbytery has no power or right to organise a church, or to conduct any work outside of her own geographical limits. She is shut in by her geographical lines as a member of the Presbyterian Church, and may not constitutionally go beyond them. And this confinement is necessary for "order and efficiency."

In like manner, and for like considerations, the Session and the Synod are confined within their proper geographical lines, over which neither may constitutionally pass.

The General Assembly is the bond of union between all these, the highest court with certain powers of review and control. To this court, which is the symbol of the Church's unity and the vehicle of its combined strength, is distributed the only power for extending the Church's territorial conquests and limits. To this court, and to this *alone*, is distributed the power "to concert measures for promoting the prosperity and enlargement of the Church; . . . to institute and superintend the agencies necessary in the general work of evangelisation; to appoint ministers to such labors as fall under its jurisdiction." Form of Government, Chap. V., Sec. 6, Par. V.

Again: "The General Assembly shall have power to commit the various interests pertaining to the general work of evangelisation to one or more commissions." *Ibid*, Par. IV.

These two quotations from our Form of Government constitute the whole provision made in our Book for prosecuting the great work of foreign missions! These provisions are pitiably small in comparison with the dignity and the urgent importance of the work.

From what has been just said of the distribution of power it is evident: 1. That neither the Session, nor Presbytery, nor Synod has any constitutional power whatever for conducting foreign missions. 2. That all the constitutional power given to any court for conducting foreign missions vests in the General Assembly. 3. That this provision is too general and indefinite to indicate suitably the work to be done in the foreign field. "Enlargement" and "general evangelisation" are the most specific words used to indicate the work, and it must be admitted that these are too indefinite to determine the dignity and policy of the work. The difficulties multiply when we remember how exceedingly limited is the original jurisdiction of the General Assembly. The conclusion of this matter, then, is that while any church court may inherently "concert measures for the enlargement of the Church," yet constitutionally the General Assembly is the only Presbyterian court that may do it.

We go further and declare our strong conviction that the General Assembly, which is "the bond of union, peace, and correspondence among all its congregations and courts," is the only body through which "enlargement" in foreign countries can *logically* be made, and the only one *capable* of overcoming the practical difficulties in the way of directing work, supporting laborers, and establishing gospel ordinances permanently and successfully in foreign and remote lands. Sessions obviously cannot do it except in very rare cases. Presbyteries cannot do it to any considerable extent. These are usually too weak, and the work is too great. Even Synods are ordinarily too feeble to conduct this work on a large and sure basis. If Presbyteries, for example, should attempt to conduct foreign missions, they would very soon be obliged by weakness to form some scheme of voluntary co-operation. They would be forced to institute some council, or waste their energies and resources in desultory efforts.

If all should enter into such alliance, which is not probable, their voluntary council for direction and supply would soon be forced to invest itself, or receive investiture from the co-operating bodies, with all the powers that are now so stingily bestowed upon our Assembly; or the whole scheme for foreign work would fail, egregiously fail. Presbyterians have not much faith in "voluntary associations." It is far better for both "efficiency" and "order" that the General Assembly shall conduct the work. We therefore conclude that the General Assembly is *the only body* that *may legitimately, or practically can,* successfully develop the power of the whole Church, and vigorously push forward the work of foreign missions.

But the power at present given to the Assembly is as vague as it is comprehensive, and its statements are as insufficient as they are brief. The General Assembly has power to "concert measures for enlargement," and "to institute and superintend the general work of evangelisation." This is all. It has no power to ordain or set apart ministers to this work whose conduct is confided to it. It has no power in the Constitution to organise a church or appoint ministers over any foreign church. It has no power of discipline directly over the missionary it sends out, and whose labors it directs and whom it supports, albeit the work and the field and the support lie beyond the territorial limits of any Presbytery. It has no power to ordain evangelists in the foreign field. The Assembly's jurisdiction is over the work; the Presbytery's jurisdiction is over the workman. The Presbytery has sole and exclusive power to ordain, to set apart, and to exercise discipline over the minister and to delegate to him what ecclesiastical power he possesses.

There is a generally felt want of some additional provisions in our Book determining the nature and extent of the powers of an evangelist in the foreign field. This article is a plea for a broader and more important amendment than that which is proposed and now pending before our Presbyteries defining the powers of the evangelist. It is a plea for amendments that shall invest the Assembly with the *whole* power necessary for "instituting" and vigorously conducting our foreign mission work, so as in some

fuller measure to meet the increased demands of this work, and to respond to the urgent call that comes from the benighted nations for the "light of the Gentiles." We would limit the exercise of these powers to the foreign missionary work, but we would give to the General Assembly the whole and exclusive original jurisdiction over the work and the workmen necessary for instituting and conducting the work of missions abroad.

What good and sufficient reason, either ecclesiastical or practical, can be given for the present division of responsibility and confusion of jurisdiction between the Presbytery and the Assembly? We believe that there is none; and that the considerations usually advanced for maintaining the twofold jurisdiction are much more apparent than real. The strongest objection that can be urged against such a redistribution of power as is proposed is that, to give original jurisdiction to the Assembly in cases of discipline is to take away from the accused the right of appeal, which is regarded by us as one of the bulwarks of personal liberty. We confess that this objection, if it lie in full force against our proposition, would be very strong. But we doubt if its force is as strong as it appears at first to be. For what is the object—the ultimate object—of appeal or complaint? It is principally to obtain the judgment of the highest court of the Church, as representing the most impartial sentiment of the whole Church. Now would not the judgment of the Assembly in the exercise of original jurisdiction over one of its servants and children be impartial, deliberate, and ordinarily as satisfactory as it is in cases taken up to it by appeal or complaint? We think that a body, composed of officers from all parts of the Church, and representing the whole Church, would be impartial and disinterested. A missionary arraigned before the Assembly would appear and plead before the same arbiter that decides appeals and complaints. Justice, we think, would not suffer. And since the recognition of the principle of "commissions" has been distinctly made in our Book, the practical difficulties in the way of the Assembly's exercising original jurisdiction are removed. Moreover, when a commission should be called to act in such cases, its proceedings are "subject to the review of the court appointing it;" thus is broken the force

of the objection to giving the Assembly ecclesiastical and original jurisdiction over the missionary. If the force of this strongest of all objections to giving the Assembly power over missionaries is so greatly reduced, we need not pause to consider others.

We therefore proceed to commend the proposed enlargement of the powers of the Assembly and their extension over the workman as well as over his work.

1. The change is thoroughly consistent with the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism, which are, that all church courts are one in nature, have the same inherent powers, are constituted of the same elements, and differ only as the Constitution distributes powers among them. If Presbytery may inherently exercise judicial power over ministers, so may the Assembly. If Sessions may exercise discipline over members, so may the Assembly. The only reason Session may exercise exclusive power over members, and Presbytery over ministers, is, that the Book distributes these powers to them. The only reason the Assembly may not exercise original jurisdiction over them is that this power is not distributed to it. It is competent for the Church to make any changes in the distribution of power among the courts which are commended to her judgment by considerations of "order and efficiency."

2. But do these considerations commend such changes as have been herein advocated? We believe that, after mature and unbiassed reflection, a sound judgment will answer, yes. It is necessary to avoid confusion of jurisdiction, and to give unity and vigor to our foreign operations. The Assembly is now the constitutional repository of all the power we impart to any court to "institute and superintend" this work; but the power of ordination and separation of the minister, and ecclesiastical and judicial control of him, personally and ministerially considered, is distributed exclusively to the Presbytery. Our Form of Government declares that "for the orderly and efficient dispatch of ecclesiastical business it is necessary that the sphere of each court should be distinctly defined." A distinct definition of the sphere of two coöperating bodies is necessary to "order," but that "efficiency" shall be promoted to the highest possible extent it is

necessary that the distinctness of definition shall be based upon some practicable perceptible difference. Now, practically it is impossible to preserve the distinction between the man and his work—between the jurisdiction of the Presbytery and that of the Assembly. It is impossible for the Assembly to pass full judgment upon a man's work without also reaching judgment upon the man's ministerial character. In many cases these are so intimately blended as to become inseparable. In cases of discipline, neither the Presbytery nor the Assembly, nor indeed both together, can reach a full understanding or pronounce an intelligent judgment upon the case; because one has to do only with the man, and the other only with the man's business; when the man's moral character in many cases is to be ascertained by the way in which he has transacted or failed to transact his business as a servant of the whole Church in the foreign field. The Assembly cannot investigate or judge of his moral character even while in its commission. The Presbytery has jurisdiction over the man, but it is impossible for it to procure witnesses or testimony from a distant land by which to try the missionary, and if it could procure these, by some means unprovided for, still, in the circumstances of the case, it would be poorly qualified to judge of the due weight of the evidence. The mode of process, as determined by the general principles of the Book and the demands of equity, would necessarily consume much time, and, if either party to any cause were litigious or refractory, the postponement would be indefinite, or so protracted through years as to lose all the wholesome effects of discipline. Besides, in the present arrangement Presbytery must ordinarily receive its information through the Assembly, or its representative, the Executive Committee. Thus the ordinary conditions of discipline would throw the Assembly into the odious position of voluntary informant or prosecutor. Presbytery has no constitutional power to put either the Assembly or its Committee into such a position, nor has it the power even to require either to appear before its bar in the trial of any cause. Fortunately our Church has had but little experience of these practical difficulties; but we are endeavoring to enlarge our missionary operations in the "open

doors" of the nations of the earth. We hope to increase the number of our missionaries. This will increase the probabilities that cases requiring discipline will occur. And if such cases shall subject our Constitution to the test, all these elements of weakness will be seen, and our present policy for foreign work will be seen to impair both the "order" and "efficiency" of our Church. Authority must act simply in order to give efficacy to any policy. "Division of labor" is desirable in all large enterprises; but division of responsibility makes babel and impairs efficiency, unless the division denotes a clear practical difference.

The change proposed simplifies, while it preserves, the fundamental principle of the inherent equality of all courts. It is proposed placing in the hands of the Assembly the power of ordaining and separating ministers to the foreign work, of organising churches in foreign fields, of original jurisdiction over the missionary, and of delegating to foreign evangelists whatever power the Assembly may see fit to confer for ordering and promoting the work of missions, rather than placing the power of "instituting and superintending" foreign work in the hands of the Presbytery. The Assembly is selected as the repository of *the whole power* for foreign work because, both logically and practically, it can do the work better than any other court. The Presbytery is not selected as such repository because, in fact, it is materially unable to prosecute the work of foreign missions on any broad and certain basis. By adding the powers above mentioned to those already given the Assembly, this representative of the whole Church will be amply qualified for prosecuting, directing, and controlling the whole work of foreign missions.

3. It is simple and proper that the body which "sets apart" and sends out and sustains and directs the labors of a minister shall exercise entire control of him while in its commission. It is complex and improper that one body shall set him apart and exercise ecclesiastical control over him, while another sends him out, sustains him, and directs his labors.

4. The foreign missionary is regarded and treated as the representative and servant of the *whole* Church, and not of a single member of that Church. If it be possible, and we think that

we have shown that it is, for him to be subject to the government and discipline of the highest court of the whole Church which he represents, it will be desirable; and the whole arrangement for ordering his services and conduct with efficiency will become harmonious. This idea, if realised fully in our practice, will exert a wholesome influence upon the missionary and the Church.

5. It rarely, if ever, happens that where several missionaries are thrown into coöperation in the same foreign field, they all belong to any one Presbytery. This creates ecclesiastical difficulties in the way of their using joint powers. Any number of ministers and elders, belonging to different Presbyteries, coming together, do not constitute a Presbytery. Their action, though taken jointly, has not the force of a judgment of any court. How, then, is it possible for any number of foreign evangelists, belonging to different Presbyteries, coming together in consultation, to give the force of an ecclesiastical judgment to what they do or resolve to do? Presbyteries cannot give them any such power, for the Presbyteries themselves do not possess it. The writer recently spoke of the plan for giving the Assembly the entire control of missionaries in the presence of one of our most judicious foreign missionaries. This brother replied, "I do not know about that, for I have not thought of it. But I have long thought that all missionaries in the same field should be required to join the same Presbytery, so as to make it possible for them to coöperate with some authority." In this missionary's remark we see the felt want of ecclesiastical unity, and a testimony to the weakness of our present complex arrangements. It is not now competent for even the Assembly to throw the missionaries together into the form of a "commission." For each one is in the field clothed with such ecclesiastical powers only as his Presbytery gives him; and his Presbytery can give him no powers to form a "commission" with members of any other Presbytery.

6. The proposed change is the only way for solving the vexed problem of the powers of the evangelist in the foreign field. As the result of this change, the evangelist, or evangelists, will bear to the General Assembly the same relations that the home evan-

gelist, or evangelists, bear to the Presbytery. He will exercise just such powers, and under such conditions and limitations, as the Assembly prescribes. These powers he will exercise severally or jointly as the Assembly directs, and to any extent which may be determined by the representative of the whole Church. Clothe the Assembly with power to organise churches, to ordain and instal officers over churches in the foreign field, to ordain and set apart foreign evangelists, and to do whatever is necessary to establish the Church in those fields; and then the Assembly can invest its evangelists with these powers—all powers necessary to planting and nurturing a foreign church. We do not forget that some regard the evangelist as an extraordinary officer, called of God and not of man to his work. But we do not suppose that these brethren regard the evangelist as independent of all responsibility to church courts. They would doubtless admit that his labors are subject to the direction of some court, and that he must sustain some ecclesiastical relations to some court. Hence we see not why these brethren should object to giving the control of evangelists to the Assembly on any logical necessities of their theory. And certainly those who hold that the evangelist is an ordinary minister set apart to a particular service, as the writer does, will not feel that it violates any fundamental principle of Presbyterianism to give the Assembly original and entire jurisdiction over him.

Before dismissing this subject, we would remark that we would require the Assembly to formally "set apart" every evangelist sent out, whether previously ordained by Presbytery or ordained by the Assembly, as Saul and Barnabas were "separated," or "set apart," at Antioch, with fasting, prayer, and laying on of hands (Acts xiii. 2, 3). Its Committee of Foreign Missions might have *ad interim* power to do this.

In conclusion, what has been said, we think, shows that some change in our foreign missionary policy is needed; that the changes herein proposed are consistent with fundamental principles of Presbyterianism; that they would promote the "order and efficiency" of our foreign work; that they give simplicity and vigor to our plan of operations. We would simply remind

the reader that "the field is the world;" and that it is ripe for the harvest. The spirit of missions is in the Church; the condition of the world demands the most vigorous action on our part: the bright promise invites us to put on all our strength. The adoption of the policy herein indicated would mark a new and bright era in the prosecution of foreign missions.

ABNER C. HOPKINS.

ARTICLE VI.

THE ATTENTION THE BIBLE HAS RECEIVED.

We do not affirm that this book is read as universally, as frequently, as carefully, or as devoutly as its merits demand. We are well aware that in many instances it is an overlooked, neglected, underrated, and even a disparagingly spoken of book, and in some quarters prohibited by the authorities. The time was, if it be not so even now, when this volume was recorded in conspicuous characters on the "Index Expurgatorius" of the Romish Church. Nevertheless we expect to show that of all productions this has received in one way and another, in one generation and in another, more attention than any other book; that it has been read more, studied more, has had more time, more laborious research, more critical acumen, more systematic mental effort, more Oriental, linguistic, and theological learning, spent upon it, than any other book, come from what quarter of the globe it may, from what age it may; let that book be classical, historical, literary, dramatic, romantic, scientific, or political.

And this we affirm in the face of such authors as Shakespeare, Milton, Addison, Johnson, Goldsmith, Butler, Hall, Bunyan, Sir Walter Scott, the old classic or American authors, or such specimens of the chaste, of the beautiful, and of the sublime, as you may happen to admire, and we to overlook. We persist in claiming for the Bible a precedence over the aforesaid productions, and indeed over all uninspired authorship.

I. This fact will be made apparent when we shall have shown the cost, the almost indefatigable labor, the drudgery connected with the getting up of the original manuscripts and in the subsequent multiplication of copies up to the invention of the art of printing, and even after that period. We moderns have inadequate conceptions of the whole business connected with the ancient mode of writing. We require to be informed that wood, stone, the inner coating of the bark of trees, tables of lead, the leaves of the Egyptian papyrus and the palm tree, the skins of animals, and vellum, which is a highly manufactured skin, were the materials. Through what ordeal was Moses taken when it became necessary for him to put on record the contents of the Pentateuch? Where was his writing apparatus? They were such as we have already indicated—crude, intractable, inconvenient, and unsightly. We who are accustomed to the telegraph, the power printing press, stenography, and the modern facilities for the taking of records and for the communication of intelligence, would be startled with the idea of writing down Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and Numbers on the skins of animals and the other materials used for that purpose in those olden times. How few of these old Hebrew words made up of large, outspreading, cumbrous letters could be recorded on one skin? The market could scarcely supply him. It would require the skins or writing apparatus of a whole province.

No two things could be more different than an ancient and a modern book—the former a great roll of hides, connected with whangs and bearing a resemblance to tanned leather exposed to sale on the shelves of a tanner's counting-house or sales-room; the latter a compact volume, neat, trim, and perhaps in a form convenient to be carried in a gentleman's coat pocket. For information upon this subject, we would refer to the Cambridge Roll, or Indian copy of the Pentateuch, which was brought to England about the beginning of this century by Dr. Buchanan, missionary to India; which Roll was written on goat skins dyed red and was forty-eight feet in length. Some of the Roll was missing, and the calculation was that if all of it had been there, it

would have been ninety feet in length. This Roll was obtained from the black Jews.

What Moses had to contend with, every subsequent author up to the age of printing had to contend with, abating perhaps the advantages which the later authors had in the improvement of the materials and a better supply of them in the market. As time passed on, the same process had to be repeated as other revelations required to be recorded. A multiplication of copies became necessary. What a laborious process! Think of the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament, from Genesis down to Malachi, embracing the somewhat lengthy documents of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, recorded on the aforesaid crude materials and the copies of them multiplied to such an extent as to allow one for each synagogue, one for each prophet, one for each priest, and perhaps a few for distribution among the common people. So much for the Old Testament.

The same process was repeated in getting up the New Testament and in keeping a supply of copies. When we reflect upon the number of manuscript copies of the Hebrew and of the Greek Scriptures (there being no other in the Oriental and European libraries), we are impressed with the amount of physical and mental labor connected with the production of such manuscripts on the part of the original authors and of the copyists. Would the most skilful penman, who holds the pen of a ready writer, be willing, furnished as he is with our modern facilities, to engage to copy off the Old and New Testaments much within a year? What, then, would be the labor and the time necessary to write off on sheep skins and goat skins, on plates of lead, or leaves of papyrus, the whole Bible in the clumsy characters of the Hebrew and the intricate letters of the Greek? If these facts be taken in connexion with what has been done since the fourteenth century in the way of multiplying the copies of the aforesaid book by the art of printing, we will be the more seriously impressed with the statement that this is not an altogether neglected book. Two publishing institutions—the British and Foreign Bible Society, organised in 1804, and the American Bible Society, organised in 1816—have contributed

largely to this purpose. We have not the exact figures with regard to the first, but there is no risk in saying that millions of copies of the Sacred Scriptures have been printed and circulated by that Society in Britain and foreign countries within the last eighty years. As to the second, the American Bible Society, we can scarcely estimate the amount of agency, human, mechanical, pecuniary, including the divine, that has been employed in the same line. When we shall have considered the pecuniary contributions in one way and another, at one time and at another, made to the institution—such as \$300,000 by private subscription to build the Bible House in New York—the working force in the establishment, amounting to 400 persons, with all the necessary mechanical apparatus and labor-saving machines which are capable, if pressed up to the maximum of their capacity, of bringing out annually two millions of Bibles, or about 6,000 copies for every working day—we say, when we shall have considered the number of volumes issued by the Society since its organisation in 1816, which is nearly twenty-eight millions, spreading them out over the face of the earth, we will be persuaded that the Bible has received some attention.

Now, in addition to what these mammoth establishments are doing in that line, there are numerous presses all over Christendom engaged in the same work on a smaller scale contributory to the same good results.

II. That the Bible has received attention is made apparent in the versions or translations into which it has been rendered. The Septuagint comes first, it being a translation of the Old Testament into Greek some three hundred years before Christ, and is called the work of the Seventy, and is generally attributed to Ptolemy Philadelphus, King of Egypt, who had it done to replenish the library at Alexandria.

Nearly everything that common fame or tradition relates in reference to this translation and the translators is discredited by Prideaux, who professes to have examined the subject and admits as “historical verities” that a translation was made by some one and at some one’s suggestion. But let the number engaged be seventy, or seventy times seven, or only seven, the amount of labor neces-