

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1863.

---

No. IV.

---

By Rev. Dr. Schaff

ART. I.—*The Anglo-American Sabbath.*

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

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

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

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

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

By J. Addison Alexander D.D.

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

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

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

\* Joshua xix. 15.

Hebrew text, we are met at once by several remarkable discrepancies. Let us examine them in juxtaposition.

*Kai sũ, Bēthlēsem, gāh 'Iouda, oudamōs elachīstē ei en toīs hēgemōsin 'Iouda. ēk sou gār ēxēlēúsetai hēgōmēnos, ōstis poiμανēi tòn laòn mou tòn 'Israēl.*

*And thou, Bethlehem, land of Judah, (i. e., in the land of Judah,) art by no means least among the chiefs of Judah; for out of thee shall come forth a leader, (chief or governor, hēgōmēnos,) who shall feed my people Israel.*

וְאַתָּא בְּרֵת-לֶחֶם אֶפְרַתָּה צְעִיר לְהַרְוֵת בְּאַלְפֵי יְהוּדָה מִמֶּה לִּי יֵצֵא לְהָרִית  
 מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וּמִזְפָּאֲרֵהוּ מִקְדָּם מִיַּמֵּי עוֹלָם :

*And thou, Béthlehem Ephratah, too small to be among the thousands of Judah, out of thee shall come forth to me (or for me) one to be a ruler in Israel, and his going forth (or the places of his going forth) are from antiquity, the days of eternity.*

The last words are added to complete the sentence, and because of their importance to the exegesis of the passage in Micah. They are not included in the quotation, as will be seen more clearly afterwards, because the point in question was the *place* of the Messiah's birth, and not his preëxistence.

It is evident, at first sight, that the points of difference between these passages are too great to admit of our regarding one as an exact translation of the other. And the question thus arises, whether the disagreement is in sense and substance, or in the mere external form in which the same thought is exhibited. In order to determine this, it will be necessary to take up the variations *seriatim*—with one exception, in the order of the text itself.

1. To the בְּרֵת-לֶחֶם אֶפְרַתָּה of the Hebrew corresponds the *Bēthlēsem gāh 'Iouda* of the Greek, in explanation of which difference an eminent writer upon biblical geography\* suggests, that Ephratah was the district in which Bethlehem was situate, and therefore included in the larger term employed by Matthew. The difference would then be nothing more nor less than that between the phrases, *Princeton, New Jersey*, and *Princeton*,

\* Bachiene, ii. 2, p. 7.

*Mercer County*, or, to take a more distinguished illustration between *London, Middlesex*, and *London, England*. But this geographical hypothesis appears to rest on no foundation, and is, in this case, perfectly unnecessary, since the seeming discrepancy is at once removed by referring to Gen. xxxv. 19, where it is said that "Rachel died and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem." *Ephrath* and *Ephratah* are slightly varied forms of the same name. And as we find the two names thus identified in Genesis, so in the book of Ruth (iv. 11) we find the two combined in a sort of proverbial parallelism: "Do thou worthily in *Ephratah*, and be famous in *Bethlehem*." Now as there was at least one other Bethlehem, the purpose of distinction was effectually answered by the addition of a second name which was not common to both places. *Bethlehem Ephratah* means nothing more, then, than the Bethlehem belonging to the tribe of Judah, which idea is the very one expressed by the form of the Greek version. Why the form was varied, is a question which depends upon another to be afterwards considered, as to the origin and the design of the translation which appears in Matthew. It will here be sufficient to quote Hengstenberg's suggestion,\* that the prophet, instead of the more common designation (Bethlehem-Judah) uses one borrowed from the thirty-fifth of Genesis, because there are several other allusions to that chapter in the context, and because he intended an allusion, at the same time, to the etymology of both names, as denoting plenty. But when the prophecy was quoted, these considerations had no force, and as the end of the quotation was to point out Bethlehem in Judah as the place of the Messiah's birth, the common and explicit form was naturally used instead of the more allusive and obscure one, which had, no doubt, become obsolete in Matthew's time. More than enough has now been said to show that notwithstanding the diversity of form, as to the first point, the same idea is expressed in both cases.

2. The next point of difference is in the  $\text{רִבְּבֵי}$  of the Hebrew, as compared with the Greek  $\eta\gamma\epsilon\mu\beta\sigma\omega\nu$ , the one denoting *thousands*, and the other *chiefs* or *governors*. This diversity has led to a

\* *Christologie*, Th. 3, p. 294.

conjectural emendation of the Masoretic text, by which the pointing of the רִבְזֵי, *thousands*, would be changed as to read רִבְזֵי, *dukes, captains, governors*.\* But in addition to the total want of all external evidence, it has been well objected, that רִבְזֵי is used in the general sense of *ruler* only by the later Hebrew writers,† while in earlier times, it was employed as a peculiar title of the Edomitish chieftains, just as *Czar*, though a derivative of *Cæsar*, is confined in usage to the Emperor of Russia. The true solution of the difficulty lies in the consideration, that *the thousands of Judah* does not mean the multitudes, the numerous population of that tribe, but its branches, subdivisions, or great families, with evident allusion to the decimal arrangement, both of tribes and armies, which has been usual in Oriental countries, since the days of the patriarchs, and with reference to which, the chiefs of the Hebrew tribes are more than once called *the heads of the thousands of Israel*.‡ Now the prophet, though he formally addresses Bethlehem itself, may be supposed to address it in the person of its chief or representative, in consequence of which the Hebrew adjective and pronoun (רִבְזֵי and רִבְזֵי) are in the masculine form, although the names of towns are generally feminine. And hence it is that the comparison, instead of being made between the town referred to and the other towns of Judah, is between that town, as represented by its chief, and the other chiefs, or *heads of the thousands* of Judah; and ἡγεμόσιν, though not a strict translation of רִבְזֵי, conveys substantially the same idea.

3. Another difference of less importance is the omission of the phrase *to me* in Matthew's version. The reason of this may be, that the לִי is expletive or pleonastic, like הֵן in הֵן-הֵן, *go thou*, literally *go to thee*,§ a similar idiomatic use of *me* being common in old English after certain active verbs. But if the phrase has an independent meaning, it is not to be explained, as some suppose,|| that the prophet uses it in application to himself, as representing the whole people—*out of thee shall come, for me, for my benefit, for that of Israel*—but rather that

\* J. D. Michaelis. *Justi on Micah*.

† See Jer. xiii. 21. Zech. ix. 7; xii. 5, 6.

‡ Num. i. 16; x. 4. Josh. xxii. 21, 30.

§ Gen. xii. 1.

|| J. H. Michaelis. *Rosenmüller*.

the words are those of God himself—*out of thee shall he come forth to me, for me*—in execution of my purpose, in obedience to my call, for the promotion of my glory.\* Thus understood, this phrase is certainly no unimportant part of the original passage; but its omission does not vitiate the version, any more than that of the momentous clause, with which the sentence, in the Hebrew, closes; and for this one reason, in both cases, that the end of the quotation was to identify the *place* of the Messiah's birth, which might be done, and is done, without introducing every thing which stands connected with that fact in the prediction, although these accompanying circumstances, in themselves, may be no less important than the one to be established.

4. To the words מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל, *a ruler in Israel*, corresponds the Greek clause, ὁστίς ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ, *who shall feed my people Israel*. The comparison of kings and other magistrates to shepherds, as it must have had its origin in times of primitive and pastoral simplicity, is often met with in the oldest heathen writers, as in Homer, who familiarly describes his royal heroes as the *shepherds of the people*, while in Scripture we can trace it, not to the habits of the patriarchal ages merely, but to a divine declaration made to David: *and the Lord said to thee, thou shalt feed my people Israel, and thou shalt be a captain over Israel*.† The noun translated *captain*, (צִיָּוִן) and the verb translated *feed* (תִּרְצֶה) correspond exactly to the Greek ἡγούμενος and ποιμανεῖ, which are in fact the very terms employed in the Septuagint version of the text in Samuel. So it seems, that in departing from the *ipsisissima verba* of the prophet, the evangelist has introduced a striking allusion to another passage, while, at the same time, he conveys the sense of Micah in a form implying the peculiar character of the Messiah's kingdom and relation to his subjects. In this case, there is neither deviation nor omission, but amplification and elucidation of the prophet's language.

5. We have reserved the last place for that point of difference which seems, at first sight, the most serious of all, and to a superficial reader, may appear to be incapable of any explana-

\* Calvin. Hengstenberg.

† 2 Samuel v. 2.

tion, which will reconcile the Greek and Hebrew text, without impugning the authority of either. And yet it will be found to be a signal instance of the paradoxical but certain fact, that forms of speech which, in themselves considered, seem directly contradictory, may be legitimately used for the expression of the same idea. The difference to which I now refer is this, that while Micah speaks of Bethlehem as too small to be among the thousands of Judah, the very same object is addressed, in the quotation, as *by no means* the least among the princes of Judah, the Greek apparently denying what the Hebrew most explicitly affirms.

To escape this seeming contradiction, it has been proposed to read the first clause as a question: And thou, Bethlehem (in the) land of Judah, art thou least? \* &c.; but from the necessity of this unnatural and forced construction we are happily relieved by the facility with which the two apparently discordant forms admit of being reconciled by paying due regard to the design and scope of the original passage. When the prophet says that out of Bethlehem the promised Ruler was to be expected, why does he speak of its small size and insignificance at all? For the purpose, evidently, of contrasting its external meanness with the moral grandeur which was to invest it. Or, in other words, he means to say, that although small in one sense, it was in another to be great, and might prospectively be looked upon as great already. It is only by supposing this to be the prophet's meaning, that the mention of the outward insignificance of Bethlehem is rendered at all relevant to his design. And this is precisely what the Greek translation makes the prophet say; while in the Hebrew, he asserts directly the external littleness of Bethlehem, and indirectly intimates its future greatness by foretelling the event from which that greatness was to spring; the former circumstance is, in the Greek translation, merged in a direct assertion of the latter. While the original says, Bethlehem is small in one sense, but a certain thing shall happen, which will make the place great, in another and a higher sense; the version says, Bethlehem is great because that same thing is to happen.

\* Paulus, quoted by Hengstenberg, (Chr. Th. 3, p. 324,) who denies Paulus' assertion that the text is so construed in the *Pirke Elieser*, c. 3.

There is here no contradiction, any more than if we should address a poor man thus: 'You are very poor in outward things, but you are rich in faith;' and he should report my words in this form: 'You are rich, for you abound in faith.' Whoever can discover in these forms an inconsistency, much more a contradiction, may be pardoned for imagining a similar discrepancy between the text of Micah and the paraphrase of Matthew.

From this detailed comparison we may draw these two conclusions, 1. That between the version and original there is not any disagreement, as to substance, and in form no discrepancy that argues any other difference between the writers than a difference of their immediate purpose in the utterance of one and the same truth. In both, the birth of the Messiah, and the place of that event, and the distinction which the place would thus acquire, are distinctly and harmoniously displayed to view; while all the changes in the manner of expression, which are found in the quotation, are of such a nature as to make it clearer, and precisely such as might be looked for in the application of a prophecy long after it was given.

2. The second conclusion is, that notwithstanding this agreement in the scope and import of the passages, the variations in the form are such as to preclude the supposition that the one was ever meant to be, in strictness of speech, a translation of the other; and as the Greek retains the prominent idea of the Hebrew, but omits some words, and exchanges others for more full and clear expressions, it deserves to be regarded, not as an incorrect translation, which would have changed the sense and made the language more obscure, but as an intentional and admirable paraphrase.

Now the Septuagint version often deals in paraphrase, and since that version was in common use among the Jews in Matthew's time, the question here occurs whether this quotation was derived from that source. On comparison, however, you will find, that the Septuagint version of the Hebrew text, in this case, is remarkably exact and literal. It is as follows: *Καὶ σὺ, Βηθλεὲμ οἶκος Ἐφραθὰ, ὀλιγοστός εἰ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλίαισι Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἀρχόντα τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔξοδοι αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐξ ἡμερῶν αἰῶνος.* Twenty-four



manuscripts read ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, which makes the agreement with the Hebrew still more perfect. The only material deviation from the Hebrew text consists in the insertion of οἶκος before Ἐφραθὰ, which Fritzsche regards as a marginal gloss introduced into the text, while Hengstenberg supposes that Ephratah, the name of a place, was confounded by the Greek translator with Ephratah, the name of Caleb's wife, who is mentioned in the first book of Chronicles,\* and that he inserted οἶκος merely to denote that the Ephratah depended, in construction, on the foregoing *Beth-lehem*, which means the *house of bread*. It may be, however, that, through mere inadvertence, the original word עֲרָאָה was first transcribed and then translated. But be this as it may, it is certain that the Septuagint version is, with this exception, rigidly exact, and cannot therefore be made use of to explain the paraphrastic form of that employed by Matthew.

There is another explanation, which some writers have adopted, and which rests upon the supposition that the version of the prophecy here given is in no sense that of Matthew, who contents himself with telling what the chief priests and the scribes replied to Herod's question, without attempting to correct the obvious faults of their quotation. But as that quotation coincides with the original in every point which could have had the slightest bearing upon subsequent events, it is certainly not easy to conceive why Matthew should have introduced it, if it was erroneous in minor points, instead of giving a correct translation, or referring to the prophecy without transcribing it. Another argument against this supposition has been urged, with no small ingenuity and force, in Hengstenberg's *Christology*,† viz., that Matthew in his whole account of Christ's conception, birth, and childhood, had it constantly in view, as a chief end, to point out the events in which prophecy had been fulfilled. Hence the number of quotations from the prophets found in the beginning of his book, and hence, too, the omission of some striking facts in our Saviour's early history, such as his mother's previous residence in Nazareth, and the occasion of her being in Bethlehem when he was born. All this is omit-

\* 1 Chron. ii. 19; iv. 4.

† Th. 3, pp. 317—323.

ted, while the fact that he was born there, is prominently stated, for the sake of introducing the fulfilment of this prophecy. The same design and rule in the selection of his facts is traced by Hengstenberg throughout the first two chapters, with a clearness which constrains us to believe that Matthew could not, in consistency with his design and his peculiar method, have adopted this quotation from the scribes, without intending to adopt it as his own. And when it is considered that the scribes, no doubt, did what any Jewish rabbi would do now, in any quarter of the world, if questioned by a Jewish ruler, that is, quote the prophecy itself in Hebrew, the most probable conclusion is that Matthew is the sole and independent author of the Greek translation, and that its paraphrastic form came from his intention to explain the text as well as quote it. Now, to us, who are believers in his inspiration, this, so far from impairing the authority and genuineness of the Greek translation, on the contrary enhances it; and we enjoy the very great advantage of an apostle's comment on a prophet's text.

Having finished our comparison of the quotation with the passage quoted, it remains to be considered whether the sense put upon the text in the quotation is the sense of the original. By sense is here meant, not the meaning of the words, but the drift and application of the sentence. Let us glance at the circumstances of the case. Magi, or wise men from the east, had come, directed by a star, to find the new-born King of the Jews, and Herod, upon hearing their inquiries, calls upon the official expounders of the law to say where Christ, or the Messiah, should be born, and they, in answer, quote this passage, which they introduce by saying, *οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται δὲ τοῦ προφήτου*, for this it has been written by the prophet. It is clear, from this view of the context, and from what has been already said, that the priests and scribes regarded this as a prediction of Messiah, and that Matthew looked upon it as accomplished in the birth of Jesus Christ. There is here no room for the favourite hypothesis of mere accommodation or poetical allusion, and to that of false or mistaken application we cannot subscribe, without renouncing our belief in Matthew's inspiration. It remains then to be seen, whether the prophecy in Micah really relates to the Messiah, and if so, whether it

relates to him exclusively, or to another person, in its first and lowest sense, and then to the Messiah in its last and highest.

A very slight inspection of the prophecy of Micah will suffice to show that it displays, in an unusual degree, that characteristic feature of prophetic composition, which consists in the abrupt and frequent alternation of encouragements and threatenings. The book contains a series of predictions with respect to the downfall both of Israel and Judah, each succeeded and relieved by an exhilarating view of that auspicious period when all should be restored, enlarged, and beautified, and placed beyond the reach of subsequent vicissitudes. Thus the first two chapters, which contain a clear prediction of captivity, are closed by the assurance that *the breaker is come up before them*, i. e., *a breaker-down of prison-doors, that they have broken up*, and is abruptly closed with this remarkable assurance: I will gather, I will gather even all of thee, O Jacob, I will gather the remnant of Israel; I will put them together as the sheep of Bozrah, as a flock in the midst of its pasture, they shall make a great noise from the multitude of men. The breaker comes up before them, (*i. e.*, a breaker-down of prison-doors;) they break down, they pass through the gate, they go out by it, and their King passes before them, and Jehovah at their head.

This encouraging assurance of deliverance, beheld in prophetic vision as already past or present, is immediately succeeded by another melancholy picture of corruption and calamity, in which the prospect closes with a distant view of Zion ploughed as a field, and of Jerusalem in heaps. But here, by as sudden a transition as before, the prophet shifts the scene and introduces that remarkable prediction of the future exaltation of the church and aggregation of the Gentiles, which is also found at the beginning of the second chapter of Isaiah, but is here pursued further till it closes with the coming of the kingdom to the daughter of Jerusalem. And then begins another gloomy strain, in which Babylon is introduced by name, and the subsequent oppressions of the Syrians and Romans not obscurely intimated, one of the most prominent and striking features in the picture being the cessation of the monarchy, and the unworthy treatment of the Jewish magistracy by their foreign enemies, a circumstance

which will prepare the way for the prediction, which is quoted by Matthew in the case before us, and which sets in contrast with the downfall of the monarchy, and the oppression of the Jewish rulers, the appearance of a prince, whose goings forth had been from everlasting, though the place of his nativity should be the small and unimportant town of Bethlehem.

Now the simple question, in relation to this prophecy, is that asked by the eunuch in relation to another: "Of whom speaketh the prophet thus?" and this is almost answered by another: Of whom can he even be supposed to speak, if not of the Messiah? That the ancient Jews applied the words of Micah thus exclusively, is clear, not only from the Chaldee Paraphrase—*from thee shall the Messiah come forth before me*—but from the answer of the scribes to Herod—and the question asked by the people at the feast of tabernacles—*Hath not the Scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem where David was?* After the birth of Christ had taken place at Bethlehem, and that fact was appealed to as a proof of his Messiahship, it came to be an object with the unbelieving Jews to do away with the prediction as specifically fixing the locality, and this they undertook to do, by making it mean merely that his origin was there, because he was descended from the family of David, which resided at Bethlehem, and after all Jews were forbidden to reside there by the Roman emperor, and thus the birth of the Messiah in the place foretold became impossible, they changed the application of the prophecy itself from the Messiah to Zerubbabel, in which they have been followed by no less a man than Grotius, who admits, however, that the passage was intended, in a higher sense, to be applied to Christ. But why resort to the embarrassing expedient of a double sense, when the exclusive application to Messiah is not only possible, but sanctioned by the uniform tradition of the ancients, until after the fulfilment of the prophecy itself; and when the first fulfilment of the promise in Zerubbabel must certainly have put an end to further expectation, which we find, however, from the answer of the scribes to Herod, hundreds of years afterwards. All this would be conclusive against Grotius's opinion, even if the terms

of the prediction had been applicable to Zerubbabel, but how much more when they are utterly inapplicable to a man who was not born at Bethlehem, and of whom it never could be said that his goings forth had been of old, from everlasting—that he was born at Bethlehem, because he was descended from the house of David, and that the last clause of the verse in Micah was intended merely to set forth the great antiquity and consequent distinction of his race, are mere expedients to escape the obvious interpretation, and expedients which would never have been thought of, but for men's unwillingness to see that the Messiah was eternal, and that his incarnation was to take place in a literal and outward sense at Bethlehem in Judah. The same thing may be said of the effect, though not of the intention, of an exposition given in the Targum and approved by Calvin, which applies the last clause of the verse in Micah to the purpose and decree of God respecting the Messiah, and not to his actual existence in eternity. To all such ingenious and refined evasions stands opposed the simple, obvious, most ancient, and most natural interpretation, which has been approved not only by the Jewish Sanhedrim and the apostle Matthew, but by the impartial though unfriendly testimony of the unbelieving German critics of the present day, who, having cast off all belief in inspiration, have no longer any motive for denying that the prophet Micah evidently did expect a superhuman person to be born at Bethlehem, and that Matthew no less evidently did believe that this prediction was fulfilled in the nativity of Jesus. It is true that both the prophet and apostle are supposed by the writers now referred to, to have been the subjects of a mere delusion; but from what do they infer this? from the false assumption that neither miracle nor prophecy is possible or capable of proof by any evidence whatever. But we who know better, through the grace of God, may profit by the frank concession which their premises afford us, while we throw away their impious and false conclusion with the scorn which it deserves. While we boldly and indignantly deny that either Micah or Matthew was in error, because one believed that Christ was to be born in Bethlehem and the other that Jesus of Nazareth was he, we may accept with gratitude,

and use with profit, the admission of these learned unbelievers, that the prophet and evangelist did so believe, and have so written.

In this case, if in any one, the maxim is obligatory :

*Fas est ab hoste doceri.*

*By Lyman Atwater D.D.*

ART. V.—*Report on Infant Baptism to the General Association of Connecticut. 1863.*

IT is one healthful and cheering symptom of the present state of Protestant Christianity, that there is a general and growing attention to the church relations of the children of the covenant. In pedo-baptist communions this increasing interest shows itself in the form of earnest and searching discussions and inquiries relative to the neglect of infant baptism, its causes, extent, and remedies; the precise relation to the church of baptized children; the respective duties and privileges of all the parties thereto; and the effect of a due recognition and understanding of these things, both theoretically and practically, in promoting youthful piety, and therein the whole cause and kingdom of Christ in the world. Most of our readers are familiar with the extent and influence of the discussion on these topics in our own church within the few past years. The mind of our ministers and people has been steadily gravitating in one direction—that is, towards the exact ground taken on this subject in our standards. There is a constant struggle to regain what we have lost, and bring back, not only our thinking, but our practice, to the requirements of our Confession of Faith and Directory. This is evinced in the utter refusal of the church to abate one jot or tittle of the stringency of the Book of Discipline, in the premises. She would sooner bear all the evils of the clumsy and awkward judicial proceedings prescribed in the old book, than admit that baptized children are not so strictly members of the church as to be “subject to judicial prosecution.” It is not likely that all who opposed this pro-