

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXV.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXIV.

ARTICLE I.

THE MELCHIZEDEKAN PRIESTHOOD.

In treating of Melchizedek, there are but three corners of the Bible which we need consult. Moses has given us some information about him in the fourteenth of Genesis—he reappears in the fourth verse of the hundred and tenth Psalm, and Paul brings him into view in his elaborate Epistle to the Hebrews. Who was Melchizedek? Extravagant conjectures have been thrown out as to this mysterious personage. Some have contended that he was the Holy Spirit; but this is the height of absurdity. It is preposterous to say that he was the Saviour, for we know who was the mother of our Lord's inferior nature. He could not have been an angel, for we know nothing about angels keeping genealogies. He could not have been Enoch or Shem, because Moses has given us the parentage of these patriarchs. We need not waste a minute upon the negative part of the question, except to say that many persons are wedded to the marvellous. There is an abundance of evidence that Melchizedek was a Jebusite. This, we think, will appear in the sequel of this discussion. The territory eventually given to the descendants of Abraham was early occupied by colonists from Egypt. It would appear from the tenth chapter and fifteenth verse of Genesis, that the eldest son of Canaan planted the city of Sidon, and became the progenitor of the Hittites, Jebusites, and other tribes who

inhabited Canaan, and whose families were spread abroad. Seven clans, tribes, or peoples established themselves within the territory extending from Sidon, on the north, to Gaza and Edom, on the south. No statement is necessary as to the location of Hivites, Hittites, or Perizzites; but that of the Jebusites is important to the subject in hand. From Joshua, fifteenth and eighth, and eighteenth and twenty-eighth, it is certain that the Jebusites took possession of the hill country about Jebusi, and he adds Jebusi is Jerusalem. From the fifth chapter and sixth verse of Second Samuel it is certain that David carried the citadel of Jebus, which became Jerusalem, the home of Jewish solemnities. But in the time of the Judges, and to the conquest of David, the place bore the old name. The Jebusites were not exterminated by the armies of Joshua. A large remnant of that people was left, who occupied Jebus and its environs, and David bought the site of the temple, which he was making ready to build, from a Jebusite; and Joshua assures us that the tribe was not expelled by the Benjamites, though on other occasions Benjamin did raven as a wolf, and devoured his prey in the morning, and in the evening divided his spoils. The descendants of Ham were under a divine malediction, and to a large extent this anathema was fearfully fulfilled. But at one time the Sidonians were possessed of a flourishing commerce, to the prosecution of which they applied their ingenuity in all the arts of navigation. Even in its severity the divine goodness is often made conspicuous. The Bible is a transcript of the divine justice and mercy. Among degraded Jebusites God chooses a man—invests him with the priestly office—makes him a king of righteousness in comparison with all others of his tribe. And why was he thus established? To represent the nations outside of the covenant made with Abraham, and set forth his ulterior purpose to call Gentiles into the blessings of that covenant when Messiah should come. Melchizedek was not a *high* priest, but priest of the Most *High* God. An important distinction, which will be more obvious as we proceed in this inquiry. Paul reproduced him from his obscurity, that like an Egyptian Judge, he might turn the image of Truth to disputatious Jews, set round as that image was with brilliant ornaments.

Some additional light may be thrown on this subject by ascertaining the locality on which Melchisedek performed the duties of his priesthood. Jebus was the place; and had he been a Zemarite, Arkite, or Amalekite, it is probable that the Jebusites would not have submitted themselves either to his priestly rod or his regal sceptre. Towns sometimes change their names. The old name of Bethel was Luz, but the glorious vision vouchsafed to Jacob induced him to call it the house of God. The capital of Palestine has borne several designations. It has been called Jebus—and in the twenty-ninth of Isaiah, the prophet calls it Ariel, or Lion of God, probably because judgments were to go forth from its gates for the punishment of his enemies. In the second verse of the seventy-sixth Psalm, it is called Salem, which, like Solyma, may be considered as its poetical name, for poets are not without a vocabulary. It is now designated as Jerusalem, possibly by the change of Jebus into Jerus, and the appendage of Salem, for Salem was its name when the interview took place between Melchizedek and Abraham, after the return of the latter from the slaughter of the kings. Adrian changed it to Aelia, and Arabs speak of it as el Kuds, the Holy. And indeed it was hallowed ground as far back as the time of its Jebusite king. For he who had spread out the vales by which it was environed—lifted up its mountain summits—started its peaceful brooks, over which poets have dreamed—flushed its concave firmament into blue, and its convex clouds into snow, had overlooked its area and sworn thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek. The “King of Righteousness” was there, to climb the Hill of Moriah and the Mount of Olives, or descend into its ravines and slake his thirst at its upper and lower wells. He stood alone as a simple priest, without a retinue of attendants—with hills for his altars and lambs for his victims. He was furnished with no magnificent cathedral like St. Paul’s, in England, or St. Peter’s, in Rome, for the Jebusites had no prelates or Popes in the programme of their ecclesiastical polity. We have no data to aid us in determining whether Melchizedek was favored with a prospective view of what Jebus might one day become. It is impossible to speak affirmatively on anything where the

holy oracles are silent. But then we cannot speak negatively on the question, because, though not of record, we cannot tell what God may have made known to this illustrious priest. We are not daring enough to say that God never talked to his Jebusite servant, for he held converse with Abraham, both orally and through his shekinah when it descended to the plains of Hebron. If he spoke audibly to the father of the faithful, why not to the friend of Abraham; and unless God told him, how could Melchizedek proceed to his altar? He must have been called to the office, as was Aaron at a subsequent period. His heavenly Teacher might have said to him, in fulfilling my covenant with Abraham, your friend and mine, his posterity will march from Egypt through the Arabian wilderness. They shall be fed on manna. The clouds will be unlocked, and the granite rocks shall obey the wand of Moses, and send forth their gushing waters. The quails of the Red Sea will hear my voice and wind their swift flight into their encampments. The Jordan shall open its waves before my hosts, and these wicked nations be destroyed. How can we positively decide that this wonderful priest did not become an apt pupil in the lore of heaven? By his faith he may have anticipated the rise of the *temple* on Moriah—the glad crowds that would ascend into that hill of the Lord—the vast assemblies of people who would come from the remotest borders of the land—and the solemn and joyful festivals which would be celebrated on territory at that time subject to his own royal and priestly jurisdiction. In the fourteenth of Genesis an interview takes place between Abram, the Nomadic prince, and Melchizedek, a pair of distinguished personages, at Shaveh, immediately contiguous to Jebus or Salem. The distance from the town was about a mile. It lay north, and was called the King's Dale, the locality in which Absalom reared his pillar spoken of in the second book of Samuel. This was an important interview. That of Hannibal and Scipio, or the one between Alexander and Napoleon, at Tilsit, cannot be brought into comparison. The one between Paul and Peter, which lasted fifteen days, is more like it, as to its influence on the destinies of our race. But in the twenty-second of Genesis we find the record of a remarkable

transaction. Abram was living at Beersheba, when he was commanded to go into the land of Moriah and sacrifice his son. It was to try his faith to its utmost capacity. Many suppose that this typical transaction was enacted on Mount Moriah; but this may be questioned. "Go to the *land* of Moriah, and offer thy son Isaac on one of the mountains that I will then tell thee of." And we should infer from this language, that Moriah was not the mount. There was a hill, elevation, or summit in the land of Moriah, afterwards Calvary or Golgotha, which was to become more sacred than Moriah. The divine finger might have pointed out that spot to his servant, on which his own Son, the great Antitype, was to die; for we incline to think that, as the Bible calls the Lake of Tiberias a sea, it may at times call a slight elevation a mountain. What was to become Calvary, lay outside of Jebus. It was more sequestered, and therefore more likely to furnish a thicket which could entangle the horns of the substitute for Isaac. Abram had been journeying for nearly three days, and being devoted to sacrifice, Isaac was regarded as dead and buried, but he believed in the immediate resurrection of the victim, because he said, I and the lad will come to you again, and might have added, we will return a joyful company to the Well of the Oath. Here are the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord. Moses does not say whether he saw his friend, Melchizedek, on this solemn mission; but we incline to think that after his faith had triumphantly passed through so severe an ordeal, he informed the Jebusite, and taught him that Shiloh would come, and to him should the gathering of the people be. He might have taught him that the gathering of the nations to his standard meant Jews, Gentiles, Canaanites, and Jebusites, wherever found. Abram saw the day of Shiloh afar off, and exulted. We think that Melchizedek was very much concerned about the call of the Gentiles, for his priesthood certainly represented people outside the pale of Judaism, and was to surpass in influence that of Aaron, to which, indeed, it was entirely antagonistic, as we shall attempt to evince as we proceed in the discussion.

We regard it beyond dispute, that Jebus, or Salem, (for the place went by both names,) was the seat of the Melchizedekian

priesthood. There was the spot on which many a lamb was led to the slaughter, and many a sheep stood dumb before its shearer, and opened not its mouth. They were taken from the captivity, to which they were subjected when sealed for sacrifice. Nor can we doubt that, acting under divine light, Melchizedek was very observant of any speck or blemish in his victims. The law of sacrifice became far more minute and complex in the time of Moses, but Abram understood its incipient principles. In the fifteenth chapter of Genesis, Abram offered sacrifice, which consisted of a heifer, a goat, a ram, a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon. This was a most solemn transaction. It had a meaning. The Chaldean patriarch fell into a deep sleep. He became enveloped in a horror of great darkness. He had forebodings of the bondage which his posterity were to undergo in Egypt; but at the fall of the sun, a smoking furnace and a burning lamp passed between the pieces of his divided offering. That smoking furnace did not consume the children of the covenant, and that burning lamp was to illumine the dark night on which they were to escape from the iron grasp of Pharaoh. Solomon looked back from his palace on this great march of the desert, and exclaimed, "Who is this that cometh out of the wilderness, rearing pillars of sacrificial smoke, perfumed with myrrh and frankincense, and all powders of Egyptian merchants?" The bush had been burning, but was not consumed, and the glory of Israel was going forth as a lamp that burneth. The foliage of the bush had become expanded and more condensed under oppression. We say this rather of that Israel of God, of which this bush was the symbol. The leaves drooped, indeed, in the heat of the wilderness; but then they were often thus in the soft gales of Arabia Felix. Now, can any one believe that Abram observed a politic reticence about these things? Did he forbear from telling Melchizedek that his descendants were to possess the land of Canaan, by the pledge given to Abram, which the Almighty would certainly redeem? The Jebusite no doubt acquiesced in the gift to Abram, for God had taken him out of Pagan darkness, and assigned him the most distinguished niche in the priesthood of the world. Had Melchizedek no tongue in his head? Were Hebron and Jebus so

far apart that he could not catechise Abram about Ur, of the Chaldees, about his call to journey—his adventures in Egypt—what altars he had reared—by what angels he had been visited? Perhaps each of them might have said with truth, “Did not our hearts burn within us when the Angel of the Covenant talked with us under the terebinths of Hebron, or the olive trees of Jebus, or the towering palms of the King’s Dale?” But here we are met by an objection. We have lately seen a suggestion from a respectable source, that the meeting between Abram and Melchizedek, recorded in the fourteenth of Genesis, probably took place at the Salem which fell into the lot assigned to Manasseh after the conquest. If so, our whole theory falls to the ground: There appear to have been three Salems in Canaan. There was one near to Aenon. At Enon, John baptized, because there was water thereabouts; or, according to the Greek, many waters, springs, or rivulets. The quantity of water could not have been his motive for leaving Bethabara. But as he had gone to the ford of the Jordan for the convenience of the two and a-half tribes on the east of the river, it is probable that he thought of nine and a half tribes as furnishing more applicants; and he chose the position, perhaps, more for the benefit of camels than of men, for they required drink. But we do not suppose that Melchizedek made his headquarters at Enon, or that he went over from that place to Shalim that he might congratulate Abram on his return from Hobah, to which he had gone in pursuit of the four petty kings who had invaded the Vale of Siddim. He could have watered his goats at the Kedron or the Siloa brook, the latter of which, in Solomon’s reign, flowed past by the Oracle of God. It would be a violent supposition that the interview took place at Shalim. But there is another Salem mentioned in the thirty-third chapter of Genesis, in the following words: “And Jacob came to Salem, a city of Shechem, which is in the land of Canaan, when he came from Padanaram, and pitched his tent before the city. And he bought a parcel of a field at the hand of the children of Hamor, Shechem’s father, for a hundred pieces of money.” Jacob set up his altar in the vicinity of this town, but at that time there was nothing to give it any special distinc-

tion, unless the proximity it bore to Shechem, at which Abram had reared his first altar to Jehovah. Shechem is far more distinguished. It lay between the mountains of Gerizim and Ebal—became the burial place of Joseph, and the conversation of our Lord at Jacob's Well with the woman of Samaria, has made the locality immortal. The scenery, as described by Dr. Edward Clarke, Professor of Mineralogy in the Cambridge University, England, is not matched by any within the limits of Palestine. He becomes truly eloquent in that portion of his travels. Jacob seems to have stayed long enough in the vicinity of Shalem to become involved in a deluge of sorrows. But Abram removed to his temporary abode between Hai and Bethel. But his locomotion was still to the South. He became domesticated finally at Hebron. He seems, after his settlement, to have had but slight connection with the North part of the country, except when he went on a hurried expedition in pursuit of Chedorlaomer and his allies. The most distant hint is nowhere given that Melchizedek ever played the part of a king in the Shalem that lay not far from Shechem, or that Abram called at that place on his return from beyond Damascus. But the narrative as presented to us is perfectly simple and intelligible. Lot was not an inhabitant of any place near Shechem. He had parted from his uncle and settled in proximity to the five kings who had been subdued. Had the four kings marauded on Shalem, in the neighborhood of Shechem? Could the goods of Lot have been stowed away so far from where he lived? Could Mamre, Aner, and Esheol, who were confederate with Abram, have been residing at any place so remote from where they usually dwelt? What motive could have induced them to tarry anywhere with the goods and chattels which they had so triumphantly retrieved from the enemy? Abram, instead of delaying anywhere, was in haste to get back to Hebron. He encamps for a while in a dale which at that time belonged to the King of Jebus, or Salem, for the names were convertible. He carries out bread and wine for the refreshment of the weary patriarch. This was a wonderful meeting. The small army of the Hebron patriarch was not yet disbanded. The prominent figures in the picture were the Kings of Salem

and Sodom, and the warrior patriarch just crowned with the wreath of victory, for the shields of earth are the Lord's. The trained bands stood around as witnesses of the scene. They heard the blessing which Melchizedek gave to Abraham, and saw the one who had received that benediction paying tithes to the King of Salem. The King of Sodom had not gone to the war. He and the other four kings had been utterly discomfited; for even the Rephaim, Zuzim, Emim, and Horites had been dispersed and subdued. But the King of Sodom had heard of the return of the victor. He came forth from his hiding-place. He speaks nobly on the occasion, unless we account for his speech from the uncommon courtesy which always prevailed among the Orientals. "Give me the persons," said he, "and take the goods to thyself." The city of which he was king, and the vale over which he ruled, had not then been scorched and burnt by the lightning of heaven. How impressive was the reply of his interlocutor: "I have lifted up mine hand unto the Lord, the Most High God, possessor of heaven and earth, that I will not take from a thread even to a shoe-latchet, lest thou shouldest say I have made Abram rich."

Of what has been said thus far about Melchizedek, this is the sum: He resided in a town which became Jerusalem—he was consecrated a priest by the Most High God—he had no predecessor in his office who could have manipulated him into the priesthood—he derived his authority immediately from the Great Supreme—he had no power to induct any one to a succession, because his office was to be continued only through the person of our Lord and Saviour—that it was an incomparably superior office to that held by Aaron—and that it foreshadowed the divine purpose to break down the middle wall of partition which divided between Jews and Gentiles, and disperse the latter from the court assigned them, both in the tabernacle and temple, into the interior of the whole gospel economy. We proceed, then, to show the superiority of his office. It is not our wish to magnify his person, but his office. It was the habit of Paul, whenever he looked at *himself*, to use a diminishing lens; but when gazing on his office, he delighted to see it looming into infinitude. In his estimation, it was high as the canopy of heaven, solemn as

the day of judgment, deep as the ashes accumulated on the margin of the lake of fire, clear as the milky way, momentous as eternity, rich as the golden city, and beautiful as the paradise of God, and laden with fruits from the tree of life. His extensive travels—his vast labors—his deep afflictions, his severe persecutions, evince that he was honest in a sacred cause. Crowded cities—obscure villages—sequestered hamlets—the isles of the Gentiles—the synagogues of Jews—the cliffs of the Areopagus—the courts of Felix, Festus, and Agrippa—the throne of the Cæsars, bore witness to his impassioned zeal and fiery eloquence. Nor can we doubt the humility of Melchizedek. He was the priest of Jebusite shepherds, husbandmen, and vinedressers. He owned a few goats, we dare say; but we do not suppose that he rode out to the King's Dale in a coach, with a showy coronet, accompanied with a group of outriders. He might have gone on a mule, camel, or swift dromedary; for he must have been in a great hurry to see Abram, after the Vale of Siddim had been overrun by Northern invaders. The ministers of God need not be so much concerned about the place *at* which they labor, as the fidelity *with* which they labor. Is there anything more charming than to read of Erskine laboring at Portmoak, Doddridge at Kilworth, Richmond at Brading, and Oberlin and Neff in the Haute and Vosgian Alps, or Martyn in the Vale of Shiraz, or Campbell among the Caffres, or Morrison translating the Scriptures among the gardens of Macao, in the flowery land of China? Salem was an humble place, but a wonderful though not a supernatural man was its insulated priest. Let us compare his priesthood with the one held by Aaron. Let us look at its antiquity. He was priest of the Most High God nearly four hundred years before Jethrö or Aaron. Antiquity is a great affair with some people; but with God a thousand years are as one day. By his sovereign will he can make his office-bearers when, where, and how he may please. Could Melchizedek and Aaron have been brought face to face, the former might have said to the latter, Why, you are a man of yesterday. We say he *might*, but we do not say he would have been so impolite. Did not the patriarch of Hebron make a low bow to the children of Heth? Melchize-

dek would have done the same thing to Aaron; but had the assumption of the latter been metamorphosed into presumption, the former would not have given up four centuries of time. So, when Presbyterians who are told about Cyprian by conceited Churchmen, they ought to talk about the two hundred and fifty years before that hierarchist obtained his mitre, for priestcraft had an early beginning. Paul says that in his day the mystery of iniquity had begun to work. When Constantine dined his clergy, the fermentation was vinous, but became acetous when he opened his persecutions upon the sects. And who, we ask, gave rise to the sects, except they who introduced human inventions and will-worship into the simple primitive Church? No one pretends to doubt the prophetic and priestly office of Aaron. In the twentieth chapter of Genesis, the designation of prophet is applied to Abram; but this could not have been done in its modern sense, because Abram did not authoritatively foretell future events. And Aaron, as a teacher of the people, may be called a prophet; and there appear to have been such teachers or interpreters of the prophecies in the apostolic Church. Aaron was not a king, but Melchizedek was the King of Salem. He was prophet or teacher of the Jebusites, their priest and regal governor. He therefore bears a threefold relation to his anti-type; and this cannot be said of his antagonistic rival. The three offices seem to trifoliate better in type and antitype; or they trichinate more happily, if we may use an illustration from mineralogy. To this view we add that Melchizedek was prophet, priest, and king, on the very locality where our Lord was to die when the fulness of the times should come. Aaron never saw Salem. He died on Mount Hor, in Arabia Petraea, and it is called Jebel Haroun by the Arabs to the present time. Moses, from Nebo, might have caught a glimpse of the sacred locality, but not Aaron. Melchizedek might have told Aaron, You were made a priest in the wilderness, and in that wilderness you exercised the priestly office; but mine was instituted and continued to my decease, about Moriah, Calvary, Gethsemane, Olivet, Shiloh, and all the sacred localities. Yes, sheep that browsed on mountains destined to become hallowed forever, and lambs that

drank from the cisterns of Salem, were subject to my crosier. Though not a stem from the rod of Levi, my prophetic, priestly, and regal sceptre touched on summits where the palaces of Hebrew kings were to stand, and songs prompted by an anticipated redemption were to gush forth—where the dumb Lamb was to stand before Pilate—and the veil of the temple was to be rent in twain—rocks to be torn asunder—the blue heavens shrouded in darkness—doves to mistake noon for night, and angels to take up the refrain of those dying words, *It is finished*, and disperse them from off melodious harps to the utmost bounds of creation. Aaron and the Jebusite were too far apart, both in space and time, ever to have met in this world. Nor do we suppose that the latter was so high-Church as to have talked to his brother priest after this fashion. Puseyism was not born in his day. It was engendered some forty years ago, at Oxford, and some were sponsors at its baptism, who have since become familiar with the unclean waters of the Tiber, and saluted the slipper of Antichrist. Thanks to the Ruler of nations, that the States of the Church no longer make a part of the dynasty engrafted among the powers of Europe by the cunning of Sylvester I., and the forgeries of Isidore, Archbishop of Seville, but to Italy, their rightful owner. It is our duty to venerate holy places; but that reverence need not degenerate into a fanatical superstition like that which distinguished fiendish crusaders, or like that affected by Russian Czars, such as Paul, Alexander, and Nicholas. But Melchizedek was a holy man, and in our reverence for him something is due to the locality in which he officiated as a priest.

It seems clear from the Bible, that the priesthood of Aaron was established with the ulterior view of making it temporary and intermediate. It was to last its period of time, and then to die and be buried. Its sacrifices were numerous, and its types were often striking. Israelites were taught in this way. The Scriptures are patriarchal, typical, historical, ethical, prophetic, poetical, biographical, doctrinal, preceptive, and are wound up by the loving disciple; but surely in the Apocalypse he talks like a son of thunder. His lightnings, voices, lamps, seven awful trumpets and seals—his falling star and bottomless pit—his mighty

angel, woes, red dragon—his Babylon, winepress, vials, plagues, scarlet lady, fowls, Gog and Magog, and lake of fire, are terrible. They make us turn with delight to his sketching of softer objects, such as his palms, and golden crowns, and cleansed robes, and spotless thrones—his harps and gorgeous city—or where his pencil seems to bury itself in the dense foliage of the tree, the fruits of which encumber the boughs—or when he drowns it in the fountains to which all the holy are led by the Lamb. We would not, for the gold of Ophir, part from any portion of this Bible. We could not give up the types of the Old Testament. We believe that Aaron, his altars and victims, did foreshadow One of whom Moses, in the law and the prophets, did write. But then the oath of God, when speaking of his Son, seems to glide over the Jewish priesthood, for thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek. Is there no meaning in this solemn declaration? God does not hesitate a moment in his decision. His choice between the two priesthoods is absolute and unconditional. The divine oath does not hover over the tent of Aaron, or lift the curtain that gave ingress to the Holy of Holies—the chest of the covenant—the golden censer—the pot of manna—Aaron's rod that budded—and the tables of the covenant, and the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat. We may well wonder that the priesthood of our Lord was not fashioned after the one held for so many ages by Aaron and his successors. The oath bars out the claims of the Levite. There must have been some high and profound reason for the arrangement. The censor of Aaron is discarded for the one wielded by Melchizedek. The blossoms and almonds fall from the rod of the Levitical priesthood; that of the Jebusite blooms in fulness and supplants it in the ark of the covenant. The high priest was the ring-leader of the Sanhedrim against our Lord. It was time, indeed, to erase his name from the genealogical record; but it has been done as far back as the time of David; and when Aaron was consecrated, it was no doubt the divine purpose that the priesthood should be changed, and that a great priest should arise after the one order of Melchizedek. According to the Levitical economy, our Lord could not have been an Aaronical priest.

Had he presented himself as a candidate at the temple, his being of the tribe of Judah, would have been an entire disqualification. They would not have washed his hands and feet, and being about thirty years of age, he went to John. He was to be the Priest of the world, and not alone of the Jews. He could not have obtained either the water or oil of the temple; but the Holy Spirit who crowned his head in the appearance of a dove, was infinitely better than a ceremonial unction. But Ritualists will object. Was not the son of Amram a great *high* priest? Did not he wear his ephod—pomegranates and bells on the fringe of his garments—his turban, golden threads, mitre, breastplate, and other appendages? Certainly; but all his paraphernalia cannot stand against the oath of God. Under that asseveration his turban falls from his temples, his threads grow dim, his bells cease to sound, and he stands undressed. He becomes as bare as were his feet. Now it is remarkable, that after the delivery of the law, when Aaron was installed, that Moses, in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, frequently calls him priest, to the leaving out of the *high*. In the close of Deuteronomy, the appellation of *high* is used once or twice, and that number alone. And this mode of designating him pervades nearly the whole of the Old Testament. “The priesthood shall be in *you* and your *sons*,” are the very words used in its organisation, and the word is probably employed in a collective sense. Aaron and his sons were a *high* power in Israel. By courtesy the father was *high*. Not order, but jurisdiction, was meant; for, according to prelatists, the Archbishop of Canterbury still keeps himself in the rank of bishop, with a little more jurisdiction than a Diocese. And we think Aaron kept himself in the rank of the priests with an oversight of the sons. The whole institution was a family affair. But we may be asked, could any one of his sons go into the most holy place on the solemn day of expiation? Why, certainly he could, if the so-called *high* priest were sick, or lame, or crippled. Otherwise all Israel must have remained in their uncleanness for a *whole year*. In the sixteenth of Leviticus and in the thirty-second verse, we read: “And the priest, whom he shall anoint, and whom he shall consecrate to minister in the priest’s

office, in his father's stead, shall make the atonement, and shall put on the linen clothes, even the holy garments. And he shall make an atonement for the priests, and for all the people of the congregation." This is sufficiently explicit. But other passages might be produced. As our Lord was of the tribe of Judah, God was pleased to find a prototype of him on territory subsequently dwelt in by that tribe, and there had Judah washed his garments in wine and his clothes in the blood of grapes.

We will now call the mind of the reader to a brief exposition of the one hundred and tenth Psalm. This document is all-important on the object and design of casting off the Aaronical and the adoption of the Melchizedekan priesthood. It was written nearly a thousand years before the advent of the Messiah. It presents a clear view of our Lord's ascension, after he had submitted himself to the infirmities of our nature by drinking of the brook in his way; for like a Hebrew pilgrim, he seems to have been a lone, wayfaring man. But he lifts up his head; that is, he ascends to that glory which he had with the Father before the world began. He is no longer a pilgrim, but has returned a palmer, who has won the victory, having spoiled principalities and powers, and made a show of them openly before the Jewish and Gentile world. Then the Lord said to him who was David's Lord, sit thou at this right hand of mine till I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Jews are enemies, but tens of thousands among them shall wear the easy yoke of the gospel. Gentiles are depraved, sensual, idolatrous, but they shall be subjected to the obedience of Christianity. From my holy hill of Zion the Lord shall send forth the rod of thy prophetic, priestly, and regal strength. Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Establish among them thy central throne, thy willing people in the day of intercessory power. Thy converts shall sparkle like the dewdrops of the morning, when the gospel is young and is shedding out the dew of its youth, and Jew and Gentile shall lie down in one fold. The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath. Men of power will oppose that gospel. It may encounter Herods and Neros, but I will make it triumphant. The Lord shall judge the *heathen*.

He shall fill the places to which thy messages are sent with dead bodies. Jerusalem shall undergo a fearful seige, and its heads or princes shall be wounded. This is a brief summary of the Psalm. It is the egress of the gospel beyond the pale of a pent up Judaism. We ask, then, how came the following words to be introduced into the central verse of that Psalm? "The Lord hath sworn, and will not change his mind. Thou art a priest forever, not after the order of Aaron, but Melchizedek." This settles the question. The Jebusite represented the Gentiles; Aaron the Jews. There is no further necessity for the Levite or his long line of successors. His altars are extinguished—his fires are quenched—his lavers are overthrown—his smoke is dispersed—his victims are released—his sheep may browse—his goats may ramble, for a new order of things will arise, and a new series of ages will begin. The decease of Jerusalem has been accomplished. Judaism was but a vestibule through which to reach the world. Ceremonies must yield to morals, and be supplanted by a simple spirituality. Melchizedek was mortal. He died; but the Priest of Calvary, to whom he stood as antitype, abideth a priest continuously, even forever. The type lives only in his Antitype. There was a long interval between the Jebusite and David. The former had not been thought of since the fourteenth of Genesis. Therefore, David was moved by inspiration to bring him from his deep obscurity, to play a conspicuous part in the conversion of the world. We turn now to the seventh of Hebrews, where Paul makes great use of the oath in accounting for the change in the similitude of the priesthoods. Any asseveration on the part of God must be ratified. He swore that he would give Israel a land flowing with milk and honey. Was not his declaration fulfilled even to the raising up of a new generation that he nursed into blooming youthfulness till the last Jewish footstep was planted on the western banks of the Jordan? We decline any argument to show that Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews. Beside the mention of his beloved Timothy, it carries internal evidence of the masterly way in which Paul always treated Jewish subjects. Professor Stuart, of Andover, thought it was sent from Italy to a church in Jerusalem, and

doubtless it soon reached Antioch, in Syria, and all the Jewish churches throughout the lesser Asia, which seems to have been the *apostledom* of Peter, to the entire exclusion of Rome. We suppose that Melchizedek kept no genealogical records at Salem. There was no necessity, for he had no predecessor in his office. None was to come between him and our Lord; and though the former was a dying man, yet he represented a Priest who was made after the power of an endless life. The effects of his oblation on Calvary were to extend through countless ages. There never was a people so devoted to genealogies as the Jews. Paul says they were *endless*. He had read those enrolled in Kings and Chronicles. The Florentine secretaries, and Magdeburg centuriators, and Hindoo brahmins, Chinese mandarins and papal legates, are nothing in comparison with Jewish scribes. Possibly it was owing to the destruction of some of their records by war that Jews at present cannot designate the tribes to which they belong. Their priesthood, property, and Messiah were to be known by these rolls, which were laid up in the chambers of the temple. Paul knew that the Jews would ask, who is this Melchizedek? He replies, you all know the father and mother of Aaron, and his successors. You have only to examine your registers; but in them you cannot find the ancestry of the Jebusite, though he certainly must have had a father and mother. You are familiar with the descent of your priests through your genealogies; but Melchizedek, according to the Greek, is not genealogised. He is no Aaronical priest, and without a niche in any gallery, either of your patriarchs or priests. But, Paul, you have made the Jebusite an immortal personage. You say that he had neither beginning of days nor end of life, and made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually. Paul's answer: Can't you Jews look into the fifth chapter, and tell from your own Scriptures how long Adam lived, for all the days of Adam were nine hundred and thirty years, and he died? If you will reduce years to days, can't you tell when the father of our race began his life, and when that life came to an end? So of all the ancient men spoken of in that chronological chapter. But you cannot even whisper anything about the nativity or demise

of Melchizedek. And his priesthood abideth forever, because it was lost in the never-ending priesthood of his Antitype. He died like others, but still he overrides all your genealogies. He was a great personage, who ruled in righteousness and peace, and many of your kings were scourges, both to your own people and the petty kingdoms by which they were surrounded. He served under the Prince of Peace, even under him who made peace by the blood of his cross. Aaron was made *without* an oath, but the Jebusite under an oath. Abram received his blessing, therefore he was greater than the one he blessed. He paid him tithes, and therefore he represented the Levitical tribe, who received tithes from the people and then paid them to the priests. Yes, he was a distinguished man. God made him, and gave him all his grandeur. God taught him without the oracle between the cherubim of your temple. The shekinah may have been lowered at Salem as well as at the oak of Mamre.

It is our profound conviction that if this subject be important, it must carry along with it some practical results. We have not written upon it to gratify an idle curiosity, or for the sake of mere speculation. It is plain that this priesthood of Melchizedek, after which the only priesthood in the New Testament is patterned, can in no way be perverted to the seeming support of Popery. Its adherents look rather to the intermediate priesthood of Aaron. But why are Christians so anxious to penetrate into the wilderness of the Scriptures? Is it to see any ecclesiastic clothed in purple and fine linen? No, but to discover the hidden wisdom of God, that the wilderness may be turned into a fruitful field and blossom like the rose. We sincerely wish that intelligent Papists would look into this subject, and they would soon bury the girdle of Aaron, not on the Euphrates, but on the stagnant Tiber. It would require a volume to trace the analogies between Romanism and Judaism. The Papal system has committed that great sin denounced in the eighth chapter of Jeremiah. They have brought out the bones of the kings of Judah, and the bones of his princes, and the bones of his priests, and of his prophets, and of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, out of their graves. And they have spread them before the sun, moon, and all the

host of heaven, whom they have loved, and whom they have served, and after whom they have walked, and whom they have sought, and whom they have worshipped. Aaron has lived a protracted life in that of the two hundred and fifty so-called Popes. Aaron's rod has, with the Papists, swallowed up the one which Melchizedek received under not the oath of man, but the eternal God. There is no likeness or distant resemblance between Peter and the Pope. That might be found out by any man, even in his second childhood. Peter was an active, self-denied apostle. He had no Vatican, with ten thousand rooms in which to reside; no cushions on which to loll; no Tetzels to send abroad; no golden roses to bestow; no carnivals to superintend; no kings to crown; no mules to baptize; no States to govern; no crusades to inaugurate; no edicts to proclaim; no persecutions to engender; no Constantines, Pepins, Charlemagnes, or Bonapartes, or Eugenies to flatter; no holy coats to exhibit; no lying wonders to invent; and no cardinals to hang from the Castle of St. Angelo, as did Leo X. But, say the adherents of Papistry, our Lord spoke great things of Peter. We know he did, in a moral but not a ceremonial sense. Lightfoot, in his *Horæ Talmudicæ*, has expressed the opinion that our Lord, in the binding and loosing, alludes to two Rabbinical schools, one of which bound a letter from going on the Sabbath, but the other loosed or allowed it to be sent. This would have been in the Oriental style of speaking; but we rather think that our Lord alludes to the inherent power in his gospel, which looses sinners who believe, and keeps bound all the impenitent, and which Peter was commissioned to declare. The loosing and binding were not in the man, but in what the man was to proclaim. All the apostles had the same power, and so have the ministry of the present day, and will have to the end of time, for the gospel is either the savor of life unto life, or of death unto death. But, says the Papist, is not Peter a rock, and *the* rock? The water of Rephidim refreshed the Church in the wilderness when Peter was in nonentity, and the Rock that supplied the water was Christ. The Angel of the Covenant was then Head of the Church; but in the view of Papists, he has been supplanted by

a voluntary abdication in favor of the fisherman. Oh no, says the Papist, he only made him his vicar. And did he need a vicar? We trow not. We thought that our Messiah held the keys of death and hell and of the universe. By a mere figure of speech our Saviour allowed him to preach the first sermon on the day of Pentecost, and to open the new dispensation to the Gentiles; that is, to Elamites and other nations. That's all. He gave Peter no key which, used by him, could lock or unlock his kingdom on earth, or the gates of the new Jerusalem. It cannot be said of Peter that he shutteth and no man openeth, and openeth and no man shutteth. This would be to put the vicar above the universal Rector. This is a stereotyped custom with Papists. When they impiously call Mary the mother of God, it is like placing the moon ninety or a hundred millions of miles above the sun. Whereas, the woman in the twelfth of the Apocalypse had the moon of Judaism below her feet, and the Sun of Christianity, with the twelve apostolic stars, over her head. Nor was that woman Mary, as Ignatius Loyola pretended, but the symbolical mother of all Christians who live beneath the rising and setting sun. Poor Mary, what iniquities have been committed in thy name! But the Rock. For fifteen hundred years the curtain hung, which prefigured the incarnation, before the Holy of Holies. The Messiah was veiled to the Jews, and even to his immediate disciples. They were curious to know who this mysterious Nazarene could be, and Peter struck the mighty Rock on which the Church was to rest. He was taught from on high the Sonship of Christ. The Messiah adopts it as a fundamental principle of the new economy, and bestows on Peter the honor of gathering into his kingdom the first fruits of Pentecost, and even the gates of Papistry shall not *eventually* prevail against the Church. But the Papal history is open to the world, and that world can scarcely contain its sanguinary records. Romanism and Judaism are Siamese twins. Any one can see the resemblance in her seventy cardinals, her puffs of incense, her lavers, her festivals, her Nazarenes, her smoking altars, her bigotry, her schismatic spirit as touching the rest of mankind, her complex ceremonies, her music, her dark-looking priests, her Le-

vitical rites. In her incipient organisation in the fourth century, and after the invasion of coarse Goths and fiery Huns, she reasoned after this fashion : Let us pass by that old Jebusite. Here's a piece of the limestone rock on which he offered sacrifice. It's of no account. His rites were very plain. He never could have invented a disgusting mass. His kingdom was so small that he might have hid it into one fold of his robe. But Aaron bore a civil mace over a people numerous as stars or sands on the sea-shore. The Pepin whom the Pope will crown intends to give us the exarchate of Ravenna. Poor Peter ! He only took a half shekel out of the mouth of a fish, and then let the fish go, though it would have served for Lent ; but the Pope can get as many rix-dollars as he may need, and we shall have a joyful time, at least till Luther sends forth his seven thunders from Wittenburg. Such was the reasoning of priests to which the logic of predicted events seems to have historically corresponded. But though God in his mysterious wisdom permitted the hateful system to arise, it is some consolation to know that it is destined to fall. It has lately been wounded ; and may the wound prove mortal, that the nations may hold a jubilee over the ruin of Babylon. The natural heart craves to be saved by *ritualism* at the present time ; but Isaiah says, in awful words, " their webs shall not become garments." If nothing else will avail to destroy the delusion, let ritualistic devotees pray for one preliminary peal of Gabriel's trumpet, that they may ask for that wind which bloweth where, when, and how it listeth, lest they be unprepared for the moment when that magnificent trump shall stop the revolving earth, and summon all its people to appear before the great white throne.

Prelacy, too, ignores the priesthood of Melchizedek. They are so devoted to the prayer-book that many of its ministers are not over-anxious to become very profound divines. Some of them skim the surface of the theological sea ; but if they would descend, like Schiller's diver, they might bring up gems superior to the twelve which blazed in the breastplate of Aaron, for the Holy Scriptures resemble that crystal ocean which the Patmos exile saw before the throne. Some of the low Church are among our dear friends ; but we fear they may get a little higher

unless they lose their grasping after the shadow of apostolical succession. We never knew a man of deeper piety than the Rev. Renel Keith, of the Alexandria Seminary. We always thought ourselves firm Calvinists; but really our Episcopal brother outheroed Herod, and he abode to the last in the same theological stay. He was not averse to Melchizedek, for he was always an hungered after Scriptural truth; and where that led he was willing to follow. His piety was an evergreen; but, like Cowper, he found it often overshadowed by the cypress tree, from a strange constitutional organisation. But in the controversy of Onderdonk and Barnes, we detect quite an inclination in the former towards Aaron. He gives up the argument in the New Testament, save the one drawn from Titus and Timothy. Well, a pair of evangelists who were, from the existing circumstances of the Church, in a state of locomotiveness, could easily be disposed of; but the bishop clings fast to the three orders of the Jewish priesthood, like a pilgrim to his wallet. It is the only collation on which Prelatists can feed; but the Papists pre-occupied the ground, for the Papists manufactured their Pope out of Aaron, and out of Eleazer and Ithamar a priesthood which no man can number; and out of the rest of the Levites, not only a few beardless deacons, but a vast swarm of monks, Eremites, and hermits. Now, we would willingly join issue with either Bishop Hall, of Norwich, or Archbishop Potter, on the question whether the Jewish priesthood consisted of three orders. But it is unnecessary, for Melchizedek stands in their way. He had no compeers in his office—no Levites in forty-eight cities to go out and catch his goats, or lambs, or red heifer; and he had no successor, except One who was the first born to the priesthood among many brethren. God chose that his Son should die at Salem, and he also chose that his representative priest should offer on the same hallowed ground. And when the great victim had waded through his sea of suffering, he chose that all priesthood should come to an end. Even that of Melchizedek was swallowed as a pebble would be in the Atlantic or Pacific ocean. The prototype died, and was buried in the same locality with his Antitype; but the latter conquered, and was buried in the new hewn tomb, and rose

as the great High Priest of our profession; and he is the only Priest in the universe. His sacerdotal robe was deeply dyed, not for himself, but for us, guilty sinners; and any one who repents and believes, under the agency of the Spirit, is welcome to the benefits of his oblation. Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not any longer, for a body hast thou prepared, which Divinity uses as a temple, and mine ear hast thou bored as a willing servant, and as such, lo I come; in the volume of thy book it is written of me that I delight to do thy will, oh God. Corresponding to these views, it is remarkable that priesthood is extirpated from every leaf of the New Testament, except that all the household of faith are moral kings and spiritual priests. The writers of the New Testament would have interwoven the priestly office if they could; for inspiration forbade them to commit that offence against the purpose of God. Therefore, they selected a series of terms in which to state the office of the gospel, as distant as possible from ritualism. Peter was slow to believe in his Gentile vision; and Paul respectfully alleges that he knew not that it was the High Priest of whom he had spoken in language of censure.

But though animal sacrifices have ceased forever—Aaron is sleeping on Mount Hor—Melchizedek in Salem—and even such faithful sons of Judaism as Hilkiab and Zadok are buried—the Old and New Testament are fastened together by a chain which neither man nor angel can rend asunder. All their moral parts are retained. The Bible is one, and but one, like the dream of Pharaoh. The Old Testament must not be laid aside. Not to go beyond the introductory chapters of Genesis, we are indebted to that record for the first beams of light that glimmered over the chaos of creation—for the laying down of its green carpet on the earth—for the birth of the sun, moon, and stars, also—for the institution of the Sabbath—for the early footsteps of Eve on pilgrimage among the flowers of paradise—for the smoke that curled upward from the altars of Abel—for the fall of man from his Eden niche—for the ark that surmounted the convulsions of the deluge—for the flight of the dove across the dreary waters—for the finding of the olive tree and rifling of the olive leaf—for the bow of the promise admired “in all

ages," and sweet patriarchal pictures, the gallery of which extended from Hebron to the wells of Haran. Tell us not that the Old Testament is devoid of beautiful incidents. Is there nothing that strikes the imagination in the pillar by which Israel was led—a wreath of vapor in the morning, but touched each successive night by the tongs of the cherubim? Nothing in the rock of Rephidim, the Corra Lynn of the desert? Nothing in the forty years fall of the manna? Nothing in the song of the well at Beer? Nothing in the landscapes looming before the entranced eye of the lawgiver, and in the crossing of the Jordan? A hundred artistic pencils have been at work on the Hebrew records, and as many poets have sung in concert the passage of the Red Sea—the death of Miriam and the demise of Moses—the ascension of Elijah and the reign of Solomon. Need we name Milton, Gesner, Cumberland, Watts, Montgomery, Buchanan, Racine, Angelo, and Prior? We forbear to associate Byron with any cluster of reverential men.

But further than this. We think that some connection was intended between the priesthood of Melchizedek and the call of the Gentiles. He presided over a people that were doomed to experience the displeasure of God for their sins. Probably many of the Jebusites handed up their children in sacrifice to grim idols in the vale of Hinnom. But Melchizedek had doubtless called out from among them a peculiar people—zealous of good works. If there were no such chosen generation then there was no occasion for a priest either with or without an oath. Melchizedek stemmed the tide of infanticide which was depopulating the land of Canaan. Infant cries had reached the ear of the Lord God of Sabaoth. It may be that there was at least a counteracting influence to this revolting crime. God may have said to the King of Salem, thee only have I seen righteous among these Jebusites, and may have set him apart for the good of a few who had not bowed the knee to the image of Moloch. Shortly after the interview in Genesis between the priest and the patriarch God promised to the latter an innumerable progeny. This may have meant his Jewish descendants in a natural sense and a spiritual offspring among the Gentiles, and we have heard the

call though Abraham be ignorant of us. Palestine was a small country: Its dimensions in length were not more than a hundred and fifty miles and seventy-five in breadth. Voltaire speaks lightly of it as a gift; but in the reign of Solomon it ran from the River of Egypt to the Euphrates. It was remarkable for fertility, its mountains, vales, and numerous brooks and variety of its products, and was large in comparison with the contracted dynasties by which it was surrounded. A country may be too extensive for easy government. Our own by way of example. But limited as was its area, from it were thrown rays of light into Persia, Chaldea, Idumea, and other eastern lands, rays preliminary to the full call of the nations. It has given to mankind the true religion, the divine oracles, the elements of law, a vast amount of early history, exalted views of the triune Creator, and the most sublime strains of poetry and eloquence. Every man of taste will spontaneously acquiesce in the eulogium pronounced on the Scriptures by Sir William Jones. The Jews were not totally destitute of feeling for the idolaters, because they admitted them both as proselytes of the gate, and when they fully adopted their religion, as proselytes of *all righteousness*. Pious Hebrews were not blind to the superiority of their system to all systems of idolatry, and they were certainly favored with dim perceptions of its extension beyond the borders of their own land. Simeon spoke of the Messiah as a Light to enlighten the Gentiles and the glory of Israel, the chosen people. Seven hundred and fifty years before the time of Simeon, Isaiah, the son of Amoz, foresaw the introduction of the nations to all the blessings which would occur to mankind from the advent of the Messiah. On this subject he permits nothing to lull his prophetic harp into repose. His predictions are decided, even to gathering the forces and eating the riches of the Gentiles. Variety of learning, the charms of taste, and invention of arts, could not keep Greece from the worship of mythological deities, nor Rome from falling into the shadows of moral death; and even after the introduction of Christianity the Latin Church and the Greek became apostate, and continue so to the present day. Rome was built on seven hills and so was Constantinople. Thus saith the Lord God, behold I

will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people, and they shall bring thy sons in their arms and thy daughters shall be carried on their shoulders. At that time continents were involved in darkness, whilst Israel had long enjoyed light in all their dwellings. But for eighteen centuries the descendants of Abraham have been wanderers over the face of the earth, and have found no rest for the soles of their feet. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell severity, but towards thee goodness if thou continue in *his* goodness. Otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. The Jews are still Aaronites, though their fathers often made the hundred and tenth Psalm to resound through their magnificent Temple. They deliberately prefer Aaron to the Messiah and their own ritualism to the oath of the living God, who broke the chain of their Egyptian bondage and planted their fathers a noble vine on the hills and plains of Palestine. We cannot coincide in the opinion of Lightfoot that they are finally and forever excinded. If they would ponder and embrace the priesthood of Melchizedek instead of hugging the rites of Aaron, and cling to their plain synagogues instead of hankering after gorgeous temples, they might speedily be restored to their own land. But if Melchizedek were a more effective priest than Aaron why is he not made more of in the Bible? Was not Adam a man of great importance? Had he no bearing on the destinies of the human family? He sleeps for the most part in the Bible till Paul brings him prominently into view in his epistle to the Romans. Revelation is a system gradually prepared and well adjusted to all its purposes, and according to the forty-ninth chapter and second verse of Isaiah, God saw fit to hide Melchizedek in his quiver that arrows may be taken out of it for the ritualistic errorists of our times.

There are one or two miscellaneous results connected with this discussion to which a bare mention may be given. If the priesthood of Aaron was changed for its supplantation, as Paul alleges, the calling in of the Gentiles, it results that our present missionary operations are of great importance. Are not all nations involved in Pagan darkness Gentiles to us who profess to have

received Christianity? Do we find the system replete with innumerable blessings? Then it is our solemn duty to make it known to all the race of man. For many centuries Israel would not acknowledge us as having any part or lot in the Abrahamic covenant. They virtually said to the people bordering on Palestine, you shall not sit down at our magnificent table. It was in vain to beg even for the crumbs that fell from their repasts. What! shall Gentiles drink at our smitten rocks, and at our wells of salvation? Shall they feast on our pomegranates, and listen to our priestly bells? Shall they recline at our Paschal supper, and join in our great Hallel? Shall they be anointed at our olive-yards, and moistened in the dew of our Hermon, and healed at our Gilead? We admit that many Jews went abroad before they were dispersed under the judicial sentence of him from whom their privileges were derived. They were among the nations, but not of the nations. They stood aloof, attached to their own righteousness, which was of the law, but deplorably ignorant of the righteousness of their Messiah. They wore frontlets between their eyes, but forgot to hide the word of God in their unregenerate hearts. They rejected the Great High Priest for whom the Aaronic ritual, with its myrrh and frankincense, was to flee away. He entered into the holy places not made with hands eternal in the heavens. At his death the veil was rent in the temple whilst the priests were preparing their Paschal lambs. The period of the Messiah's curtained Incarnation had closed, and our Intercessor had passed into the immediate presence of God, where he ever liveth. Saul of Tarsus was a fanatical Jew, but he was brought to the ground and constituted an apostle, for there had been an acceptable offering up of the Gentiles; and after his conversion he thought of propagating the gospel not only in Rome but in Spain. We who call ourselves Christians were made so by means, though divine grace may and often does act above means. We bear a most responsible relation to those destitute of revealed light. Behold the crowded millions of China, India, and Japan, in whose temples and pagodas a false religion is taught from century to century. Look on the map of South America. What do we see but an intemperate priesthood,

a benighted people, and swarms of ritualists. Look on Africa and on her hundred and fifty millions blind to a coming eternity. Behold our own Indians, for whose extermination by massacre our civic Hamans are calling with stentorian voice, that they may rush into their scanty reserves. Papists, Idolaters, Sacramentarians, Ritualists, the apostate Greek Church, Puseyites, Mohammedans need missions.

The question is one fraught with vast importance. Under what priesthood are Christians living, acting, praying, and interceding at the present time? We reply that there is but one Priest in the universe to whom we owe an undying gratitude. He laid down the stupendous price of our redemption, by rendering himself as the willing victim of Calvary. There can be no orders, ranks, or degrees in his adorable Priesthood, nor were there any in that of Melchizedek. The latter was an ungenealogised man, and therefore could have had no successor, but he was the liveliest type of our Saviour known among men. To suppose that he was a divine personage, or that he held a joint priesthood with Christ, or that he was ever brought into a nearer contact with his antitype than a period of two thousand years, would equal the impiety of Papists who make Mary co-redeemer with our Lord. Melchizedek died like any other mortal. The priesthood of Aaron was dissolved. The latter has been supplanted by his antagonistic rival who was called of God in Salem from one of the tribes of Canaan. Ritualists still hold on tenaciously to Aaron and their three order conceits, and at present a simple Christianity has many foes. Scientists are conspiring with ritualists against the life of our religion, for only degrade the internal change of the heart to forms and ceremonies and all are satisfied.

At all events the Presbyterian Kirk in the United States means to keep in the old path, turning neither to the right or left on her way. A few years ago Bishop Potter and others tried to allure us to receive the gift of apostolical succession at the hands of Prelacy. Had he forgotten that we were descendants of men and women too, who at the peril of their lives had signed the solemn league and covenant on the tombstones and cairns of heroic

martyrs. We want no line of pontiffs, no cardinals, no grand lamas, no Jesuits, no archbishops, no priests. We are satisfied with that variety of spiritual titles bestowed upon the ministry in the New Testament, which were not brought out from the chambers of the Temple or from among the archives of the Aaronic priesthood, but from that inspiration which overshadowed evangelists and apostles. Our religion is in the Bible, and men have been reared up to excavate the ruins of Nineveh and Babylon, and who are establishing its authenticity by discoveries strong as proofs from Holy Writ. Presbyterians have long borne witness against all human inventions, and may their testimony ever be unshaken as the mountains and continued to the evening of the world.

ARTICLE II.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY *VERSUS* GOVERNMENT.

With the sincerest respect and love for our fathers and brethren in the Southern Presbyterian Church from whom we may differ, we offer the following brief review of the *principle* involved in the decision of our late Assembly on the issue of *government*, as made between the Faculty and some of the students in our Theological Seminary at Columbia.

However divided the mind of the Church may be as to the righteousness or unrighteousness of the Assembly's decision, all will agree that the question decided was one respecting government—the Faculty claiming the right, under the Constitution of the Seminary, to *govern* the students—the students, that is, some of them, denying this right, at least so far as their *obligatory* attendance on chapel services on the Lord's day was involved. It is quite irrelevant how or by whom these differences were brought to the notice of the Assembly; suffice it to know that they were brought, and the decision of this venerable court invoked. We are all familiar with the decision, and the whole Church knows that however mildly worded and designedly respectful in its tone