

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1851.

No. II.

ART. I.—*Foreign Missions and Millenarianism.* An Essay
for the Times.

ONE half of the nineteenth century has now passed away. It has been a period of advance in almost every department of human activity. The triumphs of industry, art, and education are such, that the world is invited to send up its trophies for a general exhibition in the metropolis of England. Should this invitation be generally regarded, a grand display may be expected as the result—a display at once creditable to the age and to the distinguished author of the scheme. All nations, all classes, all customs, all inventions will be there represented: and we may justly anticipate that the effect of such a celebration will be highly propitious, not only by showing what achievements have been made, but by affording facilities of comparison and competition, (the most effective stimuli to inventive effort) which may lead to still more important discoveries hereafter.

While such occasions are very properly observed by men of the world, the Church also, we apprehend, may well, in part at least, imitate this example. She too has been advancing, and at the close of half a century of unusual prosperity, if she be not called upon to assemble her representatives for a jubilee

earnest search for truth to talk much of its originality; it was too intent on getting a strong and sure foundation to be ever eulogizing its own work, or boasting of its superiority to all others.

ART. V.—*The True Test of an Apostolical Ministry.*

THE Apostles governed the primitive Church, not in dioceses or fixed districts, but with an ambulatory and convenient jurisdiction. The power of each extended to the whole. Still, in the exercise of this extraordinary power, they appear to have had some regard to a division of labour. Paul expresses his unwillingness to interfere with other men's labours, and his earnest wish to preach the gospel where it had not yet been heard. (Rom. xv. 20, 21.) In accordance with this method was the general distribution of the Jews and Gentiles between Paul and Peter. (Gal. ii. 7.)

When a church was founded by an Apostle, he seems to have sustained a peculiar relation to it afterwards, as its spiritual father, and as such bound still in some degree to watch over it, and for that purpose to keep up a correspondence with it by personal visits, or by messengers or letters. Among the churches, which appear to have been organized by Paul in some of his mission journeys, were the churches of Galatia. We know that his practice was to ordain elders in every city where he left a church. (Acts xiv. 23, Tit. i. 5.) To these he committed the government and instruction of the infant churches, when he turned himself to other fields of labour or of suffering. That these successors would in every case be faithful and successful substitutes for apostolic care, was not to be expected. Nor is it surprising that in some instances abuses and corruptions, both of doctrine and of practice, should have soon sprung up. A remarkable example of abuse in practice is afforded by the case of the Corinthian church with respect to the communion. (1 Cor. xi. 20–34.) A no less remarkable example of doctrinal declension is afforded by the case of the Galatians. After Paul's

departure they were led by certain teachers who succeeded him to exchange the doctrine of gratuitous salvation for a slavish reliance upon legal ceremonies. This was the occasion of the Epistle to the Galatians, in which the Apostle expresses his surprise, his grief, his indignation, at the change which had befallen them, and eloquently pleads with them, in warm and cogent argument, to come back to the elevated ground where he had left them. From this interesting case, and the Epistle growing out of it, we may gather some instructive facts respecting the condition of the early Church, under the government of the Apostles.

It shows us, in the first place, that there were doctrinal differences, even in the primitive Church; that such differences do not result merely from the lapse of time, or grow out of a departure from the primitive organization of the Church. On the contrary, they seem to have been included in the course of discipline, through which it pleased God that the Church should pass; a discipline involving doubt, perplexity, temptation, conflict; the necessity of using means for the attainment even of what God had promised; and especially of ascertaining truth by diligent investigation, careful comparison, and deliberate judgment. The Church was indeed to be secure from all her enemies, and to pass triumphantly through all her trials; but through them she must pass, that the trial of her faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ. (1 Pet. i. 7.) She was to surmount all difficulties, but she must first grapple with them. She was to conquer all her enemies, but she must first encounter them. That this was God's providential purpose with respect to the Church, is evident from the whole tenor of his dispensations towards it; and a part of this disciplinary system was the permission of doctrinal diversities, even in her infancy. Let it be observed, too, that the doctrinal differences of which we speak, were not mere trifles, but related to the most momentous doctrines of religion. In the case before us, the point of difference was no less than the method of salvation, whether by faith or by the works of the law, and the divergence of the parties so extreme that the Apostle calls the doctrine which he con-

demns "another gospel." True, he immediately recalls the expression and adds, "which is not another;" but this, so far from extenuating the diversity, enhances it by intimating that the error was so great as not to be entitled to the name of "gospel."

These differences, too, existed not merely on the part of private Christians or unauthorized teachers, but, it would seem, also among those whose external commission and authority were undisputed. This may be gathered from the very great influence ascribed in the New Testament to erroneous teachers; an influence, which could hardly have been exerted to such an extent, and with such success, in the absence of a regular external warrant. That such a warrant would not of itself ensure soundness in the faith is plain, because it did not profess to convey inspiration or infallibility, and because it is a notorious fact, admitted upon all hands, that error may be, and has often been, inculcated by those who were regularly authorized to exercise the functions of the ministry. That the Galatians could have been so easily, so soon, and so completely led away from the faith which Paul had taught them, by their own speculations or by self-constituted public teachers, is in itself exceedingly improbable; and this improbability is aggravated by the allusion to their undue reliance upon human authority. If their departure from the faith had been occasioned by the mere indulgence of their own rash speculations, or the suggestions of obscure men, having no claim to their confidence, it would have been abundantly sufficient to condemn the error without any reference to those who broached it, or with explicit reference to their acting without any due authority. In that case the Apostle would no doubt have warned them against trusting in themselves, or in the teachings of those who were without an apostolical commission. But when he says, "though I or an angel from heaven preach another gospel," it is clearly implied that they might naturally be disposed to justify their change of opinion by appealing to the authority of those who had produced it. As if he had said, it is in vain for you to plead the apostolical commission and authority of these erroneous teachers; for if even I myself, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be

accursed. Such expressions would be wholly unaccountable, if not unintelligible, on the supposition that there was no undue regard to human authority involved in their departure from the truth. From these considerations it becomes quite evident, that the doctrinal differences in the early Church not only extended to the most important subjects, but existed among the authorized public teachers of religion. How long such were permitted to continue the dissemination of important error, is another question, which, as we shall see, the Apostle virtually answers; but all that we insist upon at present is the fact, that serious departures from the apostolic doctrine appear to have originated sometimes with the regularly authorized instructors of the people, in this case perhaps with the very elders whom Paul and Barnabas ordained in every city.

Now from these facts, that doctrinal diversities existed at a very early period, and among the authorized teachers of religion, some may be disposed to infer that the Apostles did not regard uniformity of doctrine as a matter of much moment. It becomes a matter of some interest, therefore, to observe the view which Paul takes of this subject in the case before us, and more particularly to compare his views with two rival theories which have been prevalent in modern times.

The first of these is what may be called the latitudinarian hypothesis, which reduces the essentials of belief to the smallest possible compass, and regards all beyond it as debateable or neutral ground, representing even what are acknowledged to be errors, as mere modifications of the truth, varied developments of one and the same substance, or successive phases of an invariable orb; while one class of the same school gain the same end, by explaining away doctrinal distinctions of the most important kind, as distinctions in philosophy rather than theology, various methods of explaining and accounting for the same undoubted fact.

The other hypothesis referred to is, that purity of doctrine is indeed important in the last degree, but that its security depends upon external regulations and connexions; that the truth is intrinsically of the highest value, but that in practice the first duty is to be connected with the true organization of the Church,

from the neglect of which all error springs, and by a due regard to which it can alone be avoided.

If either of these views had been entertained by the Apostle, it is easy to imagine how he must have expressed himself on this occasion. If, for example, he had regarded doctrinal distinctions as intrinsically unimportant, he would either have forborne to address the Galatian errorists at all, or he would have addressed them only to assure them that between his views and theirs there was no essential difference, but merely one of language or philosophy. You, he might have said, see one face of the orb of truth, I see another; you through one medium, I through another. Sooner or later we shall see alike; and even if we should not, it would be unwise to exasperate our spirits by mutual contention. Since we cannot think alike, let us agree to differ.

How widely does this differ from the strong and almost passionate expressions, in which Paul speaks of the foolish Galatians, as bewitched, and as having been so soon removed from him that had called them into the grace of Christ unto another gospel, and of those who were the authors of this dereliction, as accursed of God.

If, on the other hand, he had regarded purity of doctrine as in practice secondary to ecclesiastical relations and communion with a certain body, how would such a principle have led him to express himself in this case? Might he not have been expected to address them thus? You have departed from the faith. You have fallen into dangerous and soul-destroying error. But this has arisen from your culpable neglect of the external safeguards which the Church affords you. You have listened to the teachings of unauthorized instructors. You have submitted to invalid ministrations. You have forsaken the Church, and God has forsaken you. But in the Epistle there is nothing of all this, no allusion whatever to the want of authority and ministerial warrant on the part of those who had seduced them; but rather, as we have already seen, an implication of the contrary. There is no intimation that the evils he describes, had been occasioned by outward irregularities or mere defects of form; while at the same time, he speaks of the evil in itself as most momentous, as

subversive of the gospel, as not a mere misfortune, but a grievous fault, dangerous to themselves, injurious to the Church, dishonourable to Christ, and offensive to God.

All this implies, that the error, into which they had fallen, might have been avoided. But in what way? They might well have asked, how could we have foreseen the error or unfaithfulness of those, who were placed over us as spiritual guides? Would you have us to withdraw our confidence entirely from public teachers, and rely exclusively upon our private judgments? This would have been wholly at variance with Paul's instructions, who abounds in exhortations to obedience and docility. In no way then could the offence have been avoided, but by carefully distinguishing between the true and false, between the messenger of God and the unauthorized intruder between the faithful shepherd and the hireling, the thief and the robber, or the wolf in sheep's clothing; in short, by the rigid application of a test to the pretensions of all public teachers, even of such as were possessed of the most regular external call to rule the Church and teach the people.

And now the interesting question meets us, What shall this test be? This is a question not of temporary but perpetual interest; one which, far from having lost its original importance, is as violently agitated now as ever. There never was a stronger disposition than at present to lay down rules for distinguishing a true church and a valid ministry from counterfeits. Even those, who refuse to take a part in the invention of these tests, cannot expect to be exempted from their application. If we will not try others, we must be tried ourselves. It is our interest, therefore, no less than our duty, to discover, if we can, what test of ministerial authority is warranted by Scripture, and by primitive usage. And in no way can this be more easily and certainly effected, than by duly considering the language used by the Apostle Paul, in a case which required the application of precisely such a test as that in question.

We have seen that he represents the error, into which the Galatians had been led, as a most serious one, both in itself and in its necessary consequences, and at the same time, as one which might with proper care, have been avoided. But as they had been seduced by erroneous teachers, the only way in

which they could have shunned the evil into which they fell, was by refusing to obey these leaders. And unless the Apostle meant to teach, in contradiction to his teachings elsewhere, that they ought to have acknowledged and obeyed no spiritual guides whatever, the only way in which the evil could have been escaped was, by the application of a test to the pretensions of their public teachers, by trying the spirits whether they were of God, (1 John iv. 1.) by proving all things and holding fast that which was good. (1 Thess. v. 21.) It was evident, however, that the Galatians were possessed of no such test, or they would not have yielded blindly to the authority of their instructors. It was necessary therefore to acquaint them with it. Otherwise all the Apostle's exhortations and rebukes would have been unavailing to preserve them from a repetition of the same mistake. But he does lay down the rule by which true ministers and churches might for ever and in all parts of the world be infallibly distinguished. This he does in the form of a solemn malediction. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." (Gal. i. 8, 9.)

In this test the first thing which demands attention is its comprehensiveness, both with respect to the curse pronounced, and to the persons upon whom it is pronounced. The phrase ἀνάθεμα ἔστω, *let him be anathema*, was early adopted as a standing formula of excommunication in the Christian Church. This use of it is founded on the text before us and the similar expressions of the same Apostle elsewhere. That he used it himself in this ecclesiastical and technical sense, there seems to be no reason for believing. The Greek word is the equivalent of the Hebrew קִדְּשׁוּ, denoting that which is irredeemably set apart or consecrated, or more particularly that which was to be destroyed without reserve. As some things under the Old Testament were consecrated to God, to be employed in his service, such as sacrificial animals, the first fruits of the earth, etc.; so other things were consecrated to him, in the sense of being doomed to destruction. These it was unlawful to apply to any other

use. To represent this Hebrew term the Greek translators used a word denoting any thing deposited in the temples as a gift to the presiding deity. This word is *anathema*, which is therefore used in the New Testament to signify one doomed to destruction, and with a natural departure from the primary import of the Greek word, one cast out from God, and cut off from communion with him. The votive offerings in the heathen temples were given to the gods, and supposed to be accepted by them in the proper sense. The Hebrew *אנאתמה* or *אנתמה* was given to God only in the sense of being cut off from the use or society of man and doomed to irredeemable destruction.

But though the terms of this malediction do not specifically denote ecclesiastical censure, they include them. He, who is cut off from God, is cut off from the Church; and he, who is cut off from the Church, can have no official authority in it, nor any claim to the obedience of its members. If it be said that a man may be accursed of God, and yet retain his standing as an office-bearer in the Church, and in that character may claim obedience, as Judas Iscariot was entitled to the same respect as the other Apostles, although secretly accursed and doomed to perdition; this objection applies only to those cases where the curse is not revealed. But in the case before us, we are distinctly told who are accursed; and the very form of expression which Paul uses necessarily implies, that he is not merely declaring a secret divine purpose with respect to false teachers, but the duty of the Church. When he says "let him be accursed," it is not the expression of a wish that he may be accursed, but an injunction to regard him as accursed already. If not, the Apostle's language would be quite irrelevant. The sin and folly of the Galatians in leaving the gospel preached to them by Paul, under the guidance of false teachers, could not have been made apparent, by declaring that all such teachers would be ultimately punished, or were already secretly condemned. They had been guilty of culpable neglect in not judging these false teachers by the rule laid down. They ought to have known that all who taught another gospel were to be regarded as accursed, *anathema*, without authority from God, or standing in his Church. The Apostle's malediction, therefore, comprehends an absolute unerring test of ministerial authority.

Nor is the test less comprehensive with respect to the persons upon whom the malediction is pronounced. Had the Apostle said, If any private person, or unauthorized teacher of religion, preach another gospel to you, let him be accursed; the application of the test would necessarily have been suspended on the the question, whether the person whose pretensions were to be determined by it, was regularly clothed with a commission from the proper Church authorities. If so, he would of course have been exempted from the operation of the rule. Again, had he said, If any authorized minister, of ordinary rank, preach another gospel, let him be accursed; the previous question would, in that case be, whether the teacher was not more than an ordinary minister. If, for example, he was an apostle, he might plausibly have laid claim to an exemption from the operation of the rule here given, not by contending that he was at liberty to preach false doctrine, which would be absurd, but by claiming for his own instructions, be they what they might, the character of truth, without appeal to any other standard than his own apostolical authority. Again, let us suppose Paul to have said, if any other of the apostolic body preach another gospel, he would then have provided for his own case as exempt from his own rule. Or if he had said any human being, he would still have left, as it were, a special immunity to beings of a higher order. But as if to provide for the most improbable contingencies, he frames his malediction, so as to include not only private Christians or self-constituted teachers, but those possessing the most regular external call to exercise the office; not only those of ordinary rank, but even the Apostles; not only his associates, but himself; not only all men, but the angels from heaven. There is neither exception nor reserve. The terms are perfectly unlimited. Whoever, whether man or angel, preaches any other gospel, let him be accursed. Thus the test is no less comprehensive in relation to the persons upon whom it is to operate, than in relation to its practical effect upon their standing and authority. As it extends to the destruction of all authority in the Church, so it extends to all by whom such authority could be claimed or exercised. Having shown that the Apostle here establishes the test of a true ministry, from the application of which no man nor class of men can claim exemp-

tion, we proceed to consider what the test itself is. "Though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any one preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." This is the test that Paul prescribes, conformity of doctrine to the apostolic teaching under which the church among them had been organized. It is wholly unnecessary to inquire what was the gospel which Paul preached, and wherein the Galatians had departed from it. These are inquiries, which might easily be answered, which the whole Epistle was designed to answer; but for our present purpose it is quite enough to know that the Galatians were in no doubt as to these points. They knew what gospel Paul had preached, and what other gospel their subsequent instructors preached; and knowing these things, they are told by the Apostle, that conformity to what he had originally taught them, is the test by which they ought to have distinguished, not only between the truth and falsehood of the doctrines which they heard, but between the claims of authorized ministers and those who were usurpers of the name.

Observe, too, that he speaks of this conformity of doctrine as of something which they were to measure for themselves, not only able so to do, not only authorized, but bound, and that not merely by his positive command, but by an obligation arising from the very nature of the case, an obligation founded in necessity. For if they did not judge, who would, who could, who ought to judge? Their spiritual guides? But these were the very spirits to be tried. Could they be judges in their own cause, especially when it was undue confidence in them which had produced the very evils here referred to? Could the sin and folly of trusting them too much be retrieved by trusting them still more? To whom then should they look? To the Apostles? But the rule, which Paul lays down, extends to them as well as others. The teaching even of Apostles is subjected to this simple but inexorable law. Yes, even Paul himself was to be judged by it, and by the breach of it to be condemned. The duty, therefore, of comparing all that they should hear with that which they had heard already, was devolved upon themselves, and all attempts to shift it upon others

must be treated as evasions of a solemn obligation. In vain did they object, perhaps, that they were not qualified for such an office, that their judgment was fallible, their knowledge limited, etc. A sufficient answer to all such objections was afforded by the facts, that no one else could do it, and that God required it; to which it may be added, that the allegation involved in the objection is untrue. If they were able to receive and understand the doctrines of their teachers, they were able to determine for themselves, whether the doctrines of their different teachers were identical or opposite, whether the gospel preached by Paul's successors was "another gospel," or the same which they had heard from him. What was essential to conformity of doctrine, and how far diversities of judgment upon certain points might be consistent with it, these are questions not affecting the main principle contended for. In this case, Paul assumes two facts as undeniable; that the Galatians had embraced another gospel; and that they knew, or might have known it, and were therefore chargeable with having fallen wilfully from grace. If Paul is laying down a test at all, he surely must be laying down a test which they were able to apply; and if that test is uniformity of doctrine, it is necessarily implied that they were capable of judging whether what they heard was the same gospel or "another." Observe too, that the standard of comparison, by which they were to measure the instructions of their public teachers, is assumed by the Apostle to be something not only within their reach, accessible, intelligible, and a proper subject of personal inquiry and of private judgment, but also something already fixed, determined, and notorious. This is a circumstance of vast importance in relation to the practical employment of the test, one upon which its efficacy in a great degree depends. Had he said, "if I or an angel from heaven preach any other doctrine than THE TRUTH, let him be accursed," all would have been vague and indeterminate. The very problem to be solved was the true method of discriminating truth from falsehood; and the sin of the Galatians, as denounced by Paul, consisted in embracing error when they were already in possession of a touchstone or criterion, accessible, notorious, enduring, and immutable. The proof of their moral delinquency would have failed, if the test

which he refers to had been something yet to be discovered or revealed. It was, because it was complete and settled, that they were without excuse for their departure from the faith.

If the Apostle had pronounced his malediction upon those who preached a different gospel from the one which he should preach thereafter, he would not only have left the Galatians free from blame, but the whole question as indefinite as ever. For however strong the presumption might have been, that he would still inculcate the same doctrine as before, the minds of men must still have been suspended, lest some future revelation should exhibit the whole method of salvation in a new and unexpected aspect. This uncertainty would have been still greater, if he had referred to the subsequent teachings of the Apostles generally, as the standard of comparison; and greater still, almost beyond comparison, if he had made the doctrines even of the ancient church the test of truth. But how shall we describe the additional uncertainty, in which the matter must have been involved, if the validity of all ministrations had been made to depend upon conformity of doctrine with the Church throughout all ages? But instead of these expedients, which a merely human wisdom might have thought sufficient, he requires conformity with nothing still contingent or yet to be revealed, but with a system of doctrine already developed and notoriously fixed. This circumstance not only makes the Apostle's rule more suitable and applicable to the case of the Galatians, but extends its application to all churches and all ages with a perfect uniformity. For as the personal preaching of Paul had left no possibility of doubt upon the part of the Galatians as to what the gospel was, at least in its essential features, we, notwithstanding the vast interval of time which intervenes, enjoy, in this respect, a great advantage, because we possess the written word of God in its integrity. The canon of Scripture is complete and closed for ever, with a solemn curse impending over any who shall venture to add to it or take from it. If then the Apostle could refer the Galatians to what he had preached to them in person as containing the whole gospel, and insist upon conformity with this as the unerring test of valid ministrations, how much more may we be called upon to act upon the same rule, when the standard of comparison is

complete in writing, and incapable of either diminution or increase. The test then here established is a test of easy application, and referring to a standard of comparison already fixed, and fixed for ever. Our next remark upon it is, that it takes precedence of all other tests. It either includes them as its parts, or excludes them as its opposites. This is a circumstance of great importance, since the practical utility of such a test would be impaired if not destroyed, if its condemning judgments were reversible by an appeal to other standards. That this is not the case, will be apparent from a brief consideration of some other tests which might appear to claim at least equality with this, and which have sometimes been insisted on, to its exclusion.

The first of these is the criterion of a valid ministry afforded by personal character and qualifications, such as talent, learning, eloquence, apparent piety, and blameless life. But it is a historical fact, which will not be denied, that men possessing all these attributes have sometimes preached a gospel differing from that which Paul once preached to the Galatians; not in minor points alone, but in essential principles, and that so doing they fell within the sweep of this divine anathema, and thereby lost all claim to the obedience and the confidence of other Christians.

Another test proposed by some is immediate intercourse with God, and the reception of direct communications from him. But would the fact of such communications, even if admitted, place the person who enjoyed them in a better situation, with respect to this rule, than was held by an inspired apostle, or an angel from heaven? If these preached another gospel, they were to be treated as accursed. What, then, could a pretended, or even a real inspiration now avail to exempt any from subjection to the same inexorable law?

A third test, which has been contended for with greater zeal than either of the others, is that afforded by external connexion with particular societies or churches, claiming a direct and unbroken ministerial succession from the Apostles. Let us grant the existence of such a succession, and the possibility of proving it, and thus allow the advocates of this test an advantage which by no means is their due. Even with this gratui-

tous concession it is evident, that all depends at last upon compliance with the test of doctrinal conformity laid down by Paul. The fact is not disputed on the part of any, that some men claiming, and believed by many to possess, the most complete external warrant for the exercise of ministerial functions, have taught false doctrines, and essentially departed from the faith, while still retaining their ecclesiastical connexions unaltered. Now these, according to Paul's rule, were not only cursed of God, but ought to be regarded by men as having no connexion with the Church, much less any power or authority within it. And this fatal vice in their official character and ministrations cannot possibly be cured by any outward advantage, real or supposed, in point of ordination or church-membership. If they preach another gospel, they are not of God; if not of God, they are not of the true Church; if not of the true Church, they cannot be true ministers—it matters not by whom they were ordained, or with whom they hold communion. It seems, then, that this test is either inclusive or exclusive of all others; that is to say, that others are of value only so far as they agree with this, and become worthless when they diverge from it.

The test of apostolical teaching thus established by Paul is clearly recognized by John in his second Epistle. "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." (ver. 7.) This was, of course, "another gospel." The Apostle therefore adds, "This is a deceiver and an Antichrist; look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward." (ver. 8.) In like manner Paul seemed to fear that the fruit of his labours in Galatia might be lost. (Gal. iv. 11.) But how does John lay down his rule of discrimination? "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God; he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." (ver. 9.) Here is no allusion to a want of outward calls, and ordinations, and successions, but the primary test, failing which all others must be insufficient, is made to consist in uniformity of doctrine. And that this was not meant to be without effect in practice, is sufficiently apparent from what follows. "If there come any unto you, and

bring not this doctrine," whatever other claims to your obedience and confidence he may assert, "receive him not into your house, neither bid him welcome," (χαίρειν λέγετε) much less believe him and obey him as a spiritual guide; "for he that biddeth him God-speed (or welcome) is partaker of his evil deeds." (ver. 10, 11.)

From these two passages it fully appears that THE PRIMARY AND PARAMOUNT CRITERION OF AN APOSTOLIC MINISTRY IS CONFORMITY OF DOCTRINE TO THE APOSTOLIC STANDARD.

ART. VI.—*Remarks on the Princeton Review*, Vol. XXII. No. IV. Art. VII. By Edwards A. Park, Abbot Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January 1851. Art. IX.

WE are really sorry to find that Professor Park has been so much pained by our review of his Convention Sermon. His reply evinces a great deal of wounded feeling. The transparent vail which he has thrown over his acerbities, only renders them the more noticeable. A homely face may pass in a crowd without attracting much attention; but if its unfortunate owner attempt to conceal it by a gauze mask, every eye will be turned upon him. He had better put the mask in his pocket, and let his face pass for what it is. Some allowance must be made for our author. When a man delivers a discourse with great eclat, it must, we presume, be very painful to find that the reading public does not confirm the verdict of the admiring audience. This is a very common occurrence. Instead, however, of being satisfied with the obvious solution of this familiar fact, the author, if a politician, is very apt to attribute such unfavourable judgment to party spirit, and if a preacher, to theological bigotry. We are the more disposed to be charitable in the present case, because, in our small way, we have had a somewhat similar experience. We wrote a review which we intended to make a sort of model of candor and courtesy. To avoid the danger of misrepresentation, we determined, instead of giving disconnected extracts of the discourse reviewed,