

THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, S. C.

VOLUME I.

COLUMBIA, S. C.
PRINTED BY I. C. MORGAN,

1847-8

8901
 5688
 V.1
 DKPR
 7ST
 1A-4-10A
 DEC 22 1968

CONTENTS.

NO. I.

Art.		Page.
I.	THE OFFICE OF REASON IN REGARD TO REVELATION, -	1
II.	THE RELATION BETWEEN THE WORK OF CHRIST, AND THE CONDITION OF THE ANGELIC WORLD, - - - -	34
III.	THE BAPTISM OF SERVANTS, - - - - -	63
IV.	AN EXPOSITION OF MATTHEW XVI: 18, 19, - - - -	108
V.	THE LETTERS AND SPEECHES OF OLIVER CROMWELL, by THOMAS CARLYLE, in two volumes. New York: Wiley & Putnam, 161 Broadway. 1845, - - -	121
VI.	CRITICAL NOTICES, - - - - -	159
	1. Memoirs and Remains of the Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne.	
	2. The Ruling Eldership, &c. By Rev. David King.	
	3. The Book of Discipline and of Common Order, &c.	
	4. Epistle to the Romans. By Robert Haldane, Esq.	
	5. Roediger's Gesenius, translated by Prof. Stuart.	
	6. Revival Sermons, by the Rev. Daniel Baker.	
	7. Christian Unity: A Sermon, by Edward Reed, Rec- tor, &c.	
	8. The Character of the Gentleman. By Francis Lieber.	
	9. The Sacred Mountains. By J. T. Headley.	
	10. The Hand of God Recognized. A Discourse, by Rev. George Sheldon.	
	11. Dr. Hazellius's History of the Lutheran Church.	
	12. The Relations of Christianity to War. By Rev. Dr. Smyth.	

NO. II.

Art.		Page
I.	PERSONALITY, DEITY AND OPERATIONS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, - - - - -	1

Art.	Page
II. SKETCHES OF NORTH CAROLINA, HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL, ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF A PORTION OF HER EARLY SETTLERS. By Rev. WM. HENRY FOOTE. New York: Robert Carter. 1847.	30
III. TANCRED, OR THE NEW CRUSADE, A NOVEL. By B. D'ISRAELI, M. P. Philadelphia: Carey & Hart. 1847.	57
IV. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, - - - - -	78
V. AN EFFECTUAL CONTROL OF THE WILL AND CONDUCT OF MEN BY THE SPIRIT OF GOD, COMPATIBLE WITH THEIR FREE AGENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY, - - -	105
VI. THE POETRY OF THE PENTATEUCH, - - - - -	117
VII. CRITICAL NOTICES, - - - - -	133
1. Napoleon and his Marshals. By J. T. Headly, 2 vols.	
2. The Religious Instruction of the Colored Population. A Sermon by Rev. J. B. Adger.	
3. The Conquest of Peru. By Wm. H. Prescott.	

NO. III.

Art.	Page.
I. THE DIVINE APPOINTMENT AND OBLIGATION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT, - - - - -	1
1. The Rights of War and Peace, including the Law of Nature and of Nations. By HUGO GROTIUS. 3 vols. 8vo.	
2. The Relations of Christianity to War. By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D. Charleston, 1847.	
3. The Punishment of Death for the Crime of Murder, Rational, Scriptural and Salutory. By WALTER SCOTT, President and Theological Tutor in Airedale College. Bradford: Yorkshire.	
4. Capital Punishment, the Importance of its Abolition: A Prize Essay. By the Rev. JAMES BEGGS, late Missionary to India. London. 1839.	
5. An Essay on the Ground and Reason of Punishment, with Special Reference to the Penalty of Death. By TAYLOR LEWIS, Esq. And a Defence of Capital Punishment. By the Rev. GEORGE B. CHEEVER, D. D. With an Appendix, containing a Review of Burleigh on the Death Penalty. New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1846. pp. 365.	

Contents.

iii.

Art.

Page.

6. The Increase of Crimes against Life. NEW ENGLAND-ER. July, 1844.	
7. The Right of Civil Government over Life. In IBID. October, 1845.	
8. Shall Punishment be Abolished? In IBID. Oct., 1846.	
9. Capital Punishment. Biblical Repository. July, 1837. By S. S. SCHMUCKER, D. D.	
10. Capital Punishment. Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review. April, 1842. And in the Second Series of Reviews from that Work.	
11. Capital Punishment. By DANIEL R. GOODWYN. In the <i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i> , for May, 1847.	
II. THE INTELLECTUAL AND MORAL CHARACTER OF THE JEWS, - - - - -	30
Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jews, from the Church of Scotland, in 1839. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1845.	
III. THE LATE DR. CHALMERS, AND THE LESSONS OF HIS LIFE, FROM PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS, - - - -	56
Third Report from the Select Committee on Sites for Churches, (Scotland,) together with Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 5th July, 1847. Fol. pp. 201. Including the Evidence of Dr. CHALMERS, p. 121-144.	
IV. THE RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION OF THE BLACK POPULATION, - - - - -	89
The Gospel to be given to our Servants. A Sermon preached in several of the Protestant Episcopal Churches in Charleston on Sundays in July, 1847, by the Rev. PAUL TRAPIER, Charleston, S. C. Printed by Miller & Brown.	
Discussion on "The Religious Instruction of the Blacks" in the Charleston Mercury, between "Many Citizens" and the Rev. J. B. ADGER.	
V. A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF I PETER, III: 19. By the Rev. W. M. SMYTHE, A. M., Dallas Co., Ala.	120
VI. THE CHRISTIAN PASTOR, - - - - -	127
The Christian Pastor, one of the Ascension Gifts of Christ. By ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D. To which are added, by way of Appendix, Presbyterian Government, not a	

iv.
Art.

Contents.

Page.

Hierarchy, but a Commonwealth; and Presbyterian Ordination, not a Charm, but an act of Government. By the same Author. Baltimore, 1845.

VII. CRITICAL NOTICES, - - - - - 152

1. Notes on the Parables. By Richard Chenevix Trench, A. M.
2. History of the Christian Religion and Church. Translated from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander. By Joseph Torrey.
3. The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit. By James Buchanan.
4. Personal Declension and Revival of Religion in the Soul. By Rev. Octavius Winslow.
5. The Lands of the Bible. By John Wilson, D. D.
6. The Protector: A Vindication. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, D. D.
7. Life and Opinions of Madame De La Mothe Guyon. By Prof. Thomas C. Upham.
8. History of Speculative Philosophy. By J. D. Morell, A. M.
9. Christianity and its Relations to Poetry and Philosophy.

NO. IV.

Art.

Page.

I. LECTURES ON FOREIGN CHURCHES, - - - - - 1

Delivered in Edinburgh and Glasgow, May, 1845, in connection with the objects of the Free Church of Scotland. FIRST SERIES. Edinburgh, 1846.

LECTURES ON FOREIGN CHURCHES. SECOND SERIES. Edinburgh, 1846.

II. PRESBYTERIANISM—THE REVOLUTION—THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, AND THE CONSTITUTION, 33

1. The Superiority of the Calvinistic Faith, and the Presbyterian Government. A Discourse, by the Rev. D. K. JUNKIN, A. M. Easton, 1844.
2. Ecclesiastical Republicanism, or the Republicanism, Liberality and Catholicity of Presbytery, in Contrast with Prelacy and Popery. By Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D. Boston, 1843.

Contents.

Art.	v. Page-
3. Life and Correspondence of President Reed. By his Grandson, WM. B. REED. Philadelphia, 1847. 8vo. 2 vols.	
4. The Baccalaureate Address in Miami University, August, 1842, by Rev. GEORGE JUNKIN, D. D., President, on the Bearings of True Religion upon Republican Government.	
5. Relative Influence of Presbytery and Prelacy, on Civil and Ecclesiastical Liberty; a Sermon. By Rev. T. V. MOORE, of Carlisle, Penn. Preached by Appointment before the Synod of Philadelphia. Oct. 16th, 1844.	
III. THE MORAL CONDITION OF WESTERN AFRICA. By Rev. JOHN LEIGHTON WILSON, of S. C. Missionary at the Gaboon River, Western Africa, - - - -	79
IV. AN INQUIRY INTO THE DOCTRINE OF IMPUTED SIN, -	97
V. ALEXANDER'S ISALAH, - - - - -	129
1. The Earlier Prophecies of Isaiah. By JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. New York and London: Wiley & Putnam, 1846. 8vo. pp. 652.	
2. The Later Prophecies of Isaiah. By JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. New York and London: Wiley & Putnam, 1847. 8vo. pp. 501.	
VI. CRITICAL NOTICES, - - - - -	154
1. Suggestions on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes. By Charles Colcock Jones, D. D.	
2. A Grammar of the Mpongwe Language. By the Missionaries of the A. B. C. F. M.	
3. The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. By J. H. M'Ilvaine.	
4. The Four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, in Greek, with English Notes. By Rev. J. A. Spencer, A. M.	
5. The Glory of Woman. By the Rev. Charles Colcock Jones, D. D.	

Page 19, 2nd line, before "must," read "He."

Page 31, line 22nd from top, read "substance of folly," for "substance of philosophy."

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER I.

JUNE, 1847.

ARTICLE I.

THE OFFICE OF REASON IN REGARD TO REVELATION.

By J. H. THORNWELL, D. D.,

Professor of Sacred Literature, and the Evidences of Christianity in
South Carolina College.

Lord Bacon has very justly observed that, in relation to the subject announced at the head of this article, Christianity maintains the "golden mediocrity between the law of the heathen and the law of Mahomet, which have embraced the two extremes." The heathen system attached no importance to *truth*—"it had no constant belief or confession, but left all to the liberty of argument." In its richer developments it was evidently the offspring of imagination, requiring no piety but taste. Fables were its Scriptures—Poets its Divines—and the Fine Arts its altars. In its practical operations, it was an affair of State. Princes were its Priests—Magistrates its guardians, and obedience to its precepts a branch of the duties of a citizen. Destitute of truth, it was, of course, destitute of moral power—and from the intimate connection which subsists between the imagination and emotions, its appeals to the fancy must have served to inflame the passions and to augment the corruption which it is the office of religion to repress. Cultivating to excess that "forward, delusive faculty," which Butler pronounces to be the "author of all error," while it left the understanding without instruction and the heart without discipline, it must have formed a species of character in

2 *The Office of Reason in regard to Revelation.* [JUNE,

which indifference to truth was strangely blended with sensibility to beauty, and refinement of taste unnaturally combined with the grossness of vice and the obscenities of lust.

The law of Mahomet claimed to be a revelation from Heaven, and though, in accordance with its pretensions, it demanded faith, yet, as it presented no rational grounds of conviction, its policy was to intimidate or bribe the understanding, according as fear, prejudice, or lust was the predominant principle of action. Where it could not extort a blind credulity, it made the passions the vehicles of its doctrines—the timid it frightened to submission, the profligate it allured to acquiescence, and the heretic and skeptic it wheedled and cajoled by a partial patronage of their errors. Exclusively a system of authority, it gave no scope to discussion. Its great argument was the word of its Prophet, its decisive sanction the sword of its soldiers, and its strongest attractions, the licence it gave to voluptuous indulgences. Paganism wore the “face of error, and Mohammedanism of imposture.”

Christianity, on the contrary, attaches preëminent importance to *truth*, and acknowledges no faith but that which is founded in conviction. At the same time it professes to be from God, and therefore, as becomes it, speaks with authority. As a system *claiming* to be *Divine*, it invites the fullest discussion. As a system *proved* to be *Divine*, it demands implicit submission. It both “admits and rejects disputation with difference.”

But how far “it admits and how far it rejects disputation,” that is, the precise province of reason in regard to revelation, is a point which has been keenly discussed between Socinians and the orthodox—infidels and believers in Christianity.

It is needless to deny that the language of Divines has not always been sufficiently guarded on the subject. Their intemperate reprobations of the spirit of perverse speculation, which confounds the departments of revelation and philosophy, and applies to the former measures of truth which are obviously incompatible with its nature, has given some pretext to the calumny, that faith is inconsistent with reason, and that Christianity repudiates an appeal to argument. Religion, from the necessity of the case, is addressed

to reason (1)—its duties are represented as a reasonable service, and its inspired teachers, who disdained the tricks of human eloquence and disclaimed the agency of human wisdom as an adequate foundation of faith, were accustomed to resort to argument to produce conviction. It is reason which distinguishes man from the brute. Without it we should be incompetent to apprehend truth or feel the obligation of moral law—as incapable of appreciating a message from God as “the beasts which perish.” To say, therefore, that Christianity puts an absolute interdict upon the exercise of reason, is equivalent to saying that she exempts us from the duty of considering her claims. To prohibit *rational* is to prohibit *moral* action. To strip us of reason is to free us from law.

The question, however, in dispute, is not in regard to reason as a *faculty* of the mind, the faculty which judges of truth and falsehood, right and wrong—but in regard to reason as a compendious expression for the principles and maxims, the opinions, conclusions or prejudices which, with or without foundation, men acknowledge to be true. Locke and Witsius have both pointed out the distinction (2). Reason, in the one sense, is necessarily presupposed in the very idea of revelation—but to reason in the other, it is not only possible, but likely, that a system which shall preëminently display the wisdom and the power of God, shall appear to

(1) *Cæterum ratio, quantumvis corrupta, ratio tamen manet, id est, ea facultas qua homo cognoscit et judicat. Adeo quidem ut homo nihil omnino, quale illud cunque sit, cognoscere et judicare valeat, nisi per rationem suam, tanquam proximum cognitionis et judicii principium et causam. Idcirco si Divinæ res, si mysteria religionis cognoscenda sint, non aliter id fieri potest nisi per rationem. Ipsa fides, quum cognitio et *noësis* sit et assensus, rationis sive mentis est operatio. Idque tam est liquidum, ut pro rationali non sit habendus qui in dubium id revocat.* Witsius Opera. Tom. 2, p. 588. De Usu et Abusu Rationis § 10.

(2) Locke says: “The word *reason*, in the English language, has different significations. Sometimes it is taken for true and clear principles; sometimes for clear and fair deductions from those principles, and sometimes for the cause and particularly the final cause. But the consideration I shall have of it here, is in a signification different from all these: and that is, as it stands for a faculty in man, that faculty, whereby man is supposed to be distinguished from beasts, and wherein it is evident he much surpasses them.” Hum. Understand., Book 4, c. 17, § 1.

Witsius says: “Ratio significat vel Facultatem hominis qua percipit et judicat, verumque a falso dignoscit, vel *placita*, scita—axiomata, quæ vel per se evidentia sunt, vel ex evidentibus certa consecutione deducta creduntur.” Opera. Tom. 2, p. 585. De Usu et Abusu Rat. § 3.

4 *The Office of Reason in regard to Revelation.* [JUNE,

be foolishness. "The Jews," says the Apostle, "require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom—but we preach Christ crucified unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness—but unto them which are called both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." The distinctive principles of Christianity contradicted the distinctive principles of every sect of the ancient philosophers. By its humbling representations of the depravity and impotence of man, it rebuked the pride of the Stoic—the Epicurean was disgusted with its heroic maxims of self-denial and benevolence—the Sophist was confounded with a standard of eternal truth which poured contempt upon his quibbling speculations—and the Rhetorician seemed to be degraded by a system which looked for success, not to the enticing words of man's wisdom, but to the demonstration and power of God's Holy Spirit. The disciples of the Porch, Lyceum and Academy, all concurred in rejecting the Gospel, not because its external evidences were unsatisfactory, or defective—these they hardly took the trouble to examine—but because the doctrines it inculcated were inconsistent with the instructions of their masters. Here reason, or what men regarded as reason, was plainly at war with revelation. What God pronounced to be wisdom, the Greek denounced as foolishness. What the Greek pronounced to be wisdom, God denounced as foolishness. "The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise that they are vain."

In regard to doctrines which are *known* to be a revelation from God, there can be no question as to the precise office of reason. The understanding is simply to believe. Every proud thought and every lofty imagination must be brought in captivity to the Father of lights. When God speaks, faith is the highest exercise of reason. In His testimony we have all the elements of truth, and His veracity is the ultimate ground of certainty in every species of evidence. The resistless laws of belief which He has impressed upon the constitution of our minds, which lie at the foundation of all human knowledge, without which the materials of sense and consciousness could never be constructed into schemes of philosophy and science—derive all their authority from His own unchanging truth. Let it, for a moment, be supposed that God is willing to deceive us, and

who could rely with confidence upon the information of his faculties? Who would trust his senses if the instinct by which he is impelled to do so, might, after all, be a false light, to seduce him into error? That instinct is the testimony of God—and what we call reasoning, is nothing but the successive steps by which we arrive at the same testimony in the original structure of our minds. Hence belief, even in cases of the strictest demonstration, must, in the last analysis, be traced to the veracity of God. Reasoning is only a method of ascertaining what God teaches—the true ground of belief is the fact that God *does* teach the proposition in question (3). If the laws of belief be the testimony of God, and whatever accords with them be evidence, variously denominated, according to the clearness or directness with which the accordance is felt or perceived, then knowledge and opinion both rest alike upon this testimony—the only difference betwixt them being the difference in intensity and distinctness with which that testimony is perceived. All real evidence, whether intuitive, demonstrative or probable, is only the light with which He irradiates the mind, and we follow it with confidence, because the strength of Israel is not a man that He should lie, or the son of man that He should repent. The distinction between faith and the ordinary forms of assent is not in the ultimate ground of certainty—that is the same in all cases—but the methods by which it is reached. Faith reaches it immediately, having Divine Revelation for its object—in other cases it is reached through the medium of those laws which God has impressed upon the mental constitution. Hence it would seem that faith, being less remote from the ultimate ground of certainty, is more excellent than knowledge or opinion. As Locke has shown that demonstration is inferior to intuition, (4) the successive steps of proof increasing the possibilities of deception and mistake—so in all cases in which the testimony of God is only *mediately* perceived, the exposure to fallacy is in proportion to the num-

(3) Reason, says Mr. Locke, is natural revelation, whereby the eternal Father of light and fountain of all knowledge communicates to mankind that portion of truth which He has laid within the reach of their natural faculties. Book 4, c. 19, § 4, Hum. Understand.

(4) See this matter very clearly discussed. Hum. Understand., Book 4, chap. 2, § 4-9. Much of the reasoning in these sections is applicable to the subject discussed in the text.

6 *The Office of Reason in regard to Revelation.* [JUNE,

ber of comparisons employed. When, consequently, any doctrine is known to be a matter of Divine revelation, "if we will truly consider it, more worthy is it to believe, than to know as we now know." (5). There can, strictly speaking, be no improbabilities in it. And however it may appear to contradict the sentiments and opinions we have cherished, yet "the prerogative of God extendeth as well to the reason as to the will of man; so that, as we are to obey His law, though we find a reluctance in our will, so we are to believe His word, though we find a reluctance in our reason." (6). To prefer the deductions of philosophy to a Divine Revelation, is to relinquish the sun for the stars, to "imitate," as Perrot expresses it, "the conduct of the cynic, who, not contented with the light of the sun, took a candle at noon-day to search for a good man."

But the true question is—not whether an humble submission of the understanding, when God speaks and His words are rightly apprehended, be the imperative duty of man—of this there can be no doubt—but what is the office of reason, in those cases, in which the reality of the Revelation remains yet to be proved, and the interpretation of the doctrine remains yet to be settled—the office of reason, not simply as a faculty of the mind, but as furnished with the lights of experience, the inductions of science and the conclusions of philosophy. Is its own wisdom the rule by which a pretended revelation must be tried, or a pretended interpretation justified or condemned? Is it competent to judge of the doctrines—the things which profess to be revealed—either for the purpose of refuting, from their supposed absurdity and falsehood, the claims of the system which contains them, or, what is the same in principle, for the purpose of invalidating, upon the same grounds, the exegesis which derives them from a record confessed to be Divine? This is the question which we propose briefly to discuss.

(5) Bacon, *Advancement of Learning*. Works, Montague's Edition, vol. 2, p. 299. Bacon reaches this conclusion by a process of argument different from that in the text. "For in knowledge," says he, "man's mind suffereth from sense, but in belief it suffereth from spirit, such an one as it holdeth for more authorized than itself, and so suffereth from the worthier agent."

(6) Bacon, *Advancement of Learning*. Works, vol. 2, p. 299, Mont. Edition.

The origin and perplexity of this question, it deserves to be remarked, are due to the fall of man. Had he retained his integrity, the operations of his reason would have been uniformly right—his perceptions of truth clear and unclouded—and no contradiction could ever have been suspected between his deductions from the light of nature and the express communications of God. As a finite creature his knowledge would necessarily have been limited—he would have been subject to ignorance, but not to error, and whatever accessions the Deity in His goodness might have chosen to impart, would have been felt to harmonize with his previous attainments. But darkness of mind is the sad inheritance of sin. The irregular influences to which the fall has exposed us—the deceitfulness of all our measures of truth when we pass the limits of intuition and demonstration—the turbulence of passion—the force of habit and the ascendancy of education, all combine to warp the understanding, make us confound prejudices and principles and mistake the application of right and wrong. So great is the danger, if the prerogative be accorded to reason to judge of revelation—of rejecting its doctrines, because they contradict the shallow philosophy and false notions of things which have been imbibed from the schools, insinuated by custom or adopted without examination, and which, from long familiarity, are possessed of the authority of self-evident maxims—that distinguished writers, (7) particularly in modern times, since the rise of philosophical infidelity, have insisted with more zeal than discretion, upon the external evidences of Christianity, as the only ones which, in the first instance, we are at liberty to examine. Not that they suppose there is any thing *unreasonable* in the Bible—on the contrary, could it be ascertained to them, that *right* reason, and not prejudice and error under the name of reason, should sit in judgment upon it—their objections to a candid investigation of the internal evidences, as an important branch of the inquiry into its Divine authority would probably be removed. They are not willing, however, to run the risk of having a true doctrine condemned because it contradicts a false proposition, nor of having a true revelation rejected, because it contradicts a

(7) Bishop Wilson, for example, in his *Critique on Butler's Analogy* and Van Mildert in his *Boyle Lectures*.

false philosophy. Whatever, they justly conclude, *proves* any system to have emanated from God, proves at the same time, that its contents are worthy of His character—and that all objections to them as foolish, inconsistent, or absurd, must be presumptuous and vain.

But as internal improbabilities weaken external proof, they ought to have shown that the evidence of revelation can be considered as complete, before the preliminary point is settled, that there is nothing on the face of it to contradict its pretensions. We would not assert, though we have heard the proposition ingeniously maintained, that according to the natural order of thought, the *first* inquiry is obviously into the character of that which claims to be Divine, and then into the credentials or external signs by which its claims are authenticated; but it cannot be denied that it is the course actually adopted by the great majority of Christendom, who in rejecting the corrupt systems of religion that obtain in the world, are not governed by the insufficiency and defects of the proof, but the grossness of the doctrine and the looseness of the precepts.

Rome appeals to miracles. Every saint in her calendar, by his faith when living or his bones when dead, has wrought wonders, according to the Popish legends, analogous to those of Christ and His Apostles—and yet who that believes the Bible would not feel amply justified in discarding the authority of the Pope and the dogmas of his sect, because they contradict Christianity, without being able to prove the fabulousness of monkish marvels or to expose the fraud which has attempted to palm them on the world? The *internal* evidence condemns them. Few take the trouble, and none feel themselves bound, to examine the credentials of Rome, Mahomet or Smith.—It is enough that they come to us with a lie in their mouths—they teach what we *know* to be false, and no amount of external evidence can make that divine which is eminently characteristic of the Devil. Either then the rejection of the Popish and Mohammedan impostures by the mass of Protestants has been prematurely made, or the investigation of internal evidences is a legitimate subject of inquiry, where the question is yet to be decided, whether a system which professes to be revealed is really from God. According to the reasoning of Bishop Wilson, in his critique

upon Butler's Analogy, no religion can, in the first instance, be self-condemned. The credentials must be shown to be spurious before the doctrines can be convicted of falsehood. "The external evidences"—says he—"are those which should be first studied. Indeed they are the only ones that can be considered in the first instance as essential: because they undertake to show the credentials of the messenger who professes to come with a revelation from Heaven. We have no right to go farther than this in the first place. The moment the messenger is sufficiently proved to have Divine credentials, we have but one duty left, that of receiving and obeying his message, that of reading and meditating on the Revelation itself, in order to conform ourselves to it with devout and cheerful submission. We have no right at all to examine the nature of the discoveries, or doctrines, or precepts of Christianity, (and of course of no other system professing to be a revelation,) with the view of determining whether they seem to us becoming the wisdom of God and agreeable to the reason of man. It is proved that the revelation is from Heaven. This is enough." (8).

According to this principle, a plain, unlettered believer may be hopelessly entangled in the decrees of councils and the Edicts of Popes, how palpably soever they contradict the word of God and his own experience as a child of grace. They profess to be a message from Heaven and produce credentials of the Divine Commission or infallibility of the Church in pretended prodigies and wonders, which from his circumstances and education, he cannot be expected, by external proofs, to convict of forgery. As he is not at liberty "to examine the nature of the discoveries or doctrines" that are taught, he cannot deny but that these accounts *may* be true. The Church, consequently, *may* be infallible, and the dogmas which disgust him *may* be Divine. The Apostles insisted upon a very different rule from that of the Bishop. "Beloved, believe not every spirit," says John (9) "but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." But how are these impostors to be detected and exposed? By demanding their commission, examining

(8) Critique on Butler's Analogy—prefixed to the Analogy—6th Glasgow Edition, pp. 86-87.

(9) 1 Epistle, 4 chap. 1 & 2 verses.

10 *The Office of Reason in regard to Revelation.* [JUNE,

their credentials, and insisting solely upon the external proofs of their apostleship? Nothing of the kind. John remands us to the *doctrine* as the decisive test of spurious and true revelations. "Hereby know ye the spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God." "If there come any unto you"—says this same Apostle, (10) in guarding against the deceivers who were entered into the world—"and bring not this doctrine"—whatever else he may bring, "after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders"—"receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." "But though we or an angel from Heaven"—says Paul—(11) "preach any other Gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed." It is remarkable that the New Testament, nowhere insists, which it must have done upon the hypothesis of Bishop Wilson, on the insufficiency of external proofs as the decisive test of imposture. The *doctrine* and the doctrine alone is made the turning point of the argument. The directions of the Apostles were founded upon the obvious principle that one truth cannot contradict another—and therefore whatever contradicted the Scriptures which were *known* to be truth, carried upon its face the impression of falsehood. It was not because the Scriptures were a Divine Revelation, that they were made the touch-stone for trying the spirits, but, because being a Divine Revelation, they were necessarily and infallibly true. The proposition is universal, that whatever is repugnant to a *known truth*, no matter what may be the method by which that truth is ascertained to us, whether by the oracles of God, intuition, demonstration, or experience, cannot be Divine, (12) and

(10) 2d Epistle, 10th verse.

(11) Galatians I: 8.

(12) Vide Locke, Hum. Understand. Book iv, c 18 and 5. "At supposito,"—says Witsius—"ista de quibus disserimus Rationis axiomata pro veris ac certis comperta esse, et ab ipso Deo, nobis per rationem preformata; quum verum vero non possit esse contrarium, uti nec Deus sibi ipsi, consequens est, nunquam Deum supernaturali revelatione aliquid homini patefacere, quod repugnet veritatibus per se notis, sive rectae rationis dictamini. Atque hactenus illa axiomata valere quodammodo pro norma possunt, ut nihil recipiatur tanquam a Deo revelatum, quod principiis natura cognitis vera contrarium est. De Usu & Abusu Rat. § 15.

the application of this principle presupposes the right which Bishop Wilson denies, to examine the nature of the doctrines, discoveries or precepts which profess to be from Heaven. Even the Papists, who of all men are most concerned to establish the coexistence of repugnant truths, admit, with the exception of a few schoolmen who have taught the consistency of the same things being theologically true and philosophically false, or philosophically true and theologically false, that to effect contradictions is not an element of the power of God. (13). But if the right to interrogate the record be denied, admissions of this sort are nothing worth.

The argument from abuse is always suspicious: and if we are to be deterred from the legitimate exercise of reason on the internal evidences of revelation by the danger of applying false measures as the standard of judgment, the same plea might be pressed, with no little plausibility against the investigation of the external evidences, which would leave us without the possibility of any reasonable faith at all. The Greeks looked at the *doctrine* and pronounced the Gospel to be foolishness—but it is forgotten that the Jews looked at the miracles and pronounced *them* to be inadequate. The Greeks sought wisdom—the Jews required a sign. The Greek turned away from Christ, because philosophy condemned him—the Jew, because the sign which he demanded had not been vouchsafed—the one *abused* his reason in the field of internal evidence—the other in the field of external evidence. Both were wrong, in the *abuse*, but why the one had not as much right to examine the message, as the other the credentials of the messenger, or why a privilege should be denied to the one because it was abused, while it is still accorded to the other notwithstanding its abuse, does not appear.

Bishop Butler, who has conclusively demonstrated “that objections against Christianity, as distinguished from objections against its evidence, are frivolous,” has expressed himself with his characteristic caution and sobriety in defining the relations of Reason to Revelation. He is far,

(13) Denique est primum principium in lumine naturae. Omne est, aut non est: quo sublato tollitur omnis cognitio. Itaque etiam adversari, in hoc conveniunt, id non posse fieri quod implicat contradictionem. Bellarm. De Sac. Euch. Lib. 3d, c. 2, sub. fin.

however, from endorsing the doctrine of Bishop Wilson. "I express myself with caution"—says he—(14) "lest I should be mistaken to vilify reason, which is indeed the only faculty we have wherewith to judge concerning any thing, even revelation itself: or be misunderstood to assert, that a supposed revelation cannot be proved false from internal characters. For it may contain clear immoralities or contradictions; and either of these would prove it false. Nor will I take upon me to affirm, that nothing else can possibly render any supposed revelation incredible."

It is to be regretted that this distinguished Prelate, who, as a thinker, deserves the title of judicious, incomparably better than Hooker, has not attempted to draw the line between the use and the abuse of reason, though his sentiments may, perhaps, be collected from a careful attention to the tenor and spirit of the chapter from which the above extract is taken. We can only say that that chapter, in connection with some passages, to which we shall afterwards allude—in Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium*, has suggested to us the views which we are about to submit.

We lay it down then as a general principle that the competency of reason to judge in any case is the measure of its right. This competency may be actual or potential—actual, when we are in possession of the knowledge requisite to the formation of a sound opinion—potential, when, though not in actual possession of it, we are able to acquire it. This general principle which is only another statement of the proposition that contradictions can never be both true, involves, in its application, a double distinction of revelation and a corresponding distinction in the office of reason.

Revelation may be contemplated as imparting to us truths which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man to conceive—which "descend to us immediately from Heaven and communicate with no principle, no matter, no conclusion here below"—or as proclaiming upon Divine authority what we were capable of discovering without the aid of inspiration. In other words, revelation may be regarded, according to its subjects,

(14) *Analogy*, Pt. II, c. 3.

as either supernatural or natural. "Every thing in Scripture"—says Taylor—(15)"is not, in the divided sense, a matter of faith"—that is, the Scripture contains some propositions which are intuitively evident without revelation—others which reason can demonstrate from premises furnished by our natural faculties—and others still which lie beyond the province of nature, are derivatives from Heaven and communicate not at all with principles of philosophy" or science. The supernatural is that which alone is strictly and properly *revelation*—the natural is *confirmed*, but not *made known* by the Divine testimony.

This distinction betwixt the supernatural and the natural, we conceive to be important, not merely as it serves to give clearer views in reference to the office of reason, but as it equally serves to remove some popular objections sedulously inculcated by Papists to the universal reading of the Scriptures. The obscurity which is alleged to render them unfit for indiscriminate perusal, will be found, on examination, to lie, for the most part, within the province of the natural—it is of the earth, earthy. Allusions to the events, manners, customs and institutions of an age long since past—to places of which no trace can be found—to scenery which is not familiar to us and to modes of thought into which we find it difficult to enter, all of which were simple and natural to the countrymen and cotemporaries of the sacred writers are the sources of no little perplexity and labor to their modern readers. But these things affect the costume, but not the substance of revelation—the body but not the soul. Its life must be sought in its supernatural discoveries. This is its own field—and whatever obscurity attaches to them presses as heavily upon the learned as the unlearned—the clergy as the laity. All stand upon the same level. All are equally dependent upon God for his Divine illumination—none can claim to be a master, none should submit as a slave. The august mysteries of Christianity are revealed to the meek, however untutored in this world's wisdom, and concealed from the wise, however skilled in philosophy and science. Here *God* is the teacher and man the disciple—and every one in this school must become a

(15) *Ductor Dubitantium*—Book I, c. 2, Rule 3d. This whole Rule though like all Taylor's writings, very much wanting in precision and method, contains many valuable thoughts.

14 *The Office of Reason in regard to Revelation.* [JUNE,

fool in order that he may be wise. The Bible incidentally treats of history, geography and ancient manners, but these are not the things which give it its value—Christ crucified—its great subject—it is the knowledge of Him that saves the soul—and that knowledge is more accessible to the poor and ignorant than to the arrogant disputers of this world.

But to resume the immediate subject of discussion—the office of reason, in the supernatural department of revelation, may be positive, but can never be negative (16)—in the natural it is negative, but only to a very limited extent, if at all, positive. We use the terms positive and negative to indicate the nature of the conclusion, and not the arguments by which it is reached—that being positive, by which the reality of the revelation is affirmed, and that negative, by which it is denied. When we say, therefore, that reason has no negative jurisdiction in regard to the supernatural, we mean that it is incompetent to infer the spuriousness of a pretended revelation, from the nature of its mysteries—that it cannot construct an internal argument from discoveries and doctrines which transcend the limits of natural attainment to convict of falsehood what professes to be Divine. The positive jurisdiction which, in this department, we have conceded to reason, refers to the perception of those impressions of His character which it is to be expected God would enstamp upon His word—those traces of power, wisdom, goodness and glory which proclaim a Divine original, as truly as the works of nature or the dispensations of Providence. Every true revelation must authenticate itself, and the only faculty through which its reflection of the Divine image can be manifested to us, is Reason. Unenlightened by grace, it is confessedly incompetent to discover God in His word, and consequently never can exercise any positive jurisdiction until it becomes the habitation of the Spirit. It is to the called, and the called alone, that Christ crucified is the power of God and the wisdom of God. The negative power which we have accorded to reason in the department of the natural, implies that it is competent to say, to a certain extent, what a revelation ought not to be, though it

(16) There is one exception to this rule. When a professed revelation contradicts itself, another, or one which is known to be real. Then reason has a negative power. This exception, however, comes under the general principle on which the rule is founded.

is not competent to say what it ought to be. It is able here to convict a pretended revelation of imposture, by showing that it contains contradictions, palpable falsehoods or gross absurdities, though it cannot infer that a system is truly Divine, because it is free from objections which would be fatal to its credit. The sum of our doctrine then is, that in the supernatural, reason may prove, but cannot refute the claims of a pretended revelation—in the natural, it may refute, but cannot establish.

This distinction of the use of reason, corresponding to the division of the subjects of revelation, is only an application of the principle, that the right of reason to judge, in any case, springs from its competency. To justify a negative judgment upon internal grounds, there must be contradiction to previous knowledge. The very idea of the supernatural involves the supposition that its discoveries are new. The field which it occupies is inaccessible to our natural faculties, and having no previous informations of the subjects it discloses, we cannot condemn it, on account of inconsistency with known truth. The revelation, in this aspect, is a source of new ideas, perfectly independent of every other source, and it is to be expected that they should differ as widely from those derived from experience, as these, in turn, differ among themselves. When truths beyond the reach of nature are announced upon the authority of God, a new world is opened to reason—a world of invisible realities and of mysterious things. All may be strange and unexpected, as the scenes of the moon or some distant planet would be to a traveller from earth. Still as such a traveller would be guilty of great folly in refusing to credit his senses, because the appearances before him differed from those in the world he had left, so reason would be guilty of equal folly in rejecting the disclosures of revelation, because they were unlike the discoveries of nature. We are no more competent to say beforehand what shall or shall not be revealed, than we are to pronounce, independently of experience, upon the species of information which our senses might be expected to supply. The embryo in the womb is as capable of predicting what sort of a world it shall enter, as natural reason of predicting the things of the spirit of God. Revelation again may be likened to a new sense unfolding to reason a new field of ideas: and it would be

16 *The Office of Reason in regard to Revelation.* [JUNE,

no less preposterous to discredit its testimony, because it was different from that of nature, than it would be to despise the information of the eye, because it differed from that of the ear. We have no natural measures of supernatural mysteries, and as they, therefore, cannot contradict philosophy and science, they cannot be judged by the wisdom of men.

The relation in which we stand to the supernatural disclosures of an authentic revelation, is analogous to that which, according to the sublime aphorism of Bacon, (17) we sustain to nature. As the phenomena of the material world are not to be *judged*, but *seen*, so the mysteries of Heaven are not to be *judged*, but *apprehended*. Interpretation is to theology what observation and experiment are to philosophy. As it is the business of science not to fabricate imaginary worlds and dignify hypothesis with the title of laws, but patiently investigate the facts of nature as they really exist, so it is the business of reason in regard to revelation not to form fantastic theories in relation to its discoveries, doctrines and institutions, but to interpret with humility and digest with reverence what God has chosen to communicate. The scope of inquiry in each case is not what ought to be, but what is. The facts of nature, reduced to general expressions declaring their uniformity, constitute laws, and these laws arranged into system, constitute science or philosophy—the facts of revelation are its doctrines or mysteries, and these reduced to method, according to their dependencies and connections, constitute theology. Actual phenomena furnish the materials of the one—the word and oracle of God, the materials of the other.

These seem to have been the views of Bacon, who treats revelation as an independent source of new ideas, and concedes to reason the two-fold use of explication and inference (18), “the former, in the conception and apprehension of the mysteries of God to us revealed, the other, in the inferring and deriving of doctrine and direction thereupon.” The inference of Bacon, however, does

(17) *Homo naturæ minister et interpres, tantum facit et intelligit quantum de naturæ ordine re vel mente observaverit, nec amplius scit, aut potest.* Nov. Organ., Aph. I.

(18) Advancement of Learning. Works, Montagu's Edition, vol. 2, p. 301-2.

not refer to the inductive process by which the scattered instructions of revelation are collected, compared and digested into system, but to the application of its principles to the practical emergencies of life. It is the inference of a chess-player, who deduces from the positive laws of the game, the most successful method of regulating his movements—the inference of the statesman, who devises the wisest schemes for the conduct of the republic in conformity with the maxims and principles of the Constitution—the inference of daily life, in which the general laws of society are applied to the circumstances and conditions of men. It is an office of reason, in the *use* of revelation, presupposing that its reality has been proved and its maxims understood.

The doctrine which we have endeavored to illustrate, that reason possesses no negative jurisdiction in regard to the mysteries or supernatural facts of revelation, because it possesses no previous knowledge which they can contradict, subverts the basis of the whole system of philosophical infidelity. The corner stone of the fabric, is the competency of man to determine before hand what a revelation should contain. That from the very nature of the case, it deals with the unknown, and contemplates us in the attitude of learners and not of teachers; of servants and interpreters, and not lords and masters, is a proposition, simple and obvious as it is, which the disciples of Herbert, Bolingbroke and Hume, have entirely overlooked. The legitimate conclusion from their principles is, either that man possesses, in his natural faculties and resources, the means of omniscience, or that whatever God knows beyond the reach of reason, must forever remain an impenetrable secret with himself. The Deity, in His omnipotence, cannot impart ideas “which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man to conceive.” He cannot open the eyes of the blind nor unstop the ears of the deaf. But if God can indefinitely unfold to us new sources of ideas—if He can lift the curtain which covers the invisible from mortal eyes—open worlds, peopled with realities, of which fancy had never dreamed—if He can impart to us new senses or illustrate the unknown, by analogies borrowed from the present state, as the form of

the key is adapted to the ward of the lock: Then, revelation may be as real as nature; as independent in its own sphere and as certain in its results. (19). Faith may be as unsuspected a means of knowledge as sense, consciousness or reason, and no more to be condemned because it is adjusted to no natural measure, than one sense is to be cashiered because it speaks not the same language with its neighbor.

Those, therefore, who deny the reality of supernatural mysteries, who confound what is *above* with what is contrary to reason, and reduce every thing to the level of natural attainment, deny the reality of *any* proper revelation at all. To be supernatural, is to be above reason. That these mysteries, however, can contain no contradictions to reason, must be obvious to the slightest reflection. Descending upon us immediately from heaven, their source is the bosom of God; and as they communicate with no principles of earth, we must take them just as they descend from the fountain of truth. Reason is simply the eye to apprehend the light—the ear to distinguish the sound. And the *new* truths of faith can no more be *contrary* to reason, than new truths of sense, impressions of color and sound, in the instance of the blind and deaf, restored to the enjoyment of their lost senses, can be contrary to their previous attainments. All that we can say is, that reason is furnished with new materials of thought, knows something which it did not know before, is in possession of a class of ideas different from any thing to which it had been previously accustomed. There can be no contradiction, however, where the terms are not the same.

We have attributed to reason a positive jurisdiction in authenticating the claims of a real revelation from the nature of its mysteries. As we demonstrate in natural theology, the being and perfections of God, from the order

(19). Id primo tenendum, axiomata rationis certis quibusdam circumscripta esse limitibus, ultra quos eniti non valeant; mysteria autem fidei eos limites plurimum transcendere. Sic ut nequaquam Rationi liceat mysteria isthaec eo nomine rejicere, quod nihil unquam iis simile in suis ideis ac notionibus invenerit. 1 Cor 2: 9. Certe et id ratio docet, multa in Dei infinitate et consilio ejus latere, quae ipsa per se assequi non possit; Deoque dignum esse ea de se revelare quae captum nostrum superant. Witsius de Usu et Abusu Rat., §20.

and beauty of his works, and infer the relations which must sustain to the worlds He has made, so the scheme of Providence, disclosed in revelation, may in its majesty and grandeur, its harmony, beneficence and purity, contain such memorials of Deity, as to render skepticism little less than madness. In the case of Christianity, for instance, the glory of God is so conspicuously displayed in the provisions of the Gospel, that to the called, it would be as easy to doubt the shining of the sun in the heavens, as the Divine mission of Jesus. Redemption is its own witness. We may study its doctrines and its facts in their harmony and connection—we may compare the end with the means, and discover the wisdom and the power, the grace and love which animate the whole. We call it *reasonable*, not because reason discovered its doctrines or originated its precepts, but because it is consistent with itself—it is a system made up of parts, nicely adjusted and exquisitely arranged, and not a mass of insulated, incoherent, independent phenomena. The fitness and propriety of its provisions—the simplicity and scope of its laws—the beauty of its rites and the sublime purity of its code—as information upon these points, may be gathered from itself, are topics which may not only furnish legitimate employment to reason, but task its highest powers.

But the execution of these functions, requires the illumination of the Holy Spirit. Reason can perceive very faintly the positive proofs which revelation carries on its face, though, as we shall afterwards see, it may construct a negative argument, which, if not sufficient to satisfy faith, is sufficient to rebuke unbelief.

But what we wish particularly to inculcate here is, that an incapacity of perceiving the impressions of Deity upon His Word, creates no presumption against the truth of their existence. It would only follow that we are weak and blind, and not that the things themselves were either false or unreasonable. We cannot reason from our ignorance. Though the invisible things of God are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, yet multitudes in every age have gone down to the grave, without being conducted to the great Creator by the heavens which declare his glory, and the firmament which showeth his handiwork. The stupidity of the learner is no proof against the truth

which he fails to apprehend. It remains certain to reason and to faith, that God made the worlds, and His finger is conspicuously displayed in their arrangement and government, though thousands have failed to recognize His hand, and to adore the wisdom which conducts the universe. That the blind are incapable of receiving the impressions of light and color, is no presumption against the existence of either: and so the glory of God may be indelibly stamped upon the Gospel—it may reflect His image, display His wisdom, and make known the manifold riches of His grace, and yet mortal ignorance and mortal stupidity may fail to apprehend the fact. The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not. Hence, it is impossible, from the mysteries of revelation, to construct an internal argument against it, though one may be framed in its favor.

In addition to this, as we have already intimated, there are negative considerations, suggested by the contents of revelation, which go far to establish its supernatural pretensions. This point has not passed altogether without notice in Butler's masterly treatise. (20). The argument consists in showing that no causes, apart from the interposition of God, are adequate to explain the appearance or to account for the phenomena of thought involved in the subjects of the professed revelation. One by one, all natural solutions may be removed—every supposition may be destroyed, but that which ascribes to God the agency which is claimed. If, for example, human invention is alleged as a sufficient explanation of the case, that may be proved to be inadequate, by showing that the materials which compose the system, either as they separately exist or are combined into a whole, are not such as could have been suggested by any conceivable laws of association to the human mind, and, therefore, must lie beyond the province of human ingenuity. Such transcendent elements as the Trinity, the incarnation of the Son, the work of the Spirit, personal election, and particular redemption, are not the ingredients which man was likely to use in devising a system of religion. These ideas never arose spontaneously in the human breast—they are indeed so remote from the

(20) See the *Analogy*, part 2d., chap. 3d., last sentence.

ordinary trains of thought, that the authority of a confessed revelation finds it difficult to subdue the remonstrances of carnal reason against them. The scheme of redemption as a whole—its conception and gradual developement—the harmony of its doctrines, as delivered in successive ages and generations by patriarchs and prophets—the correspondence of all its dispensations, and its grand consummation in the death of Jesus and the institutions of the Gospel—all these exhibit a reach of thought and an amplitude of purpose, which we feel it to be mockery to chain to earth. The temple is too grand and august for a puny architect. If again such a revelation should be referred to the devil, the argument of our Saviour is ready with overwhelming force—a house divided against itself cannot stand—Satan cannot be expected to cast out Satan. The moral tone of the Gospel is too pure and elevated—its doctrines tend too evidently to promote the glory of God, the peace of society, and the good of man, to have sprung from hell. Its atmosphere is too clear, its light too brilliant, its hopes too sublime, to be an emanation from the pit.

If Christianity should be ascribed to policy or enthusiasm, the answer is also ready, that the effect does not correspond to the cause. We are competent to judge of the natural operation of these principles, and we trace none of their peculiarities in the glorious Gospel of the blessed God. Christianity, however, exists—it is an effect which must, like every other, have had *some* cause. And if it can be shown to have sprung neither from earth nor hell, the conclusion is irresistible that its source is the bosom of God. Such is the nature of that negative argument, founded on the principle that every effect must have an adequate cause, which reason, we think, is capable of constructing from the acknowledged phenomena of revelation.

We have now, we apprehend, sufficiently explained our views, in saying that the office of reason in regard to supernatural mysteries, can never be negative. It cannot condemn them, because it has no law by which to try them—it is not a fit judge, because not a competent judge. It cannot say beforehand what a revelation should be—how it should be given—what it should contain, nor with what evidence it ought to be attended. At the same time, it

may study these mysteries, and find God in them—while it possesses the power of proving upon other grounds that they could have originated from no other source. The conclusion is most important that no mysteries ever can create the slightest presumption against the divine original of the system which contains them, while they may contain irresistible evidence both negative and positive of its truth.

The office of reason in relation to those parts of revelation, which communicate with principles of natural knowledge, we have defined to be negative and not positive, or, if positive at all, only to a very limited degree. Every system, and particularly every written system, professing to be divine, with which we are acquainted, contains not only its mysteries or supernatural facts, but allusions direct or indirect, to a variety of subjects which fall within the limits of the human faculties. Geography, history, and philosophy, the manners, customs, institutions of a distant age—the scenery and productions of other lands, and especially the appearances of human nature, in its moral, social and political condition, at the period of the writers, are embraced in the sacred records, and the statements concerning them attested by the same inspiration which covers the mysteries of the faith. In regard to these matters, the human mind, according to the extent and accuracy of its knowledge, is capable of judging between truth and falsehood, and any real inconsistency with fact, is evidently fatal to the plea of inspiration. A record, pretending to this high character, which should contain anachronisms or geographical mistakes—which should blunder in its political or social allusions, reason could not hesitate to brand with the stigma of forgery. While, however, error in these matters, would be evidently fatal, the strictest fidelity and truth would create no necessary inference of Divine interposition. Human causes would be adequate to explain the phenomenon, without an appeal to the supernatural agency of God. Reason, therefore, can give a negative, but not a positive decision—it can say what is *not*, but not what is from God. If there be any exception to this principle, it is in the department of moral inquiry, though Bacon seems to reckon the purity of the Gospel among its supernatural

facts. (21). He grounds upon the word and oracle of God; "not only those points of faith which concern the great mysteries of the Deity, of the creation, of the redemption, but likewise those which concern the law moral truly interpreted." It is revealed in the Scriptures with a degree of perfection, to which the light of nature cannot aspire, and though conscience is a "sparkle of the purity of man's first estate," yet in his present fallen condition, it is no adequate guide—no perfect rule—it can "check the vice, but not inform the virtue." Hence, he concludes, that the doctrine of religion, as well *moral* as mystical, is not to be attained but by inspiration and revelation from God.

That the standard of rectitude displayed in the Scriptures, is beyond the capacities of fallen man to discover, may, as a general truth, be admitted, and yet the positive argument arising from this fact, seems to us to rise no higher than a presumption, since it is impossible to fix the limit to which the light of nature might have conducted us without the guidance of revelation. The subject of morals is not *above reason*, considered in itself, apart from the consequences of the fall. If man had never sinned, his moral vision would always have been clear. His incapacity, in his present state, to frame a perfect system of duty, does not pertain to nature, *as such*, but to nature *as fallen and corrupt*. It is an *accidental* and not an *essential* defect. The incapacity, however, to discover the *mysteries* of religion, is *absolutely natural*. The angels are as much dependent upon revelation for the sublime facts of redemption as man himself. There are deep things of God, which none can penetrate but His own Eternal Spirit, and none can know them but those to whom they are graciously revealed. These unfathomable depths are evidently supernatural, in a sense which cannot attach to any code of morals, however pure and exalted.

As man, even in his fallen state, possessing a moral nature, possesses necessarily *some* knowledge of moral distinctions, and as this knowledge is unquestionably capable of being enlarged and refined, we can never be certain that any particular moral discovery *could* not have been the

(21) Advancement of Learning. Works (Montague,) vol. 2, p. 300.

offspring of nature. There may be violent presumptions against its natural origin, arising from the condition of those who announced it—their want of education—their early habits, prejudices and associations—the superiority which it evinces to the spirit and attainments of the age and country in which it first made its appearance—these and such like considerations are entitled to no little weight—but still as we cannot definitely say how far nature *might* go, we cannot determine where the necessity of a revelation begins. Immorality is clear proof that the system containing it is not Divine, but a high *morality* is not decisive evidence to the contrary. It has great force in removing objections—in showing that the doctrine is not unworthy of God, and as concurring with other proofs, it may make them amount to a moral demonstration—but, in itself considered, we are inclined, with Warburton, to rank it no higher than a *presumption*. (22). The credibility of the sacred writers—the reality and honesty of their convictions—may be established by their moral tone; and these established, establish the facts to which they bear witness, and these, in turn, the Divine original of their religion—but morality here is not a direct proof of inspiration, but the means of fortifying the direct proof. The internal evidences upon which alone we would confidently rely, are those drawn from the *mysteries* of revelation—its supernatural facts and discoveries. Here *God* must be seen and confessed. There can be no suspicion of *nature's* agency. The grand facts of redemption,

(22) Divine Legation—Book ix., chap. 5. His words are: “But in reverence to truth, I hold myself obliged to own, that in my opinion, the reasonableness of a doctrine pretended to come immediately from God, is of itself alone no proof, but a presumption only of its divine original: because, though the excellence of a doctrine, (even allowing it surpass all other moral teaching whatever,) may shew it to be worthy of God, yet, from that sole excellence, we cannot certainly conclude that it came immediately from Him; since we know not to what heights of moral knowledge the human understanding, unassisted by inspiration, may arrive. Not even our full experience, that all the wisdom of Greece and Rome, comes extremely short of the wisdom of the Gospel, can support us in concluding with certainty, that this Gospel was sent immediately from God. We can but very doubtfully guess what excellence may be produced by a well-formed and well-cultivated mind, further blessed with a vigorous temperament and a happy organization of the body. The amazement into which Sir Isaac Newton's discoveries in nature threw the learned world, as soon as men became able to comprehend their truth and utility, sufficiently shews what little conception it had that the human faculties could ever rise so high or spread so wide.”

these are the glory of the Gospel, and its inward witness of a heavenly birth.

The supernatural facts of revelation may, however, react upon morals, by the addition of new and impressive sanctions to its duties, and by enlarging the sphere of moral obligation. It is a low and narrow view of Christianity which those have been accustomed to take, who, anxious to exalt natural religion upon its ruins, have artfully depicted it as a system of ceremonial rites and positive observances. It reveals, they tell us, no new duties essentially *moral* in their character—and its chief value consists not in its own peculiarities, but in the relation which they bear to the great doctrines of natural religion. As containing an authoritative statement of what the light of reason might have been able to discover without it, and as diffusing, by the judicious institutions of its ministry and ordinances, and impressing, in the regularly recurring seasons of its worship, the solemn obligations of nature which men are prone to overlook and forget, revelation, they confess, is not to be despised. Still, its highest office is to anticipate the slow discoveries of reason, to supersede the excuses of indolence and ignorance, and to make nature effective by an appeal to the awful majesty of God.

The shallow sophistry of these pretenders in Theology, is at once refuted (23) by the fact, that the great object of redemption is not to fortify nature, but to recover it from the ruin and degradation of the fall—it is a scheme of *salvation*—of life to the dead—liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound. In unfolding the mysteries of grace, it unfolds at the same time relations to God, to all the persons of the Trinity, to our

(23) This subject is very ably treated in the First Chapter of the Second Part of Butler's Analogy. The distinction, however, which Butler draws between natural and supernatural religion, does not strike us as being strictly just. "The essence of natural religion" he places in religious regards to the Father—"the essence of revealed," or as we would prefer to call it, supernatural "religion, in religious regards to the Son and the Holy Ghost." Now we apprehend that the difference betwixt them is not in the *objects* to which they are respectively directed, but in the *relations* under which those objects are contemplated. Supernatural religion is founded on the relations in which God stands to us as a Redeemer and a Saviour—natural religion, upon the relations in which He stands to us as Creator and Governor. The Trinity is alike the object of both. It was Father, Son and Holy Ghost who created Adam, and he was bound

fellow-men and ourselves, which, as they are founded upon nothing in nature, could not be discovered without the light of revelation, and just as truly create obligations essentially moral in their character as the natural relations discoverable by reason which are so much extolled. The distinction of moral and positive duties is not a distinction of the mode in which the grounds of duty are ascertained to us—but a distinction of the grounds of duty themselves—that being moral which grows out of a moral relation—and that positive which is simply the offspring of command. The relations of redemption, which are made known by Revelation, being as truly moral as the relations of creation made known, if indeed it be so, by the light of nature—this new department of relations opens a new field of duties specifically moral, which can no more be neglected without guilt than the more obvious injunctions of natural religion. To disregard a Redeemer and a Saviour would seem to be even more aggravated depravity than not to love a Creator and Preserver. The relations in the one case are tenderer and sweeter than those in the other, and the neglect or contempt of them consequently argues intenser hardness of heart and deeper obduracy of conscience.

That the offices of the God-head in the economy of salvation present the Deity to us in a new light and expand the circle of our moral obligations may be admitted, while it is not so obvious that our duties to ourselves and others are any otherwise enlarged than as they are enjoined with greater clearness and authority than unassisted reason could reach. But Christianity unquestionably binds the race together in ties unknown to nature—she establishes a sacred brotherhood in a common origin, a common ruin, a com-

to worship the Trinity—for there is no other God—under the pain of idolatry. Natural religion is as much revealed as supernatural. If its object be the Trinity, nature never could discover the personality of the Deity. Adam was dependent upon the author of his being for the knowledge of His name. And though when the object of worship was once made known, and the relations in which man stood to the Deity discovered, the duties were a matter of obvious deduction—yet, as the same holds in supernatural religion, revelation is equally important to both. By natural religion, we understand the religion of man in his state of nature, as he came from the hands of his Maker—by supernatural religion, the religion of sinner redeemed by grace, and restored to the favor of God. The covenant of works is natural, the covenant of grace supernatural religion, and both are equally revealed.

mon immortality and a common Saviour, which unites the descendants of Adam into one great family, and renders wars, discords and jealousies as odious as they are hurtful. The benevolence of the Bible is a different principle from the benevolence of nature, and that peculiar sympathy of the redeemed—the cultivation of which is at once a duty and a delight—founded upon a common union with their Lord, and a common participation of the glorious Spirit, is as much above any thing attainable by unrenewed humanity, as the heavens are above the earth. “A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another.”

The duties of temperance and chastity, which primarily respect ourselves, are placed upon a basis entirely novel, and invested with awful sanctions by the doctrine of the Scriptures, that our bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost. Chambering, wantonness and dissipation, become, under this view, not merely excesses, but sacrilege. They insult God, while they degrade ourselves.

In all these cases, however, in which Christianity enlarges the field of morality, by enlarging our knowledge of the moral relations into which our duties must ultimately be resolved, reason is competent to recognize the duty as soon as the relation is discovered. It cannot, indeed, discover the relation itself—this grows out of the supernatural facts of revelation—but when they are once admitted, there is nothing in the subsequent process beyond the capacities of nature. Hence, if any duties contradictory to these relations should be enjoined, the pretended revelation might be as confidently pronounced to be the offspring of imposture, as if it inculcated principles inconsistent with the relations discoverable by reason. The negative jurisdiction of reason in this department of morality, is the same as that which belongs to it in the department exclusively natural. The morality does not vary with the light by which it is perceived. The form of communication makes no change in the essence of the duty. We cannot, therefore, agree with Lord Bacon, in looking upon morality, in any aspect of it, as strictly supernatural. It falls within the legitimate province of reason, and though revelation may enlarge its dominion, remove its defects, and enforce its claims, by new and more effectual sanctions—still, as in itself, it does not bear visibly the impress of God, it can hardly be regarded

as competent to authenticate any system professing to be from Him.

It is remarkable, too, that it is only in the negative light upon which we have insisted that the Scriptures present the argument from morality, upon which so much stress has been laid by a certain class of writers, as to make it the great internal proof of revelation. Our Saviour does not say that His system is necessarily from God, because it is pure, but that it cannot be from the Devil. The sublime sanctity of His precepts was a triumphant demonstration that the finger of Beelzebub had no part in his miracles—therefore *they* were Divine, and *therefore* his doctrines were to be received. The pure morality is pleaded to remove objections, and nothing more—and the principle is obviously implied, that any imperfections in this respect, are a conclusive refutation of the pretensions, however supported, of a professed revelation.

The negative jurisdiction which we have assigned to reason in the natural department of revelation, we are not reluctant to confess, is capable of immense abuse. This is the arena upon which shallow philosophy and spurious science have delighted to contest the claims of Christianity. The dreams of visionaries, the maxims of education, and the prejudices of ignorance, will, in the exercise of this jurisdiction, be made, to a greater or less extent, the touchstone of Divine truth, and prove the rock on which thousands shall stumble and perish. It is not to be expected, in this world of sin and error, that rights will be always rightly used. The Jews, without controversy, not only had the right, but were solemnly bound to try the religion of Jesus by the standard of Moses and the prophets, and yet, in the exercise of this unquestionable right—the discharge of this imperative obligation—they were led to condemn the Saviour as an impostor and blasphemer. They were surely not to be denied the privilege of reasoning from the Scriptures, because they reasoned badly. The use of medicine is not to be prohibited because quacks and mountebanks turn it into poison and murder their unfortunate patients. If God gives reason the right to judge, He gives it subject to a fearful responsibility—and in nothing is the obligation so solemn and awful to cultivate a love of truth—to cherish a spirit of honesty and candor, and guard the mind against

prejudice and passion, as in this very matter of weighing the evidence of a professed revelation. When there is a contradiction betwixt our philosophy and it, the method of reason and of duty is to compare their respective evidences, and lean to the side which has the preponderance. If the principle which is contradicted be an intuitive truth or a demonstrative conclusion, the pretended revelation must be evidently discarded—if it be only a probable opinion, the arguments which sustain it must be stronger than the proofs of revelation, before the latter can be justly rejected for the former. Whatever credentials the professed revelation presents, are so many positive arguments, which cannot be set aside without stronger opposing proofs. The great danger is in over-estimating the evidence in support of a favorite opinion. "Nothing"—says Paley—"is so soon made as a maxim." Those consequently who do not make conscience of truth, are under severe temptation to contract the guilt of rejecting the word of God, on account of its opposition to silly prejudices and hasty inductions, which are assumed to be unquestionable. This abuse of reason is a sin to which the apostasy has exposed us. We may misjudge where we have the right to judge, but we do it at our risk.

The most precious doctrines of the Gospel, though in the forms of their developement and the precise mode and circumstances of their application, they are preëminently supernatural, yet ultimately rest upon moral principles which do not transcend the legitimate province of reason. Justification by faith, for example, while it involves the supernatural facts connected with the advent and offices of Christ, at the same time proceeds upon a law, that of federal representation, and the consequent propriety of imputation, which belongs to the department of morals, and upon the essential character of which, as just or unjust, reason is, to some extent, competent to pronounce. A false philosophy may condemn this cardinal principle of God's dispensations with man—it may be assumed as a maxim, that neither sin nor righteousness can be justly imputed. The proper reply to such cavils and objections is, not that reason has no right to pronounce a judgment in the case, but that the judgment in question is contrary to truth and evidence. Those who obstinately persist in their prejudices, are in the same condition with the Jews, who felt

it to be impossible that he who was accused of God, as Christ, according to the Scriptures, was shown to be, by hanging on a tree, could be the Saviour of men, or their own promised Messiah. They were not wrong in applying the test of Scriptures to the pretensions of Christ, but they were wrong in adopting false interpretations—in reasoning from false premises or corrupting those that were true. There is no such moral axiom as the enemies of imputation allege—the doctrine is fully consistent with reason—and if on account of it, a revelation is rejected, it is rejected in concession to a false philosophy. So again, it may be assumed that all sin consists in voluntary action—and the Bible may be spurned for teaching a better doctrine. But the species of abuse which reason undergoes in this case, is analagous to that which it received at the hands of Hume, when he attempted to demonstrate that miracles were incapable of proof from human testimony. Reason, in such instances, does not pronounce upon a subject entirely beyond its province, but it may grievously and sinfully err in the character of the judgment it shall render. It may prostitute its right to the cause of falsehood and hell.

Could it be shown that the doctrine of imputation involved a principle essentially iniquitous, or that states of heart, as contradistinguished from transitory acts, could not be possessed of a moral character, we should feel that the argument against Christianity were as complete as if it had been convicted of inculcating lying or authorizing fraud. And hence we regard those who, by their perverse disputations, corrupt the great truths of justification and original sin, not simply as heresiarchs, but as the patrons and abettors of gross infidelity. The world is not to be mystified by absurd interpretations—and the issue which will ultimately be made, is not what is the sense of the Scriptures, but whether documents containing the sense which the Bible evidently does, can be inspired. The advocates of the new Divinity, are laying the foundations, broad and deep, of a new phase of philosophical infidelity—an infidelity more dangerous because more subtle than that of Bolingbroke and Hume—which pretends reverence, while it really insults—which, like Judas, betrays the Son of Man with a kiss. We would remind these men that the

whole train of evidences in favor of Christianity—its prophecies fulfilled—its stupendous miracles—its salutary effects on the world, are so many positive arguments *against* their pretended axioms, which they are solemnly bound to weigh, before they are authorized to dignify their crudities with the title of intuitive truths, and on account of them, dismiss the Gospel with a sneer. The Jews were as certain that no prophet could spring from Galilee, and no good thing from Nazareth, as they can be that neither sin nor righteousness can be imputed, or that all sin must be resolved into voluntary action. *They, too, may* be confounding familiar prejudices with intuitive truths—and they too may find that the penalty of this awful abuse of God's best gift is, that they shall die in their sins. We would not attack this species of philosophical infidelity, by putting its moral inquiries beyond the territory of reason, but we would assault its principles themselves—and we are much mistaken, if it cannot be shown, though this is not the place for doing so—that they are as contrary to the facts of experience as to the Word of God—that they are shallow, false, sophistical, having indeed the semblance of wisdom, but the substance of ~~philosophy~~. We should be reluctant even to suggest the impression, by timid distinctions and sly insinuations against the office of reason, that the friends of truth were unable to meet its enemies on the moral ground which they have chosen to occupy. We would direct our batteries against their strong-holds, turn their favorite weapons against themselves, and construct the same species of argument against their cob-web theories, which they have in vain fabricated against the *grace* of the Gospel. We would appeal from reason mis-informed to reason rightly informed—from the drunken to the sober judge—from philosophy, falsely so called, to the true philosophy of facts.

We wish, however, to have it distinctly recollected, that the province which we assign to reason in this whole department, is purely negative. It is not within the compass of nature, of moral philosophy, or metaphysics, with all the lights and resources which either or both can command, to devise a system of religion adequate to the wants of a sinner—to determine of what elements it ought to consist, how it shall be communicated, in what form dis-

folly.

pensed, or under what circumstances imparted. These are secret things which belong to God, and can be known only as He chooses to reveal them to the sons of men. But, while reason cannot say what the scheme of salvation shall be, it may condemn a system, which, professing to be from heaven, contradicts the obvious principles of truth and rectitude. Its office hath this extent, no more. (24). What revelation actually is, must be known from its own records. The word and oracle of God, is our only source of information. We have no sympathy with the prevailing tendency of some modern speculations to aspire at universal truths—truths which shall contain the seeds of all possible knowledge, the principles of all philosophy, and from which universal science may be deduced, by strictly a priori processes. It was to be hoped that Bacon had completely exploded this whole method of investigation, though he has given countenance to the possibility of some such universal science—attained, however, by induction, and not from necessary maxims of pure reason, in his curious speculation upon what he denominates the first philosophy.

There is but little danger that the physical sciences will ever be cultivated upon any other principles than those of the *Novum Organum*. The time has gone by, when the dreams of Rabbins and Hutchinsonians upon the letters, points and dots of the Bible, shall be substituted for the observation of nature and the consequent generalization of facts. Science is felt to be no longer the creature of ingenuity, but the offspring of patient attention and rigorous induction.

But in religious and moral subjects, the age is prone to revert to the exploded method of the schools. Discarding in nature the safer guidance of experience, and in revelation the safer guidance of a sound interpretation, those who aspire to the highest forms of philosophy, are intent upon constructing systems without facts, from prin-

(24) The negative jurisdiction, for which we contend, is generally assumed by Protestants in their arguments against transubstantiation. Though it professes to be a supernatural mystery, yet it touches upon points of human philosophy, and contradicts the most obvious principles of science—and therefore, instead of being entitled to credit on the authority of a pretended revelation, it is sufficient to damn the claims of any system which inculcates it. We feel the argument to be complete against it, because it is an absurdity.

ciples which have been woven of the stuff that dreams are made of. The origin of this unfortunate tendency, is no doubt to be ascribed to an obvious defect in Mr. Locke's theory of the sources of our knowledge. Overlooking the fact that the understanding is, and must be, a source of ideas to itself, he had ascribed too much to sensation and reflection—the detection of the error has created a tendency to the opposite extreme, and, in modern times, too much is attributed to the spontaneous development of principles in the mind. These are made the universal forms of knowledge, and as weary a search is instituted after these magic forms as ever the realists embarked in after their general entities.

As many an Alchemyst persuaded himself, and perhaps others, that he had found the golden secret of his toil, so these deluded children of the mist, eagerly embrace phantoms, which they mistake for the object of their quest, and chuckle in the imagined possession of materials, from which they are prepared to fabricate God, worlds and religion. Happy mortals! no longer doomed to the slow discipline of the senses, and the slower discipline of the understanding—they carry a laboratory within, from which they can extract at will the essence and quintessence of all possible and real things. They wield an enchanter's wand, potent as the eye of omniscience. They need no voice from nature, the universe, or God. Nature, the universe, and God, are all the creatures of their skill. For ourselves, doomed to drudge in an humbler sphere, we are content to know of the external world just what our senses reveal—of the world within us, what reflection can bring to light—and of the world above us, what the inspiration of the Almighty may vouchsafe to impart. Beyond these soundings, we are lost in unfathomable depths. Here, then, we are content to abide.

Timid believers may, perhaps, be alarmed at the negative jurisdiction which we have conceded to reason, in those points in which revelation touches the subjects of natural knowledge. But they have nothing to apprehend from its legitimate exercise. Not a single contradiction to any single principle of science and philosophy can be justly imputed to the records of Christianity. Time was, when infidelity exulted in the prospect of reading the doom of the Gospel

in the mysteries of the stars—but astronomy now is made subservient to its glory, and the God who rules the heavens is felt to be the God of redemption. Then, the bowels of the earth were ransacked, and some secret voice was invoked from the monuments of faded races and past generations, to give the lie to the narrative of Moses, but nature in all her caverns, answered back to the testimony of inspiration. Nothing in the *facts* of the earth's history could be found in contradiction to the sacred records—although they were often rendered subservient to conclusions, with which they are as slightly connected, as a sick man's dreams with the realities of life. None dare assert that the *facts themselves* were contravened by the Bible. And who shall affirm, that the deductions which they were made to yield, are entitled to the prerogative of infallibility, or possess any clearer proof than the external evidence of the credibility of Moses. We repeat it, Christianity has nothing to fear from true science—it has passed the test—and whatever is the extent of the presumption of Divine interposition, arising from the fact that it touches upon philosophy in so many points, and yet contradicts it in none—it is a presumption, to which our holy religion is fully entitled. How different is the case with the records of Mahometan and Hindoo faith! The Bible is certainly singular in this respect, and it ought to be a matter of sincere gratulation to the heart of every believer.

ARTICLE II.

THE RELATION BETWEEN THE WORK OF CHRIST AND THE CONDITION OF THE ANGELIC WORLD.

In our meditations upon the Atonement of Christ, we are prone to regard it exclusively in its relations to the human race. This, perhaps, is natural. The Bible reveals the plan of redemption, not as a subject for speculation, but as a method of salvation: we are led, therefore, to view it in its special adaptedness to our condition as sin-

ners, and to overlook the relation it may possibly sustain to other beings beside ourselves. We know indeed that the sacrifice of Christ has an intimate connexion with the moral government of God; but, are prone to think, only so far as we form a part of that government. If the nature of God's rule is such, that pardon cannot be bestowed upon the transgressor without an adequate atonement, we are easily content with the belief that the only design of that atonement was to secure this pardon for the actual transgressor, and that no other and higher ends are comprehended within it.

But we are persuaded that the scheme of grace revealed in the Bible, should be regarded from a far higher point of view than this low earth on which we dwell; that its relations are more vast and extensive than is supposed by those who would confine it to any one distinct class or order of beings. Taking, indeed, the narrowest view of it, it is sublime beyond all human conception. The redemption of a single soul from death, its deliverance from the bondage of sin and the power of Satan, its entire sanctification, and its introduction into heaven, are all events of the most startling and impressive kind. The passage of even one redeemed saint from the deep pit and miry clay of sin to a throne with Christ in his glory, unfolds a history which might command a listening senate of Angels. But, if with John, we could behold, in Apocalyptic vision, the one hundred and forty and four thousand, standing with the Lamb on Mount Zion, having his Father's name in their foreheads, their voice as the voice of many waters, and their song that of harpers, harping with their harps: in view of that immense number, each seeming equally a monument to the mystery of grace, we should confess this is a great salvation, this salvation by the blood of Christ. Yet, this is but a standing point, from which to spring to a higher and more commanding view. We have only to look upon the different orders of worshippers in the heavenly temple, and witness the whole hierarchy bending before the throne of the Lamb, to be overwhelmed with the mystery of divine grace. It is not difficult to say why "the spirits of just men made perfect" should cry day and night, "thou art worthy, for thou hast redeemed us by thy blood;" but whence come these—this "innumerable company of An-

gels"—these "flames of fire"—who catch from redeemed sinners the key-note of praise, and swell the chorus, "worthy is the Lamb that was slain?"

The answer to this question, brings us to the grave, yet delightful theme, which it is the object of the present article to pursue. It may be expressed in the following proposition :

Christ Jesus, by his atonement, has introduced into the moral government of God the *principle of grace*, which avails to the confirmation of beings who are holy, as well as to the redemption of beings who are fallen.

It may not be wholly unnecessary to state precisely in the outset the point which is to be proved. It is not our design to show that the redemption of man is by grace : this, we presume, will be freely granted ; at any rate, our attention is not now directed to the proof or denial of this fact. It is sufficient that the term grace is adopted in Scripture, for the purpose of defining the whole scheme of salvation. The believer is said to be "justified by grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Again, "we are saved by grace through faith," &c. Furthermore, the promise made to Abraham, that he should be heir of the world, a promise which envelopes the whole work of Christ, is expressly said to be not of the law but of faith, in order "that it might be by grace." And lastly, the whole Gospel, which is but the story of redemption, is defined "the Gospel of the grace of God." These plain passages shut up controversy upon this point, even though it should not be cheerfully conceded : our design will be to lead off from this admitted truth, and to show that mankind is not the only class of beings directly indebted to this grace, but that "principalities and powers in heavenly places," stand equally with justified believers upon a gracious platform : and this grace is introduced to them as well as to us, through the stupendous work accomplished by Jesus Christ.

The first argument bearing upon this point, will be drawn from the fact, that the holy angels have been confirmed in their original holiness and bliss against all possible defection. But, as this fact forms the keystone of the argument, it will be necessary first to place it firmly in the arch : and perhaps the majority of our readers who readily concede the position, will not object to see arrayed before

them the proofs of a long-cherished opinion, if indeed it may not be considered a settled article of faith. Of course, the appeal must be made exclusively to the testimony of Scripture: and in gathering up this testimony, we feel the need of very great caution, since the condition of the angelic world is not made the subject of direct revelation in the Bible, but is incidentally unfolded, and only on those points where it is mysteriously interlinked with the destiny of man.

We conceive, then, that the term "elect," applied by the Apostle to the whole body of holy angels, involves, necessarily, their confirmation. Paul, having given various directions to Timothy, concludes with this solemn injunction: "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ and the elect angels, that thou do these things." (1.) Now, what is meant here by the term "elect," as applied to the angels? If we follow the analogy of the word, as it is used in Scripture relative to man, it must mean that in the purpose or decree of God, these are chosen that they may stand fast in the holiness in which they were created. The elect of mankind are those who from eternity have been chosen in Christ to be the heirs of everlasting life: the design of their election being their holiness—a holiness secured to them by their redemption in Christ and their sanctification through the Spirit. In like manner, the elect angels are chosen from eternity in Christ (2) to be the heirs of everlasting life, the design of their election being simply the confirmation of their original state. Precisely, therefore, as in the one case, the decree of election respects the redemption and sanctification of a being who is sinful, so in the other case, the decree of election respects the security and steadfastness of a being already holy. The term election in both cases discriminates between two distinct classes. The elect of mankind are chosen out from

(1) 1 Timothy, 5: 21.

(2) "The Apostle calls the blessed Angels the elect. 1 Tim., 5: 21. But the election, whether of men or of angels, out of Christ, cannot be understood. To this, I think, refers that passage of Job, (Job 38: 7,) where good angels are styled sons of God: not because they are begotten of God, (for Christ is the only Son of God,) but because they are adopted as sons of God for Christ's sake. Hence, therefore, it is evident that the grace of Christ, the Mediator, is necessary for the happiness even of angels." Bishop Davenant's Comment on Col. 1: 20.

a race lost in sin and condemned righteously to hell ; and stand opposed to and are discriminated from the remainder of the same race, who sink under a weight of condemnation to final perdition. The elect angels are those chosen from the whole angelic race, to abide the period of their probation, then to be confirmed against all possible defection : and they stand opposed to and are discriminated from another portion of the same race, who failed in accomplishing their probation, and were at once adjudged to the damnation of the pit. (3.)

We are aware that Arminian interpreters have placed a very different construction upon this phrase ; but the feebleness of their attempt only corroborates the interpretation given above. Generally speaking, they place side by side two expositions, leaving their readers to choose between them. It is urged on the one hand, that the term election only refers to excellence of character ; that elect angels means no more than holy angels. As reprobate signifies what has been tested and rejected, so elect signifies something approved, and therefore worthy and excellent ; and this is given as the full and only force of the term in this passage in Timothy. On the other hand, it is urged that the phrase "elect angels" does not refer to the whole body or class of good angels, but only to the chief of them, those selected from the rest to discharge certain offices among men, and who were thus special witnesses of Timothy's conduct. It appears to us a strange oversight to place in juxtaposition two such interpretations, since the one must infallibly eat up the other. The fundamental principles upon which the two rest are utterly at variance. The first assumes that the term elect is not properly a discriminating term : it does not separate between parties, setting one over against the other ; but is only comparative, the comparison

(3) President Edwards goes very far in affirming election of the angels, by ascribing their preservation from falling, to grace actually bestowed ; his language is, "when Lucifer rebelled and set up himself as a head, in opposition to God and Christ, and drew away a great number of the angels after him, Christ, the Son of God, manifested himself as an opposite head, and appeared graciously to dissuade and restrain by his grace the elect angels from hearkening to Lucifer's temptation ; so that they were upheld and preserved from eternal destruction at this time of great danger, by the free and sovereign distinguishing grace of Christ." *Miscell. Observations*—Works, vol. 8, p. 491.

lying between a certain standard and the character which is tried by it. The other assumes, on the contrary, that the term is discriminating, and undertakes to set forth between whom the discrimination is to be made. One of these may be admitted, but not both. We willingly allow the Arminian a fair choice between the two, as readily as the law allows the woman a free selection, whose husband returns after a seven years' absence, and after she has contracted a new alliance. But, we certainly cannot allow him to adopt and present both, to play at hide and seek between positions which are contradictory. If he adopts the first interpretation, we will undertake to show that it does not assign to the word elect its proper sense, but unwarrantably takes it in a signification unusual and highly metaphorical. We will further show that the terms elect and reprobate, however they may stand as correlates in scholastic divinity, are not etymologically thus related; nor are they employed in the symbolic language of theology as the representatives of opposite doctrines, because of any native antithesis of meaning. It is impossible, therefore, to determine the meaning of the word elect, by regarding it simply as the converse of the word reprobate. If he adopts the latter interpretation, we will undertake to show that the discrimination made is altogether without warrant from this or any other passage of Scripture; and that as there are two classes of angels constantly discriminated in the Bible, the elect and the apostate, the presumption is of the highest possible kind that this is the discrimination intended here.

But we find ourselves expanding this subordinate point beyond its just limits. The meaning of the phrase "elect angels," may be settled by an easy process. The term usually signifies in Scripture, a being who is taken from a class to be the recipient of a special favor. This is its ordinary, because its technical, signification in reference to man. Its ordinary sense is to be taken as the true sense, when applied to angels, unless some other sense is plainly declared, or unless the condition of the angelic world unequivocally forbids its application to them. Neither of these restrictive conditions exists in the passage before us: no other sense is declared in opposition to its ordinary import; and so far is the condition of the angelic world from forbidding its proper application to them, it specially invites it.

There are two distinct classes of angels constantly discriminated in Scripture; elect and apostate angels are as much opposed as elect and reprobate men. Discrimination, then, being the elementary idea in the word, and the condition of the angelic world being such as to require discrimination equally with men, surely in the absence of any other sense given here or elsewhere to the word, as applied to angels, it must be taken to mean that the holy angels are the objects of an eternal divine decree, which infallibly secures their confirmation in holiness. They stand in relation to their eternal state precisely as the elect of mankind to theirs; the only difference being as to the condition in which the decree of election finds them both. What is affirmed of one may equally be predicated, *mutatis mutandis*, of the other. They are both chosen; they are both chosen in Christ, as we shall see more fully hereafter; they are both chosen to everlasting holiness and happiness. The difference between them is circumstantial, not essential: in one case, election finds man a sinner and procures his holiness by a process called sanctification: in the other case, it finds the angel a holy being and secures his holiness, by a process called confirmation. (4).

Other passages of Scripture, examined with equal care, would yield the same conclusion. The Apostle Jude says, "the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains," &c. (5). Manifestly, the language here opens the inquiry whether by this first estate, is not meant a defined probation, bounded, as in the case of man's, by certain and prescribed limits. Omitting, however, this inquiry for want of space, one reflection strikes the mind in reading this, as well as the parallel passage in Peter: "for if God spared not the angels that sinned," &c; (6) which is, that these wretched beings are designated by their original apostasy, rather than by their habitual wicked character. They are

(4) "Qui erexit hominem lapsum dedit stanti angelo ne laboretur: sic illum de captivitate eruens, sicut hunc a captivitate defendens. Et hac ratione fuit aequae utriusque redemptio; solvens illum et servans istum. Liqueat ergo sanctis angelis Dominum Christum fuisse redemptionem, sicut justitiam, sicut sapientiam, sicut sanctificationem: sic ergo omne quod erat Angelis, factus est nobis." Bernard in Cantica, as quoted by Zanchius, in his treatise de bonis Angelis. Cap. 21.

(5) Jude 6.

(6) 2 Peter, 2: 4.

referred to as an apostate class, and as becoming so by a single transgression. The reader cannot fail to notice a remarkable analogy here to the single transgression which closed the probation of man, and threw the whole race into the same category of apostate beings.

It is time, however, to pass on to other proofs of the angels' confirmation in holiness. We allege, then, that the offices which they discharge, are scarcely consistent with a present probationary state. They were with Christ when on Mount Sinai he set up the typical dispensation of Moses: they appeared at sundry times as messengers of Christ to his church below; they heralded his birth when he appeared in the fullness of time as the babe of Bethlehem; they ministered to him after his long temptation in the wilderness, and strengthened him when fainting in the garden of Gethsemane; they watched about his sepulchre, when he was laid in Joseph's new tomb; they first witnessed his resurrection to his wondering and amazed disciples; they will fill his train of glory, and place his throne in the clouds when he shall descend upon the earth for judgment. It is the voice of an angel which shall proclaim by the solemn name of the existing God the end of time; it is the trump of an archangel which shall wake the nations of the dead; the angels will go forth as reapers, gathering the righteous into heaven, and casting the wicked into unquenchable fire; they are now, and will ever be, these elect angels, around Christ's throne in Heaven, praising him as the blessed Mediator, worshiping him as God and the Lamb forever. It seems scarcely possible that they should be so fully identified with Christ in his work of patience and of power upon the earth, if there existed still a doubt of their steadfastness as holy beings: and if they cannot fall, it must be only because they are graciously secured by the power of God, and not by any necessity of their own natures. One certain fact, however, concludes our faith in this matter, and will be found in the sequel to meet all the exigencies of the argument. It is undeniable that the destiny of angels as well as of men will be unalterably fixed at the day of judgment. "Know ye not," says the Apostle, "that we shall judge angels?" (7). An evil spirit once challenged Christ, "art thou

(7) 1 Corinthians, 6: 3.

come hither to torment us before the time?" (8). And Jude says explicitly, the rebel angels are "reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." (9). Here, then, is palpable proof that on this day of destiny the condition of angels will be irrevocably fixed. If not before, then their probation must cease; the rebellious forever doomed, the holy forever established. Now as their offices discharged in the resurrection and final judgment are viewed in connection with their manifest confirmation, the same or similar functions discharged by them from the beginning are presumptive of that confirmation, as far back, at least, as the history of our own race. (10). We care not, however, to press these speculations, as the careful reader will soon see that any limit, however distant, which is placed upon their probation, as for instance at the day of judgment, will sustain the argument we design to construct.

At the hazard, however, of over-arguing an admitted point, we must add, in final proof of the angels' confirmation in holiness, their recapitulation in Christ. In that mediatorial dominion which is given to Christ, the angels are included: "that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth." (11). All the orders of holy angels, then, are included in Christ, and he is made Head over all. But can this be, unless those thus included are confirmed beyond the risk of apostacy? If none among men are united to Christ save those who are fully justified thereby, and their salvation infallibly secured, surely none among angels can be united to the same blessed Head save those who are confirmed thereby, and they made equally secure. It is this gathering all things in Christ, which makes up the greatness of his mediatorial glory; and the loss of one thus gathered, either human or angelic, cannot be affirmed without blasphemy. It would destroy the integrity, mar the beauty, and dash the glory of the mystical body of Christ: the Mediator would not be perfect, because

(8) Mathew 8: 29.

(9) Jude 6.

(10) President Edwards regards the period of Christ's ascension into Heaven as the 'punctum temporis,' at which the elect angels were confirmed. See his *Miscel. Observ.*, Works, vol. 8, p. 507.

(11) Ephesians 1: 10.

of the lost member—the mystical Christ would sit upon his throne a deformed and mutilated object, to praise whom would be the bitterest irony, to worship whom would be most insulting mockery.

The proofs of this generally conceded point have been thus fully expanded, because we do not remember to have seen them any where drawn out: yet the conclusion which has been reached is only the first stage in the discussion before us. If the holy angels are now confirmed in their primitive integrity, or if they shall be thus confirmed at the period of the general judgment, (for the fact and not the date of their confirmation is alone important,) the question arises, upon what principle are they confirmed? How comes their probation ever to cease? Why should not their happiness be conditioned to all eternity, upon their good behaviour? It is obvious this confirmation can proceed upon no principle of mere law. All that law does, and, from its very nature, all it can do, is simply to point out the course of duty, and to enforce its teaching by an adequate sanction. It consists of only two parts, both being equally essential; the precept which indicates what is right, and the penalty which inculcates the reciprocal of right,—obligation. The one informs the understanding: the other binds the conscience. Law simply recognizes a moral being as a subject of government: it simply *sets forth* existing relations, without having the least power to *modify* them. A dispensation of mere law, then, is necessarily conditional: the precept recognizes the subject as in circumstances to obey, and therefore teaches him; the sanction equally recognizes him as in circumstances to disobey, and therefore threatens him. All its blessings are necessarily conditional, suspended upon the obedience rendered. Four brief words exhaust its vocabulary: keep—live—break—die. These words it must utter to all, and through all existence. As long as the being lives who is God's subject, the law must speak to him, this is the will of God, and it binds you.

Now the moment we introduce a limitation and say, up to this period I am liable to disobey, but beyond it I am secured against every contingency, a new principle is introduced, which is distinct from law. The proof is obvious.

In his probationary state, the being was alike under law as to its precept and its penalty; he was instructed by the one and warned by the other: but in his confirmed state, he is under law only so far as its directive nature is concerned, but is delivered from its penal sanctions—he enjoys everlasting immunity from the threats of law, because he is secured against disobedience. Now can it enter into the nature of law, and, by consequence of a legal dispensation, to relax itself, and to discharge its subject from one essential part of its own constitution? It would cancel all our ideas of law, if we attribute a principle to it by which itself shall in due season be limited, and its subject be emancipated from any portion of its control.

If, then, this confirmation rest upon no principle of law, what kind of principle is this which makes so essential a change in the condition of moral beings? We answer, it must be a principle of grace, and this *ex necessitate rei*: for what is not of law is of grace. Law expresses the relations subsisting between subject and ruler, and of course declares the obligations of both. The law of God, therefore, while it proclaims the duty of the creature to him, also sets forth all that he is bound to do in his relations to the creature. If, then, above law, God places a period to any being's probation, confirms him in holiness and secures him against future peril, he does more than his relations to that creature require, and the act is gratuitous. The confirmation is not by law, because it is not of right; it is altogether of favor, therefore it is by grace. These terms as necessarily oppose each other as light opposes darkness, and occupation, vacancy. This opposition is expressed in Scripture: "if by grace, then is it no more of works (by law); otherwise grace is no more grace: but if it be of works, then is it no more grace; otherwise work is no more work." (12). The authority of Scripture is always sufficient, even without a reason: yet in this case, the reason is obvious enough. While a being is upon probation, which is a dispensation of law simply, his future state is conditioned upon his obedience. In his confirmed state, it is conditioned upon nothing but the good pleasure of God, who wills him to be thenceforward an infallibly perfect being. In the one case,

(12) Romans 11: 6.

his eternal condition is suspended upon something within himself: in the other case, upon something as palpably without him, and external to him: which we take to be, in their scriptural meaning, the essential difference between the terms grace and law, grace and works.

Each step taken in this discussion, only opens upon a more steep and thorny path. The remarks which follow, the writer would offer, not as a conclusive argument with which he is in all its parts entirely satisfied, but in the way of suggestion, to awaken the spirit of inquiry in those who may read them. It devolves upon us now to inquire how this principle of grace supervenes upon a legal dispensation? The angels were first placed upon probation, in which state they held no relations to God but such as were defined by law: now they are confirmed forever and cannot fall, and consequently hold relations to God such as are defined not by law, but by free and sovereign grace alone. How, then, comes this new and foreign principle to be engrafted upon the general economy of God's administration? The right answer to this question, if it can be rendered, will conduct us into the interior of the gospel plan, open to us the unfailing wealth of that word *grace* in its evangelic meaning, reveal to us the very heart of Christianity. It will lead us to that hidden chamber where God not only unveils the splendor of his holiness, but also the glory of his love—to that curtained sanctuary where the glorious majesty of God embosomed in his mercy, the brilliancy of the one mellowed by the softer radiance of the other, is the shechinah of the Temple on High.

It is not altogether satisfactory to attribute the introduction of this grace to the intervention of the divine *will* simply. Indeed, this does not meet the point of the inquiry, which is not as to the *quâ potestate*, but to the *quâ ratione*. We admit the divine will to be the final cause of all things: but we inquire how this will comes to be exercised in a given way. It is not sufficient to say in reference to any subject which revelation brings wholly within the scope of human inquiry, that God's will is sovereign and free: for, however sovereign, it is not arbitrary. God, as sovereign, may act, without giving to any creature the reasons of that act: and whenever these reasons are withheld, we are bound to rest in the simplicity of faith upon the divine oracle, 'thus

saith the Lord.' But though he may not reveal to any the reasons of his act, reasons he must have, which are approved by himself. This is the precise distinction between sovereignty and arbitrariness: He cannot act without reason, that is, he is not arbitrary: he may act without disclosing his reasons, that is, he is sovereign and free. In a given case we are at liberty to inquire, not only into the determinations of his will, but if he has been pleased to reveal them, into the grounds of that will. If he has withheld them, we bow abased before his sovereignty: but if he has disclosed them, we will read them, and adore his condescension. Now the question before us is simply this: may we gather from the written word the 'quo modo,' the way in which God has introduced this principle of grace into his moral government? Let the reader apprehend the point before him. Here are two classes of moral beings, angels and men, placed upon a limited probation: but why a *limited* probation? Why introduce through this limitation a feature which is foreign to a dispensation of law? Can it be that the obedience of a creature for an assigned period, merits this act of grace from God, that he shall be transferred to a safer platform? Merit an act of grace! the solecism of the language betrays the fallacy. (13). If law simply declares the relations between ruler and subject, the latter is bound by those relations to obey. Obligation is the formal nature of law. Through all the successive moments of one's probation, the obedience of the moment only equals the obligation of the moment. There can be no supererogation in the case. The law demands from the creature all his obedience, and that for every moment: the obedience rendered can only answer to the legal tally. Of course, however protracted the probation, the being is just as far removed from merit at the end as at the beginning. Why, then, does God re-

(13) "I believe that God is so holy, pure, and jealous, as it is impossible for him to be pleased in any creature, though the work of his own hands: so that neither angel, man, nor world could stand, or can stand, one moment in his eyes, without beholding the same in the face of the Mediator: and therefore that before him, with whom all things are present, the Lamb of God was slain before all worlds: without which eternal counsel of his, it was impossible for him to have descended to any work of creation: but he should have enjoyed the blessed and individual society of three persons in Godhead forever." Lord Bacon's Confession of Faith — Works, (Montague,) vol. 2, p. 407.

ward a limited obedience with eternal immunity, from all peril? Shall we say the procedure is arbitrary? This is impossible: God may be sovereign, but he is able always to give the reasons of his acts. Shall we say the reason is not revealed to us? If so, there is an end of all inquiry, and we will reverently adore the mystery. But we submit that the disclosure of this reason is important, that we may not fall into the error of supposing that man or angel may win this grace from God, as a knight may win his spurs. Nor is this all: if the reason be withheld, we are embarrassed with a serious difficulty. According to preceding statements, when a being passes over the limits of his probation, he passes to a certain extent from the jurisdiction of law. In his confirmed state he is wholly emancipated from the penalty, which is preëminently essential to law, because in it resides that obligation which is the soul of law. There is, then, in this confirmation, a relaxation of law; a species of violence is done to it; and one might infer that in so far forth the authority of God would be weakened, and the power of his rule retrenched. Again, the law is the medium through which God reveals his glory to his creatures: for the law not only expounds their relations to him, but also reflects his image to them. But as the penal sanction is an essential part of law, it not less discovers the glorious holiness of God than does the precept. If God, then, cut off this penalty from the law, so far as the confirmed angels are concerned, will it not be attended with loss to them? Will not the glory of God be dimmed by withdrawing a lens which collects and concentrates upon them so many of the rays of that glory?

Upon these two grounds it would not be difficult to construct an *a priori* argument against the possibility of setting a limit to any being's probation. The argument would be simply the *reductio ad absurdum*. If this confirmation be attended with such results as are manifestly impossible, it is plain that we are mistaken as to the fact. But the fact is clearly revealed: Holy angels and justified men are both placed upon a platform where they enjoy perfect exemption from the penal terrors of the law. Here, then, is a dilemma: a fact is put beyond dispute by revelation, yet it leads seemingly to an impossible conclusion. Surely this is a case where God may be supposed, without presumption, to make

“known his ways.” It appears to us that in the work of Christ a principle is involved which removes this whole difficulty: and which, in our want of a universal term, we may call the principle of compensation. The problem to be solved is simply this: how can grace be engrafted upon law, without at the same time relaxing it? If now a work shall be accomplished by which the law is magnified, and upon which this grace shall be predicated, it is obvious, upon the principle of compensation, that all damage is prevented. If one allege that to confirm an angel by grace will relax law, we answer, not so: because this grace is not granted arbitrarily, but upon the ground of a high service which has been done to law for the express purpose of introducing this grace. There are, however, manifestly three essential conditions to such a work, in order to make out the compensation required. First, it must be wrought by a being who is able to magnify the law, and make it honorable; so as to compensate for the partial violence done in setting aside the penal portion of the law. Secondly, it must be wrought by a being who is able to make a more glorious revelation of God than the law can do; so as to compensate for the glory intercepted in the loss of the penalty. Thirdly, it must be the work of a being who is not bound to law on his own account; so that his work may be a ground of merit. (14). If these conditions are met, all will admit Grace is not exercised at the expense of law. If, for instance, upon the supposition there are three persons in the Godhead, one of these—say the second person—should become for a season a subject of this law and perfectly keep it, who does not see, that upon the ground of this service, and at his instance, favor may be bestowed upon any holy being whatsoever? And this because he fulfills all the above named conditions. As to the first, his obedience does more homage to the law than the obedience of all creatures through all eternity, because his nature infinitely transcends theirs,

(14) “Quia cum ipsorum obedientia quam Deo præstant suapte natura imperfecta sit et indigna quæ coram Deo compareat eoque vnicuique opus habeat: propter obedientiam Christi perfectissimam pro perfectissima reputatur in conspectu Domini. Atque ita per Christum et justissimi et in sempiternum beatissimi: ut merito quidquid habent perfectæ justitiæ et veræ felicitatis, illud ipsi Christo acceptum ferre debeant; eumque ut caput non tam nostrum quam etiam suum adorare.” Zanchius—de bonis Angelis, Cap. 21.

and he brings all the resources of Deity to impart dignity and worth to his obedience. As to the second, he makes the fullest conceivable revelation of God's glory, because he is the essential God manifested. While the law is but an expression from God's lips, he is "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person." As to third, Christ's obedience is not only the voluntary homage of a being independent of law, but the sublime condescension of one infinitely above law. His subjection being thus gratuitous, it is perfectly meritorious, and affords just reason for treating any holy being, whom he favors, not according to the rigid requisitions of mere law, but by the milder rules of a dispensation of love. It is seen thus that if one of the persons of the Trinity, say the second, would perform a work of a prescribed character, grace might be engrafted upon the divine government, without any possible injury accruing. What shall we say then, upon turning to the sacred Scriptures, to find just such a work actually accomplished by this very person, the Son of God: a work in which these very conditions, each and singular, are fully met? Is not the presumption irresistible, that by this work is introduced that grace by which the angels are confirmed? Look at the facts, and then weigh the presumption. Here are the angels confirmed forever in holiness: this confirmation is above law, and is due to grace alone: grace cannot supervene upon law unless the law be compensated by some high service done to it, upon which this grace may be predicated: and here is just such a work accomplished by Jesus Christ. What is the conclusion forced upon us, but that a real connection subsists between the atonement of Christ and the confirmation of elect angels? (15) Here is grace palpably engrafted upon law; and here is the identical work which would seem a

(15) "Ex hoc interpretatione facile est colligere ad angelos quoque pertinere beneficium Christi: quanquam non eo plane modo quo ad nos homines pertinet. Scholastici quoque sentiunt, angelos bonos participes esse factos beneficii Christi: tum quia Christus, etiam qua homo factus est illis caput, sub quo uniti sunt et tota cum ipsis ecclesia: tum etiam, quia qua homo est, illos illuminat et cognitione auget: tum denique, quia sua passione et obedientia promeruit illis præmia in coelis permulta. Itaque, hæc esto thesis: gratia et beneficium Christi, tametsi non ex æquo ad angelos et ad homines derivatur, cum illi non ut nos redemptione ac remissione peccatorum opus habeant: ad ipsos tamen magna ex parte spectat et ejus facti sunt participes." Zanchius—de bonis Angelis, Cap. 21.

priori necessary to that engrafting. We leave the candid reader to weigh the two members of the argument, and decide for himself.

To all this there is one plausible objection which may be urged: to wit, that Christ did not assume angelic nature, and perform this work in their legal stead. This, however, was not necessary in their case: had they been sinful, as men are, then Christ's work must have been for them, as well as for us, strictly vicarious. A sinful being has no righteousness, in which to be accepted with God. He must therefore have a righteous substitute, and the obedience of this substitute can become his only by a strict legal imputation. But these, as holy beings, are already accepted: all they require is simply an act of sovereignty, yet of grace, which shall secure their present state. The only difficulty in the case (of course the difficulty is not real, as to God, but only apparent as to us,) is the introduction of a new principle of government, the engrafting grace upon law. The moment the principle is introduced, God may, in the exercise of sovereignty, apply it to what holy beings he may please: he may be sovereign in applying it to holy beings, as we know he is in applying it to sinful beings. This difficulty, as we have seen, is met through Christ, by his atonement. Grace is manifestly introduced and made a principle of the divine administration. The extension of this principle from one to another class of beings (16) who are without sin, as it does not affect the integrity either of his nature or of his government, creates no embarrassment in our minds; but we freely submit it to "the good pleasure of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will."

Before closing this long and cumulative argument, we

(16) "God having from eternity, from his infinite goodness, designed to communicate himself to creatures, the way in which he designed to communicate himself to elect beloved creatures, all of them, was to unite himself to a created nature and to become one of the creatures, and to gather together in one all elect creatures in that creature whom he assumed into a personal union with himself, and to manifest to them and maintain intercourse with them through him. All creatures having this benefit by Christ's incarnation, that God thereby is, as it were, come down to them from his infinite height above them, and is become a fellow creature, and all elect creatures hereby have opportunity for a more free and intimate converse with God, and full enjoyment of him, than otherwise could be." Edward's Miscel. Observ., Works, vol. 8, p. 522.

must crave the further indulgence of expressing some general views respecting the connection between justified men and elect angels, and their mutual dependence upon the atonement of Christ. We conceive that angels and men, all worlds and all beings, were created expressly for the divine glory. God, being infinitely happy and blessed *ad intra* in the communion and fellowship of the three glorious persons, determined to glorify himself also by the exercise of his power *ad extra*. Hence the whole creation. Oneness of motive and design, is the universal tie by which all orders of beings are bound together. Moral beings also are created, many and various classes of them, who become the subjects of government. Through the nature of these, and through his government of them, God's glory is declared. But so long as all these are holy, there is only a partial exhibition of the divine perfections: for however wisdom, power, goodness and holiness may appear, there can be no display of mercy and punitive justice. Hence a race is created whose whole destiny is linked with this high purpose of God, the discovery to the universe of his love and grace. This race is man: one class out of many: but ordained to be the medium through which God will be known to all as the God of grace no less than the God of holiness. One feature in the condition of man, indeed, would show him to be created for this end: which is, that the individuals of the race are not, as in the case of angels, created at once and placed singly upon trial. They spring from one original by derivation: and he who is their natural father is also their moral Head, constituted their representative in that great covenant which was the platform of their probation. What was this arrangement but a staging for the after work of Christ? the headship of Adam being simply the usher to the headship of Christ, and the covenant of works the scaffolding for the covenant of grace. In due season, man, in the full exercise of his powers, sinned, and became apostate: and now the way is clear for the scheme of grace. In the fullness of time the second person of the Godhead descends to earth, assumes human nature, becomes a substitute for his seed, dies for them, rises again, and their redemption is accomplished. The great problem is solved: grace is wedded to law, and as the queen majesty, sways a universal empire. The cre-

ation of this globe is but the erection of a platform upon which shall be enacted the tragedy of redemption: and the fall of man by sin is only the preface to the universal introduction of grace. For the grace thus introduced cannot be confined to the province where it is wrought out; but as all worlds were created for God's glory, and grace is the highest manifestation of that glory, the grace purchased by Christ is at once engrafted upon the whole government of God. Its application to holy beings is circumstantially different, but just as real and necessary to their confirmation as it can be to the redemption and justification of sinful beings. (17).

We have thus led the reader through what he may consider a tangled forest of abstractions, in the search after golden fruit. But we have dwelt thus long upon the argument from the confirmation of the elect angels, because it brings up to view the great and radical difference between law and grace, which we cannot too clearly apprehend: and because the solution of the problem, "Mercy and truth are met together," affords to the devout materials of the highest praise to "the Lamb who was slain." There are two other lines of argument much less difficult to pursue, and which may therefore be developed in smaller compass. They cannot be omitted, because, being positive in their nature, they do certainly conclude the truth that Christ is the author of grace to angels as well as to men.

We allege, then, in the second place, that the mediatorial dominion of Christ over the angels, is proof of a gracious relation between the two. This general subject has been referred to before, but for a different purpose. Then their

(17) "But that out of his eternal and infinite goodness and love, purposing to become a Creator and to communicate to his creatures, he ordained in his eternal counsel that one person of the Godhead should be united to one nature, and to one particular of his creatures: that so, in the person of the Mediator, the true ladder might be fixed, whereby God might descend to his creatures, and his creatures might ascend to God: so that God, by the reconciling of the Mediator, turning his countenance towards his creatures, though not in equal light and degree, made way unto the dispensation of his most holy and secret will: whereby some of his creatures might stand, and keep their state, others might possibly fall, and be restored: and others might fall, and not be restored to their estate, but yet remain in being, though under wrath and corruption: all with respect to the Mediator: which is the great mystery and perfect centre of all God's ways with his creatures, and unto which all his other works and wonders but serve and refer." Lord Bacon's *Confession of Faith—Works* (Montague,) vol. 2, p. 407.

recapitulation in Christ was adduced simply to establish the fact of their confirmation : now it is adduced to prove that this confirmation proceeds upon a gracious relation sustained to the work of Christ. Let us attend, in the first instance, to the evidence of Christ's mediatorial dominion over them. In Ephesians it is written : "that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather into one all things in Christ, both *which are in heaven* and which are on earth." (18). Again in the same Epistle : "when he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all *principality* and *power* and *might* and *dominion*, and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come ; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him which filleth all in all." (19). In this passage, the testimony is exceedingly full : the angels are clearly designated by the terms principality, power, might and dominion ; all these are put under Christ's feet, that he may be head over all to the church ; and this church, which is called his body, must include elect angels as well as elect men, since it is the fullness of him which filleth all in all. Further on, in the same Epistle, we read : "For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom *the whole family in heaven and earth* is named," (20) which surely sets forth the actual incorporation into one body of redeemed sinners and elect angels, and their unity as consisting in a common relation to 'Jesus Christ. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the Apostle writes, "thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet ; for in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him." (21). Again, the apostle Peter writes : "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is gone into heaven and is on the right hand of God ; angels, principalities and powers being made subject unto him." (22). In the Epistle to the Philippians it is written, "God hath highly exalted him and given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth." (23). This passage is valuable, because it is

(18) Ephesians 1 : 10. (20) Eph. 3 : 14, 15. (22) 1 Peter, 3 : 22.
 (19) Eph. 1 : 20—23. (21) Hebrews 2 : 8. (23) Phil. 2 : 9, 10.

spoken expressly of that "form of a servant" which the Son of God "took upon him," and makes the homage of angels the reward of Christ's death when he was "found in fashion as a man." Lastly, in Colossians, it is recorded: "having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." (24). We beg the educated reader to consult this passage in the original, and to determine the exact force of the word *καταλλάξαι*, translated in our version 'to reconcile,' viewing it in connection with the angels. To us it appears that the word *reconcile* is altogether appropriate when "the things in earth" are spoken of: these may be reconciled with literal exactness, because they were before at enmity with God. But this meaning is a shade too precise (25) when spoken of "the things in heaven:" these not being at enmity, cannot be said to be reconciled, though their relations to God may be modified, by Christ's work—so that in reference to this member of the sentence, we are thrown back upon the more general and radical meaning of the word *καταλλάξαι*: to change the relations of any thing. At any rate, this is clearly taught, that elect angels hold a relation to the Mediator closely analogous to that of redeemed sinners, and the relations of both are grounded upon the same atoning work of Christ. (26).

These passages clearly establish two facts: First, that Christ rules and governs the angels; and, secondly, that this dominion is not his essential dominion, which belongs

(24) Colossians 1: 20.

(25) "We say this reconciliation, taken *strictly*, refers to men alone. For since *reconcile* is to renew a friendship broken off by offence, we alone, from among his enemies, are restored unto the love and favor of God, which we had lost by sinning. But if we may understand it *analogically*, it may be extended to the blessed angels themselves, and to all creatures." Bishop Davenant upon Col. 1: 20.

(26) "Sed tamen duabus de causis angelos oportet quoque cum Deo pacificari: nam quum creaturæ sunt, extra periculum lapsus non erant, nisi Christi gratia fuissent confirmati. * * * * * Deinde, in hac ipsa obedientia quam præstant Deo, non est tam exquisita perfectio, ut Deo omni ex parte et citra veniam satisfaciatur. Constituentium igitur, non esse tantum in angelis justitiæ, quod ad plenam cum Deo conjunctionem sufficiat, itaque pacificatore opus habent, per cujus gratiam penitus Deo adhæreant. Unde recte Paulus, qui in solis hominibus negat residere Christi gratiam, sed angelis etiam communem facit." Calvin's Comment upon Col. 1: 20.

to him of right as one of the Persons of the Trinity, but his mediatorial dominion, which he enjoys as God-man. Now, the question arises, how obtains the Mediator this ascendancy over the angels? We easily comprehend how Christ is Head and King of the Saints, because he redeemed them. His mediatorial power over these, is founded strictly upon a mediatorial relation to them. But how is he the Head and King of the Angels, who, not being sinners, were not the objects of redemption? The usual reply furnished to this question, does not satisfy us. It is said, this rule over the angelic world is given to the Mediator in the way of sovereignty, and as the reward of his voluntary humiliation and obedience; that is, if we understand it aright, the angels are put in subjection to the Mediator, not because of any relation to him, but solely in the exercise of sovereignty, and as a mere gratuity to him. We complain of this reply, not because it states what is false, but because it does not state the whole truth. We agree that this mediatorial dominion is given to Christ, as the reward of his obedience, and that the Father, as a sovereign, has the power to bestow it. But all this is equally true of Christ's rule over redeemed sinners, and yet in their case, manifestly, this rule is founded upon a real relation which he sustains. So, while we admit that Christ's dominion over the angels, is freely given as the reward of his work, we still think that it is founded upon a true relation which, as Mediator, he sustains to them.

Let us analyze the reply given above. If Christ's dominion over the angels is only by grant from the Father, and has no other foundation than the sovereign determinations of his will, then this dominion of Christ is not a real dominion, but only a vicegerency: For the obedience rendered to the Mediator will not have respect to his authority, but to the will of the Father, which lies back of that authority. Suppose, in a given case, the Mediator's authority should be challenged: an angel rises up, and inquires, why should I obey your behest? the final answer must be, I am installed into this jurisdiction over you, and God commands your obedience to me. Very well, the angel obeys; but upon what does that obedience rest? Manifestly, not upon the authority of Christ as Mediator, but of God, who appointed him to rule. The Mediator,

then, is not a King, but only the vicerent of a king: he is not power, but only the exponent of power, and is revered simply as the representative of the sovereign. We then dismiss this opinion, which regards Christ's Mediatorial dominion over the angels, as arbitrary, and seek some other which will harmonize with the Scriptural representations of the same. We think this broad principle altogether sound in every possible application of it: that wherever there is real authority possessed and a true dominion exercised, these must be founded upon a true relation subsisting between the subject and ruler. If Christ, as Mediator, has a mediatorial jurisdiction over the angels, it is because his mediatorial work has established a true relation between him and them.

This conclusion will be rendered stronger, by remembering, that in this case, the inferior nature, in part at least, is exalted to supremacy over the superior: "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor." (27.) If by arbitrary appointment, simply, the human nature is exalted to this lordship over angelic nature, then the mediatorial authority of Christ, resting, as we have seen, upon the mere will of God, there will be no real distinction between the mediatorial and the essential kingdoms of Christ. His authority in the one will resolve itself in every instance into his authority in the other. His kingdom, as Mediator, will be simply the kingdom he has as God: thus, those things are commingled, between which the Scriptures discriminate.

There is, then, a substantial relation between Christ and the angels, in virtue of which, He is crowned their Head. What is this relation? We answer it is the same relation, not specific, but generic, which he sustains to redeemed men. Having, by his work of obedience and suffering, introduced the principle of grace, God, in his sovereignty, applies it to the confirmation of angels who are holy. The elect of these, as well as the elect of men, are given to Christ, because he is the author of the grace by which they both stand. He is made the Head of both: they enjoy this grace, because of their relation to him; and upon this is erected the whole structure of his mediatorial empire.

(27) Hebrews 2: 8.

There is but one difficulty, that we are aware of, likely to occur to an inquisitive mind ; and this respects the jurisdiction of Christ over the apostate angels. One of the acts of his mediatorial reign will be, to pronounce judgment upon these. But, how is this, if he has never sustained any peculiar relation to them in his mediatorial work? Is not this a case where he exercises mediatorial authority, not upon the ground of a true relation, but by the bare grant of the Father, who "judgeth no man, (28) but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." The same difficulty, however, exists in the case of reprobate men. (29.) Christ sustained no peculiar relations to these ; they never were given to him ; he never redeemed them ; thousands, yea millions of them, perish in sin, who never heard of his grace. Yet, as Mediator, he will judge and condemn these also. How so? We answer, simply by an extension of his mediatorial authority proper, for which extension a valid reason can be rendered. His mediatorial authority, properly relates to the elect of angels and men, who are the subjects of the same. He is their Head, and they stand by his grace. The extension of his mediatorial authority to apostate men and angels, is due to the worth and splendor of his work ; nor to this alone, but to this, in conjunction with the service done by him to the law. Having painfully magnified the law, and shed lustre upon the government of God, he fairly purchased the right to administer the law and to decree the penalty which he had himself so fully borne and honored in the bearing. Moreover, after grace became thus engrafted upon law, the majesty of God, which before, was in the keeping of the law, is revealed for the greater manifestation of God's glory, always in conjunction with grace. But, in the case of the reprobate, this

(28) In the original, there is no word answering to man in our version, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ πατήρ κρίνει οὐδένα, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ. Christ, then, as judge, must preside over the destinies of angels and of men — all judgment is committed to Him.

(29) "Si quis praetextu universalis notae quaestionem moveat de diabolis, an Christus eorum quoque sit pacificator; respondeo ne impiorum quidem. Tametsi fateo esse discrimen; quia his offertur beneficium redemptionis, illis non item: sed hoc nihil ad Pauli verba, quae nihil aliud continent quam solum esse Christum per quem adhaerent Deo omnes creaturae quae quicquam habent cum ipso conjunctionis." — Calvin on Col. 1: 20.

can be done only by allowing grace, in the person of its Author, to discharge the office of majesty, and enforce the decree of inflexible justice. (30.)

Our final argument for basing the confirmation of elect angels upon the grace wrought out by Christ, is drawn from the worship which they render to him as Mediator. For the sake of brevity, we will introduce but two passages of Scripture, in order to show that this worship is of the highest kind, not civil, but religious; and that it is rendered to him, not as God simply but as God-man. In Hebrews, we have this record; "when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, let the angels of God worship him." (31.) Evidently, this worship is commanded to him, not merely as the Son, but as the Son Incarnate. In the book of Revelation, the rapt prophet describes his vision of the worship in Heaven thus: "and I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands: saying, with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength and honor and glory and blessing: and every creature which is in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing and honor and glory and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever." (32.) It may be said, as Christ is God, this worship is given to the divine nature exclusively. But, if this worship discriminates between the divine nature and the person of Christ, it is not worship rendered to the Mediator, for this respects his person, as uniting the two natures. It will then be asked, is the human nature of Christ an object of worship? We answer, certainly not, as separate from his person, for this would be rank idolatry. But the hypostatical union forbids the separation of either nature: they are both necessarily united in his Mediatorial person;

(30) President Edwards regards the rebellion of the fallen angels as occasioned by the doctrine of the incarnation of the Son of God, foretold to them. If this conjecture could be reduced to certainty, it would be easy to see how Christ should execute judgment upon apostate angels.

(31) Hebrews 1: 6.

(32) Revelation 5: 11, 13.

and it is the peculiar property of this union, that what is true of either nature, may be affirmed of the person. We have no doubt that the divine nature is the ground of worship, but not as distinct from his person, but as united with the human in that person. Still, the difficulty is not met; if the worship rendered by angels and redeemed men to this person, is rendered because that person includes a divine nature, the question recurs—why worship this divine nature in that person, as distinct from the divine nature alone? for they worship day and night *God and the Lamb*. What is the special foundation of this special worship of the Mediator? Let it be observed that one of the main constituents of worship, is a sense of obligation. Worship, in its proper signification, is the religious homage to one who is supreme of a dependent creature; who, feeling his obligation, at the same time delights in the being whom he serves and trusts. Angels and men worship God, Jehovah, because he is supreme, and they are his creatures; this relation of creatureship creates the obligation of worship. Now, if angels and men all worship the Mediator, it is because he is supreme, and they are dependent upon him, as Mediator. Redeemed sinners are dependent upon him for grace and holiness; hence, the mediatorial relation is the ground of their mediatorial worship. If the angels do not hold some analogous relation, being dependent equally for grace and the security of their holiness, then, it will become those who deny it to explain the difficulty stated above as to angelic worship of the Mediator. Indeed, this is an “Experimentum Crucis”: a more difficult test could hardly be imagined. If the proposition defended and illustrated throughout this article, abides this test, there is at least philosophical ground for receiving it as true.

We have, at length, accomplished our task, so far as the statement and defence of doctrine are concerned; but, before concluding, we solicit the reader to view the whole in its practical relations. This subject is not wholly speculative, for it suggests noble thoughts of God and his government. How vast the scale upon which he projects his plans! With what variety of wisdom has he framed the universe, and interweaved principle with principle, gold and silver threads, into the web of his government! How

sublime, and yet how lovely, is the work of Christ. Like the rainbow, spanning the hemisphere, it reveals the perfections of God, as though prismatic, which, combined, make up the great glory of the great God. Who can fail to adore that Being, who, by his own pains and grief constructs, upon the basis of an immutable law, a platform of grace—the orchestra upon which “an innumerable company of angels,” joined in concert with “the general assembly and church of the first-born,” cause the arches of heaven to reverberate with their glad hosannas.

There is one matter, in connexion with which the subject of this article may be maturely pondered. We allude to the origin of moral evil. Few reflecting minds have not been humbled before this thorniest of all theological points. God certainly had power to prevent the introduction of sin; it is an awful blur upon the glory of creation; it occasions the destruction of many, many thousands; how, then, came it to pass? Many able divines have tried their strength at breaking the shell of this mystery. One thing, we learn from the preceding pages, that the introduction of sin is but a single link, though important, in a chain which girdles the universe and lengthens out through an illimitable eternity. In viewing the divine economy in its detached parts, we are sometimes seriously posed by local difficulties in the system; but in so far as we take in the scope of his government, these difficulties are dwarfed, till they fall out of view. At least, we learn, that all our embarrassment proceeds from ignorance; and that if more enlarged views even now relieve our minds partially of pressure, when we reach a state of perfect knowledge, we shall discover the entire symmetry of the divine administration.*

Let the Christian reader especially reflect, that the human race is chosen, as a burnished reflector, to throw the light of divine grace upon the universe, it is the privilege of each believer to be a point upon its polished surface. Let not a spot dim his lustre; for no more solemn, yet animating reflection, can suggest itself to him than this, that in time and through eternity, he is an exponent of God's matchless grace to a ravished universe.

NOTE.—The argument, presented in the foregoing pages to the consideration of the reader, is pressed with one serious

difficulty, which occurred indeed more than once to the writer's mind, as he was composing, but has since been forcibly represented to him. It is that in the discussion, the existence of sin seems to be assumed as necessary to the existence of grace. (33.) Suppose, for instance, it may be asked, that Adam had not betrayed his trust, but had remained steadfast in holiness, would it have been impossible for God to have confirmed him and his posterity forever? In that event, must they have remained forever on trial, enjoying a conditional happiness; and in that event, could not the angels have been confirmed by the good pleasure of God alone, without any reference to a compensation rendered to the law? The reader will perceive that these questions are not inconsistent with the belief, that in fact the angels are confirmed through and by the work of Christ, of which work the fall of man was in fact the antecedent: for angelic confirmation may be supposed to rest upon Christ's atonement, while yet the absolute necessity of such an atonement may not be so admitted as that the confirmation in question could not take place without it.

In reference to this difficulty, we beg leave to suggest a few reflections. In the first place, it is not the doctrine of this article, that the existence of grace in the Divine mind is dependent upon any mode chosen for its development. Indeed, the development involves its prior existence. If there be a stream, there must be an originating fountain; and grace existing in the universe must have its well-head in the bosom and nature of God. The whole atonement of Christ is the fruit, not the original, of God's infinite grace: "then he is gracious unto him and saith, deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom;" Job. 33: 24, in which passage "deliverance from the pit," as the end, and the ransom, which is the means, are both traced to grace preëxisting, as the source. God is necessarily the good and gracious being that he is: the only point of inquiry is, what may be necessary to the proper display or manifestation of that grace.

(33) If the term grace be used in its close technical sense, as equivalent to favor bestowed upon the guilty and ill-deserving, this would be strictly true. But, as the term is used by the writer in the broad and liberal sense, in which it is employed by the old writers, as signifying favor to the undeserving, simply, it would not be true.

It may appear to some that God might have engrafted grace upon his government by a simple and sovereign determination of his will, independent of any previous exercise of his power *ad extra*, by which grace might be set upon law, a new shoot upon an old stock. Now, we undertake not to determine what God could do or could not do, under a system materially different from that he has been pleased to adopt. And we are far from saying, that even under this system, God was shut up to this one plan of introducing grace into the universe; for had there been no sin, and still the law required a compensation, in order to its sharing its supremacy with grace, why may not God have power and wisdom to frame a service of which sin should not be the necessary antecedent? All our reasoning is founded upon the actual state of things as God has ordained them. Taking the system as it stands, we discern these facts: that God placed his creatures upon a platform of law, and yet not of law alone, but law as essentially modified by grace. We find this grace introduced into his government through Christ's work, therefore not by a simple exercise of will, but by an exertion of power. In a word, we find that in this actual system, one link in the introduction of grace, is the existence of sin. As to matter of fact, then, we conclude this sin necessary to grace, simply as it is the actual antecedent. We affirm not such an absolute necessity as that grace could in no wise be displayed, but through sin; but, simply, that in the system which God has adopted, grace is predicated upon a service done to law; this service is rendered by Christ, the necessary antecedent of whose work, because the actual antecedent, is the apostasy of man. We are so far, then, from making the existence of sin, in an absolute sense, necessary to the existence of grace, that we are by three degrees removed from it. First, by maintaining that grace to be displayed, must exist originally and infinitely in the divine nature itself. Secondly, by conceding, that for aught we can tell, God might have framed any number of systems, in all of which, though in different modes of discovery, he might still have been recognized as the God of law and as the God of grace: though, it must yet be maintained, that no other system but this actual one is at all conceivable by us. Thirdly, by admitting that in this present system, modified only by

the exclusion of sin, for aught we can know, God might, in many ways, wholly inconceivable by us, have magnified his law and introduced grace. All that we have contended for is this, that taking the system which he has framed, and reasoning from its revealed principles, there does seem to be necessary some work of God in honor of the law, by which it shall be blended with grace in the government of moral beings. The work of Christ in man's redemption, is that by which it is actually accomplished; but whether upon the supposition that man had never fallen, and consequently Christ had never died, the system of law remaining otherwise as it is, some other work of God, magnifying the law, would not have been still necessary to the manifestation of grace, we think altogether probable.

ARTICLE III.

THE BAPTISM OF SERVANTS.*

The institution of slavery has existed in the world with little substantial variation since the earliest ages. There must have been some previous example of it, or the threatening against Cainan that he should be a servant of servants, would hardly have been intelligible to those to whom it was addressed. But ever since the Abrahamic covenant was introduced, it has prevailed no less in the church of God than in the ungodly world by which this church has been surrounded. When Abraham was called from the state and land of idolatry in which he had been reared, he seems to have been the owner of slaves; and in the closing period of revelation, when Paul wrote his epistles, masters

* The present article is designed to embody the main arguments presented before the Synod of South Carolina at its last meeting, on which the action of that Synod, referred to in a subsequent page, was based. These views were ordered by Synod to be laid before the churches within its bounds. As the subject is of general importance to all Presbyterian and other pædo-baptist churches in the Southern States, it deserves at least the patient and candid consideration of Christian masters, desirous of knowing the full extent of their duties, and of doing them as in the sight of God.

and their bond-servants were both included in the church of Christ. During this entire period of more than 2,000 years, in which God was revealing his will to men, sending among them prophets and apostles, rising early and sending them, the institution of slavery is continually alluded to in the Scriptures, recognized as an existing condition of human society, and spoken of without the slightest mark of the divine disapprobation. He who cannot look upon sin with allowance, and hates every act of violence and wrong, took slaveholders to be his chosen friends, entered into covenant with them in reference to all those precious blessings on which our hopes depend, revealed to them in an especial manner his holy will, appointed some of them to be his prophets and representatives on earth, and closed the volume of inspiration, which condemns all sin, without one word of censure pronounced against this system, which is represented by many of our cotemporaries as the greatest outrage and most damning crime ever perpetrated by man. Nay, as is obvious to every reader of the Scriptures, the duties of masters and servants are prescribed no less than the duties of parents and children, husbands and wives, and no more is said of the relation of master being wrong, than of those necessary relations of the domestic state which result from the original constitution of human society. While all are called upon to repent of sin, and the various sins of which men are guilty are expressly mentioned, none are called upon to repent of the sin of holding slaves. Acknowledging the lawfulness of this state of society, the duties of masters are enjoined, and not a syllable uttered as to the guilt of continuing in this relation, and as to the duty of immediate emancipation. And servants are commanded to "be obedient to their masters, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward, with fear and trembling, in singleness of heart, as unto Christ; not with eye service, as men pleasers: but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men." In the pastoral epistles, the ministers of Christ are commanded to "exhort servants to be obedient to their own masters, and to please them well in all things, not answering again, not purloining, but showing all good fidelity." And it is added, "If any man teach otherwise, and consent

not to wholesome words, even to the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting [*νοσῶν*, sick, morbid,] about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth." We do not expect any more perfect revelation while the world shall stand. Till the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, the word of God remains unchanged and steadfast, and though some of our abolition cotemporaries seem impatient with the Scriptures, and others laboriously seek to impose a new and *holier* meaning upon them than their words will bear, they will ever remain the most illustrious proof of the benevolence, wisdom and holiness of God. While the times of ignorance under a former dispensation were winked at, God, who then spake unto the fathers by the prophets, and progressively revealed his will, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, and put the finishing stroke to his delineation, both of the scheme of salvation and of the rule of human duty. And it is the glory of the gospel, and the highest proof of its divine origin, that it is in advance of all the wisdom and attainments of men, and that no refinements of earth, nor schemes of morality here elaborated, can ever reach its celestial purity.

It is a consolation to the Christian master, that, abused and maligned as he is at home and abroad, as a thief and a robber, he has the testimony of his own conscience that he is neither, and that he has also the sanction and protection of the divine word, while living in that condition in which the providence of God has placed him, and while endeavoring to fulfill conscientiously the duties which this condition requires.

Still there are responsibilities of amazing weight resting upon the Christian master, and it is well for him to take a calm and deliberate view of these responsibilities in their largest extent. He cannot say, Am I my brother's keeper? There is a trust committed to him, and to this trust he must be found faithful. As the husband is to shelter and provide for the wife of his bosom, as the parent is to care for the children God has given him, so, with those just modifications the relation supposes, is the master to care for, protect and cherish the bond-servants whom the Most High

has placed beneath his power. The master is the representative of these by human law and divine, as he is of the more immediate family with which he stands connected by the ties of nature. The head of a household where slavery does not exist, has responsibilities and duties of a far lighter character. Their labor and care for us in sickness and health, and the affection they bear to us, demand a corresponding care on our part, for our servants,—a care which is not to extend merely to the present life, but to the interests of the undying soul. And more especially at this present time, when the eyes of the world are fastened upon us, and the most excited state of feeling exists in relation to American slavery, we are called upon to be found walking in the path of duty, and to be conducting in a way to commend ourselves to the impartial approbation of the reasonable portion of our fellow men. To those who are smitten with the mania of abolitionism, we are incapable of doing any thing right, so long as we lie under the damning sin of sustaining our present relation to our fellow men who are under the yoke of bondage, and we must leave them in the undisturbed possession of their uncharitable opinions.

The possession of power is always liable to abuse; and the more so, the more absolute it is. The parent has the most abundant opportunity of abusing his child, the husband his wife, and the master his servant. But in every one of these cases, affection and interest come in to prevent the unjust exercise of this arbitrary power. Strong affection makes us desire the happiness of those who sustain to us these relations, and even our temporal interest and the opinions of society around us, are restraints to check us in those moments of infatuation when passion would prompt us to deeds of violence and wrong. Yet acts of injustice, notwithstanding this, do occur in all these relations. Parents have so far forgotten themselves as to treat their children with cruelty, husbands their wives with brutal violence, and masters their servants with inconsiderate severity. In all these relations, therefore, there may be crying wrongs and excessive suffering. And since we read the "Thousand facts concerning Slavery," circulated by our abolition brethren some years ago, some of which were irrelevant and some untrue, we have read the record probably

of a thousand more, equally atrocious, of husbands treating cruelly the wives of their bosom, and parents the children of their own bodies. But religion throws its hallowed spirit over all these relations, making them more tender, more pure and healthful, and causing these transitory connections, which begin in time, to issue in eternal consequences of blessedness and peace. The unbelieving husband is often sanctified in more than an outward sense by the wife, the unbelieving child by the parent, and the unbelieving servant by the master. When religion is once established in a country, it is the order of God's providence that it is transmitted through the family in its narrower and also in its larger sense; so that the family is the nursery of the church as well as the state, and the greater number of those who make a credible profession of piety in any Christian country, have been trained first in the family, and been educated in a general knowledge of the truths of revealed religion.

Parallel with this line of facts are the institutions of religion. The first church that ever existed was set up in the family, and the first officiating priest was the head of the household. The earliest form we know the church to have assumed was the patriarchal form, and it appears to have retained this longer than any other under which it has existed. Although under the covenant of Sinai the Levites were appointed to officiate before God instead of the natural head, the first born son in each family, the ancient family aspect of the church was still perpetuated in various ways, nor has it ceased even to the present day. It was acknowledged in the Jewish rite of circumcision, and, as we believe, is still acknowledged in the rite of baptism in the Christian church.

We may as well say, without further circumlocution, that our object at this time is not to discuss the general question of slavery, not to say whether the institution is desirable or undesirable, defensible or indefensible, but whether, finding ourselves in the condition in which the church has been through the greater period of its existence, as it respects this great question, the duties which devolved anciently upon masters do not devolve upon them now — whether, in fine, it is not the duty and privilege of Christian

masters to bring their servants, while in infancy, before God, and dedicate them to him in the rite of baptism, as it was the duty of Hebrew masters, under the ancient form of the church, to dedicate their male servants in the rite of circumcision. As this is a conclusion which the writer of this article has been unable to resist, he will proceed to state, as far as his limits will allow, the reasons which have brought him to this result. And as the Synod of South Carolina at its last sessions took action on this subject in accordance with the opinion which has now been expressed, the arguments which led to that result will be freely presented in review, with such additional reasonings as may suggest themselves at this time.

In the first place, we remark that the institution of domestic slavery, existing among the patriarchs, is substantially the same institution as now exists among us. Attempts have been made by those opposed to us, to show it to be otherwise, but these attempts have, in our view, been signal failures. In whatever way slavery arose, whether as the result of violent compulsion, or whether it was submitted to voluntarily, as in innumerable instances it must have been, in the early stages of society, for the security it gave to the poor and defenceless, against injury and wrong from violent men, or to procure the means of subsistence in seasons of distress and famine, (1) it was plainly an institution already in existence and universally recognized, when Abraham appeared on the stage of action. It is not improbable, that when Terah, the father of Abraham, left Ur of the Chaldees, he left with a retinue of servants. This is always the case in every removal, in all slaveholding communities, except where families are in extremely impoverished circumstances. He left his country in obedience to the divine command, and on their way to Canaan, took up his abode at Haran, where he died, and where his family "sojourned many days." (2.) When, in obedience to the divine command, he left Haran, to migrate to that country which was to be the seat of the church for many ages, "he took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all

(1) Alison's History of Europe, vol. 1, p. 20, 21.

(2) Judith, v. 8.

the substance that they had gathered, and the *souls they had gotten* in Haran," (3) and came into the land of Canaan. He was at this time seventy-five years of age, and there had been time for his property in servants to have accumulated, both by purchase and by their natural increase. After he entered Canaan, God again revealed himself to Abraham, again entered into covenant with him, and promised to his seed the land in which he dwelt. A famine compelled him to go into Egypt, and while there, by the interested benefactions of Pharaoh, his servants, both male and female, were greatly increased in numbers. A few years afterwards, he rescued Lot, his substance, his women and people, out of the hands of Chedorlaomer, with the aid of "318 *trained servants*," i. e., probably, instructed, well-taught servants, of tried fidelity, "born in his own house." Abraham was now about 84 years old, and had that number of active young male servants, reared and carefully taught by himself. According to the usual proportion of men, capable of bearing arms, to the remaining members of society, Abraham must have then had 1590 servants, at least. These *yelidhey bairho*, οἰκονομῆς, "servants born in the house," were not all he owned. There were others, "bought with his money," who regarded him as their master. (4.) Again, we read of other men-servants and maid-servants, given to Abraham by Abimelech, king of the Philistines. (5.) These servants, who belonged to Abraham, were inherited by Isaac, who, besides large possessions of flocks and herds, which continually increased, had "great store of servants" so that he excited the envy of the Philistines. (6.) Jacob, too, came to be a man of large possessions. The wonderful increase of his flocks and herds while with Laban, is fully detailed in the inspired word. The care of these required many servants, which we find he must have possessed. (7.) Esau came against him with 400 men, which would not have been necessary, had the company of Jacob been small and feeble. Jacob's military conquests could

(3) Gen. xii: 3—5; souls they got or acquired, *hannepesh ashur asu*, πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἣν ἐκτήσαντο. See *nepesh*, used for servants, in whom a traffick was carried on. Ezek. xvii: 13. Comp. ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων. Apoc. 18: 13; and 1 Mac. x: 33.

(4) Genesis xiv. 14: xvii. 23.

(5) Gen. xx. 14.

(6) Gen. xxvi. 14.

(7) Gen. xxxii. 16.

not have been made with his single hand (8); nor could Simeon and Levi, without aid, have slain all the men of Shechem. There must have been a body of dependents employed by them, and the remaining sons of Jacob, when they performed this deed of violence upon the people of a neighboring prince. (9.) The traffic in slaves, too, was rife throughout the land in the days of Joseph, and the Midianites purchased him as they would have done other kinds of merchandise. (10.)

Now, it has been asserted, that the cases of Abraham and the patriarchs were so different from ours, that we cannot reason from one to the other. That they were independent chiefs, like the Arab Scheicks, and that their servants stood in the same relation to them as the Bedouin tribes do to the heads of the clans who rule over them. But clan-ship and domestic servitude are very different things. The Emirs of the Syrians, and the Scheicks of the Arabs, are the elective rulers of the tribes, as Jacob was of the 12 patriarchs. The servants of the Emirs and Scheicks, and their subjects, are very different persons, and sustain very different relations.

The servitude of the patriarchal age, was hereditary and perpetual. Hagar was entirely under the control of her mistress, Sarah, and her children were born into slavery, and could "not inherit with the son of the free woman." (11.) If she had remained in the land, her children must have been regarded as born into a state of bondage. Job, who, doubtless, lived in the patriarchal age, speaks of the grave as the only place where the servant is free from his master. (12.) The same facts go to show that they were not bought *out* of slavery, as some have maintained, for the purpose of manumission; and that they were not bought from themselves, the price being paid to them, but from third persons, is further evident from Gen. xvii., 27, where purchased slaves are said to have been "bought with money of the stranger." (13.)

Nor was the servitude existing among the Hebrews, after their deliverance from Egypt, materially different from that

(8) Genesis xlviii: 22. (10) Gen. xxxvii: 28. (12) Job iii: 19.

(9) Gen. xxxiv.

(11) Gal. iv: 21—31.

(13) See many false reasonings on this subject in Barnes on Slavery, Philad., 1846.

among us. The Jewish servant was regarded as property, was subject to the discipline of his master, and might suffer exceedingly under that discipline. If death immediately ensued, the master was punished; but if the servant should survive a day or two, there should be no punishment, because the servant was "his money." (14.) In none of the states of this union, is there a law which bears marks of greater severity than this which is found among the laws of God. The Hebrews, who, through poverty, fell under the yoke of slavery, were released at the year of Jubilee, but others, bought of the heathen around, descended as an inheritance to children, and were bondmen forever. (15.) Fugitive slaves, who had escaped from their masters, were either pursued and taken by their masters themselves, or returned to them by the kindness of others. (16.) To the labor of their servants, they regarded themselves as entitled, without wages or compensation, other than that implied in their regular support, maintenance, and protection, (17) in their receiving "their portion of meat" [*το σίτομαθήριον*, their allowance,] "in due season." (18.) Our abolition brethren have undertaken a hard task, in attempting to point out any essential difference between the slavery of the biblical period of the world's history and that of this age and country.

Now God was pleased to set up his Church, when he gave it the permanent form it now has, in a slave-holding family. After Abraham had rescued Lot, God entered into

(14) Exodus xxi: 20, 21.

(15) Lev. xxv: 44, 46. Joseph. Antiq. iii: 12, 3.

(16) 1 Samuel xxv: 10. 1 Kings, ii: 39 et seq. Gen. xvi: 6—9. Philemon: 11, 12, 16. The Abolitionists of the North, in vain appeal to Deut. xxiii: 15, 16, to justify themselves in violating the Constitution of these U. S., by the detention and harboring of fugitives from service, who escape to the free states. If that law gave immunity to the runaway servant, and protection from the claims of his master, servitude was impossible in the Jewish commonwealth. If a servant, by escaping from his master, who resided in the tribe of Judah, into the confines of the tribe of Benjamin, could not be reclaimed, involuntary servitude was unknown in that land. Even Mr. Barnes, has the candor to acknowledge that "this relates only to the slaves which escaped to the country of the Hebrews, from surrounding nations, and that it did not contemplate the runaway slaves of the Hebrews in their own land."—Slavery, p. 140.

(17) Luke xvii: 7—10. Matth. xxv: 14 et seq.

(18) Luke xiii: 41—48. How absurd to quote such passages as James 5: 4. Jer. 22, to show the injustice of masters. What have the wages of

a covenant with him, promising him an heir, and a posterity like the stars of heaven for multitude; and the fortunes of his posterity and their deliverance from Egypt were mentioned. And he believed in the Lord, and it was imputed to him for righteousness. (19.) If he had not been a believer before, he at least at this time became interested in the justifying righteousness of Christ, and was called the Friend of God. (20.)

After he had been in Canaan ten years, Ishmael was born of his handmaid Hagar, and thirteen years after, when Abraham was ninety-nine years of age, the Lord appeared unto him again, entered into a covenant with him, renewed the promise of a numerous seed, and assured him that he should be the "father of many nations," changed his name from Abram, *the exalted father*, to Abraham, *the exalted father of a multitude*—and his wife's name from Sarai, perhaps meaning *the contentious*, or, as is supposed by some, *my princess*, to Sarah, *the princess*. This covenant is declared to be an everlasting covenant with Abraham and his seed. Of this covenant, circumcision was the seal. Every male child among them, in all their generations, was to be circumcised: and not only their own children but the servant also—he that was born in the house, or bought with money of the stranger, which was not of their seed. Twice is this repeated, that it might be clearly understood, that not their children only, but their servants also, were to partake of this rite. And the covenant of God was declared to be in their flesh for an everlasting covenant. When God went up from communing with Abraham, he circumcised all the males in his numerous family, bond and free, in the self-same day. The particularity with which this transaction is recorded, the solemn and visible appearance of God to Abraham, the formal covenant, and the peculiar seal of that covenant, the change of the names of Abram and Sarai, indicative of a change of relation, show that this was the great transaction between God and Abraham, and indicated

hired men to do with this subject. We too have our $\mu\sigma\delta\iota\omicron\nu\varsigma$, *shakyriym*, hired servants, and are as punctual in the payment of their wages as the most of our fellow citizens.

(19) Gen. x: 3, 6.—Rom. iv: 3.—Gal. iii. 6.

(20) Jas. ii. 22.

the form which the visible church was to assume in after ages. (21).

The Church of God was thus established in the family; the covenant was made with the head of that family; and all whom he represented in the family relation, not only his children, but his servants also, obtained a membership in the visible kingdom of God, through the faith of Abraham, which faith he had, while yet uncircumcised. That this circumcision was the seal of the righteousness of faith, of a covenant ecclesiastical, (22) and not a mere national badge, nor family distinction, is what the Apostle Paul has declared, and what we have ever maintained against our opponents on the subject of infant membership in the Church.

That it was not a family and national mark in its original design, is further evident from the fact that it is explained in the Scripture to denote, as the Christian rite of baptism does, the renovation of the heart. Depravity is called the "foreskin of the heart;" the unrenewed and unhumiliated are called "uncircumcised in heart;" this spiritual circumcision was ascribed expressly to God as its author; and even in the New Testament, believers are described as being "circumcised in Christ, with the circumcision made without hands," and the true circumcision is said to be not "outward in the flesh, but of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God." (23). And further, as a family mark or a national badge, it was wholly futile, for it was practised by the ancient Egyptians, the Troglodytes of Africa, and the Colchians of Asia, is still practised by Christians of the Coptic and Abyssinian churches, was found in existence among the Mexicans when first visited by the Spaniards, and has been found to prevail among many tribes of Western Africa and of Polynesia. The true view is, that it was a sign of the righteousness of faith and of the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and it became in any sense a national mark among the Jews, only because it was the will of God that the ecclesiastical limits of the Jewish people should coincide with those of the state.

(21) See Genesis xvii.

(22) Romans iv. 11.

(23) Leviticus xxvi. 41. Deut. x. 16. Deut. xxx. 6. Jer. iv. 4. Acts vii. 51. Gal. ii. 11. Rom. ii. 28, 29.

Their civil government was a Theocracy as well as their ecclesiastical. (24.)

With this sign of circumcision and seal of the righteousness which is by faith, the Jewish church were commanded to circumcise all their male servants, both those "born in the house, and those bought with money of the stranger," and the covenant of God was to be in their flesh for an everlasting covenant. He that was not so circumcised, was "cut off" from that people. The rite was to be observed not only in their own families throughout their generations, but also in the families of those proselytes of righteousness who were received among them. In reference to these last they added the ceremony of baptism, which was extended to persons of either sex. All such persons were admitted to the passover, when that was instituted on the eve of the Exodus from Egypt. A foreigner and a hired servant could not eat thereof. (25).

Such, then, was the principle introduced into the church by the Abrahamic covenant. Every male child of the servants was to be circumcised, on the eighth day, on the profession of faith made by the master. And every adult servant, after suitable instruction, was also to be circumcised, or he could no longer remain in connection with God's chosen people. We say after *suitable instruction*, for although Abraham seems to have circumcised his servants all at the same time after God had gone up from him, (26) yet these servants had probably been sufficiently long with him for those of adult years to have become acquainted with the doctrines of Abraham's faith. The 318 servants who assisted Abraham in the rescue of Lot, were *trained* servants, or, as it is more correctly rendered in the margin, *instructed* servants, the word so translated signifying those imbued with knowledge. (27). Such servants were taken on this critical enterprise because they were attached to their master, and he could rely on their fidelity. And God speaks of Abraham as one who would command his chil-

(24) See on the extent of the rite of Circumcision, Spencer de Legibus Hebræorum, Michælis' Laws of Moses, Kitto's Biblical Cyclopædia, Penny Cyc., vol. vii.

(25) Exodus xii. 43—50.

(26) Genesis xvii.

(27) See Gesenius, Calvin, Oleaster, Vatable, Arias Montanus, and the Arabic and Samaritan versions.

dren and his household after him, and adds, They shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment. (28). Not even in Abraham's case, then, when circumcision was first instituted, is it necessary to suppose it was performed upon adults, without a previous instructing of them in the things of religion. After it was fairly instituted and brought into practice, the necessity of circumcising adults would be limited to the few servants whom the Hebrews might acquire by purchase from the nations around, or who might belong to proselyted families. On all other servants the rite would be performed in infancy, so that infant circumcision would be the rule in the case of servants as well as among the free born descendants of Abraham. The question whether adult servants could be *compelled* to receive circumcision, has been variously decided. Some have contended that they could, not only from the passage, (Genesis xvii. 12,) but 1. Because servants were the property of their master, and obliged to accede to his wishes. 2. Because the command that the servant should be circumcised, is annulled if you leave it at his option. 3. If it were not compulsory, then there would be no difference between a slave in this respect and the hired servant, for he *might* be circumcised should he so desire, but the passage (Exodus xii. 44, 45,) makes a manifest difference between his case in this respect, and that of the slave. The view taken by Maimonides of this point, he thus expresses :

“Whether a servant be born in the power of an Israelite, or whether he be purchased from the heathen, the master is to bring them both into the covenant.”

“But he that is born in the *house* is entered on the eighth day, and he that is bought with money on the day on which his master receives him, unless the slave be *unwilling*. For if the master receive a grown slave from the Cuthæans, and he be *unwilling*, his master is to deal with him for one year. After which, should he refuse so long, it is forbidden to keep him longer uncircumcised. The master must therefore sell him back to the Cuthæans, from whom he came. (29). Bochart adds that the infants of slaves could be cir-

(28) Genesis xviii. 19.

(29) Maimon. Hilchoth Miloth, ch. i. sec. 8, quoted in Ainsworth on Genesis xvii., in Bochart Hieroz. Tom. i. p. 578, and in Barnes on Slavery, p. 132.

cumcised on the 8th day by the master, whether their parents were willing or not. The same usage they extended to children that had been exposed by heathens, or taken in war. It was optional with them whether they would treat these children as freemen or slaves; if they decided to adopt them as their own children, this was acknowledged at the time of their circumcision and baptism, otherwise they were circumcised and baptized as slaves. "An Israelite," says Maimonides, (30) "that takes a little Heathen child or finds an Heathen infant, and baptizes him for a proselyte, behold he is a proselyte." And so the Rabbi Hezekiah, in the Hierosol. Jevamoth, fol. viii. 4, "Behold, one finds an infant cast out, and baptizes him in the name of a servant, do thou also circumcise him in the name of a servant; but if he baptize him in the name of a freeman, do thou also circumcise him in the name of a freeman." (31).

It was the will of God, then, and it was the practice of his people, from the first charter of the church, in its settled organized form, that the master should represent his whole household, children and servants, and that they both should receive, as far as it could be affixed to them, the seal of that righteousness of faith which he possessed. This arrangement preceded the Sinaitic covenant, and was not disannulled "by the law which was four hundred and thirty years after," but was confirmed through all that period till the coming of Christ.

It will be remembered that not all the lineal descendants of Abraham were continued in this covenant, though receiving the seal. Ishmael was excluded and his posterity, — Esau and his, — the children of Keturah and theirs; constituting a larger portion of Abraham's descendants, in all after ages, than retained their ecclesiastical connection with their great progenitor. The Arabs and Saracens have always outnumbered the Jews.

It will also be remembered, that the nations who were to be destroyed before the children of Israel, but who were spared and reduced to a state of servitude, were not admitted to the right of circumcision, nor considered a part of the

(30) Halach Aibdim, c. 8.

(31) See Maimonides and other Jewish authorities, quoted in Wall on Infant Baptism, I. p. 15, and Lightfoot on Matt. iii. 16, Selden de Jure, &c., juxta Discip. Ebræorum, L. ii. c. iii.

church of God. They were employed in menial offices, in connection with the tabernacle and temple, but were not regarded as worthy of the privileges of the congregation, having been originally under the ban, either of expulsion from the land or utter extermination, if they should resist the occupation of Canaan by God's chosen people.

At length, the Jewish nation having rejected the Messiah, were broken off from the olive tree God had planted, and we were grafted in. The promise to Abraham, that he should be the father of many nations, was now, for the first time, fulfilled. And the covenanted church received a wider extension; and the holy mountain of the Lord's house was no longer in Judea, but wherever men should be found to worship him in spirit and truth. Abraham was still the father of the faithful, and they were his seed, the *true* children contemplated in the Abrahamic covenant, as Paul, in various passages has earnestly taught.

Baptism, which had before been practised in the admission of proselytes of righteousness, and extended in Jewish practice to parents and children, male and female, masters and servants, took the place of circumcision under the ancient form of the church, and had the same spiritual signification. That this was the case, we have, among other things, these proofs, that circumcision was discontinued, and baptism used to answer the same ends, a fact, which all history confirms. — And that baptism is expressly stated to be in place of circumcision, Paul, in Col. ii. 11, 12, says: "In whom also (i. e. in Christ) ye are *circumcised* with the circumcision made without hands, putting off the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ, *buried with him in baptism.*"

Justin Martyr, forty years after the Apostle, uses the same language in his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, calling baptism the Christian circumcision — and in his *Quest. ad Orthodox.*, replies to the question, Why we do not practise circumcision? — "that we are circumcised by baptism with Christ's circumcision." Cyprian and the Council of Carthage, 150 years after the Apostles, constantly call baptism the "spiritual circumcision," and represent circumcision under the Old Testament, as typical of baptism in the New. (32.) Basil, 260 years after the Apostles, Ambrose, 274,

(32) Wall. 1, p. 103, 104.

Chrysostom, 280, and Augustine, 300 years after the Apostles, all call baptism by the name of circumcision, and in some cases, discuss the question whether, like circumcision, it is to be administered on the eighth day.

This is but a specimen of the language of the Greek and Latin fathers respecting baptism, and its substitution in the place of circumcision.

The same authorities, and others, claim baptism for the infant seed of believers, or speak of it as administered to them on the faith of their parents. Do we find it also administered to slaves, as in the ancient dispensation, on the faith of their masters?

The nearest to an affirmative answer to this question, afforded us by the New Testament, is the family or household baptisms, of which we read in the Acts and the Epistles. Lydia was baptized, and all her house; the house of Stephanas, was baptized by Paul; the house of the Phillipian jailor, by Paul and Silas; and Crispus, and all his house, by Paul and his assistants at Corinth. The house of Cornelius, too, was baptized by Peter. The house of Onesiphorus is spoken of with honorable mention, and the salutation of Paul is sent to the families of Narcissus and Aristobulus. (33.) Here are eight Christian families spoken of in the New Testament, four of which are expressly mentioned as baptized, and the others, if Christian, we know, had also received baptism as the rite which admitted them into the Christian church. We argue against our opponents in the baptismal controversy, that in so many families there must have been infants, and if the family was baptized, these were baptized with their parents. And may we not, with equal reason argue, that if in a slaveholding community, eight Christian families received baptism, which baptism was governed by the same rules as circumcision, only that it was more extensive in its application, being applied to persons of either sex, that the slave, or at least the infant slave, shared in the same rite with the children of the master? Suppose there had been no change in the form of the rite of initiation into the visible church, in the form of the seal of the ecclesiastical covenant made with Abraham, and that Christ had directed his disciples to go into all the

(33) Romans xvi: 10, 11.

earth and preach the gospel to every creature, *circumcising* them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, would they not have applied the rite of circumcision to all members of the family, on whom it could be performed, both bond and free? Would not the servant have shared with the master and his children in the sacred rite? Why, then, was it not so, where baptism was practised in lieu of circumcision. Where is the law repealing the ancient practice, and debarring a portion of those who shared in the rite and in its advantages, from their former privileges. But it was only circumcision which was discontinued. Baptism, which before prevailed in the reception of proselytes to Judaism, was retained and clothed with new divine sanctions. But, this baptism had been performed upon the entire families of proselytes, including servants, and when the Apostles were called to baptize, they would, unless divinely admonished otherwise, administer it to parents and their children, and also to the infant slaves of masters, professing faith in Christ. It was most natural for them to do so. It can hardly be believed, that in countries where there were from three to five slaves to every freeman, as was the case among the Romans and Greeks, eight families, and these not in the lowest class of society, could be received into the church, and not one slave be connected with them. Mention is expressly made of "the household servants" of Cornelius, and we have every reason to believe that there were bond-servants connected with the households of the jailor of Philippi, of Lydia, of Crispus and Gaius, of Onesiphorus, of Narcissus, and Aristobulus. As the houses or families of these persons were Christian, their being so, was acknowledged by administering to them the baptismal rite. Should any one contend that the οἶκος of the master is less extensive than the οἰκία of the master—that the one is the house, the residence of his proper family, and the other, his whole premises, including the dwellings of his domestics, and that when used metaphorically of families, the one includes the children, the other the servants also, and that because the οἶκος of Lydia and others, alone are spoken of as baptized, that therefore the children alone of these believers were baptized with them, and their servants were not baptized; we then reply, that the distinction, though ingenious, does not

seem to be borne out by the prevailing use of the Greek language, that οἶκος and οἰκία are used interchangeably, and that the οἶκος of Stephanas in 1 Cor. i: 16, is his οἰκία in 1 Cor. xvi: 15. We also read in 1 Timothy iii: 12, that the deacons were to be the husband of one wife, ruling their children *and* their own houses well, καὶ τῶν ἰδίων οἴων. The houses of the deacons were *more* than their children, and included, therefore, we suppose, their *servants*, and all matters pertaining to their domestic arrangements. (34.) We infer, then, that the household baptisms of the New Testament may have included the servants of the family as well as the children. And if they were not included, then was the principle regulating the application of circumcision under the Old Testament changed under the New, and one entire class of persons excluded from the privileges secured to them by a former and preparatory dispensation.

But of this change, we have not one particle of evidence; the presumption is otherwise; and till the contrary is shown, we must believe that infant *servants* were baptized as well as infant children, on the faith of the head of the family, who stood for the children of his own race, in the relation of father, and for the rest, in the relation of master. Both these relations were appointed by God, as the nexus which united persons, who, through their necessary condition, were not responsible themselves, with his visible church, which connection was acknowledged in circumcision, under the old economy, as it is by baptism, under the new.

In tracing down the subject of our investigation to later times, we find no reference to servants by name as the subjects of baptism, till the fourth century. We there find evidence that infant slaves were offered by their masters for baptism. Augustine, in his letter to Boniface, says, "You see that a great many are offered, not by their parents, but by any other persons, as infant slaves (*servuli*) are sometimes offered by their masters; and sometimes where the parents are dead, their infants are baptized, being offered

(34) Compare Gen. 17: 19: For I know him, that he will command his children and his household [the *lxx.* ἡ οἶκῳ αὐτοῦ,] after him. But the household of Abraham consisted, when Sarah and Isaac were deducted, of his *servants*.

by any that can afford to show this compassion upon them." Children that were cruelly exposed by the heathen, were also incorporated into the church by baptism, and educated at its expense; so were captive children taken in war, or redeemed, or bought with money." Augustine also says in his Treatise on Grace and Free Will, "that this grace is sometimes vouchsafed to the children of infidels, that they are baptized, when by some means, through the secret Providence of God, they happen to come into the hands of pious Christians. (35). The same thing is asserted of exposed children, by Ambrose. (36). And in the Pandects of Justinian, it is made penal, if any converted Pagan shall fail to present his infant children, or shall leave his *servants* in error. And in the Novels of Justinian it is enjoined, that the infants of the Samaritans should be at once baptized, and the rest who had reached the years of discretion, not till they had been instructed two years in the faith, and in a knowledge of the Scriptures. (37).

We find, then, that it was the custom and law of the Church at this period, that infant slaves should be baptized on the faith of their masters, and that those of a mature age should be prepared for baptism by a proper course of instruction in religion.

¶ The interest which conscientious masters took in the religious education and salvation of their servants, is strikingly illustrated by an incident which occurred in the early part of the fifth century. A gentleman of Carthage had bought a negro slave, that had been brought out of the heart of Africa, where Christianity was wholly unknown; his master had caused him to be instructed in the faith—he was a Catechumen for some time, and at last was admitted among the competents for baptism. He had appeared before the Church, made his profession of faith, and the usual renunciations. But just before the time of baptism, he became sick of a fever, and became speechless. He was baptized, however, others answering in his name, as if he had been an infant, and soon afterwards died. Ferrandus, deacon of Carthage, who writes these circumstances in a letter to Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspa, had some doubts concern-

(35) Chap. 22, Tom. vii. p. 827.

(36) De Vocat. Gent., l. i., c. 8.

(37) Cod. Instit. l. i. tit. xi. Novell Coll. ix. Tit. xxvi. Nov. cxlii.

ing this baptism. He does not see how it could be valid in the case of one capable of reason; for, says he, it is infants only who have none but original sin, whom we believe to be saved by the faith of those that bring them. Fulgentius, in reply, comforts Ferrandus, respecting the salvation of the deceased negro. He argues that the condition required by our Saviour for adult persons was, that they should believe and be baptized. This man had both faith and baptism. Faith, and the profession of it, was his own act—baptism, the act of the minister. God's taking away his senses, was no sign of his rejecting him. He had his senses when he professed, and was alive when he was baptized. (38).

We perceive now, by these facts, what was the opinion of the Church at that day. It was, that masters should do all for the instruction and salvation of their adult slaves in their power, that they should strive to have them prepared for baptism on the profession of their own faith, but that their infant slaves should be baptized on the faith of the master himself. The adult slave could in no case be baptized if his master was a Christian, without his testimony to the character of the servant being first obtained, which is required also by the Apostolic Constitutions. (39).

As we come down to the divines of the period of the reformation and after, we find similar views entertained. Calvin, in his commentary on Genesis xvii. 12, "He that is born in the house," &c., says, "God commanded Abraham to circumcise whomsoever he had in his own power. In this shone forth his singular love towards holy Abraham, that his grace embraces his whole house. We know that formerly slaves were scarcely reckoned as numbered among men. But God, because of his favor to his servant, adopts them as his own sons. To this mercy nothing at all can be added. The pride of the flesh is cast down, when God, without respect of persons, joins the free and bond together. Moreover, in the person of Abraham he prescribes this law to all his servants, that they should strive to bring whoever are subject to their power, into the companionship of the

(38) Wall 1, 408: Bingham 3, 180.

(39) Lib. viii. c. 32. "Slaves were not received to baptism without the consent of their masters, who in such cases became their sponsors or god-fathers." Coleman Christ. Antiqq., p. 285.

same faith. For the individual families of the pious *should be so many churches*. Therefore if we desire to prove our piety, every one of us should labor to have his house ordered in obedience to God. Not only does he command Abraham to dedicate and offer to the Lord those slaves born in his house, but whomsoever he might afterwards have acquired."

Slavery did not exist in its proper distinctive character in the countries of the Reformation, nor, except to a very limited extent, in the colonies of those countries in which the doctrines of the Reformation were professed, at the time when the several Protestant confessions were drawn up. The attention of the divines of that period, therefore, was not drawn to this relation, and it seems not, as a general thing, to have been present to their minds when giving their decisions as to the subjects of baptism. Yet the Reformed Church of France admits the principle implied, in relation to children of parents who are members of the Church of Rome, or who have been and are excommunicated, and in relation also to the children of Bohemians, Saracens and Gipsies. These were admitted to baptism when presented by godly sureties, their parents consenting, and the sureties binding themselves to see them educated and instructed in the true religion. (40).

Andrew Rivet, a divine of Holland in the year 1651, expresses himself in the following terms: "By this consideration is resolved that question often agitated, and which also has arisen in this, our time, in respect to the baptism of those who are born of unbelieving parents; and so, if we regard their origin, are not in the divine covenant. For it appears that many have been baptized when they were not yet imbued with a true knowledge of Christian doctrine, nor arrived at that age when, after sufficient instruction, they might be able to render a reason of their faith. For it is the constant opinion of the ancient and modern Theologians that adult unbelievers should not be baptized before, subjected to diligent catechetical instruction, they can render a reason for their faith, and not only consent, but in addition earnestly demand, the administration of baptism. Concerning such as are baptized after open profession of

(40) See Aymon. Synodes Nationaux, Tom. 1, p. 177, Quick's Synodicon, vol. 1, p. xiv.

their faith, although all things have not been exactly observed, no difficulty is made. The doubt respects the children of unbelievers who are offered for baptism by men who are Christians. Instances of this are not few, especially in these times in which various regions before unknown having been discovered, the infants of unbelievers, plainly aliens from Christ, have been brought away, and baptized with Christian baptism.* Concerning these, it is inquired whether they are fit subjects of baptism, since they did not belong to the covenant of God, but sprang from Pagan or Mahomedan unbelievers. This reply, therefore, is given: either these infants which are baptized, were baptized not only while their parents were unwilling, but while the children remaining still in their parent's power. Such could not be baptized, and we affirm the baptism administered unto them to be invalid, because true baptism requires those to whom it is administered, to be in the covenant. Or these infants have been taken by Christians and brought into servitude, or have been bought with their money. In this case we say that baptism can be administered to them on the same principle that circumcision was to the servants of Abraham, that were either born in his house or bought with his money. Moreover, if any have been baptized in infancy, Christians into whose power they came being the procurers, we hold their baptism valid, and would not repeat it. * * * To this head is to be referred that declaration of the author of the treatise *de vocatione Gentium*, in Prosper Lib. 2, c. 8, "Sometimes this grace is conferred on the children of unbelievers, that they are baptized when, by the secret providence of God, they come in any way into the hands of the pious." Hence we gather that it was the practice of the ancient church to baptize the infants of unbelievers, but after they came into the hands, *i. e.* into the power of pious persons." (41).

Benedict Pictet, Professor of Theology in Geneva, in 1721, holds the following language: "It is demanded if one must baptize infants that are foundlings, and of whom one does not know whose they are. I answer that we may baptize

* Columbus bore away 500 natives of America, to be sold in the markets of Seville. They were afterwards liberated by Isabella. But the same was done by other discoverers.

(41) And. Rivet, Exercit. lxxxix. in Genesis. Opera Tom. 1. p. 343.

them, provided there present himself some one who promises to have them trained in the true religion. It is demanded if one may baptize children taken in war, or which are purchased, they being unbelievers. I answer, yes, provided we are very sure of training and instructing them before baptizing them." In this last decision Pictet seems to have in view youth past the period of infancy. In the former he deems the pledge of some competent surety, such as a believing master would be in reference to his servant, all that is requisite. "The subjects of baptism," says he, in another place, "are all that are in the covenant, whether they be really such, or are likely to become such, either on account of their outward profession and communion with the faithful, or on account of their being born of Christian parents. (42).

These authorities, we have quoted, were all divines, respectively of the churches of Holland, France, and Geneva, divines of our own Presbyterian faith, and holding the strictest views as to the doctrines and discipline of our church. To them, we may add the more recent opinion of Dr. Miller, of the Princeton Seminary, who, in his treatise on Infant Baptism, says, "If deserted, or orphan children, be cast in the families of strangers, who are in no way related to them according to the flesh, but who are willing to stand in the place of parents, and train them up for God; even these strangers, in short, any person of suitable character, who may be willing to assume the charitable office of giving them a Christian education, may, and ought to present such children for Christian baptism. Not only the offspring of Abraham's body, but "all who were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money," were commanded to be circumcised. Surely, no Christian who has a child, white or black, placed in his family, and likely to be a permanent member of it, can doubt that it is his duty to give it a faithful Christian education. And as one great object of infant baptism is to secure this point, he will not hesitate to offer it up to God in that ordinance which he has appointed, provided no valid objection in regard to the

(42) Pictet *La Theologie Chretienne*, Tom. ii. Liv. xv., chap. xii. *Theologia Christiana*, Lib. xiv., cap. 4.

wishes of the parents of such a child interpose to prevent it." (43.)

Similar to this has been the decision of the Presbyterian church in these United States. In the year 1786, the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, then the highest judicatory of our church in this country, decided, "that Christian masters and mistresses, whose religious professions and conduct are such as to give them a right to the ordinance of baptism for their own children, may, and ought to dedicate the children of their household to God in that ordinance, when they have no scruple of conscience to the contrary." The overture, which called forth this decision, came from the Presbytery of Donnegal, and was, 'Whether Christian masters and mistresses ought, in duty, to have such children baptized, as are under their care, though born of parents not in the communion of any Christian church?' And in 1816, the General Assembly decided: "1. That it is the duty of masters who are members of the church, to present the children of parents in servitude to the ordinance of baptism, provided they are in a situation to train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, thus securing to them the rich advantages which the Gospel provides.

"2. That it is the duty of Christian ministers to inculcate this doctrine, and to baptize all children of this description, when presented to them by their masters." (44.)

At the same time, there is a decision that the infants of believing servants shall be admitted to baptism on the faith of their parents, thus making it the rule of the church to administer baptism to infant slaves, when presented either by their believing masters or their believing parents.

It will be remembered, that these resolutions were passed by the highest judicatories of our church, when, as yet, the institution of domestic slavery pervaded the entire church in this land, and long before any of the modern theories of abolition came into vogue. They are the conclusions to which conscientious men of slaveholding communities came, when meditating on their own responsibilities to their ser-

(43) Miller on Infant Baptism, p. 57.

(44) Minutes of Synod of New York and Philadelphia, p. 519. Digest, p. 97. Hodge's History of Pres. Ch., ii., 413.

vants in the light of God's word. The rule by them established, appears to be correct and scriptural, and sustained too by ecclesiastical usage. The only question is, whether it is in all respects as strenuous, as a proper regard to the commands of God and the duties of believing masters, would make it; whether, in fine, there are any circumstances which will exempt believing masters from presenting their infant servants to God in baptism, which would not also exempt them from presenting their infant children? Under the Abrahamic covenant, during a former dispensation, both children and servants were circumcised. Why, under the Abrahamic covenant, in the present dispensation, this covenant being still in force, should they not be baptized? Is it said that the covenant was made with Abraham and his seed, and therefore is now to be confined to the believer and his seed? We reply that the seal of the covenant was originally applied to more than the natural seed of Abraham; it was applied by express divine appointment to all whom he held as property, and represented as such; it was regarded as the privilege of the servant of the believing master, that he also should have that measure of connection with the visible church, which circumcision gave. Is it asked if this privilege shall also be extended in the New Dispensation, to adult servants, as in the old? We answer, No—because in the New, the requirement addressed, manifestly to adult persons, is, *believe* and be baptized, and in their case, the application of baptism is limited to such as make a credible profession of faith in Christ. The duty of the master to his adult slave, we conceive to be, to instruct him by every means in his power, in a knowledge of Christ, and to use the proper means for his conversion, that he may believe in Christ, and be baptized, when he so believes, on the profession of his own faith. We hold to "believer's baptism" for all adults, but maintain that infants are to be baptized on the faith of their parents, if free, or on the faith of their masters, if the children are born in slavery and their own parents are not members of the church, or do not choose to offer them on the profession of their own faith. By all means, the *master* is to see to it, and on him the responsibility is made to rest by God's word, of having them dedicated to God in baptism, and trained up in a knowledge of his ways. God will have families and house-

holds, entire households, their head being a believer in Christ, acknowledged as joined to his church, and taught to know his ways. Where domestic slavery exists, he holds the master responsible for all this. And the conscientious master, if he views the subject rightly, dare not content himself with exacting their daily toil from his servants, and furnishing them as he does the brute beasts that labor for him merely with their *σιτομασπιριον*, their portion of meat in due season, with a house to protect, and clothing to cover them, and care in sickness and old age. He is held responsible, by God, for their religious training, as the parent is for the religious training of the child, (though not to the same degree, for neither is the opportunity nor the ability the same,) and to secure this, God has determined that they shall belong to his church, as the infant child of the believer shall belong to his church, that whoever becomes a permanent member of a family whose head is a believer, whether it be by being born of his seed, or by being born in his house, though not of his seed, or by being bought with money from the stranger, shall be also a member of his church, and acknowledged as such by the primary rite of initiation. God does not place men under the absolute power of others, without binding those, under whom they are so placed, by the most stringent obligations. The father is made, by God's appointment, not merely the natural, but the ecclesiastical head of the child in his infant years, and so the master is of the servant. By a double, yea, triple bond, nature, law and covenant, the father and master, themselves being free and responsible, are held bound for the dependent and irresponsible members of their families. In this way, is there a compensation divinely appointed for the abridgment both these relations suppose, of the personal freedom of those in subjection. In this way, are both relations made to subserve interests for time and eternity, precious to society and to the bodies and souls of the major portion of society. In the providence of God, these bondmen have been torn from their country, and placed under Christian masters for their salvation. Numbers of them have been joined to Christ, while their brethren at home are worshippers of the devil. But how much faster would their illumination and sanctification have been secured, if believing masters had acknowledged this sacred

relation they sustain to them, dedicated them to God in infancy, and trained them up for him. How would the reproach of slavery itself have been well nigh rolled away, and the sacred influence of religion have blessed with its happy purifying power the hut of the servant and the dwelling of his master? How would the providence of God, in bringing them to this Christian land, to learn the ways of peace, been more signally vindicated in the eyes of all mankind? When a Christian man finds himself in the condition of Abraham, the father of the faithful, i. e., of believers, he must follow his example wherein it has been crowned with the divine approval. This being ascertained, the conscientious man, must ever regard him as a pattern, and be found walking in the steps of faithful Abraham. He would so have many proofs of the divine approbation. "Shall I hide from Abraham, saith the Lord, that thing which I do: For I know him, that he will command his children and his *household* after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him." The master is responsible for all his house. This responsibility, Joshua, another ancient master, felt, and made this noble determination: "But as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." And Solomon, who in his great prosperity, got him servants and maidens, and had servants born in his house, so that he became great and increased more than all that were in Jerusalem before him, bestowed especial attention upon his servants. "The sitting of his servants" is mentioned as one of the things which awoke the admiration of the queen of Sheba; and doubtless he, in his better days, paid great attention to their religious well-being. When he repented of his sin, he, doubtless, as his illustrious father did, when he came up from conveying the ark from the house of Obed Edom, "returned to bless his house;" nor was the blessing, in either case, confined to the children, it must have been extended to the servants of the family also. A shame will it be to us, an everlasting reproach, if our servants shall be no otherwise situated as to religious and church privileges, than those of the men of the world, which have their portion in this life.

In the arrangement, by which the servants of believing masters, were acknowledged as in the covenant, and enti-

tled to its seals as well as their children, we see distinguished proofs of the divine wisdom.

There was a reason, in the nature of the case, for this arrangement; for with them, as with us, the care of their children devolved much upon their servants; and unless these servants were educated in religious things, in some measure as their children were educated, they would corrupt their infant offspring, and train them up in the ways of evil. And in no other way could they be a holy people, than by the religious education of their children and servants together, which was secured by the divine ordinance, and the holy covenant of God, by embracing them alike in the visible church, and affixing to them equally the visible sign of the covenant, the seal of the righteousness which is by faith.

Our children catch the very dialect of our servants, and lisp all their perversions of the English tongue, long before they learn to speak it correctly. The irreligion and vice which prevail among them, become common to them and our own offspring. And not only is this true of our domestic servants, but those who may be more removed from our immediate families, exert their corrupting influence over those members of the same, with whom they casually or in the necessary conduct of business, are brought in contact. We need, for our children's sake, as well as for the sake of those whom providence has placed beneath our guardianship and care, and who toil for us and attend us in our hours of sickness and calamity, to obey this ancient divine institution, which no subsequent legislation has ever repealed. And, especially when this system of domestic slavery, is now by the entire civilized world, ourselves excepted, violently impugned, and we resort to the divine word for shelter and defence from the angry arguments of men, we should see to it that we place it on a scriptural basis, and that by our conduct towards our servants, we may claim for ourselves the divine approbation and protection.

In conclusion, we remark, that we have occasion to know that the views we have now expressed, will have to contend, not only with many practical difficulties in carrying them out, but with many objections in the minds of our brethren. The subject has been up for the last two years before the

Presbytery of Charleston, and the Synod of South Carolina, and though a decision, favorable to these views, was given by the votes of the great majority of the brethren of Synod present, it was manifest that difficulties were felt by some, as to the practical working of the plan. In our view, these difficulties all arise out of our own neglect, through all these years that are past. The church has been unmindful of its duty and its solemn obligations, through two or three generations, and it is hard to repair the ruins of so many years, to recover from the sins which long habit has fastened upon us. All these objections, demand an attentive consideration, and we feel called upon to meet them as far as may be in our power.

We suppose, then, it will be granted, that with minor differences, the slavery of the patriarchal and Jewish period of history, is substantially the same as that now in existence. The institution, in its early commencement, may have originated in violence, or it may have been, as Alison in his history of Europe remarks, voluntary on the part of those submitting to it, and a benefit to them rather than an evil. In whatever way it originated, it was treated as an existing relation, taken up and protected by the ecclesiastical covenant made with Abraham, and continued down, unproved, through the period of inspiration. The Christian church was engrafted upon the Jewish, or rather upon the patriarchal, and the Abrahamic covenant is still the charter of the church. It seems to us to follow, that men finding themselves in the situation of Abraham, are now required to do what he, by this covenant, was required to do, and, therefore, to apply the seal of the covenant, which now is baptism, to those to whom he was bound to apply it, discharging, at the same time, those duties of religious nurture, which it implies.

It is objected to this, that if we adopt the provisions of that covenant, we must baptize not only our infant but our adult slaves, on the profession of our own faith in Christ. To this we have already, in part, replied. We further add, that the genius of the former dispensations, was different from the genius of this. Those were designed to embrace the seed of Abraham, according to the flesh, and this the spiritual seed of Abraham alone. A historic faith, therefore, was all which was secured under those dispensations,

in such as were admitted to sealing ordinances. To secure this, we have seen pains were taken to instruct all who were capable of instruction, till they understood and received the doctrines of Judaism, before administering the rite of circumcision. Thus, proselytes and their adult servants, were prepared for circumcision and baptism in the Jewish church. And servants, purchased by Jewish masters, if not ready to give their intellectual assent to the doctrines and usages of Judaism at once, were instructed and dealt with for a twelvemonth, and if impracticable, were sold back again to the pagan nations, from whom they had been purchased. Even Abraham's grown servants, who were circumcised at once by him, had probably been years in his possession, and all the while taught a knowledge of the true God. They were trained, instructed, catechised, and, it is to be presumed, cheerfully submitted to a painful rite, on the conviction of its propriety, as a religious ordinance appointed by God. Now, according to the genius of the new dispensation, none have a right, they being of adult years, to membership in the church, except those upon whose hearts the work of regeneration has taken place. With infants, the rule of admission is otherwise. Their connection with believing parents, constitutes them members of Christ's fold, which membership is acknowledged, not constituted in their baptism. In like manner, the connection of infant bond-servants with believing masters, did constitute them members of the church, which membership was acknowledged in their circumcision, and should now be acknowledged in their baptism. We can conceive no more evil, arising from recognizing this connection of infant servants with believing masters, as constituting a reason for membership in the visible church, than the connection of infants with their believing parents. It matters not how the connection is formed, whether by blood or otherwise. If God ordains the connection, though different in its nature, as constituting the channel through which covenant mercies and privileges shall flow, man has no right to withstand him, impugn his wisdom, or annul his ordinance. Grace runs not in the blood, sin, not piety, is transmitted, in accordance with the law of carnal descent. It is the fact, that both child and servant are dependent on the master, — that he has both within his power, represents both, is

responsible for both, and accountable for both by all law, human and divine, has a property in both, which the *parents* of the infant servant have not. It is because the master is the head of his entire household, of his children and his servant's children, and not the parents of these servants, the head of their own offspring, that membership in the church is made, in this ancient and still binding covenant, to be dependent on the master's faith. The contrary doctrine to this, would seem to sweep away infant baptism altogether. For, if one entire class of subjects are to be supposed debarred from the baptismal rite, under the new dispensation of the old Abrahamic covenant, why not the other. If the infant born in bondage, why not the infant born in civil freedom. Is it urged, that in the New Testament, the promise is said to be to you and your children? It is replied, the language was no other in the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, yet the covenant plainly included more, and its seal was more widely applied. Is the language of Paul, "The believing husband is sanctified by the wife, &c., else were your children unclean, but now are they holy," adduced to show that the covenant embraces the children alone? We answer, the question there was respecting the permanency of the marriage relation only, and not at all respecting the relation of servants and master, the mention of the ecclesiastical state of the fruits of the marriage, was alone apposite to the Apostle's argument, and its mention does not show that the ecclesiastical relation of the infant servant had terminated. Is it urged that Pædobaptist writers almost never bring this particular question into view, and seem to regard it as excluded, it will be remembered that these men, in modern times, have not ordinarily been holders of slaves, and have not felt that this question had any present interest to the church.

Is it pleaded that now, when different views prevail through the community, to a large extent, on the whole subject of baptism, and of those who are entitled to it, new difficulties exist in the administration of infant baptism? We answer, it is manifest that these different views have arisen, in a great measure, from the abuses which have crept into the church, in the practice of infant baptism, and from the erroneous notions of those who have held it, and further, that the errors in opinion on this whole subject, now

prevalent, cannot absolve us from our duty. Is it still pleaded that great difficulties lie in the way of training up our servants in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? We answer, that we must do so, or we cannot train up our *children* in the fear of God; we must educate, in some measure, our whole dependants together, that any portion of these may be educated aright; and, further, that the same difficulties pressed the master under the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, without absolving him from his duty; and that if a conscientious master could discharge his duty then, he can, with sufficient effort and self-denial, discharge his duty now.

It may be asked, what shall be done where the parent of the infant servant opposes its baptism, either because hostile to all religion, or because a member of a church hostile to pædobaptist views. Shall the master in this case have the baptismal rite administered to the infants of these servants? We conceive that he should, because on him primarily rests the responsibility of their education in religion, as well as in relation to all things else connected with their welfare. Because, further, infant circumcision was a divine ordinance, and no hostility of slave parents, from whatever cause arising, could absolve the master. Because it is the master's duty to repress the opposition of the one servant, who is hostile to all religion, and to explain to the other his own religious views and obligations, and to show him his own sincerity and conviction of duty in the matter; and we venture to say, if this were affectionately and tenderly done, there is hardly a Christian servant to be found who would allow himself to stand opposed to the wishes of the master. If it be asked whether the master has a right to interfere in the religious opinions of his servant, we answer yes, even as he has to interfere with the religious opinions of his own children, and it is his duty to interfere. He is bound to guard him against all mischievous errors, and to lead him to all truth. His interference with the servant's children, to secure their religious training in connection with the church of Christ, is a solemn duty. He judges for his servants and their children in all other things, even to the questions how, where, with whom they shall live, and what through life they shall do, and it is the least of all like usurpation to judge for them here.

Every Hebrew master did control, and was commanded to control, his servant in religious things, to bring him into the covenant, to cause him to eat the passover, and to oblige him to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, a command of the decalogue binding still on us.

But it has been said that the relation of master and servant is *sui generis*, a civil relation and not ecclesiastical, and the church, therefore, has no right to interfere in relation to it in any way. We answer, that slavery, in its essential character, is neither a civil nor an ecclesiastical institution, but one wholly domestic. It arises in the family, is created by the wants of the family, and is under the primary control of its head, with whom, in the first instance, it originated. In all countries where it has existed, it has been acknowledged as a domestic institution. Slaves are a part of the οἶκος, οἰκία, familia, domus, household, of their master, as truly as are their master's children. They are called οἰκέται οἰκίῳι, familiares, domestici, *benay baith*, domestics, "sons of the house." When Abraham circumcised his family, he held only the family relation. He was a component part of no civil government. When men unite in a civil capacity, the institutions they form recognize and protect the relations before existing; and if legislation has respect to servants, it has also to children. And so in the church. The church creates no social relations not before in existence in human society; it recognizes and regulates, where they are not sinful in their nature, those it finds in being.

But it has been said that Abraham was a type of Christ, and that because he was so, all connected with Abraham were in union with the church of God, because all who are joined to Christ are constituent parts of the church which is his body: and though in some things Abraham was an example, in others, in which he was a type, he was not so, and it is inferred that, in the circumcision of his slaves, though he acted under a divine command, he is no example to us.

Our first remark in relation to this, is, that there is something sacred in a type where it really exists, which makes us discourse of it with an awe, which we do not feel on ordinary topics, even of a religious nature. We would be exceedingly unwilling to deny the existence of a type where one by the divine appointment was intended, and unwilling

to assert the existence of one where none was meant. The entire subject of types is intrinsically difficult, and one on which both a skeptical and an imaginative turn of mind are alike liable to err. We do not suppose that mere resemblance between two things constitutes one of them the type of the other; resemblance in itself would more properly point out the constancy and uniformity of the divine laws, than that one thing is symbolical or admonitory of another. "It is essential to a type," says Bishop Vanmildert, "in the scriptural acceptation of the term, that there should be competent evidence of the divine *intention* in the correspondence between it and the antitype; a matter not left to the imagination of the expositor to discover, but resting upon *solid* proof from the Scripture itself, that this was really the case." (44). In this, more than in almost any thing else, the history of the past makes us feel the necessity of a divine warrant to enable us, with certainty, to declare the existence of a type. It is further essential to a type that it should be an adumbration of the thing typified. And it seems to us that it should not be another instance of the same thing it is supposed to typify, but something which, while it is similar to it, is still specifically different from it. If it be an instance of the same thing it is thought to typify, it is but an example, it may be the first in a series, and therefore very important, as revealing to us the method which is to be pursued in all succeeding instances of the same thing.

Now there are two admitted points in which Abraham stands related to us. In the first place, as an *example*. He is the example and pattern of our justification. So the Apostle reasons. (45). And we who are justified "walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham." (46). For this reason, because of the resemblance between us and him, in this respect, and because he was the first one in this dispensation of the covenant of grace, was he the "father of them that believe." (47). So Jabal and Jubal, sons of Lamech, with some unimportant modifications of sense, were respectively the fathers of those who dwelt in tents, and who handled the harp and organ. (48). He is

(44) Bampton Lectt., p. 199.

(45) Romans iv.

(46) Verse 12.

(47) Verse 11; see also Gal. iii.

(48) Genesis v.

the example whom we should imitate in our faith, who believed even against hope, and received the blessings which God had promised: It is on this footing of an example, divinely appointed, as has already been seen, that we are disposed to base, in great part, our duty, to present our children and servants in baptism. It is an example which has been followed by all who have been acknowledged as in the Abrahamic covenant down to the times of Christ, and is still of binding force, unless God shall, by some express command, repeal the usage as the law of the church, and inform us that the example of Abraham, our father, is not in this to be followed. But in vain have we searched the Scriptures for any such command or declaration.

But Abraham stands related to us *as head of the covenant*. In this point of view, what was proper to the members of this covenant, and indeed the blessings of the covenant itself, are sometimes also affirmed of him. He represented, in fact, the covenant itself in its entire fulness. It was said of him, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." But, when we have this promise drawn out in its true meaning, we find it said that in his seed all the families of the earth shall be blessed. And when we still further hear the Apostle, pointing out the main import of this promise, we find him commenting thus: "He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy Seed, which is Christ." (49.) But the head of a covenant is not properly a type, as a federal head of those whom he represents. As head in this gracious covenant, he was the father of many nations, (which his name Abraham denotes,) not only of the Jewish tribes, but of the myriads out of every language, kindred and tongue, who walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham, and are redeemed through the promised seed, Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham.

These two points, appear to exhaust all that the scripture teaches us of the relation subsisting between Abraham and ourselves, nor do we find divines, in general, regarded Abraham as a type of Christ and of our relation to him. Macknight speaks of him as a type of believers; (50) and Frey, whose book on types is the only one expressly on the

(49) Galatians iii: 16.

(50) Apost. Epist. p.p. 252, 713.

subject, at this moment at hand, says, divines do not consider him a type of Christ. (51.) Yet, in many respects, the stipulations of the *covenant*, of which he was the head, were typical. Isaac, in particular, was a type of Christ, in many respects, and also of believers; and the natural seed of Abraham, were types of the spiritual seed; and the natural and civil blessings secured in the covenant, of the spritual and eternal ones this spiritual seed are to enjoy. The offering up of Isaac in particular, has been considered as typical of the one great sacrifice. But in this, Isaac was the type of Christ, the second person in the glorious God-head, and Abraham, an example of overcoming faith, and not a type of either the Father or the Son, though some, as Mr. Frey, make Abraham's act, a striking emblem of the love of God the Father, in the gift of his Son to suffer and die. This is the only personal transaction, we recollect, in Abraham's life, to which a typical import could well be given. It may be true, that all covenants, which God enters into with men, since the fall, rest, ultimately, on the merits of Christ, but this will not prove the head of the covenant a type of Christ. Noah may have been designed as a type of our Redeemer, for his name, and the hopes expressed by his father Lamech, may be interpreted to confirm this supposition. But, the covenant entered into with him, did not necessarily constitute him so. The ark, more properly, and the salvation effected by it from temporal death, was a type of Christ and his salvation, rather than Noah. Both he and Abraham, were examples of eminent faith, which examples we are bound to follow, as far as they themselves followed the command of God.

But, even admitting the typical relation of Abraham and those connected with him, to the Messiah and those connected with him; if the argument for the baptism of servants must fall to the ground, because of this, so also must the argument for the baptism of infants, so far as this rests on the covenant made with Abraham. But we see no other foundation for it, than the principle recognized in that covenant. The declaration, that the promise is unto you and your children, found in the New Testament, the federal holiness of children, whose parents are in the church,

(51) J. S. C. F. Frey, *Scripture Types*, vol. ii., Lect. xxv.

and the declaration of Christ, respecting children, that of such is the kingdom of heaven, seem to be only recognitions of the principle of the older economies, which is traced back to the Abrahamic covenant, where it was first publicly recognized by God.

But if all connected with Abraham were in the covenant, because this is so of all who are connected with Christ, of whom he is affirmed to be a type, our argument is valid still, on scriptural grounds. Those connected with him, whether as children or servants, were sealed with the seal of circumcision, the seal of the righteousness which he himself had through faith. In the generations which succeeded, the children and servants of his posterity bore the sign of circumcision in their flesh, because of their connection with him. But, how were proselytes, *their* children and servants circumcised? Here there was no natural connection with Abraham. They possessed faith in Abraham's God, and in the promised seed. And why are not all believers now equally proselytes to the faith of Abraham, which he had, being yet uncircumcised? Why are not they, *their* children and servants, equally in the covenant, and equally entitled to its seals? Are not all believers still his true seed, and in the covenant made with him? Do not those of them, who are masters of bond-servants and parents, sustain precisely the domestic relations he did? We ask then for the warrant from above for declaring a part of those who sustain these connections out of the covenant, and another part in. Or, if the circumcision of servants was typical of something to come, which the circumcision of infants was not, we ask for the anti-type, which being come, releases us from the necessity of performing this typical rite.

It may be objected, that in acknowledging infant servants, as entitled to baptism, on the faith and suretyship of their masters, we introduce a new element, not recognized in our Confession of Faith, which declares that "the visible church consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children," and that "the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized," thus excluding the infants of servants who are not believers in Christ. Our answer to this has, for substance, been given, that when the Westminster, and other early con-

fessions of the Reformed churches were written, this particular subject was not a practical one to the framers of these confessions. They were not holders of slaves, and this question did not come before them. This confession was adopted by the Synod of Philadelphia, without change, in 1729. But, in 1786, the decisions were given on the subject of this article, which we have before quoted, in answer to the overture from the Presbytery of Donnegal. The Donnegal Presbytery, at that time, occupied the geographical position now occupied by the Presbyteries of Baltimore and Carlisle, into which it was that very year divided, and the institution of domestic slavery then pervaded the entire bounds of the Presbyterian church, both in the North and the South. The body which gave the decision, was a body of men who were intimately connected with this domestic relation.

As to the failure of direct historic evidence, in favor of the baptism of infant servants, from the cessation of the Jewish church to the times of Augustine, we can only say that Augustine speaks of it as a custom in existence; that it resulted, in his day, from the conviction that baptism came in place of circumcision, a conviction which we can trace up through the earliest fathers; that the same break in the historic proof exists in relation to the baptism of the infant children of believers, though for a shorter period. If the occurrence of intervals of time, during which the traces of an institution or custom fail from history, could prove its non-existence, the argument for the weekly Sabbath, as an institution perpetually observed by the people of God, would utterly fail, for there are no express notices of it, from Adam to Moses, a period of 2500 years, nor from Moses to David, an interval 500 years in duration.

We have thus considered the principal objections we have heard urged against our argument, and none of them seem to us to overthrow it. The greatest one of all, appears to arise from the practical difficulty of carrying out a long neglected duty. Yet, that it is practicable to do so, is plain from the case of Abraham, who, though a more extensive holder of slaves than any of us, could, and did perform for them all that circumcision required him to do, and it required of him all that baptism requires of us. He could do

it, and obtain the approbation of God for his faithful performance of the duty. If he, and other Hebrew masters, could discharge these obligations, so can we. Not the same amount of training is required from us, in relation to them, as is required in relation to our own children, for the same amount cannot now, nor ever could be bestowed. In our belief, all difficulties would vanish, or be gradually overcome, by conscientious perseverance. It will take years, and may require a generation, to place this matter in the favorable position in which it should be placed. God requires us to do what we can. He certainly requires us to attend to the religious education of our servants, whether living in immediate connection with ourselves and children, or more remote. If we are not willing to meet our obligations here, we are not worthy of the responsible trust he has devolved upon us, by bringing so many of our race beneath our power. He requires it of us, as really as he requires of us the religious education of our own children. We can provide for their religious training. Where the parents are pious, we can conduct it through them. We can furnish to all our servants the preached word. We can show them that we take an interest habitually in their religious welfare. We can pray with and for them. We can have them regularly taught in the doctrines and duties of the Christian faith. Less than this, we are not permitted to do, by our obligations to them as men—by our responsibility to them as our dependents—by the requirements made on us by God in his holy word.

To every reader of these pages, then, and especially to all resident in its immediate bounds, we commend the resolutions of the Synod of South Carolina, at its last sessions, as expressive of the duty of the church and its members on this important subject.

“1. *Resolved*, That it is the duty of believing masters to train up their servants, as well as their children, in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

“2. *Resolved*, That the principles of the Abrahamic covenant, as to the circumcision of servants, is still in force in reference to the infant offspring of those who stand to us in this relation; and that as baptism succeeds to circumcision, it is the duty of masters to dedicate such serv-

ants to God in the ordinance of baptism, and to do all in their power to train them up in a knowledge of the truth, and in the way of salvation through Christ.

"3. *Resolved*, That though there are great and manifest difficulties in carrying out the principles of these resolutions, these difficulties have chiefly resulted from the long continued neglect of believing masters and of the church, and that these difficulties must be gradually overcome by continued and persevering efforts. (52).

The language of the able and good Bishop Berkeley, used by him more than a hundred years ago, in relation to these very plantations in America, is solemn and sad. "To this," says he, speaking of a cause which we trust does not now exist, "may be imputed the small care that hath been taken to convert the negroes of our plantations, who, to the infamy of *England*, and scandal of the world, continue heathen under Christian masters, and in Christian countries. Which could never be, if our planters were rightly instructed and made sensible, that they disappointed their own baptism by denying it to those who belong to them: that it would be of advantage to their affairs, to have slaves who should obey in all things their masters according to the flesh, not with eye service as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, as fearing God: that gospel liberty consists with temporal servitude; and that their slaves would only become better slaves by being Christian." (53).

Though we believe our servants are far more enlightened and Christian than they were then, and are many removed from heathenism now, yet the language is still too sadly true; with all our doings, we do too little for them. We are too partial, too inefficient, too languid in our efforts for their salvation. The day has come for more energetic action, more ample instrumentalities, more self-denying labor to bring them to a knowledge of Christ, who hath made of one blood all nations of the earth.

(52) Minutes of Synod of South Carolina for 1846, p. 21.

(53) Berkeley's Works, Vol. II., p. 422.

ARTICLE IV.

AN EXPOSITION OF MATTHEW XVI., 18, 19.

The Evangelist informs us that "When Jesus came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

Upon these memorable words, addressed by our Lord to the Apostle Peter, rests the great doctrine of the Pope's supremacy; from hence the Bishop of Rome derives his right "to oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Papists contend, that the Saviour here confers a supremacy upon Peter, makes him Prince of the Apostles, the foundation upon which the church would be built. Now Peter, they say, possessing this exalted power, enjoying such eminent distinction, was made Bishop of Rome, that having, as the vicar of Christ, exercised his authority, he died, leaving to his successor in the Episcopal Chair that supremacy which his Lord had bestowed upon him. From this brief statement, it appears that the supremacy of the Pope rests upon three assumptions, either one of which, being shown to be false, the whole fabric falls to the ground.

If the Romanists fail to prove either that the Lord conferred a primacy upon Peter, or that he was Bishop of Rome, or that his authority descended to his successors in

office, then it must be acknowledged that the extravagant claims of the Pope are without foundation, are "like the baseless fabric of a vision." We will now briefly examine these three positions. What reasons have we for believing that the Lord Jesus made Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, his vicar upon earth, and the head of the church? We will not anticipate what must be said in giving an exposition of the words to which allusion has been already made; in the sequel we think that it will be shown that the papists can derive no support from them. Let us see whether the Scriptures give us any reason to suppose that Peter was the first of the Apostles. If Peter held supremacy over his brethren, it is very evident that the Apostle Paul was entirely ignorant of it, because he says of himself that he was not "a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles." At Antioch he "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed" for conduct which proceeded from an unmanly fear of the Jews. If, then, Peter was prince and head of the church, the great Apostle to the Gentiles was guilty of insubordination, was highly criminal in refusing to honor him whom Christ had commanded to honor. The other Apostles on no occasion acknowledged the pretended primacy of Peter. It was but a short time after our Saviour addressed to him the remarkable words from which such monstrous conclusions have been drawn, that we find the disciples inquiring "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" Did the Lord point them to Peter as their prince, did he tell them to reverence him as his future vicar upon earth? On the contrary, he taught them that their greatness consisted in humility. Having taken a little child and placed him in the midst of them, he said, "Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven."

We ask if the Pope, seated upon his throne at Rome, with more than royal magnificence, before whom thousands prostrate themselves, and who arrogates for himself the right to depose kings and give away nations, can lay any claim to this badge of supremacy?

The Apostles, it is certain, acknowledged no superiority in Peter, when they were deliberating in the council at Jerusalem, upon questions which agitated the church. He did not preside upon that occasion, he did not with authority

pronounce his infallible decision. It was James who presided over the body, it was James who delivered the opinion of the council which was to regulate the conduct of Christians. It seems that the brethren at Jerusalem knew nothing of Peter's supremacy, whose opinions they were bound to reverence and adopt—because, after he had preached the Gospel to Cornelius, and had baptized him and those that were with him, they of the circumcision contended with him concerning the propriety of his conduct, and were not satisfied until he explained most fully that he was actuated in so doing by the Divine command. We do not read that Peter, seated in pomp upon his Episcopal Throne, sent the Apostles to preach the Gospel; on the contrary, *he is sent* by them to Samaria, with John.

In his Epistles we find him advancing no claims to supremacy, asserting no superiority over his brethren. "The elders which are among you," writes the humble Apostle, "I exhort, *who am also an elder*," and at the same time charges them not to be "lords over God's heritage." Is this the style of his letters, who, claiming universal power, rules with despotic sway over the church, pretending to be the successor of the fisherman of Galilee?

Having now shown that the supremacy of Peter has no foundation in the sacred Scriptures, we will inquire whether he was ever bishop of Rome. No one, we think, will be so reckless as to assert that the word of God gives us any reason for so believing. The desperate effort which papists make to prove their position from the expression which occurs in the first Epistle of Peter, "The church that is at Babylon saluteth you," does not demand even a passing consideration. The whole evidence, then, of such a fact, rests upon tradition—upon the writings of men who lived many years after it. Now we may safely say, that there is no witness whose testimony is more uncertain than tradition, none whose evidence should be more carefully sifted. When, therefore, we examine its testimony, we find such ludicrous circumstances connected with Peter's residence at Rome, such ridiculous miracles that none can believe, except those who can swallow the monstrous dogma of transubstantiation, who can give implicit credence to the lying legends of priests and monks. Yet these rest upon the same evidence with the pretended fact that Peter was

Bishop of Rome. If, then, we believe the one upon this authority, we must likewise believe that at the gates of Rome the flying Peter met his Saviour; we must believe that the devil, filled with rage, lifted him in the air; and, with the blinded papist, we must reverence the impressions which the knees of the Apostle have left in the solid granite. (1). But the Scriptures do not leave us in uncertainty upon this point—they furnish us with abundant reasons for supposing that Peter was never Bishop of Rome. The very office of an Apostle militates against such a supposition, he was not to confine his labors to any particular place, but was to be a “witness to Christ in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.” (2). If, however, we should believe that it was probable that an Apostle was placed at the capital of the civilized world, it would be most natural to suppose that that Apostle was Paul. He was emphatically the Apostle to the Gentiles—to him was given the exalted privilege of proclaiming the Gospel to the heathen, whilst it is notorious that to Peter was committed the Gospel of the circumcision, that is, the office of preaching to the Jews. Upon the theory of our opponents, the conduct of Paul, when he wrote his Epistles, is most unaccountable. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, the vicar of Christ upon earth, the rock upon which the foundations of the church were laid, sits in his chair at Rome, holding in his hands the keys of the kingdom of heaven, receiving the homage of all the faithful, and yet Paul, the devoted servant of the Lord Jesus Christ, in writing an Epistle to Rome, sends salutations to several Christians by name, who resided in the imperial city, yet makes no allusion to the representative of his Master, to the visible head of the church. Moreover, this same Apostle resided at least two years at Rome, and from this place wrote several Epistles, in none of which does he make mention of Peter. But in substantiating our position, we are not compelled to rely upon negative evidence alone—we are not confined to the proofs arising from the silence of Paul—if we mistake not, he virtually declares that Peter was not at Rome. In his Epistle to

(1) Bower's History of the Popes. Cave's Lives of the Apostles.

(2) Barrow's Supremacy of the Pope, Supposition iii.

the Colossians, written from that city, he says of Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Jesus, which is called Justus, "*These only* are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, *which have been a comfort unto me.*" Strange language to proceed from an inspired writer, if the theory of the Romanists be true. What, Peter, the universal Bishop, the head of the church, residing at Rome, gives no aid to Paul in his arduous labors, affords him no comfort in his trials! Who that believes in the zeal of the bold fisherman of Galilee, who that values the communion of the saints upon earth, can suppose that the Apostle Paul would have so written, if Peter had really been at Rome, and was faithfully attending to the duties of his office?

But if for the sake of argument, we admit that Peter was really the prince of the Apostles, and was bishop of Rome, we challenge our adversaries to prove that his power has descended to the future bishops of Rome. If this be so, then we are compelled to believe that John, the beloved disciple, who survived the other Apostles thirty years, was subject to men, who were the successors of Peter in his office. Now, it is a fact, altogether undeniable, that the ancient church knew nothing of an universal bishop; if so, why did a bishop of Rome, Pope Gregory the Great, anathematize the bishop of Constantinople for assuming that title. But we deem it useless to dwell upon this subject, we regard it as an insult to the understanding, to prove that Pope Alexander VI., and many of his predecessors and successors in office—men steeped in pollution and crime, could not be the representatives of Christ upon earth.

We stated in the beginning of this article, that the extravagant claims of the Pope, rest upon three assumptions, either one of which, being shown to be false, the whole papal fabric falls to the ground. We have examined these positions, separately, and if we mistake not, have proved that each one is without foundation in the sacred scriptures. Now, we ask, in all candor, if the papal doctrine be true—if our salvation depends upon acknowledging the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, would not this important doctrine have been clearly revealed—would we have been left in doubt upon a subject of such momentous importance? But, it is said that this doctrine is clearly revealed—papists contend that it is undeniably contained in the memorable words addressed by

our Saviour to the Apostle Peter. Admit, however, all that they contend for—admit that our Saviour really conferred a supremacy upon Peter, they have still to prove that he was bishop of Rome, and that his power has descended to his successors in office. But, passing by such considerations, we will now endeavor to give the true exposition of our Saviour's words.

The first question which arises is, to whom did our Lord address himself—to whom were these great promises made? Most Protestant commentators, following the example of some distinguished fathers, contend, that as Peter was the spokesman of the company, and only expressed the general confession of the Apostles, that the reply of Christ was through him addressed to them all. With due deference to such high authority, we are compelled to believe that this position is untenable—that to Peter, and to him alone, our Lord, on this occasion, addressed himself. We cannot conceive how language could be more explicit—how one individual could be more clearly distinguished from others, than was done on this occasion. Christ puts to them the question, "Whom say men that I am?" "They said," that is, it was the reply of them all—"Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets." "But whom say ye that I am?"

The disciples seem all to have been ready with an answer to the first question, and to have replied without hesitation. To the second, but one replied—Peter in the exercise of strong faith, answered and said, "thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Our Lord then singles him out, and addresses him personally, "Blessed art thou Simon Bar-jona.—And I say also unto THEE, That thou art Peter—And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

If, then, Simon, the son of Jona, was not personally addressed—if to Peter these promises were not made, language seems to lose its meaning—it appears impossible to single out one, by any thing that may be said, from the company around. 'Tis true that Peter, on two other occasions, spoke in the name of all, but then, there was no doubt that he really did so. Other considerations might be urged in

support of this position; but the words of scripture, it seems to us, are sufficient to convince the candid inquirer after truth, that Peter, alone, was addressed by the Saviour.

“And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church.” Upon the interpretation of these words, two prominent opinions are maintained, both of which may be explained in full accordance with the sacred scriptures, and with the Protestant faith. Peter, Greek Πέτρος, was the name given to Simon by Christ, when he called him to be a disciple. In addressing him, he says, “*συ εις Πέτρος και επι ταυτη τη πετρα,*” thou art Peter and upon this rock—upon what rock? Upon Peter, say some—upon Christ, the rock confessed, say others. Let us examine the first opinion. If the church was built upon Peter, it was, unquestionably, in a subordinate and figurative sense, for inspiration assures us that “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” But there is a sense, in which the Apostles were the foundations of the church. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, we read, “Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God, and are built upon *the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.*” The beloved disciple, on the isle of Patmos, was permitted to behold “that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God.” In describing her fair proportions, he says, “And the wall of the city had *twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.*”

The question now arises, in what sense were the Apostles the foundations of the Christian church? It is very evident, that it was not built upon them, because “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” He, alone, is that “*tried stone, that precious corner stone, that sure foundation, which has been laid in Zion.*” The Apostle Paul, we think, teaches in what sense the Apostles were the foundations of the church, “According to the grace of God, which is given unto me, as a wise master builder, I have *laid the foundation.*”

How did he lay the foundation? By preaching Christ, by proclaiming the doctrines of the cross, by building upon the corner stone laid in Zion.” In this sense, and in no

other, were the twelve Apostles of the Lamb the foundations of that glorious city, the New Jerusalem. Bearing in mind this scriptural view of the subject, let us turn to the words now under consideration.

Admitting that Peter was the rock upon which Christ promised to build his church, we have here a glorious promise made to that Apostle. And we have no hesitation in asserting, that on this occasion the Lord Jesus did assign to him an important part, in laying the foundation of the Christian church. Now, does history give us any reason to suppose that such a promise was ever made, or being made, was ever fulfilled? If we turn to the Acts of the Apostles, we will find that Peter performed a conspicuous part in the first promulgation of the Gospel. On the day of Pentecost, he preached the first sermon under the new dispensation, and three thousand souls were awakened and embraced the blessed Saviour. A marked distinction had previously been drawn between the Jews and the Gentiles, the Gospel had only been preached to the former, the latter were regarded as unclean, as having no interest in the great salvation. To Peter, was committed the distinguished privilege of first proclaiming that Christ had broken down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile—to him was given the honor of first declaring that no man was “common or unclean,” but that every one, whether Jew or Gentile, was invited to look upon “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.” Now, if the Apostles, as has been shown, were called the foundations of the church, because they first preached the great doctrines of the cross—first built upon the corner stone laid in Zion—Peter, by way of eminence, might be called the foundation of the church in this sense, because he first preached the Gospel to the Jews—he first proclaimed the glad tidings of salvation to the Gentiles. If, then, it can be proved, as many learned and pious Protestants suppose, that Peter and the “*πετρα*” are identical, we can give this passage a very natural interpretation, and one in entire accordance with other portions of the sacred scriptures. Admitting the position which Papists labor so hard to establish, that Peter was the rock upon which the church was built, we ask if the words of our Saviour give any warrant to the bishop of Rome for his exorbitant claims, for his extravagant preten-

sions? If they conferred a supremacy upon Peter, it was altogether personal, and could not, from the very nature of the case, descend to another. His supremacy consisted in being the first to proclaim the Gospel both to the Jews and Gentiles; that work once performed, could never be repeated; he could have no successor in this office. O! how unlike the great Apostle is he, who, surrounded with the insignia of royalty, dwells in luxurious indolence at Rome, never breaking the bread of life to his starving people, condescending, only after the lapse of ages, to preach even those doctrines which his church has pronounced true. Is he anxious to imitate Peter—does he desire to be his successor?—let him descend from his royal throne—let him leave his magnificent palace, and lay the foundations of the faith in heathen lands—let him go to the dark corners of the earth, and tell the Mahomedan and the Pagan, that Christ has died, and that sinners may be saved through him. Until he does these things, let him not pretend to be the successor of him, whose greatest glory was to open the kingdom of heaven for the Jew and for the Gentile.

Now, although it may be said that Peter, in a certain sense, was the rock upon which the church was built, and that our Lord, in the words under consideration, bestowed upon him an exalted privilege, yet it seems to us that this honor consisted, not in making him the “*πετρα*,” but in placing into his hands “the keys of the kingdom of heaven.”

It will be readily perceived that the church is here compared to a city, built upon a rock, and surrounded, as in ancient times, by a lofty wall, the only entrance to which, was through massive gates, which were, usually, strongly locked and bolted. The gates of the church, built upon the rock, had hitherto been closed against the Gentiles, by Jewish rites and ceremonies; before the coming of Christ, if they wished to enter it, they were compelled to be circumcised, and to observe the law of Moses.

Now, a great change was soon to take place, a new dispensation was to be ushered in, and these things were to be required no longer. Peter was the instrument appointed by God to effect these things—to him was awarded the honor of opening the church to believers of every nation, and for this purpose “the keys of the kingdom of heaven” were

placed in his hands. Let us turn to the Acts of the Apostles, and learn when this important event transpired, and how the Apostle executed his mission. Peter, dwelling in Joppa, at the house of one Simon, a tanner, goes upon the housetop, at the sixth hour, for the purpose of prayer. Whilst there, he falls into a trance, and under the symbol of a sheet let down from heaven, enclosing animals, regarded as unclean by the Levitical law, he is taught by God, that there is no longer a distinction between Jew and Gentile—that he should, henceforth, call no man common or unclean. As soon as he had recovered from his trance, messengers, sent from Cornelius, a centurion and a Gentile, waited upon him, requesting him to visit their master. Obedient to the heavenly vision, the Apostle went to the house of Cornelius, and preached Jesus to him and to all about him. And lo, as he was preaching, the Holy Ghost descended upon them, regenerated their hearts, and gave them faith to embrace the Saviour. When Peter said, “Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we,” and when these Gentiles were baptized in the name of Jesus, then were the Jewish bolts, which locked the gates of the church, drawn aside, and the kingdom of heaven was opened to the penitent believer of every nation. We are fully aware, that in giving this interpretation to “the power of the keys,” about which so much has been written, we differ from the majority of those whose opinions deserve to be respected. It is most generally believed that the power of the keys, and the power of binding and loosing, are identical. But it seems to us that by adhering to this interpretation, we do not obtain the full meaning of our Saviour’s words. The keys do appear to have been given to Peter alone, and for a specific object—that object was accomplished when the church was opened to Gentiles as well as Jews. If this be true, we readily perceive that Peter could have no successor in holding the keys of the church. When they had been applied to the Jewish locks, which fastened the gates and threw them open, they were cast aside as useless. And blessed be God, “The happy gates of Gospel grace stand open night and day,” and will stand open until the redeemed of the Lord shall be gathered “out of every kindred, and tongue and people,

and nation." But it may be said that, according to our interpretation, the power of binding and loosing was peculiar to Peter, because it was as particularly conferred upon him as the power of the keys. We have no hesitation in admitting, that the whole reply of our Saviour was addressed to Peter exclusively, and that, upon this occasion, the power of binding and loosing was bestowed upon him alone. It was not, however, the intention of the Lord that he should have the exclusive right to this power, because a short time after he gave it to all the disciples alike. But when he bestowed this power upon them, he made no allusion to the keys—they are mentioned in no other place than in the words which were addressed to Peter alone. This is the reason, and to our mind it is conclusive, why we suppose that the keys belonged only to Peter, the power of binding and loosing to all the disciples alike. We will now inquire what is this power? To understand its meaning, it is necessary to have some knowledge of the phraseology which was used at that time in the schools of the Rabbins. Binding and loosing were frequently used by them: the one meaning to forbid, the other to permit. What, then, does Christ promise Peter and the other disciples? The power of making laws for the government of his church, whatsoever they should bind or forbid, should be regarded by God as binding upon men. Whatsoever they should loose or permit, should be loosed in heaven. Not long after the ascension of our Redeemer, we find them acting upon this power, in the council which was convened at Jerusalem. By their decree, nearly all the prohibitions of the Mosaic law were repealed, whilst a few were still enjoined as binding. But would God commit to fallible men such important powers, would he intrust them to make laws upon which the welfare and prosperity of the church so much depended? This power was given to an infallible body, the Apostles were guided in all their deliberations by God the Holy Spirit, the laws they made were emanations of Divine wisdom, were first framed in the councils of heaven. We know that inspiration is still claimed by that church which arrogantly assumes the title of infallibility, and makes laws which she binds upon the consciences of men. We ask for her proof, we appeal to her history for the evidence that she possesses so important a power. Have her

popes been guided by the Holy Spirit, when they have, at different times, advocated different opinions, contradicting their own previous assertions, contradicting the avowed sentiments of their predecessors? Do we seek for her infallibility in her general councils? Where does it reside? Is it to be seen in the contradictory decrees of different councils? Is it to be found in her monstrous dogmas, repugnant alike to Scripture and to reason? Has she ever maintained the unity of the faith within her own pale? Witness the violent controversies between the Franciscans and Dominicans—between the Jesuits and the Jansenists; observe the great variety of opinions now held by the members of her communion. Until, then, she can establish, by undoubted miracles, her claims to inspiration, until she can prove, by evidence unquestionable, that she is guided by the Holy Spirit, let her beware how she makes laws for the church; how, upon her own authority, she declares the terms upon which sin may be pardoned. This power was promised in the first place to Peter, and then to all the disciples alike, during their Master's residence upon earth. After his resurrection, he repeated this promise in other words: "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained;" and, to qualify them for this office, "He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Their power, then, was declarative, to publish what the Holy Spirit directed; to declare the terms which God had determined upon which sin might be pardoned. When, therefore, the Bishop of Rome, on his own authority, claims the power to bind and to loose, to remit and to retain sins, does he not usurp the prerogative of God—is he not manifestly "the man of sin," sitting "in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God?"

No one can be the successor of Peter, or of the other Apostles possessing the peculiar power conferred upon them, unless he has been commissioned by God to make a new revelation, and is consequently infallibly guided by the Holy Spirit. But, in a certain sense, the officers of the church are the successors of the Apostles. Drawing their instructions from the sacred Scriptures, they declare how sin may be pardoned; by the same standard they decide upon the qualifications of members of the church, and ex-

pel from her communion those whom God's word excludes. With the interpretation which has been given, we will briefly revert to the words under consideration. The Lord Jesus promises Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that is, the privilege of preaching the first sermon under the New Dispensation; of opening the church to all believers, by receiving into her communion the Roman Cornelius and those about him. Now, in order that he might be qualified for this office, the Saviour promises that he will give him the power of binding and loosing. The Acts of Apostles teach us how this promise was fulfilled. On the day of Pentecost, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, he declared to the Jews the only condition upon which they might obtain the Divine favor; instructed by the same Spirit, he exercised the power of binding and loosing, and received into the church Cornelius, the centurion, on a profession of faith in Christ.

On considering the opinion maintained by many, that Peter was the rock upon which the church was built, we observed that it furnished a very natural interpretation, and one in entire accordance with the sacred Scriptures. But to us it seems that it was not our Saviour's intention at that time to point to the person of Peter as the rock, but to him whom Peter had just confessed. Now we have said that Peter, in the Greek language a stone, was the name given to Simon by our Lord, when he first called him to be a disciple. These proper names, when thus given by Divine authority, were descriptive of something remarkable in the dispositions, lives and destinies of those upon whom they were bestowed. The truth of this remark will appear, by a reference to the Old Testament. The name of Abraham was conferred upon the venerable patriarch, because he was to be the father of many nations; the name Israel was given to Jacob, because, as a prince, he had power with God and with men. Now in the same way our Saviour gave the surname Peter to Simon, as expressive of his disposition, and, perhaps, of the important part he should act in laying the foundations of the Christian church. After, then, he had made the noble confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," our Lord said, "Thou art Peter," that is, thou hast been rightly named; the firmness of thy faith in seeing in me the God

incarnate, shows that the name *Πετρος*, stone, has been well applied to you.

That this interpretation is not strained, that this was a form of speech which might be easily understood, will be seen by referring to the book of Genesis. The venerable Jacob, when about to die, endued with prophetic wisdom, spoke of the future destiny of his children. In the blessing pronounced upon Judah, is found these words: "Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise;" that is, thou art properly called *Judah*, which signifies *praise*, because thy brethren shall *praise thee*. The propriety of Peter's name then appeared, because, with a firm faith, he confessed that Jesus was the long looked for Messiah, the eternal Rock upon which the firm foundations of the church would be laid. Now the interpretation which makes Christ, instead of Peter, the *πετρα*, it seems to us is evident, from the following considerations. There was much more in confessing that Jesus was the Christ in the days of the Saviour and his Apostles, than appears at the first blush. God, for ages, had been preparing the way for the advent of his Son in human flesh. A long line of prophets heralded his coming, and declared in glowing language the great work which he would perform, his victories, sufferings and death. When, therefore, any one confessed that Jesus was the Christ, it was nothing less than an acknowledgement that he was the glorious person concerning whom so many prophets had written, that he was the incarnate Son of God. Now, in examining these prophecies, we find our Lord represented by different objects, suited to the different parts of his work. As a king, he is represented as a victorious conqueror, with his garments red with the blood of his enemies; as a sacrifice for sin, he is represented by the bleeding lamb upon the altar; as a sure foundation upon which his church would rest, he is called the corner-stone laid in Zion. In the 118th Psalm, we read, "the stone which the builders refused, is become the head stone of the corner." That this referred to the Messiah, cannot be questioned by any who acknowledge the authority of God's word. The Jewish Rabbins admit it, and it is frequently applied by Christ and his Apostles to the Lord Jesus. This stone the scribes and Pharisees rejected as worthless, but in the wisdom of God, it has been made the head stone of the corner.

It binds together both Jew and Gentile—it is the corner stone of that noble building, which, “fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord.” In the 28th chapter of Isaiah, we also read, “Therefore, thus saith the Lord, Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation.” Now, Peter, in confessing that Jesus was the Christ, acknowledged, as has been already remarked, that he was the Messiah, in whose praises the royal Psalmist struck his harp—whose glory was the chief topic of Isaiah’s prophetic song. David spoke of him, as the corner stone of that great spiritual building, which God would rear. Isaiah described him as a tried and precious stone, laid for a foundation in Zion. When Peter, therefore, confessed that he was the Christ, concerning whom these glorious things were written, and when our Lord designed to speak respecting his church, how appropriate was his reply upon the interpretation which we have adopted. “And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock,” this head stone of the corner, this precious stone, laid in Zion, which thou hast just confessed, “I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” The glorious truth, then, which Peter confessed, that Jesus was the Christ, God, incarnate, is the rock upon which the church is built—hence, any society that does not acknowledge that Christ is God, cannot be regarded as a branch of his church. That Christ, not Peter, is the rock, seems evident from the words used. If Peter was the rock, it is natural to suppose that our Saviour would either have said *ἐπι σοι*, upon thee, or *ἐπι τούτῳ πέτρῳ*, and not *ἐπι ταύτῃ πέτρᾳ*, I will build my church. Upon the supposition that Peter was the rock, we can see no reason why the gender should be changed. (3.) Now, this way of alluding to himself, we find was not uncommon

(3) It has been asserted on high authority, that the Greek word *πέτρος*, signifies only a little piece of a rock, or a stone that has been dug out of a rock, whilst *πέτρα* means a whole rock. If this be so, then the *πέτρα*, upon which our Saviour promises to build his church, must be as superior to the *πέτρος*, to whom these words were addressed, as *πέτρα*, a real rock, is to *πέτρος*, a fragment. See Townsend’s Arrangement, where this subject is more fully discussed.

with our Lord. On one occasion, when looking upon the beautiful temple at Jerusalem, he said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." Those who were around him, supposed that he alluded to the noble edifice upon Mount Moriah, but we are assured that he referred to the temple of his body, which, destroyed by death on the third day, would burst the confines of the tomb. How beautifully consistent is this interpretation with the teachings of the Apostles? Peter, having been instructed on this occasion, that Christ was the rock upon which the church was to be built, declares to the Jews, "This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner." Paul says to the Ephesians, ye "are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, *Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.*" And he assures the Corinthians, that "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, *which is Jesus Christ.*" These are some of the reasons which have led us to the belief that Christ, and not Peter, is the rock alluded to in the words under consideration. We may adopt either opinion, and yet embrace no doctrine which is not revealed in the sacred scriptures. Peter, unquestionably, might be called the rock, because he was the first to preach the Gospel, but he could not be the rock in the same sense in which Christ was, and that our Lord alluded to the latter and not the former, seems to us to be evident.

As to the meaning of the promise, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," there exists a great diversity of opinion. The most probable seems to be this. In ancient times, cities were surrounded by walls, and the only way of access was through gates. Now, the wise men and rulers of the city, met together in these gates, to consult concerning the public welfare. Hell, then, is here represented as a city, and her rulers as plotting against the safety of the church. But all their wisdom will come to naught—all their power will be unavailing. The church, resting upon the corner stone laid in Zion, defies every assault. Although the storm of persecution roars around her—although embattled hosts are leagued against her—although the powers of darkness plot her destruction, she shall stand and will stand, until the angel descending, shall place one foot upon

the sea, and the other upon the land, and lift up his hand to heaven, and swear by him that liveth for ever and ever, that time shall be no longer.

We have now endeavored to give a true exposition of the words which have, for so many ages, elicited so much controversy. Having explained, according to our knowledge, the privileges which the Lord bestowed upon Peter — having pointed out the rock upon which the church was built, it may not be uninteresting, in the conclusion, briefly to trace upon the pages of history the fulfilment of the glorious promise, that “the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” Even in the days of the Apostles, we learn, that “the mystery of iniquity” began to work — heresy, at that early day, raised her hydra-head in the church of Christ. Corruption, beginning so early, gradually increased, until after the lapse of a few centuries, Christianity bore but little resemblance to that pure religion, which the Apostles had labored so arduously to establish. A strange power was seated upon the seven hills of imperial Rome — a man claiming to be the successor of the fisherman of Galilee, the vicar of Christ upon earth, arrogated a supremacy over the whole church, deposed kings and gave away nations. The Bible, the only rule of our faith, the guide graciously given by God to lead us through a wilderness world to heaven, was taken from the people, and they were directed to follow guides as blind as themselves. Instead of “one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus,” they made mediators many, and prayed to the spirits of the departed dead. Instead of being clothed in the robe of Christ’s righteousness, they vainly endeavored to hide their nakedness with “the filthy rags” of their own righteousness. And as if to cap the climax of folly and superstition, the monstrous dogma of transubstantiation was proposed to the belief of the faithful. O, if grief could ever enter the blest mansions above, if tears could ever fall from those eyes, which gaze upon the glories of the uncreated God, surely these things would have transpired, when man, so deluded, first prostrated himself before a wafer, and, in imagination, fed upon the body of his God.

Here and there, some lone watchman, standing upon the crumbling walls of Zion, wept over her desolations, and boldly lifted the standard, truth, against prevailing errors.

But the eagle eye of the inquisitor was soon fixed upon him, he was dragged to the prison, he was tied to the stake, and his emancipated spirit winged its joyful way to glory from the blazing faggot. During this night of Egyptian darkness, which brooded for many centuries over the earth, did not the promise of Christ fail, did not the gates of hell prevail against the church? No, blessed be God, his promises never fail, the woman seen by John, in his Apocalyptic vision, "clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars," was not destroyed by the great red dragon. She fled into the wilderness, where she had a place prepared by God, and there she was preserved. If we seek for the visible church at this time, we must not go to the crowded courts of kings—we must not look for her among the worshippers of him, who, seated upon his throne at Rome, "lords it over God's heritage." But, let us go to the wilderness, and there we will find her witnessing for Jesus, irradiating the surrounding gloom, by the brightness which she reflected from the glorious Sun of Righteousness. When "the man of sin" had subjugated the church, and all men seemed to pay him homage, the Culdees, a pure church, never in connexion with Rome, enlightened the wilds of Caledonia and Erin, and protested against prevailing errors. And there, for centuries, did she exist, diffusing the light of the Gospel, until after Wickliffe, "the morning star of the Reformation," arose in England. In the vallies of Piedmont, a church of Jusus existed, claiming Apostolic origin, which, from century to century, protested against the corruptions of Rome, and contended for "the faith once delivered to the saints." Wave after wave of persecution rolled over these peaceful valleys—crusades were sent against these witnesses for Jesus—the blood-hounds of the Inquisition, pursued these sheep of Christ from mountain to mountain. But the sword of the crusader, the rack of the inquisitor, the faggots of the persecutor, could not prevail against this church, for it was founded upon the Rock of Ages. In defiance of Rome, she stood from century to century, and when the beacon light of the Reformation blazed upon the mountains of Switzerland, when the Sun of Righteousness arose upon be-nighted Germany, then did the mountaineers of Piedmont welcome the Reformers as brethren, and rejoiced in the

triumphs of God's church. Time would fail to tell of those bodies of faithful men, who, during Rome's supremacy, protested against her abominations, and sealed their faith with their blood. Enough has been said, to show that Christ has always had a church upon earth, that the gates of hell have not prevailed against her.

The Scriptures, in the opinion of many, predict another apostacy. Dark clouds may be seen gathering in the horizon. Rome seems to be shaking herself for her last great and expiring effort. The waves of persecution may again roll over the earth,—the peaceful family may again be startled from their slumbers, by the midnight cry of the inquisitor—the fires of Smithfield may again be kindled—another night of St. Bartholomew, may clothe a nation in the habiliments of woe. Faithful men may fall, the blood of the Church may again be poured out, but, blessed be God, the church will stand, the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, for her foundations are laid upon the eternal Rock of Ages.

ARTICLE V.

The Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, by THOMAS CARLYLE, in two volumes. New York, Wiley & Putnam, 161 Broadway, 1845.

It is a trite, but not the less true maxim, that "experience is the best teacher," yet surely not our individual acquisition alone, or life would be spent in learning the lesson; and knowledge attained, when the grave is about to place a seal upon its use;—instead of this slow accumulation, we contemplate and compare the acts of those, who, living before us, are yet sympathetically united by like passions and motives;—thus appropriating the knowledge culled for us, we gather wisdom from an extended circle of comparison. Such is the province of history; whether the tale of a nation's progress, or the story of individual existence. But history has failed most signally to do her work; for we have little yet written, approximating sufficiently near impartiality, to

be received as truth. This is true of history in general;—much more so of English. In that country, two great and strongly marked parties, have for ages divided the people, and struggled with varying, but nearly equal success for rule. It follows that all attempts at her history have in a great measure failed to develope truth; they were not histories, but party arguments; conducted, not by philosophers, but one-sided advocates of party views. History, when written, is but the dramatizing of evidence; human testimony is so subject to infinite bias, even when applied to simplest facts in every day life, that we cannot fail to feel the difficulties which surround its use in the investigation of past events, having no official defender to pass it through the stern crucible of cross-examination. Thought is but the eyesight of the mind, to receive and compare facts, its material; like the eye, it is often deceived with false colors, with illusions, with nothings. We venerate things hallowed by time, and barely escape adoration for its hoary record, with little to recommend them, except that they are seen through the deceptive glimmerings of distance, and mellowed by its softened light.

History, in its inception, is nearly, if not always false. It is written by the actors; they can say—

“Quorum pars, magna fui.”

For this reason they write the more positively, but by no means always the more knowingly; they are tempted to hide many facts; to distort others; to color all. Both parties write, but both are not always heard. In another generation, arises some professedly literary man, to extract a direct tale from these fragmentary legends. He, too, is a party man,—most frequently the tool or the “*attache*” of the dominant one. In England, all are party men; in all free governments, it must be so.

This man examines—discards all the records of his opponents—and assumes, as undoubted truth, the tale of his own party;—he, too, colors;—if his diction is pure, his arrangement good, his language chaste, he is ranked standard; the actors in the busy scene described, are gone; there are none to question; the next generation read him without a doubt, and history, or what professes to be, comes to us

distorted, blackened, warped, and falsified by the spirit of party and the bigotry of ignorance, and so remains, perhaps always, until some bold searcher for truth, living long after, when all cause for bias is over, plunges into the investigation, takes up the buried masses of contemporaneous record, calmly weighs the evidence, and decides, or leaves the world to decide upon its relative weight.

So has Roman history been in modern days exhumed, its fables exposed, and its story, in part, re-written. Can this be done with England's past, with like success? The same principles remain ever; in free governments, however, their names may change; the same contests descend from age to age; and the same difficulties beset the native citizen, who would remodel the page of his country's history. The foreigner is too little versed in institutions, whose daily and hourly influence he does not feel, ever fully to appreciate them.

I do not intend to theorise, or lay down a universal rule, drawn from the nature of things or the constitution of man's mind; I take matters as I find them, and say England's history is yet unwritten. One-sided arguments we have; statements unproved; fallacies advanced; and unsound deductions, resulting from the sophistries of biased minds, are but too often raised on rotten premises; but history we have not. A good illustration of this position, is found in the serious doubt now thrown on the received histories of the wars of the Roses. No one now questions the fact, that despotic power and public treasure were freely used by the Tudors, to falsify transactions little to their credit, and blacken the characters of men they had driven from the throne. The bloody temper and bloodier deeds, even the personal deformity of Richard, are made subjects of doubt; and Simnel and Warbeck have now high claims to characters, hitherto charged as impostures.

Nearer our own times, causes similar in character have produced like results, as to an epoch replete with the development of the most important principles in church and state, which ever agitated a people; and in which were enacted events, whose import is not yet forgotten; to the patriot and Christian of this day and nation, fraught with lessons of infinite wisdom. Fortunately, time has only hidden, not obliterated, its records; and many friends of

truth and justice are now struggling to dissipate the mist, and bring to the light of day the glorious deeds and high hopes of a people, whose God was indeed the Lord, and who in their day and generation bore valiant testimony for the truth.

No name in English story has been more slandered and maligned than the leading spirit of this age. A Prince, who made his country prosperous, peaceful and happy at home, respected and feared abroad; the high-souled defender of the Protestant faith, whose arm protected the persecuted, even in the distant valleys of Piedmont, and dictated terms to the haughty Mazarin, has been for two centuries a bye-word and reproach, in the land he elevated and ennobled. The man who gave birth and energy to England's proudest boast, (her navy,) is known to her, under the false character of hypocrite and tyrant, fastened upon him by the fabrications of hireling mercenaries, and handed down by the smooth falsities and subtle insinuations of the wily sophist, who dipped his pen in that rancorous gall, which flowed from a heart truly "enmity against God" and his people. Oliver Cromwell, the champion of liberty and religion; the first statesman who advocated and practised toleration; the man, not of his age, but far beyond his age, has found in that very period, made glorious by the partial triumph of his principles, a historian, who dared to place the stamp of his literary fame upon the counterfeit coin of these base hirelings, and palm upon posterity the spurious currency for truth. The reading public know Oliver Cromwell chiefly through the pages of David Hume. The man in whom a public spirit to "*God's* cause did breathe," is chronicled for us by England's *Godless* historian.

Unquestioned, the false record has been reproduced in a thousand forms, and stamped its impress upon our literature.

Oratory adorns her flowing periods with allusions to its pretended facts; argument is built on its false premises; theories of statesmanship raised on its distorted incidents and mistaken principles, and fiction herself needed only to repeat its story, to indite tales, which trespass on her province and emulate the excursions of her fancy.

A powerful party are at this day hostile to the principles that age developed; and even those who have battled for

its truths have had a too ready ear for slanders against men whose motives are too lofty for their sympathy, and whose purpose was far nobler than their own; they advocate, in part, the cause, but believe and swell the cry which asperses its defenders and derides their motives.

So has it always been with the men, who, filled with the spirit of God, have striven to arouse their slumbering race to the spirituality of the Gospel. The immortal Luther, imbued with deep longings after truth, and earnest views of eternal things, pure and single-minded in his purpose, has been, and to a great extent still is believed by many true Christians, to have been instigated in his first efforts at reform, by an ambitious desire to exalt his own order. The Romanist slander, that his wrath was kindled by the preference given to the dominicans in the sale of indulgences, and many similar falsehoods, are largely credited. The deep debt of humanity is acknowledged, but accompanied by the falsest views of his character and motives. The Godless historian, to whom we have referred, with his usual reckless malignity against spiritual religion, has adopted, without investigation, the same and kindred charges; their baseless character has been fully proved, but the polished sophist is read by the many, the laborious expositors by the few.

Equally were Calvin and Zuinglius, and Beza, and that host of fathers, maligned. Oliver Cromwell, and the Gospel men of his day, under their several names of Puritan, Covenanter, Independent, and Presbyterian, are nearer home; their views, deeds, and motives, far more interesting; they are household words, standing out boldly on the page of history for us; so striking in their principles, so bold and ardent in their course, we cannot pass them down the stream of time unnoticed; they pervade our whole literature, and are found enstamped upon the very page of living life, instinct with energy, and calling into active hate, even now, the contemners of God and despisers of holiness.

To the advocates of Spirituality, as opposed alike to Ritualism and Neology; to the friend of toleration, and the lover of civil freedom,—it is not only a grateful task, but an imperative duty, to redeem from slander these precious memories; and now, when the battle is to be re-fought, to examine the truth of principles so important, and rescue from

undeserved slander the men whose lives were given to their support. Many a sneer has escaped the sons of American freedom against the gallant hearts who breasted for *them* the storm, and gained for *them* their present triumph; many a sigh have they given to the memory of those who fought for "divine right, and absolute submission to hereditary despotism;" whose partial triumph retarded the cause of freedom, and the progress of civilization. It is time the mist was swept away,—if not from the eyes of the world, at least from the many Christians who yet believe the Presbyterians of that day were, to a man, the slaves of bigotry; the Covenanters, fanatical enthusiasts; the Puritans, pharisaical mannerists; the Independents, disorderly radicals; and Oliver Cromwell, the mighty leader of that host of burning hearts, who rode the whirlwind and directed the storm, whose expanded views soared far above them all, to the great doctrine of freedom of conscience,—an arch hypocrite and usurping tyrant.

Some able pens have begun the work, and already prove the ease with which truth overwhelms falsehood and detects fallacy. Macauley's pages teem with the rich gatherings of a truthful mind; and the gorgeous, but lucid and nervous essays on Milton and Hampden, throw light upon the darkened scroll of history. One of Scotland's able divines has placed lance in rest against her brightest intellectual luminary; and brought to severe reckoning even the great Magician. But there has suddenly burst upon us a most unexpected advocate. The author of "Hero Worship" and "the History of the French Revolution" is found battling stoutly for the Calvinists; Saul is among the prophets; Thomas Carlyle, the eulogist of Oliver Cromwell.

This work we propose to make the subject of some remarks.

It is not unimportant to see if there is not a key to this general misapprehension of Cromwell and the Puritans; this readiness to believe charges against their character, universal distrust of their motives and ridicule of their sanctity; a disposition which develops itself not only as to them, but the spiritually minded of every age.

Various causes have been already assigned. The antipathy of the Anglo-Saxons to the Saxon reformer, is accounted for by one able writer, from the intemperate quarrel he

had with their multiuxored king, and the coarseness which marked that dispute: Calvin's single case of persecution* is the glad defence of those who still advocate principles whose active development poured out the blood of the saints like water. The wrong of another is ever precious consolation to the guilty.

In the case of the Puritans and their leader, the assigned causes are numerous. Among other things, Scott's novels are thought to have tended greatly to produce erroneous impressions. With deference to Dr. McCrie, and others of his brethren, I hold Sir Walter more sinned against than sinning. It is true, his tory and high church principles have given some coloring to his portraits—but it is slight. He is far truer than the historians. We have, in the main, faithful representations of the various classes, who formed the great party of freedom and free worship. There were fanatics among them—he has not charged all with fanaticism. There were enthusiasts, and noble enthusiasts too; Ephraim McBriar, in the torture, might rival the Apostolic martyrs; has he desecrated the holiness of his elevation, or degraded the sublime aspirations of the victim? They have not suffered under his hand; nor has he charged his enthusiasm upon all. The self-seeking Cuddy had none, but for his kail; he is not a caricature; nor the scolding old wife untrue to nature; nor Poundtext wanting in sound and moderate views of the question at issue; nor Morton in the high qualities of a Christian gentleman. There were Burleys in those days; in fact there was John Balfour himself, much as he is painted; and wiley turncoats, and even fiery maniacs, like Habbakuk Mucklewrath. On the other

* It is evidently the opinion of the writer of this article, that Calvin is justly chargeable with the spirit of persecution in the case of Servetus, here referred to. It is due, however, to the memory of this great and good man, to advise the reader, in this connection, that the charge is not sustained, in the judgment of many pious and candid men, by the facts in the case. We cannot give here the history of this affair: but would simply say, that Calvin's agency in the prosecution of Servetus, was never mentioned to his reproach by any of his contemporaries, not even by his enemies; nor was the charge of persecution fastened upon his memory till it was fifty years too late for him to defend himself. Many, in the present day, regard it as unsupported by the evidence adduced; and those who attach a degree of blame to his conduct, greater or less, find much in the circumstances of the case, and in the character of the times, to palliate his error.

Editors of the Review.

side, has he given "bloody Claverhouse" one quality to endear him to the Christian, or Bothwell an aspiration to which we can say Amen? Good manners, handsome address, undaunted courage, are assigned them. He is but true to history. The vices of the party are not hidden. Cruelty, recklessness of human life and human rights, profanity, debauchery, all ungodliness, and every vice prayed against in the anglicised Missal, except outward "schism," are ascribed to them. The picture is a true one. He

"Has naught extenuated,
Nor set down aught in malice."

Old Mortality is a fair sample of the others, whose scene is laid amid these troubled elements.

Yet we admit, no man reads them, without finding a secret bias, contrary to his better judgment; a softening towards the errors of the church party, an undue exaltation of their limited virtues. The deep piety, the true principles, the engaged hearts, the stern but high enthusiasm of the other party, rouses but comparatively little emotion; their follies and their errors excite derision. And why is all this so? It is the result of one universal principle, whose application solves all similar historical mysteries, "The carnal heart is enmity against God," and equally against the things and the people of God. We sympathize naturally with the wicked, for the thoughts of our own hearts are wicked; we hate righteousness, and the follies or the weaknesses of the righteous are triumphant proofs of their being no better than ourselves; their vices are subjects of secret gratulation. Their holiness, their trust in God, their zeal, their earnestness, bursting into enthusiasm, their conscientiousness, unappalled by the rack, receive, it may be, the cold assent of the convinced understanding, but want the sympathy of the heart; our own carnal sense gives its gloss to the tale, our awakened and enlightened judgment shrinks from the result, and startled conscience strives to deceive itself by blaming the novelist.

Scott no doubt felt the same tendency, but in no greater degree than others. I claim for him liberality unusual, almost unexampled in his party.

This enmity has always been directed against the shin-

ing lights of every age which has developed them. We need not search for secondary causes. Luther is still maligned and despised because he preached the humbling doctrines of the cross; Calvin shunned not to declare the whole truth; but men love not the light, and hated him who strove to exhibit it.

Oliver Cromwell encountered a double disadvantage. Ahead of his age, he was misunderstood, in some degree unappreciated, by his cotemporaries and co-workers. Zeal for his God was a crime which repels the heart of man through all ages.

The Christian scans the page of history, not to observe the poor strugglings of man's imaginary wisdom, or to draw what are called philosophical deductions from its events, or to explain its great phenomena by causes which strike the eye of the statesman. He reads there the progressive record of God's purposes. He sees prophecy after prophecy fulfilled; he sees the church, surrounded by outward enemies, triumph in her apparent weakness; he sees her, filled by intestine foes and pretended friends, almost expire in the sink of her own corruptions; he sees nations rise and fall, as they are necessary to her; he sees the Spirit of God descend, and use means, man would discard, to rescue from utter night the spirituality of the gospel, and restore once more his fallen church; he sees the strong wrestlings of the earnest men of God, who refuse to bow the knee to "Old Baals" with new names; he sees the fierce conflict, the temporary triumph, the distant glimmerings of light, the dark mist of indifferentism arising to obscure it, the long reign of decent formalism and ritual quietism, the faint struggles of God's people, the gradual clearing away of the cloud, the beams that pierce it, the dawn of a better day—when suddenly, even now, once more the howlings of the beast strike his ear; the old battle cries of Popery and Prelacy, of gnosticism and philosophy, of neology and skepticism, resound, and in the nineteenth century he finds the church again battling with its ancient foes—both its flanks attacked—blind credulity advocating the dogmas of absolute submission to priestly Ritualism; credulous Infidelity, in its protean shapes, stealing away its spirituality to merge it in the equal deadness of deified Reason.

Philosophy tells him he is in an age of movement, change

and uncertainty surround him; the foundations of society seem to breaking up; the sacredness of the past is desecrated; the temples of old prejudice are broken open and rifled; the great human mind is tossed in unutterable doubt, and the throes of her troubled restlessness threaten all things. But the eye of the Christian is upon the Rock of Ages, the promise of his coming is before him, and amid the chaos, he reads by faith the great lesson of history. He traces through the crumbling ruins of the past, the firm pathway of the Church. He yet feels the sure footing made for her people, and with hope, based on the eternal purposes of God, he fears no foes, dreads no threatening evils, but knows that her triumph is certain, built, as she is, upon the foundation laid by the Son of the living God.

To the wise of this world, these things are foolishness.

A Christian man has written a Christian history, of that period when God awoke his church from her long sleep. Ritualist and Socinian have alike failed to comprehend him. Both of the earth, earthy, the things of God are to them incomprehensible.

D'Aubigne traced in all things his Master's hand, the workings of his spirit, the purposes of his will. The Ritualist thinks he has compassed God and dispenses his spirit in his forms, and will see his work no where else. The philosopher expects to read in the second causes of historical fact the true solution of such astounding events. The Christian historian, as he sits amid the broken fragments and scattered masses of that bewildering period, sees the hand of God ruling the storm, fulfilling his own ends, and working his own purposes, using instruments the most opposed, and making good and evil alike subservient to his will. Luther, thinks the worldly wise, is prepared for his work, and carried to its performance, by education, position and circumstances. The Christian views him as the chosen instrument prepared by the spirit, directed by the will, aided by the power, protected by the arm, and triumphing for the glory of his God. The Emperor's vacillating course, his strange changes, his ultimate failure to stop God's work, are, to the worldly, found in the politics of the day, the various interests, the conflicting purposes, and the mercenary views of the princes of this world. The Christian knows he and they are God's unwilling agents, in their vain imaginations,

working their own will, yet steadily driven to accomplish the signal purposes of Jehovah. All history, to the believer, speaks one great living fact, one ceaseless struggle, all its forms and shapes, its opposite appearances, diverse incidents, and varied names, reduceable to the one great conflict, Christ and Anti-Christ. God's way of salvation, and man's way of salvation, have divided, and will divide this world, until the day of the Lord shall come. All events, read by one who believes God the ruler of everything, great and small, is seen directly or indirectly to bear on this mighty conflict. To the statesman and patriot, history, doubtless, has lessons of secondary value in its details; but to them, as to the Christian, there would be far higher wisdom in the contemplation of the great whole, the mighty plan of earth's progress to that knowledge which is eternal, and that wisdom which is everlasting life.

Every page of history, thus viewed, is but the record of God's eternal decrees. Doubly interesting to us, are those periods in the story, when the manifest workings of the Spirit, arouse alike friend and foe; force into activity the slumbering Christian, and startle into zeal the dead formalism which vainly dreamt it had possessed the earth, and stilled forever the voice of God. Especially are those periods full of instruction to this age, that seems to promise a repetition of one of those movements, which reinvigorated the sleeping nations, and roused to her work the slumbering and too often slothful church.

The subject presented in the book before us, is one of these periods, when the awakened heart cried for bread, and would not be any longer quieted by the cold viands of stony-hearted ritualism; when it asked wholesome nutriment, and refused the poisonous dead works the serpent offered to the lips. The book is a record, (partly a self-record,) of one of the God enlightened men of that day, who boldly looked in the face the hoary fallacies of time, tore away the glittering robes prejudice had thrown around authority, and dared to ask for that mandate of God, which empowered man to dictate faith to the conscience of his fellow.

The compass of a review, forbids even an enumeration of the deep lessons of wisdom, to be gathered from the storehouse of the memory of these earnest times. Our desire is

more to draw attention to the first important work, professing to tear away the vail which falsehood and prejudice has spread over the name of England's noblest prince, and to give the world some truer notions of the great moving principles which actuated him, and the strong hearts who followed him, to break alike the fetters of body and soul; struck down the prestige of divine right and hereditary despotism in the state, and wrested from a corrupt church the sword with which she coerced the conscience.

A growing desire for the truth, as we have already said, has developed itself in some able but slight glances at the times; Mr. Carlyle proposes to add his mite, in the shape of a readable collection of the *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*. I say readable, for hitherto, the want of punctuation, has made the scraps and patches, quoted in history, nearly unintelligible. On this want, a charge of studied obscurity has been built. The author says:

"I have punctuated and divided them into paragraphs, in the modern manner. * * Oliver's spelling and pointing, are of the sort common to educated persons in his time, and readers that wish it, may have specimens of him in abundance, and of all due dimness in many printed books; but to us, intent here to have the letters read and understood, it seemed very proper at once and altogether to get rid of that incumbrance."

This process has certainly, in most cases, entirely removed a charge, which prejudice alone could have entertained; it is hard to imagine his known influence in the parliament, if he was not understood by his auditors.

Mr. Carlyle has interwoven a slight, but accurate thread of narrative, which connects the documentary history, and supplies, at least to the educated, all that is necessary to a full developement of the times; yet, it leaves a want in literature unsupplied; a life of Cromwell is yet to be written for the mass. To the few already versed in the falsehoods of the record, already awake to its leading facts, these jottings may suffice; but for the great reading public, a true life of this impersonation of England's most earnest age, would be full of life-vigor; might dispel the languor of dull indifferentism; wake up self-satisfied common place properties; banish Cant's sickly canting against cant, and teach us —

“By no means to credit the wide-spread report, that these seventeenth century puritans were superstitious crack-brained persons; given up to enthusiasm the most part of them.”

We might then learn,

“That our fathers, who had thought about this world very seriously indeed, and with very considerable thinking faculty indeed, were not quite so far behind hand in their conclusions respecting it. That actually their ‘enthusiasms,’ if well seen into, were not foolish, but wise.”

Truly might the great active world feel a new and most important truth, that

“Cant was not fashionable at all; *that* stupendous invention of speech, for the purpose of concealing thought, was not yet made.”

And thus be afforded a key to language and thoughts, to us now little known; washing out our old creditable faith in our fathers’ hypocrisy, in the knowledge that

“The use of the human tongue was then other than it now is,” and “gradually a very stupendous phenomenon may arise on the astonished eye. A practical world, based on belief in God; such as many centuries had seen before, but as never any century since has been privileged to see.”

The book before us is in the usually distorted diction of its most singular writer. It is too late in the day to criticise Mr. Carlyle’s style. If the evil ended with him, we might well forgive the vehicle in which he gives so much to compensate for the uncouth conveyance. But when puny imitators, disguise their common places in maudlin copies of his sententious inversions, and a poor gentleman finds himself swindled out of his time, by abortive nothings, turned wrong side out, or familiar truisms, up side down, he is not to be blamed if he sometimes regrets a vicious departure from good taste, and the received modes of arranging the parts of speech. Nor is Mr. Carlyle, himself, totally free from the charge, of deceiving us with familiar friends, disguised in unaccustomed garments.

This is a secondary matter; the most important feature in the book, is its tone; so unexpected after “Hero worship;” so entirely out of tune with much he has previously written;—that is, if he has been understood. We cannot be sure of this; nor has he any cause of complaint, if he is misinterpreted. If a man persists in walking backwards,

he has no one but himself to blame, when he encounters obstacles and falls over them.

In this book, "Calvanism" appears to be his one life-giving principle, to impart true heroism. In "Hero worship," we are not sure but that religion is, to him, only a refined heroism. He has uttered, in the work before us, sublime Christian truths;—but whether he understands them himself, is a question unsolved when we close the book. How much of the pure Gospel; how much of mysticism; how much of vague philosophy and unmeaning cant, (I receive his own idea of the word,) there may be, it is impossible to define. Whether it is the God of the Bible he worships, or some of those imaginary dreams of the Eternal Spirit, which neology has palmed upon the sleepy German mind, we cannot say. Whether he has found his way to the truth, or is yet groping in a region more misty than his language, we are unable to tell;—they are questions his books, so far, leave insoluble.

But it is certain he fully understands the earnest tone of the English mind in that day, when religion was a thing of every day life, entering into all the details of existence, influencing great things and small; a thing to live by as well as to die by;—not a holdiday ceremony, kept for periodical display. Especially does he enter into the deep purpose and high resolves of his hero;—for, to him, Oliver is what God made him, a Christian hero, imbued with love to God, and good will to men.

Turning to his pages, his first step, as we find, is to fathom the real sources of the tales which represent Oliver as England's tyrant and her foe.

"Mark Noble reckons up some half dozen 'Original Biographies of Cromwell,' all of which, and some more, I have examined, but cannot advise any other man to examine. There are several laudatory, worth nothing; which ceased to be read when Charles II. came back, and the tables were turned. The vituperative, are many; but the origin of them all, the chief fountain indeed of all the foolish lies that have circulated about Oliver since, is the mournful brown little book, called *Flagellum, or the Life and death of O. Cromwell, the late Usurper*, by James Heath; which was got ready so soon as possible on the back of the *Annus Mirabilis*, or Glorious Restoration, and is written in such

spirit as we may fancy. When restored potentates and high dignitaries had dug up 'above a hundred buried corpses, and flung them in a heap in St. Margaret's church yard,' the corpse of Admiral Blake among them, and Oliver's old mother's corpse, and were hanging on Tyburn gallows, as some small satisfaction to themselves, the dead clay of Oliver, of Ireton and Bradshaw;—when high dignitaries and potentates were in such a humor, what could be expected of poor pamphleteers and garreteers? Heath's poor little brown lying *Flagellum*, is described by one of the moderns as a 'Flagitium;' and Heath, himself, is called 'Carrion Heath,'—as being an unfortunate blasphemous dullard, and scandal to humanity;—blasphemous; who, when the image of God is shining through a man, reckons it in his sordid soul to be the image of the devil, and acts accordingly; who in fact has no soul, except what saves him the expense of salt; who intrinsically is Carrion and not humanity."

Of the other biographers, he says a few words, for which we must refer the reader to the book; showing how, as time swept away the first rubbish of prejudice, gradually

"In spite of the stupor of histories, once more the memory of Cromwell, in its huge inarticulate significance, not able to *speak* a wise word for itself to any one, has nevertheless been steadily growing clearer and clearer in the popular English mind;" but concludes, that "of Cromwell's actual biography, from these and from all books and sources, there is extremely little to be known. It is from his own words, as I have ventured to believe; from his own letters and speeches, well read, that the world may first obtain some dim glimpse of the actual Cromwell, and see him darkly face to face."

The libels of his enemies begin with such small matters as his birth and parentage. In England, whose "Old Pantheon,—home of all the Gods,—has ever been a "peerage book," this was a thing to move the common mind of leaden ritualism, with its "four surplices at Allhallow-tide." He is, therefore, pronounced the low-bred son of a brewer, by some of the early "Swiss;" but this, like Harrison's butcher parentage, has long ago been abandoned, even by those who love neither Oliver nor his party. Most of them still hold as undisputable, that Oliver's youth was

very dissolute; for which no other authority can be found but Mark Noble's commentary on the following passage of a letter to Mrs. St. John, his kinswoman, in 1638.

"You know what my manner of life hath been. Oh, I lived in and loved darkness, and hated light; I was a chief, the chief of sinners. This is true: I hated godliness, yet God had mercy on me. O the riches of his mercy! Praise Him for me; pray for me, that He who hath begun a good work would perfect it in the day of Christ."

To the Christian, all this is plain; the conclusion drawn by poor Mark is but natural. Hear Carlyle apostrophise him:

"O my reverend imbecile friend, hadst thou thyself never any moral life, but only a sensitive and digestive? Thy soul never longed towards the serene heights, all hidden from thee; and thirsted as the hart in dry places wherein no waters be? It was never a sorrow for thee that the eternal polestar had gone out, veiled itself in clouds;—a sorrow only that this or the other noble patron forgot thee when a living fell vacant. * * * Brother, hadst thou never in any form such moments in thy history? * Well, thy path was peaceabler, I suppose. But the Highest was never in thee. * Thou shalt at best abide by the stuff."

We may dismiss this and many other similar charges with little notice. They are principally traceable to Heath, and he is their sole foundation.

We know that Oliver Cromwell was of good family and connexions, and married, within a few months after coming of age, the daughter of Sir Thomas Bourchier; a man of some opulence, who would hardly give his daughter to "the most debauched man in England," as he is designated by Dr. Goldsmith. That he retired to his residence in Huntingdon, and lived the usual life of an English country gentleman, until called to take his part in the active scenes that shook the middle of that eventful century. Mr. Carlyle, with some hesitation, fixes his first awakening to a knowledge of the truth, some three or four years after his marriage—namely, between 1622 and 1624. Let us listen to Mr. Carlyle's account of it:

"It is, therefore, in these years, undated by history, that we must place Oliver's clear recognition of Calvinistic Christianity; what he, with unspeakable joy, would call

his conversion; his deliverance from the jaws of eternal death. Certainly a grand epoch for a man: properly, the one epoch; the turning point which guides upwards or guides downwards him and his activity forevermore. * * * Oliver was henceforth a Christian man; believed in God, not on Sundays only, but on all days, in all places, and in all cases."

In 1627-8, Cromwell was member for Huntingdon, in Charles' third Parliament; a Parliament full of earnest men. "The nobility and gentry of England were then a very strange body of men. The English squire of the seventeenth century clearly appears to have believed in God, not as a figure of speech, but as a very fact, very awful to the heart of the English squire. He wore his Bible-doctrine round him, says one, as our squire wears his shot-belt; went abroad with it, nothing doubting."

This same Parliament framed the petition of right, and the remonstrance against ministers, including Buckingham; the debate on which, Col. Alured graphically paints in a letter, we regret our limits forbid us to copy. He describes Sir Edward Coke as sitting down, overcome by his tears. Carlyle asks,

"How came tough old Coke upon Lyttleton, one of the toughest men ever made, to melt into tears like a girl, and sit down, unable to speak? The modern honorable gentleman cannot tell. Let him consider it, and try if he can tell! And then, putting off his shot-belt, and striving to put on some Bible-doctrine, some earnest God's truth or other,—try if he can discover why he cannot tell."

This Parliament was hastily prorogued from June to October; afterwards to January; but they had first purchased from the king a recognition of their own rights, and paid the stipulated price.

In August, Felton removed the Duke out of their way.

They met in January, to find the Petition of Right *altered in the printing*, and its admitted, unaltered provisions, violated; tonnage and poundage again levied; men imprisoned for refusing to pay; they began to find the value of a king's word, and to know, they must bind in strong cords him whom no oath could restrain.

The questions of religion were not the least interesting

which came before them. The old leaven, reluctantly left by Edward, had been increased by Elizabeth, fostered by James, was now working naturally, and exhibiting, as it does every now and then, "most unutterable tendencies to Papistry, and the old clothes of Babylon."

The English reformation differed from that of all the nations that awoke from their long sleep in Luther's day, in this: That the statesman had as much, if not more to do with it, as the man of God. Henry and Elizabeth, Somerset and Cranmer, with worldly wise policy, foresaw the storm, and turned the helm with the current. All their efforts were conservative; all their hopes bent, not on *how much* they could reform, but how *little*; not how *pure* they could make the church, but what *impurities* they could retain. But the Spirit of God was abroad on the great national mind, and his work going on without reference to the careful organization of the subtle politicians; the number of its recipients demanded a hearing, and stern necessity compelled an admission of their principles, based in the unchangeable words of gospel truth.

Alas! the children of this world are ever wiser than the children of light. The wily leaders of this royal Reformation conceded to God's people the framing of articles which, however spiritual, and doctrinally correct, were seldom heard; and easily retained in their control the apparently secondary matter of ceremonies. Thus, their cold, lifeless formula of generalized prayer, translated from old Popish Missals and their Arminian ceremonies, redolent of ritual salvation, read day by day, ever before the masses — were far more likely to impress their tone on the Church, than an orthodox creed, almost unknown. The long continued triumph of this subtle scheme, belongs to the history of another day, not less important to us now. But in 1629, when men "believed in God, not on Sundays only," the manifest workings of this State fabric were very visible; and earnest men, like Oliver Cromwell, saw plainly that certain approach to Rome, which the history of to-day proves is the natural progress of Prelatic Arminianism.

A new remonstrance was prepared, aiming specially at "Laud" this time; the king forbids Speaker Finch to put the vote; some stout hearts, seeing the crisis, hold him in his chair. The house passed three resolutions against Ar-

minianism, Papistry, and Tonnage and Poundage, and hastily adjourned. Oliver was in this memorable scene.

Eleven years roll over, full of eventful facts for England and her hero; but he is quietly farming near Ely, and there is little mention of him until 1640, when he takes his seat in the "Long Parliament," for Cambridge Town.

The acts of that Parliament are well known, but now little understood; to do so we must

"Not imagine it was 'Constitution,' 'Liberty of the people to tax themselves,' privilege of Parliament, or any modification of these sublime privileges, now waxing somewhat faint in our admirations, that mainly animated our Cromwells, Pym, and Hampdens, to the heroic efforts we still admire in retrospect. Not these very measureable 'Privileges,' but far other and deeper, which could not be measured; of which these, and all grand social improvements whatsoever, are the corollary. Our ancient Puritan Reformers were, as all Reformers that will ever much benefit this earth are always, inspired by a heavenly purpose. To see God's own law, then universally acknowledged for complete, as it stood in the Holy Written Book, made good in this world; to see this, or the true unwearied aim and struggle towards this; it was a thing worth living for and dying for! Eternal Justice; that God's will *be* done on earth as it is in heaven: corollaries enough will flow from that, if that be there; if that be not there, no corollary good for much will flow."

We cannot pause to trace the history of the long war and that most troublous time. Let us glance at Oliver in some salient points of his eventful career, and see how he bore himself amid the dark elements he controlled, and was forced finally to compress into some semblance of order, lest wild anarchy and turbulent misrule bring as heavy an evil on England as prelatical and kingly tyranny, and her last state be worse than her first.

The early acts of the long Parliament are history—petitions and remonstrances; plots, and counter-plots; king's promises and parliament's deeds; Strafford's trial; the cowardly 'death warrant;' the execution of 'the one supremely able man the king had;' the Scotch invasion; the Irish rebellion ('one of the best models, and one of the worst imitations ever seen in this world,'); Laud in the Tower;

Charles' armed attempt on the five members; the king's flight to Oxford; demand of Parliament for the Militia; 'No! by God, not for an hour,' says the king, and both sides grasp their swords—Oliver could not have been an idle man in these stirring scenes, but his part must have been humble; for history, and even its matted roots, is very silent about him.

In August, 1642, we find him active in Cambridgeshire; in fact, chief manager there. In September he is named captain of troop number 67 in the Earl of Bedford's horse; Edgehill Battle (indecisive) is fought in October. Oliver here sees that they could not "get on with a set of poor tapsters and town apprentice people, against men of honor; to cope with men of honor, they must have men of religion;" not long after, he developed his idea in immortal "old Ironsides;" "they were men that had the fear of God, and gradually lost all other fear. Truly, they were never beaten at all."

In this same year, 1642, the associations were formed; but all died out in a few months, except the eastern, which Oliver's genius and energy made successful, and which kept its borders clear of invasion all through the war. In 1643 he is Colonel, and henceforth, for many years, more soldier than politician.

At "Long Marston Moor," he proved himself, and "Old Ironsides," worthy to cope with "men of honor;" Fiery Rupert "tastes their steel and did not in the least like it." In 1644, he is Lieutenant General, and thinks Essex and the other leaders too slack;—in fact they were;—afraid alike, to beat the king too much, or being themselves utterly beaten. Oliver is first to shake himself clean of old time worn fallacies of sacred persons, such as king and the like, and has said, "if he met the king in battle would fire his pistol at him as at another."

He warmly supported the "self-denying" ordinance moved by Mr. Tate; which ordinance contains a clause, "That religious men might now serve in the army without taking the covenant;—another effort to break the fetters of formula;—glimpse of truth rising out of the general mist, and slowly dispelling old notions of "Dutch Dragon uniformity;" to shine out fully, not until our days,—if now,—in that unity which is of the spirit; or as our author ex-

presses it, "the uniformity of free growing healthy forest trees."

The new model army actively progressed; Cromwell, by special leave, retained his commission;—his enemies say he labored to this end. Let them read the record, with dates all right, not misplaced as they often are. They will find that when the old officers resigned, Cromwell was absent with Massy, facing Rupert, whom they drive back. The parliament learns that Rupert has sent 2000 men to convoy his Majesty and the artillery to Worcester. They order the convoy attacked, and charge General Cromwell with the service. The night before he received their commands, he went to Windsor to kiss the General's hands and take leave. Next day, he obeyed the order;—routed the convoy;—took Bletchington house;—gained another victory at Radcot bridge, and returned triumphant. To all persons, it is clear he cannot be dispensed with in the army. Fairfax and his officers, petition the house to appoint him Lt. General, with command of the horse. His services are continued at first by instalments of 40 days and three months—finally altogether.

The new model army marched to meet the king, now in the Midland counties; but before they go, a fast day for prayer was held in London.

"Consider it actually praying! It was a capability old London and its preachers and population had; to us the incrediblest."

They met;—these two hosts,—at Naseby, on the 14th June, 1645, to decide the great quarrel; deep interests, for them, and us, and all mankind, hung on that fight—

Fiery Rupert breaks the left wing and his "men of honor" gallop off the field to plunder. "The men of religion," (not tapsters and town apprentice people,) Oliver and "Old Ironsides," are thundering on the king's left;—it breaks;—the high discipline of these praying men detains them from plunder;—they charge the main body;—charge Rupert's victorious cavalry, now returning, and Charles' last hope is shattered; and worse,

"The king's carriage was also taken, with a cabinet, and many royal autographs in it, which, when printed, made a sad impression against his Majesty,—gave in fact a most melancholy view of the veracity of his Majesty."

Another gallant deed was done at Bristol. But we are not now much interested in details of battle and siege. There are better things to learn from the slight sketches of Oliver that remain. Some further glimpses of his speech, we can gather from this conclusion of his letter to parliament concerning this siege—

“It may be thought that some praises are due to those gallant men, of whose valor so much mention is made:—their humble suit to you and all that have an interest in this blessing is, that in the remembrance of God’s praises they be forgotten. It is their joy that they are instruments of God’s glory and their country’s good. It is their honor that God vouchsafes to use them. Sir, they that have been employed in this service know, that faith and prayer obtained this city for you. I do not say ours only, but of the people of God with you and all England over, who have wrestled with God for a blessing in this very thing. Our desires are that God may be glorified by the same spirit of faith by which we ask all our sufficiency, and have received it. It is meet that he have all the praise. Presbyterians, Independents, all have here the same spirit of faith and prayer; the same presence and answer; they agree here, have no names of difference: pity it should be otherwise anywhere! *All that believe, have the real unity, which is most glorious: because inward and spiritual, in the body and to the head. For being united in forms, commonly called uniformity, every Christian will, for peace sake, study and do as far as conscience will permit. And for brethren, in things of the mind we look for no compulsion, but that of light and reason.* In other things, God hath put the sword in the parliament’s hands, for the terror of evil doers and the praise of them that do well. If any plead exemption from that, he knows not the Gospel: If any would wring that out of your hands, or steal it from you under any pretence soever, I hope they shall do it without effect.”

We cannot add better comment than Mr. Carlyle’s:—

“These last paragraphs are, as the old newspapers say, ‘very remarkable.’ If modern readers suppose them to be ‘cant,’ it will turn out an entire mistake. I advise all modern readers, not only to believe that Cromwell here means what he says, but even to try how *they*, each for himself

in a new dialect, could mean the like or something better !”

The game now came rapidly to a close. The last royalist general, Sir Jacob Astley was extinguished, in March, 1645, and on the 27th of April the king goes to the Scots. In the autumn, the parliament filled its vacancies. The glorious old Sea King Blake, is one of the new members. Then followed the long farce of attempting a treaty with a man without faith or veracity. The payment of the Scotch arrears; their surrender of the king; the efforts of good and moderate men, of both parties, for peace. The king, a long way behind the age, is still full of confidence in the prestige of majesty, and “that divinity which doth hedge a king;”

“Sed quem Deus vult perdere prius dementat.”

Just here amid this hurly burly; this war of political and religious elements, and seeming wreck of hereditary despotism and old honored fallacies and cants;—when Oliver ought, according to his worthy biographers, to have been scheming to direct the storm to his own interest;—steeped to the lips in plot and intrigue, comes most refreshingly upon us this letter to his daughter. What a double-dyed hypocrite must they believe this tender father to be, who found time, amid all his cares and public services, to write this affectionate counsel to his young daughter, just entered on the untried tide of matrimonial life :

“To my beloved daughter, Bridget Ireton, at Cornbury, the General’s Quarter’s: These—

LONDON, 25th October, 1646.

Dear Daughter,—Your friends at Ely are well; your sister Claypole is, I trust in mercy, exercised with some perplexed thoughts. She sees her own vanity and carnal mind; bewailing it, she seeks after (as I hope,) what will satisfy. And thus to be a seeker, is to be of the best sect next to a finder; and such an one shall every faithful humble seeker be at the end. Happy seeker, happy finder! Who ever tasted that the Lord is gracious, without some sense of self, vanity and badness? Who ever tasted that graciousness of His, and could go less in desire,—less than pressing after full enjoyment? Dear Heart, press on; let

not husband, let not anything cool thy affections after Christ. I hope he will be an occasion to inflame them. That which is best worthy of love in thy husband, is that image of Christ he bears. Look on that, and love it best, and all the rest for that. I pray for thee and him; do so for me.

My service and dear affections to the General and Generals. I hear she is very kind to thee; it adds to all other obligations.

I am,

Thy dear father,

OLIVER CROMWELL.

We have paused, in this sketch of great events, to record this glimpse of Oliver, in those endearing relations in which all sympathize. We intended to add it, and others similar, in a slight notice of his private life, which our space now warns us we must forego. It is, perhaps, best to place it here, where it was in life;—peace and love in the midst of strife and war.

In 1646, the Presbyterian platform was passed by law. Unhappy day for England; more so for Presbyterianism, and true religion generally, of all names; England yet feels the blow; and Presbyterianism is only now, of these late years, shaking off the marks of the state's unhallowed embrace; beginning fully to understand herself.*

* We suffer this and other expressions of our esteemed correspondent to remain unaltered, which imply a decided censure upon the Presbyterian party of that day—because we agree with him, that in the matter here referred to, they fell into a grievous error. The Presbyterian Church in Scotland, like the Episcopal Church in England, was connected with the state, and exceedingly wedded to the belief that entire uniformity in religious order and worship was essential to the success of the Reformation. In their judgment, the only safeguard against the return of Popery, either open or disguised, was to be found in the complete establishment of Presbytery throughout Britain. Doubtless, too, their zeal for Presbyterian uniformity, was quickened by their conviction that the great body of the English people was prepared for a more thorough reformation than reforming kings and prelates had allowed to take place. Their error was a natural one, but every way lamentable. Cromwell deserves the highest praise for striking out so distinctly, in this time of strife, the magnificent idea of universal toleration. Probably he threw himself into the bosom of the Independent party, because it was too weak to be tempted into the error of enforced uniformity; the dogma which rendered the Presbyterians, as a political party, altogether impracticable to his purposes. God, in the workings of a sublime providence, has lately enfranchised a large portion of this same Scotch Church from its unhappy Erastian bondage; and so the whole Presbyterian body throughout the world

“London city knows with pain, that there are ‘many persons in the army who have never yet taken the covenant;’ the army begins to consider it unlikely that certain of them will ever take it! London city cries, ‘Apply the shears!’ the army answers, ‘Apply them gently; cut off nothing that is sound!’”

Here are glimpses of the breach; we will see more yet; see it grown so wide that Charles, and Prelacy, and formalism, and dead Arminianism marched in through it. God permitted it; but we must mourn, when we see his people mistaking uniformity for unity, and apeing Prelacy in her worst features, ere they had well buried her dead body. The details are useless now; Cromwell’s part in the controversy is, to our purpose, interesting. We will let Mr. Carlyle speak. “Common history, old and new, represents Cromwell as having underhand, in a most skilful and indeed prophetic manner, fomented or originated all this commotion of the elements; steered his way through it by ‘hypocrisy, by master strokes of duplicity,’ and such like: as is the habit hitherto of History.

“The fact is, History, contemporaneous and subsequent, has treated this matter in a very sad way. Mistakes, misdates; exaggerations, unveracities, distractions; all manner of misseeings and misnotings in regard to it, abound. How many grave historical statements still circulate in the world, accredited by Bishop Burnet and the like, which, on examination, you will find melt away into after-dinner rumours. I do not cite them here; I have examined most of them; found not one of them fairly believable; * * * Ask for dates, ask for proofs; who saw it, heard it; when was it, where? A misdate, of itself, will do much. So accurate a man as Mr. Godwin, makes a ‘master stroke of duplicity,’ merely by mistake of dating; the thing, when Oliver did say it, was a creditable truth, and no master stroke, or stroke of any kind. * * * Cromwell steered himself victoriously across such a devouring chaos, by continuances of manful simplicity—by meaning one thing before God, and meaning the same before men, as a strong man does. By conscientious resolution; by sagacity and silent wariness, and

is becoming the consistent, as it is already the staunch, defender of the Protestant doctrine of the right of private judgment, and man’s responsibility to God alone in matters of faith.

Editors of the Review.

promptitude ; by religious valor and veracity — which, however it may fare with *foxes*, are really, after all, the grand source of clearness for a *man* in this world.”

We know how it ended — the army marched to London. They did not pull down the Presbyterian platform, but they claimed and secured “fair treatment for all the honest party ; and the Spiritualism of England shall not be forced to grow in the Presbyterian fashion, however it may grow.”

On the 13th October, 1647, Parliament limited Presbyterianism “to the next session after the present. Cromwell voted for three years ; then for seven ; lastly, for what he could get.

In November, the unhappy king (his web of deception all tangled beyond extrication,) makes his escape, and wanders helplessly, almost purposeless, to Hammond, in the Isle of Wight. One of Hammond’s uncles was the king’s chaplain, and a royalist ; this connexion may have given him hope. Indeed, there may have been some foundation, for the Parliament removed Hammond before long ; seeming to think his temptations too great.

In the midst of these important doings, we find Oliver and Mr. Mayor, of Hursley, in full correspondence about a marriage between Richard Cromwell and Mayor’s daughter. If Cromwell’s aspirations were as high as some say, at this date, and he was plotting the king’s death for his throne, it was strange to entertain, or rather propose, this treaty for matching his eldest son with a family in no way above his original rank ; yet before this, there had been talk among “a class of men dreadfully in earnest,” about bringing to justice “the chief delinquent.”

In this same year, Parliament settled on Oliver land, of the value of £2,500 per annum, nominally — his enemies say worth more — his friends less — the Parliament probably knew best. It made some talk then — this rewarding a faithful servant — and more afterwards. There had arisen no Dukes then to win Waterloos, and get well paid.

The next year is full of trouble : the Scotch army threatening ; the royalists ready to rise ; the Presbyterians dissatisfied ; the radicals prompt for mutiny. Cromwell labors for unity in vain ; various insurrections break out in divers quarters, and render things more perilous. Fairfax and Cromwell put them down speedily. Freed from these in-

cumbrances, Cromwell hastens to meet the Scots under Hamilton. At Preston, in August, 1648, after a confused and very scattering fight of several days, he wholly breaks them, though three times his number; drives them out of England; goes to Edinburg, and settles matters. The "men of religion," now in an enemy's country, are kept in much better order than "the men of honor." All plunder is forbidden; one Lieutenant is hung; a Colonel cashiered, and a whole regiment sent home for disobeying the order.

On the 6th December, 1648, Col. Pride purges the Parliament—instigated, no doubt, by Cromwell, say his own friends—perhaps so; it is however certain he was engaged in the siege of Pontifract Castle, and came to London only on the evening of that day.

The object was to bring Charles Stuart to justice; and they did it, "in the face of all nations." Blood-stained, and traitor to his oath and his word; to his kingdom and crown; to his people, and even himself—were the nations not to be taught a mighty lesson, because the victim was clothed in purple? Was the world not to learn that no time-hallowed fable about the Lord's anointed should screen the man whose lust of power deluged a nation in blood; made widows and orphans innumerable; and yet sought, day by day, to re-plunge the wearied kingdom into new horrors? Though conquered at Naseby, in custody, and guarded, he had managed to evade every attempt at settlement; incited new insurrections; brought on England another Scotch army, and on his own soul the blood shed at Preston; and were these men, who knew the Nation, themselves, and Him to wait until he roused again the slumbering embers into another flame? They did not wait; those brave iron-nerved men!

"*Ipsis molossis ferociores*, More savage than their own mastiffs!" shrieks Saumaise; shrieks all the world, in unmelodious, soul-confusing diapason of distraction—happily, at length, grown very faint in our day. The truth is, no modern reader can conceive the then atrocity, ferocity, unspeakability of this fact. First, after long reading of the old dead pamphlets, does one see the magnitude of it. To be equaled, nay, to be preferred, think some, in point of horror, to the 'Crucifixion of Christ.' Alas, in these irrev-
erent times of ours, if all the kings of Europe were to be

cut in pieces at one swoop, and flung in heaps in St. Margaret's church-yard on the same day, the emotion would, in strict arithmetical truth, be small in comparison! I reckon it perhaps the most daring action any body of men to be met with in history, ever, with clear consciousness, deliberately set themselves to do. Dread phantoms—a glaring supernal on you—when once they are quelled; and their light snuffed out, none knows the terror of the phantom.

A certain Queen in some South Sea Island, was converted to Christianity. She assembled her people; said to them, "My faithful people, the Gods do not dwell in that burning mountain. That is not God; no, that is a common burning mountain, mere culinary fire, burning under peculiar circumstances; I will walk before you; empty my wash bowl into it; cast my slipper over it; defy it to the utmost. She walked, accordingly, this South Sea Heroine; her people following in pale horror and expectancy: She did her experiment; and they have truer notions of the Gods in that Island ever since. Experiment, now very easy to repeat, and very needless. Honor to the brave who deliver us from phantom-dynasties, in South Sea Islands and North!"

The parliament named a council of state, of whom Cromwell was one, and in May passed an act, "brief as Sparta," containing but 104 words, declaring England a Free Commonwealth. In this very period, from February to April, we find traces of the marriage treaty between Cromwell and Mayor going on; and in May the marriage takes place. Strange that Oliver, plotting for the throne; the king out of his way; ambition, drawing him to power, with her arms ready open to receive him, should decline other, better worldly matches for his first-born, and persist in this alliance, valuable chiefly for the piety of the family! Mr. Mayor is hard to please; Oliver is patient; and overcomes all obstacles, having heard a good report of the "lady" and her kindred. About the time of the wedding, he is himself quelling "Levellers." Several misguided corporals are necessarily shot.

"So died the Leveller Corporals," says Carlyle, after sketching the story, "strong they, after their sort, for the liberties of England; resolute to the very death. Misguided Corporals! But history, which has wept for a mis-

guided Charles Stuart, and blubbered, in the most copious helpless manner, near two centuries now, whole floods of brine, enough to salt the herring fishery, will not refuse these poor corporals also her tributary sigh."

In March, Cromwell had been named to the command in Ireland; in July he went. "The curse of Cromwell" is yet a proverb in the Green Isle. Yet England, in all the long years she has held Ireland in half conquest, neither free enough to rise, nor slave enough to be still, never sent her as good a blessing.

There were no long years of torture, murder, insurrection, burnings and devastations, half-smothered, only to burst out anew. No. He laid his iron hand upon her, quelled her, and then gave her good laws and good government.

The heaviest charge against him, is his putting to the sword the garrison of Drogheda, (Tredah it was then called.) He had summoned the place; offered quarter upon surrender; expressly said he would give none if he stormed; and he kept his word; he always did. He knew the people, and determined by one act of severity to stop the endless bloodshed. The garrison, too, was English, and traitors to the then government of England. It had the desired effect; was in fact real mercy. "The execrable policy of that regicide," says Jacobite Carte on the occasion, "had the effect he proposed. It spread abroad the terror of his name; it cut. In fact it cut through the heart of the Irish war."

Ireland reduced to submission, obedience to the constituted authorities was enforced. "Lord Clarendon himself admits that she flourished, to an unexampled extent;" but no man's conscience was forced. Cromwell thus writes to the Governor of Ross:

"As for that which you mention concerning liberty of conscience, I meddle not with any man's conscience. But, if by liberty of conscience, you mean liberty to exercise the Mass, I judge it best to use plain dealing, and to let you know, where the parliament of England have power, *that* will not be allowed of."

The parliament of England, neither then, nor afterwards, when he writes to the same effect to Mazarin, cannot stretch their ideas of toleration so far; Cromwell was beyond the parliament of England on all such subjects.

He continued in Ireland faithfully obeying the parliament and fulfilling his trust, until the proceedings of the new king threaten again to disturb the peace of the Commonwealth; the eyes of all men turn to Cromwell, as soon as this new evil arises. On the 8th January, 1649, the parliament resolves to recall him; the orders do not reach him until 22d of March. In April, he writes for further instructions, matters having somewhat changed their aspect in the interim. He is reluctant to leave, but in May receives positive orders, and hastens home. Ireton remains as his deputy.

This man of intrigue, patiently conducts this foreign war; subjects himself to hardship and disease; performs laboriously all the drudgery of a subaltern, nor thinks of returning, where alone his plots could be successfully matured, until recalled; even then, lingers over his proper work; looking only to meet other and similar toils at home. Singular plotter! Most unaccountable aspirant!

It was high time the parliament should look to matters in Scotland. She is rent by parties; the majority, however, clinging to the Covenant, including a Stuart king; they were willing to take poor facile Charles, if he would swallow it; he did so. "How dare you enact such mummery before high heaven?" exclaims Oliver. They and Charles dared this and more. Active preparations are made to force on England and her heroes this desecrated Covenant and perjured King. Fairfax, but more his wife, objects to fighting against the Scots. Cromwell, say both Whitelock and Ludlow, strives hard to overcome his scruples, and induce him to retain his commission. Ludlow says, "he acted his part so well, I really thought he wished Fairfax to go." In after years, he seems to think he was mistaken. When was he right? His first opinion certainly harmonizes best with all Cromwell's conduct; never thrusting himself forward, but following humbly the leadings of God's providence, who was working great things for England by him, and for Scotland, too, as we shall see.

In June, 1650, Fairfax having resigned, the house naturally appointed Cromwell "Commander-in-Chief." In three days, he was on his march. In Scotland, he published declarations, denouncing the unholy union of Charles and the Covenant, and professed to seek the real substance of

the Covenant. He found cautious David Lesley, with his line from Leith shore to Carlton Hill, well secured: cannot attack him at any point, and fails to draw out the discreet soldier. They stand thus for a month; in which time it was, Charles swallowed the declaration against his father's sins. Cromwell, finding Lesley impracticable, returned to Dunbar. This town is at the point of a level peninsula, based on the Lammermoor Hills. Lesley advanced to these Hills, and occupied Doon Hill, twenty thousand strong. Oliver is hemmed in, but not in such a strait as historians have commonly reported. Dunbar is good winter quarters, with a harbor accessible to the fleet, and Oliver quite strong enough to defend it. His line rests its right on Belhaven Bay; its left on Brocks mouth House. The town is in his rear; Brocksburn runs along his front, in the bottom of a ditch or glen some forty feet deep. All our readable histories, being high tory, are inimical to both parties here, and favor us with misrepresentations of each.

“A vague story, due to Bishop Burnet, the watery source of many such, still circulates about the world, that it was the Kirk committee who forced Lesley down against his will, &c.”

The fact is, Lesley had no option but to retreat, a movement which would have been defeat, or to march down and attack Cromwell. He could not winter in those shelterless hills; he could not have remained there many days. His plan was good. Between the Burn and hill, was some level ground, though narrow; and not far from Brocks mouth House, the brook widened out and formed a good passable crossing. To get down on the level ground; possess this pass and the house, and march across, and attack Oliver's inferior army on the plain in front of Dunbar, was his scheme. On the second of September, he began to move his army down, and by the dusk, they were on the narrow ground described.

Oliver, walking in Brocks mouth garden, perceived the movement, and noted, that Lesley shifted his left wing of horse to the right; penetrates his plan, and resolves to anticipate him. At 4 o'clock, on the morning of the third, a heavy force of horse move forward to the pass, under Lambert. Lesley fails to surprise, but charging desperately, gains some advantages; Cromwell's horse drive him back.

Lesley's army is pent on the narrow level between Doon Hill and the forty foot glen. The discomfited horse, intended to secure the passage, and flank Cromwell's left, charge over their own foot. Cromwell throws his whole army across, and the affair becomes a mere rout;—the Scotch army is a wreck.

We cannot follow the details, but Scotland was soon conquered. The Covenanted King, some twelve months after, in sheer desperation, one would think, marched with such force as he could gather into England. Cromwell came up with him at Worcester, on the anniversary of Dunbar, and beat him finally and effectually. Charles escaped in very romantic ways, and went to the Continent. So ended the Scottish war. Cromwell "sent new judges to Scotland, 'a pack of kinless loons,' who minded no claim but that of fair play." He united Scotland "to England by act of parliament;" (still ahead of his age,) "tried in all ways to unite it by still deeper methods. He kept peace and order in the country; was a little heavy with taxes; on the whole, did what he could; and proved, as there is good evidence, a highly beneficial, though unwelcome phenomenon there. The clergy, though opposed to him, admitted the Gospel flourished under his rule; and even Bishop Burnet, says, "There was good justice done, and vice was suppressed and punished. So that we reckon these eight years of usurpation a time of great peace and prosperity."

The work of the parliament was now done; and men looked with general expectation to its dissolving itself, and calling a free parliament to settle the government. Such a project it did discuss, but prolonged the debate, from month to month, until all despaired of any termination; the eyes of men began to turn towards the only official person, who seemed proper to hasten its action; this was the "General." Accordingly, the Rump, under his spur, did make some efforts; but the retention of their own power was the uppermost feature. They were to sit in the new parliament, and members elected, to be subjected to their negative.

This suited no party; Cromwell perceived that the moment was come, when he must grasp the reins, or stand by and see the fruit of all their toils forever lost, and the nation replunged in endless anarchy. The scene that followed,

is well known; the English Nation, by its evident satisfaction, fully sanctioned the bold act. "They went very softly;" "we did not hear a dog bark at their going."

This was on the 20th April, 1653; on the 6th June, the General issued his summons to 140 men, selected by anxious consultation with the godly clergy, and chief men in their respective counties.

This is the Parliament derided in veracious history as "Barebone's," from the name of one of its members, 'Mr. Praisegod Barebone,' a leather merchant of Fleet Street; the son of pious parents; himself a man of piety, understanding, weight, and considerable wealth, who, in conjunction with Alderman Ireton, represented the city. Whitelock says, it contained many persons of fortune and knowledge; and even Lord Clarendon admits, "divers gentlemen who had estates." The list still exists—there were some Peers; some founders of peerages, as Montague, Howard, &c.; many, greater than Peers—among them, Admiral Blake and old Sir Francis Rouse, the versifier of the Psalms.

It sat five months, and did some excellent things; attempted more, for which the world was not ready; for instance, meddled with 'Tythes;' disturbing, in their comfortable seats, a safely settled ministry; thought 'Chancery' not the best machine for human justice, when the docket had 23,000 cases, of from 5 to 30 years' continuance, and talked of modification or abolition. The lawyers were more horror-stricken than the clergy. The law and the Gospel proved too much for this same honest Parliament: Finding they could do no real good, they resigned their power to His Excellency, and went home.

Four days after, the "Council of Officers and other persons of Interests" appointed Oliver "Lord Protector," with "Instruments of Government," "Council," &c.

Oliver calls a "Free Parliament," which met on the 3d of September, 1654; wherein England was more truly represented than ever before or since. About the same period, began plots against the "Protector's" life, which continued until his death. The king, by royal proclamation, offered £500 per annum and a colonelcy to any who would kill him, by "sword, pistol, or poison." (Thurloe II., 248.)

Before the meeting of Parliament, the "Protector" had

adopted many ordinances ; one of which, well deserves our notice.

It named 38 chosen men for the trial of preachers ; 9, laymen, and 29, clergy. He inquired but little about their sects ; some are Independents, some Presbyterians, and one or two even Anabaptists. He was only careful to have them men of wisdom and piety. By another ordinance, he named from 15 to 30 commissioners in each county, to "inquire into scandalous, ignorant, and insufficient ministers," and to eject such. Not a few of the commissioners are Oliver's enemies ; most of them Presbyterians, who, to say the least, were not his very warm friends. Baxter, one of the commissioners, gives unwilling testimony to the wisdom and liberality of these schemes.

The "First Protectorate Parliament" began its work, by questioning the authority which called it. Oliver thought this no time to do so. England was too much in the breakers, to be safe without her Pilot. He caused an oath to be offered each member, to the effect that they would not moot this question ; those who declined it, were excluded ; these were about one-fourth of the House. The remainder went plodding on, doing nothing in "Spirituals," but trying to torment heretics ; a thing Oliver could by no means consent to then, or afterwards ; and in "Temporals," kept fiddling with the present constitutions, notwithstanding the oath. So Oliver dissolved them at the end of the 5 months, for which they were summoned, counting 28 days to the month, which they disputed. But that was the "Soldier month," and Oliver thought it good enough for useless Parliaments.

In the midst of these days of little interest to us, we will plead no apology for dropping in this little fact, full of interest to Oliver then, and not wanting in it to us now :

"On Friday, (16th November, 1654,) Secretary Thurloe writes incidentally, 'My Lord Protector's mother, of ninety-four years old, died last night. A little before her death she gave, my lord, her blessing, in these words : 'The Lord cause His face to shine upon you, and comfort you in all your adversities ; and enable you to do great things for the glory of your Most High God, and to be a relief unto His people. My dear son, I leave my heart with thee. A good night !' and therewith sank into her long sleep. Even

so. Words of ours are but idle. Thou brave one, mother of a hero, farewell! Ninety-four years old: the royalties of Whitehall, says Ludlow very credibly, were of small moment to her; at sound of a musket, she would often be afraid her son was shot; and could not be satisfied unless she saw him once a day at least. She—old, weak, wearied one—she cannot help him with his refractory Pedant Parliaments, with his Anabaptist plotters, Royalist assassins, and world wide confusions; but she bids him, Be strong, be comforted in God. And so good night!”

The Major Generals succeeded the First Parliament, and did very well, though not at all constitutional: Whitelock (always at heart a royalist,) gives such testimony, which our author thus quotes: “And yet singular, observes my learned friend, (Whitelock,) how popular it seems to grow. These considerable infringements of the constitutional fabric, prohibition of cock-fights, amercing of Royalists, taxing without consent of Parliament, seem not to awaken the indignation of England; rather almost the gratitude and confidence of England. Next year we have “Letters of great appearances of the country at the Assizes; and how the gentlemen of the greatest quality served on Grand Juries; which is fit to be observed.”

In 1655, the Duke of Savoy began to preach, Romish fashion, to the poor Protestants of Piedmont. The ‘Lord Protector,’ and all good Englishmen with him, are roused. He refused to sign the French treaty; sent the Protestants £2,000 from his private purse, and ordered collections all over England, which resulted in a very large sum; the exact amount not now known. Mazarin was forced to interfere; and the Duke of Savoy to cease his pious labors.

In this same time, England’s navy, under Blake and others, is feeling the energy of such a prince. The Dutch he had already beaten into peace. The Duke of Florence is now forced to repent of some old injuries, and atone. The Dey of Tunis refuses to make any reparation for some deeds of his—whereon Blake burnt his ships under his castle walls, and did such other persuading things, as brought the Dey to reason. He then sailed in search of the Spanish Silver Fleet, and with good success. For some time in 1656 he got hold of it, and “took endless silver.” “News of the fact comes in October.” “In Novem-

ber came the fact itself;" "some eight and thirty wagon loads of real silver." England's naval greatness dates properly from these days—yet her hero-king is forgotten! or worse.

A new Parliament assembled in 1656—showing, very plainly, that Oliver had no wish to govern without them; desired, in fact, gradually to give England a free government, as she could bear it. He however discreetly excluded some hundred members elect, who are likely to give trouble, and makes much such a sifting as the "oath process" made in the last Parliament; leaving upwards of 300 members.

Upon their assembling, he abolished the "Major General System," an act of very doubtful policy, in his situation; but he was anxious to get constitutional, as the times gave him opportunity. The age, however, was very much behind him, as he well knows, and as he tells Mazarin in the following extract from a letter, written this year:

"The obligations, and many instances of affection, which I have received from your eminency, do engage me to make returns suitable to your merits. But although I have this set home upon my spirit, I may not, (shall I say I cannot?) at this juncture of time, and as the face of my affairs now stands, answer to your call for toleration.

I say I cannot, as to a public declaration of my sense on that point; although I believe that, under my government, your eminency, in the behalf of Catholics, has less reason for complaint as to rigor upon men's consciences, than under the Parliament's. And herein it is my purpose, as soon as I can remove impediments and weights that press me down, to make a farther progress, and discharge my promise to your eminency in relation to that."

Oliver's successful and peaceful rule, had now proved to England and the world his capacity for government. The Second Parliament ceased to pester him and derange his plans, by inquiries into an authority which spoke its own right in its acts. They tried a little intolerance; but Oliver wrote to "Our Right trusty and Right Beloved" Mr. Speaker Widdrington, and hinted they had better let that matter alone; which they wisely took in good part.

They reconstructed "the Instrument of Settlement," and offered Oliver the crown, which he a long time hesitated

about, very wisely; for there were sound arguments, pro and con. We cannot now know whether he decided well; but that he hesitated from a desire for an empty bauble, which he dared not yet grasp, will be believed soon by none—not even by the Saint Charles Martyrologists.

The new 'Frame' provided an upper House, and gave Cromwell power to nominate his successor. In June, 1657, they installed him, with great splendor. He strengthened himself henceforth at home and abroad; acquired Dunkirk, and left it a heritage for Charles, to sell for a mess of pottage; made England great and glorious, and her name a covert for the oppressed Protestants.

There is little more to finish this sketch. Plots were numerous, but his promptness quelled them; his clemency is a proof how false those fictions are, which ascribe to his latter day a restless dread of assassination. The Duke of Ormond's presence in London, to superintend his master's intrigues, was well known to him. He remained two months, unmolested. Oliver one day told the Lord Broghil that the Duke was lodging in Drury Lane, "and you had better tell him to be gone." The Duke took the hint. When the plots were fully developed, only two—prime instigators, unsafe to England—perished.

The Protector found the intrigues had spread into his Parliament, and dismissed it.

"It was high time * * if their session had continued but two or three days longer, all had been in blood both in city and country, upon Charles Stuart's account."

The afflictions common to all, when time begins to narrow our circle, now came rapidly upon him. Twelve days after the dissolution of Parliament, his son-in-law, Lord Rich, grandson of the Earl of Warwick, died. His letters to the old Earl on the occasion, are lost. We may guess the contents, from this extract from the answer:

"I cannot enough confess my obligation, much less discharge it, for your seasonable and sympathizing letters; which, besides the value they derive from so worthy a hand, express such faithful affections, and administer such Christian advices, as renders them beyond measure dear to me." "Blessings, and noble eulogies," says Carlyle, "the outpourings of a brave old heart, conclude this letter of

Warwick's. He himself died soon after; a new grief to the Protector."

Some six months hence, the Lady Claypole, Oliver's favorite daughter, after a long illness, died also. Her death scene, and the agony of the tender father, we must reluctantly pass over. He never recovered the blow, but sickened, and in less than a month followed her to the tomb.

The account of his dying moments, taken not from a hireling, like Heath, but from his chaplains, the attendants of his last hours, is too long to copy. They will well repay perusal. We give the prayer uttered in this awful time, as taken down by those around his bed: "Lord, though I am a miserable and wretched creature, I am in covenant with Thee, through grace. And I may, I will come to Thee, for thy people. Thou hast made me, though very unworthy, a mean instrument to do them some good, and Thee service; and many of them have set too high a value upon me, though others wish and would be glad of my death; Lord, however Thou do dispose of me, continue and go on to do good for them. Give them consistency of judgment, one heart, and mutual love; and go on to deliver them, and with the work of reformation; and make the name of Christ glorious in the world. Teach those who look too much on thy instruments, to depend more upon thyself. Pardon such as desire to trample upon the dust of a poor worm, for they are thy people too. And pardon the folly of this short prayer: even for Jesus Christ's sake. And give us a good night, if it be thy pleasure. Amen."

So prayed this hypocrite and usurper, just entering the presence of his Maker! We suppose the first clause, and his frequent allusions to the covenant, together with his utter self-annihilation, utterly incomprehensible to such soulless men as Heath—gave foundation to the common story, "that his dying faith was fixed on the belief that he once was in covenant, and therefore must be safe."

One by his bedside understood him very differently, when he heard him exclaim, "The Lord hath filled me with as much assurance of His pardon and His love, as my soul can hold."

The third of September—the day of his earthly victo-

ries—was the date of his final triumph: his victory over death and the grave.

With him, died England's last hope of regeneration in that century: the event proved the wisdom, not to say absolute necessity of his so called usurpation. "Puritanism crumbled down even faster for sixteen months in mad suicide, and universal clashing and collision; proved, by trial after trial, that there lay not in it either government, or so much as self government, any more; that a government of England, by it, was henceforth an impossibility. Amid the general wreck of things, all government threatening now to be impossible, the reminiscence of royalty rose again. Let us take refuge in the past; the future is not possible! And Major General Monk crossed the Tweed at Coldstream, with results which are well known."

Our task is done. We have buried our Hero. "High Dignitaries and Potentates" dug up his dead body, and hung it on a gibbet. From amid the foul rubbish of two centuries, we are just raising the memory of his immortal part, to stand life-like, though dim, in the clear atmosphere of Truth.

ARTICLE VI.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Memoirs and Remains of the Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne, Minister of St. Peter's Church, Dundee. By the Rev. ANDREW BONAR, Minister of the Free Church of Scotland, Collace.*

The above mentioned work we have lying before us, in the Scotch edition printed at Dundee, and in the abridged edition of the Board of Publication of our own Church. Still another edition has recently been issued from the press of Robert Carter, New York, in two volumes, which we have not seen.

Upon this work we can scarcely bestow a higher commendation than to say, it is a religious biography which should have been written. In no class of reading is greater discrimination required than in the memoirs of pious men. In our deliberate judgment, few of these with which the Christian world is flooded are profitable to the reader, while of a large portion we should be glad to think they are not decidedly injurious. They present the Christian character oftentimes exceedingly warped: some graces exaggerated beyond proportion, others stinted into insignificance—yet the whole so advantageously set off by the partial address of the author, that the unwary reader is betrayed into the admiration and perhaps the imitation of what is not really excellent. And it is far easier to take some form of Christian experience, developed in the life of a religious favorite, as the standard of Christian character, than to gather up the elements of that character from the inspired records, and see in what proportions they meet in ourselves. But this memoir of McCheyne we are happy to exempt from all such censure. We commend it to the earnest perusal of every private Christian, and to the prayerful study of every minister, elder, and candidate. It reveals a type of ministerial devotedness as well as of inward personal piety, which, when God bestows it, is the earnest of richest blessing to the Church. It shows, too, how eminently useful may be the labors of a man not ranking high in the scale of intellect, when that intellect is duly sanctified by grace and thoroughly toned by the doctrines of Christ. It exhibits how sweet is the memory which a saint leaves upon earth: and that, living or dying, his influence, like the soft dew, distils refreshingly upon the world.

Mr. Bonar has admirably sketched the life of his friend—a spiritual sympathy made him near of kin, and enabled him to read and understand his soul. We only regret that he has not enriched his work with an analysis of McCheyne's character: for it should be the leading design of a religious biography to trace out the elements of character, and to show how nature and grace make up that whole which we admire.

2. *The Ruling Eldership of the Christian Church.* By the Rev. DAVID KING, L. L. D., Glasgow. Second Edition. Edinburgh: 1846. 18mo., pp. 284.

The above is the title of an excellent treatise on the Eldership, by Rev. Dr. KING, of the United Associate Church of Scotland. The object of the writer, as he informs us, was wholly practical. With high views of the duties and importance of the Eldership, he has striven to lead those holding the office to a right appreciation and discharge of their duty, and to advance the well working of their entire order. His endeavor is to show, 1st. That the primitive churches received from their divine Head a constitution which was intended to be permanent. 2d. That each of the primitive churches had a company of elders for its spiritual office-bearers. 3d. That while all these office-bearers ruled, only some of them taught, so that a distinction subsisted among them of teaching and ruling elders. 4th. That as this system has the sanction of Scripture, it is also most reasonable in itself. He then views the office of Ruling Elder, relatively to that of Deacon. These topics occupy parts first and second of the treatise. Part third considers the duties of Elders; their conduct in their secular affairs; their government of their families; their official individual duties, as that each should have his district, keep his district roll-book, visit church members and the sick, exhort with offenders, exercise a care over the religious education of the young, and conduct district prayer-meetings; their duties viewed collectively in their sessional capacity; their duties in the higher church courts. Part fourth treats of the qualifications of elders. The scriptural part of the argument, the author informs us, has been extended in this, the second edition, "chiefly to meet the reasoning of some American writers, who, though distinguished Presbyterians, assail the only foundation on which the office of ruling elder can be firmly established." The subject is handled with ability and earnestness, and could the treatise be made accessible to the ministers and elders of the Presbyterian Church in this country by an Ameri-

can edition, it would doubtless have no small influence in imparting an intelligent appreciation of the office of the Elder, and awakening a new zeal for the full performance of its duties.

-
3. *The Books of Discipline, and of Common Order ; The Directory for Family Worship ; The Form of Process ; and the Order of Election of Superintendents, Ministers, Elders, and Deacons.* Edinburg, pp. 230, 12mo.

Our antiquarian tastes have been gratified by the perusal of this little book, from the press of the Edinburg Printing and Publishing Company. We have been carried back to the cradle of the Presbyterian Church since the Reformation. The collection (the title of which we have copied above,) contains the following interesting publications: The Book of Common Order, or, The Order of the English Kirk at Geneva; whereof John Knox was minister, approved by the famous and learned man John Calvin; first published at Geneva, the 10th of February, Anno 1556. Previously to the establishment of the Protestant Religion in Scotland, this book was generally followed by the Scotch Reformers. It was, however, found inadequate for the regulation of a church consisting of many congregations, and was superseded by the second publication embraced in this reprint, viz: The First Book of Discipline, or, The Policie and Discipline of the Church; drawn up by Mr. John Winram, Mr. John Spottiswood, John Willock, Mr. John Douglass, Mr. John Row, and John Knox, and presented to the nobilitie anno 1560, and afterwards subscribed by the Kirk and Lords. Accompanying this, is The Forme and Ordour of the Electioun and Admission of the Superintendent; which may serve in electioun of all other Ministers. Edinburg, anno 1560, John Knox being Minister. Another document is The Electioun of Eldaris and Deacons in the church of Edinburg, Edinburg, Anno 1569. Then follows, in the order of time, The Second Buik of Discipline; or Heidis and Conclusions of the Policie of the Kirk,

agreed upon in the General Assembly, 1578; inserted in the Registers of Assembly, 1581; sworn to in the National Covenant, revived and ratified by the Assembly, 1638, and according to which the Church government is established by Law, anno 1592 and 1690. The Directory for Family Worship approved by act of the General Assembly, anno 1647. The Form of Process in the judicatories of the Church of Scotland, approved April 18, 1707.

These several books, which embody the decisions of the Fathers of the Presbyterian Church, and are rendered easily accessible by this republication, are monuments of the intelligence, piety, faith, and steadfastness of the founders of the Presbyterian Church, and are not without great and manifest utility in the exposition of the present standards of our Faith.

4. *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans: with remarks on the Commentaries of Dr. Macknight, Professor Moses Stuart, and Professor Tholuck.* By ROBERT HALDANE, Esq. From the fifth Edinburgh Edition. New York: Robert Carter, 58 Canal Street. pp. 746.

Mr. Carter has done a good work in republishing this valuable Commentary. It has long been a favorite with us—and we have heretofore contributed our mite towards increasing its circulation, by importing several copies from Europe, and commending it to the study of our friends and neighbors. It is a book deeply impregnated with the doctrines of grace—it breathes the spirit as well as catches the meaning of the sacred text—and exhibits the Gospel in its life and power, even more than in its form and letter. From some views of Mr. Haldane, as Americans and Presbyterians, we, of course, dissent—but, as a whole, we can cordially commend his work to the patronage of our churches. In a future number we may, perhaps, review it more minutely and extensively.

5. *The Hebrew Grammar of Gesenius, as edited by Roediger: Translated with additions, and also a Hebrew Chrestomathy; by M. STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature, Theological Seminary, Andover. Andover: Allen, Morrill, and Wardwell. 1846. 8vo., pp. 360.*

The Grammar of Gesenius has been a standard work in this department of Hebrew Literature for the last forty years. It was often republished during the life time of its distinguished author, and is now re-edited by Prof. Roediger, formerly his pupil, and afterwards his colleague, in the University of Halle. We have in this Grammar, then, the results of the labors of two of the most eminent Hebricians of Germany, perfected, at least on the part of the author, by continual revision, and by a constantly increasing acquaintance with the field of oriental literature. The present translation is from the fourteenth German edition. Another has been published in England by Dr. Benjamin Davies, and contemporaneously with that of Prof. Stuart, another translation has been brought out in this country, by Prof. Conant, of the Theological Institution at Hamilton, New York. Of the controversy between the two last named gentlemen, as to the right of publishing, and the correctness of the two translations, we have nothing to say. But that these translations into our own language should occur so soon after the publication of Roediger's edition, shows the estimation in which the work is held. Like all the works of Gesenius, it confines itself to an honest statement of the phenomena of the language, with little of theory and philosophic speculation. Nordheimer has more of philosophy, and often renders the otherwise dry details of orthography, etymology and syntax, luminous and attractive by the ingenious and satisfactory explanations he gives of them. Some will prefer this grammar, from the fact that it confines itself almost wholly to a brief statement of the facts the language presents. A grammar of 640 pages, like Nordheimer's, has to meet with some objections in the mind of the student, when com-

pared with one of only half the size. As yet, we prefer the old method of arranging the nouns, which is retained in Roediger's Gesenius, to that adopted by Nordheimer, which is certainly perplexing to the student. Nordheimer's explanation of the Tenses is far more clear than that adopted by Roediger in this edition of Gesenius. Nor are we satisfied that any thing has been gained by calling the future tense the imperfect.

On the whole, we cannot but be gratified at the advances which are making in Hebrew Literature in our land. No students are better supplied with elementary books in this department than those of this country, and it will be their own fault if they do not render themselves acquainted with this noble and sacred tongue, and become familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures. Our Theological students and ministers might, with profit to themselves, bestow much more attention upon this department of study.

6. *A Series of Revival Sermons, by the Rev. DANIEL BAKER, formerly Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Washington City, now of Holly Springs, Mississippi. Philadelphia: published for the Author by William S. Martien. 1846. 12mo., pp. 376.*

These sermons will be read and prized by many who held sweet intercourse with their beloved author, in those revivals which pervaded these southern Atlantic States fourteen or fifteen years ago, and by many who regard him as their spiritual father. As we read them, they revive in our memory those scenes in which, while there is much in the review to regret, there is still enough for which to be thankful—happy influences which have not yet ceased, abiding fruits still living, and still cheering the Church of God. This volume contains twelve sermons, selected from among those preached during these revivals, deeply interesting at that time to those who heard them. Nor do we read them now without emotion. They bring afresh before us the impassioned preacher and the thronged assemblies whose hearts

were then moved as the trees of the forest are moved before the wind. Still our ideas of what belongs to good taste are not met by these discourses. They abound more in anecdote, in exclamations, and free colloquialisms, than suit our views of the true dignity of the pulpit orator. Apostrophe, and other strong figures of rhetoric, are too freely used, and carried beyond the bounds of propriety. There is too much effort to be awakening. The style of the French rather than of the English pulpit is adopted, the Asiatic fervor rather than the calm reasoning of the Occident. And yet these discourses were blessed in their first delivery, to men of all descriptions, learned and unlearned, cultivated and uncultivated. The vivid moral painting, the fervid impassioned appeal, and the rhetorical mode of presenting argument, are infinitely more likely to move an audience, than a style more rigidly correct, and reasoning more technical and abstract. The preacher's words are words of faithfulness, but the reader feels also that they are most truly words of love.

7. *Christian Unity: a Sermon preached before the Convention of the Diocese of South Carolina, on Thursday, 4th of February, 1847, by EDWARD REED, Rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Grahamville.*

A discourse on Christian unity, in these days of infuriated churchism, and from an Episcopal clergyman, naturally attracts our notice: we are happy to add, in this instance, our approbation. The sermon is founded upon that striking portion of our Saviour's prayer, recorded in John xvii., 23: "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me,"—and is a brief but truly evangelical exposition of the text. It sets out by showing that this unity is not merely outward and visible; it loves visible concord, yet is not satisfied with it, but aspires after something more heavenly. Then follows an exposition of the true inward unity, as consisting in the *possession of the spirit*, unity of faith,

unity of *affection*, and unity of *purpose*. The discourse concludes with a glowing description of the spiritual effects produced upon the world by the exhibition of this unity.

There is but one sentence in the whole sermon which exhibits the astringent properties of the doctrine of apostolic succession: in which the author laments the defects of other religious denominations "in the want of an apostolic constitution, and in the want of an inherent recuperative energy, by which error can be thrown off from the body." To our minds, there is a smart touch of irony in this last clause: but as it occurs in the introduction of the discourse, and we can hardly suspect the author of wishing to burlesque his own church in a discourse delivered before the Episcopal Convention, we conclude this must have been a sop to Cerberus. We, however, pardon this one sinning passage, in consideration of the piety, unction, and catholicity of the remainder: and rejoice there are a few found in the bosom of that church disposed to contend so earnestly against what Carlyle calls its "unutterable tendencies."

-
8. *The Character of the Gentleman. An Address to the Students of Miami University, Ohio, on the evening before Commencement Day, in the month of August, MDCCCXLVI. Second and enlarged Edition.* By FRANCIS LIEBER, Professor of Political Philosophy and Economy in South Carolina College. Columbia and Charleston, S. C. Allen, McCarter & Co. MDCCCXLVII. 12mo., pp. 110.

A subject appropriate to the occasion, novel in the method of treatment, and discussed with that quiet, easy ability, which are always so grateful and satisfactory to the reader. Few men have those ample stores of historic and political anecdote at command which are proved by this address to exist in the memory of its author. We are happy too to see that he considers it possible to conceive of the character of which he treats, in its entire fullness, only by the aid of Christianity, and that the whole dis-

course is pervaded by a moral tone so elevated and pure. The getting up of the edition also does honor to the publishers and to the press of Mr. Morgan.

9. *The Sacred Mountains.* By J. T. HEADLEY. New York: Baker & Scribner, 36 Park Row & 145 Nassau St. pp. 175.

Mr. Headley has already become favorably known as an author, by his work on Napoleon and his Marshals, and is still more widely diffusing his name by a work very recently completed, on Washington and his Generals. His style is suited to popular effect, and though he is not a writer after our hearts, yet he is likely to be esteemed as much as he deserves, and to escape the fate of many a profound thinker and laborious scholar. The book before us is beautifully printed, beautifully illustrated, and perhaps beautifully written—but we doubt whether so large an infusion of the sentimental as it contains, will contribute much to the edification of his readers.

10. *The hand of God recognized.* A discourse delivered on Sunday, 22d of February, 1846, in the Independent or Congregational Church, at Dorchester, St. George's Parish, S. C., in observance of the 150th Anniversary of the building of the Church. By Rev. GEORGE SHELDON, Pastor. Published by request of the Congregation. Charleston: Burgess & James. 1846.

The church at Dorchester very appropriately observed the 150th Anniversary of the erection and dedication of its house of worship. We learn, from the interesting discourse delivered by the pastor, the following facts respecting its history. That in the year 1695, some pious and enterprising persons in Dorchester, Mass., and its vicinity, hearing by letters and otherwise, of

the spiritual destitutions then existing in these regions, formed themselves into a colony for the purpose of migrating to Carolina, and 'settling,' as the term then was, 'the gospel there.' As was the custom with the Puritans of New England, they first formed themselves into a church, and elected their pastor, Rev. Joseph Lord, who, on the 22d of October, 1695, was set apart to the work of the gospel ministry. This band of Christians, then a colony from the 2nd Congregational Church of Dorchester, Mass., sailed on the night of December 14, 1695, in two small vessels, one of which came near being lost, and arrived in the course of a month at Charleston, about sixteen years after the settlement of that city. Threading their way up the Ashley river, in quest of a convenient site for a settlement, they selected a spot for their earthly abode, which they called after the name of their late residence. This settlement is stated in the discourse to be the first made out of Charleston. The country was wild, and while they were erecting their dwellings they were obliged to station armed sentinels, to apprize them of the approach of the savage foe, the Westoe and Stonoe Indians being in their immediate neighborhood, and exceedingly hostile. On the 2d of February, 1696, under a spreading oak, "still stretching out its weather-beaten limbs, affording a shelter to the living and to the resting places of the dead," they celebrated the communion of the Lord's Supper. Shortly after, they erected their house of worship, which was used as a barrack by the British during the war of the Revolution, and in which the discourse which we notice appears to have been delivered. In 1734-5, a colony was sent out from this church, under the pastoral care of Rev. John Osgood, who was a native of Dorchester in this State, and a graduate of Harvard University, and settled themselves at Medway, in Liberty County, Georgia, where they have been greatly blessed, and have contributed much to the spread of the gospel at home and abroad. We hope that other churches will copy the example this congregation has set, cherish the memory of their founders, and preserve in some authentic form the record of their origin and history.

11. *History of the American Lutheran Church, from its Commencement, in the year of our Lord 1685, to the year 1842.* By ERNEST L. HAZELIUS, D. D., Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Lutheran Synod of South Carolina. Zanesville, Ohio: 1846. 12mo., pp. 800.

The various denominations of Christians in our land are turning their attention to their past history, and noting the hand of God's providence toward them. For this they have a divine warrant. "Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations: ask thy Father, and he will show thee; thy elders—and they will tell thee." Dr. Hazelius has given us a valuable, truthful, and candid narrative of the rise and progress of the Lutheran Church in America. He has drawn from various German authorities, as well as from his own personal knowledge of American Lutheranism, itself extending through a long ministerial life, and from other sources. That portion which relates to the Saluda and Broad River, Saxe Gotha and other settlements in this State, and to the settlement of the Salz-burgers at Ebenezer in Georgia, are, from local considerations, to us especially interesting.

-
12. *The Relations of Christianity to War: and the Portraiture of a Christian Soldier. A Discourse delivered on occasion of the first commencement of the Citadel Academy.* By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D. Charleston, S. C. 1847. pp. 33.

The author of this discourse shows that government, and the right of self-defence are alike ordained of God; that government, therefore, may defend itself; that it is bound to punish crimes, and may punish them with death; that law is a punishment of the nation against which it is waged; that the right of punishment confers, therefore, the right of making war; that the Bible sanctions, approves, and in many instances commands war; that

in the New Testament, even, it is not forbidden, nor the profession of the soldier condemned. Yet Christianity provides for and aims at the cessation of war. It transforms the character, elevates and humanizes nations, binds them in fraternal intercourse, and originates for them a common Christian literature. The profession of the soldier then, in the present condition of humanity, must continue. But the soldier should be a gentleman, a patriot, and a Christian. In these days of Peace Societies and sickly Philanthropy, it is rare that we hear from the pulpit a defence of War. The present circumstances of our country make such a discussion as this opportune, and clothe it with unusual interest. In the conclusions of Dr. Smyth, and in most of his reasoning, we fully concur. That a nation is constituted the judge of another independent nation, and can *punish* it for injuries not received by itself, and for conduct not directly involving its own safety, we might be unwilling to affirm. In these cases, we would leave vengeance to Him to whom it belongs. The right of punishment in other cases, is little more than the right of self defence, a right belonging alike to individuals and to States.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER II.

SEPTEMBER, 1847.

ARTICLE I.

ΠΙΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΛΟΓΙΑ, or a *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit: wherein an account is given of His Name, Nature, Personality, Dispensation, Operations, and Effects, &c.* By JOHN OWEN, D. D., being the 2nd Volume of his Works, edited by Russell. London: Richard Baynes.

The True Divinity of the Holy Spirit, proved from Scripture: in six Sermons, by the Rev. JOHN HURRION, late Minister of the Gospel in London, being the 3rd Volume of his Works. London: Richard Baynes, 1823.

The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit, in every age, with reference to particular persons: considered in several Sermons, on John III., 6, and Galatians V., 25. By JOHN HOWE. Works of John Howe, London, 1832.

1. *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ, ex scriptis, quæ extant, Catholicorum Doctorum, qui intra prima ecclesiæ Christianæ sæcula floruerunt; in qua obiter quoque Constantinopolitana Confessio, de Spiritu Sancto, antiquorum testimoniis adstruitur.* 2. *Judicium ecclesiæ Catholice.* 3. *Primitiva et Apostolica Traditio.* 4. *Breves animadversiones in Tractatum Gilberti Clerke. Authore Georgio Bullo, Presbytero Anglicano.* Constituting the Vth and VIth volumes of his works. Oxford: Clarendon Press, MDCCCXXVII.

VOL. I.—No. 2.

1

An Exposition of the Creed. By JOHN PEARSON, D. D., late Lord Bishop of Chester. Revised by Rev. W. S. Dobson, A. M. New York: Appleton & Co. 1844. Article VIII, "I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY GHOST."

The Personality and Office of the Christian Comforter asserted and explained, in a course of Sermons on John XVI., 7, preached before the University of Oxford, at the Lecture founded by the late Rev. John Bampton, M. A., Canon of Salisbury. By the late Right Rev. REGINALD HEBER, Bishop of Calcutta.

Handbuch der Dogmatik der Evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, Von Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider. Leipzig, 1828.

Lehrbuch der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte, Von D. Ludw. Fr. Otto Baumgarten-Crusius. Jena 1832.

We have placed at the head of this article the titles of a number of the more prominent authors within our reach, on the Divinity, Personality, and Offices of the Holy Spirit. An earlier class might have been found in those fathers of the Greek and Latin churches, who defended the doctrine of the Trinity against the early heretics of the third and fourth centuries. At first this doctrine was embraced in the church with great simplicity, as it is by ordinary Christians, who have not bestowed upon the subject of Theology a learned and scientific study. The Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Spirit, was commonly held, but the doctrine of the Trinity, as exhibited in the writings of those early times, until the influx of erroneous views induced the careful study of this mysterious subject, was not well defined; nor did it become so, till the discussions of years had detected the various forms of heretical opinion, had sifted out what was untenable, and settled the doctrines of the church on a firm and scriptural basis. The heresies of the four first centuries principally had respect to the several persons of the Godhead, and errors were introduced on this subject both from the Gnostic and the Grecian philosophy. The admirers of the one interpreted the doctrine concerning the Father, Son and Spirit, accord-

ing to the emanation system of the oriental theosophers; those of the other, by their views respecting the reason and will in man, making the *λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the Word of God, and the *Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the Spirit of God, to be equivalent to the *reason* and the *energy* of God. The Unitarians of the second and third centuries had their representatives in Theodotus, Artemon, and Paul of Samosata, while the Patripasians, Praxeas, Noetus, Beryl of Bostra, and Sabellius, made no personal distinction between Father, Son and Spirit, but represented these as one and the same person, performing three kinds of operations upon the world without. All these heresiarchs erred, in making too little distinction in the Godhead. In the fourth century arose Arius, erring in an opposite direction, and drawing vast numbers of the Christian world after him, into a denial of the supreme divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Differing totally from the preceding errorists, he separated entirely between the Father and Son, allowing to the former the attributes of deity, and making the latter a creature, though the first and noblest of those beings formed by the power of the Creator. The heresy of Arius overshadowed Europe, Asia, and Africa, more or less, till the seventh century. The true divinity of the Son, and his relations to the Father, were determined by the Nicene Council, in the year 325. Afterwards arose, in the 5th century, the Nestorian view of the double person of Christ, the Eutychean or Monophysite theory, which gave to Christ but a single nature; and in the 7th century, the Monothelite heresy, which ascribed to him but a single will. During the controversies which these various errors occasioned, every thing was brought forward on both sides which could tend to the elucidation of these mysteries, and the moderns have added nothing new in the discussions of later times, to the reasonings of the ancients.

In all these discussions, the true divinity and personality of the Spirit was, in a great measure, passed by in silence. The earliest form of the Nicene Creed, while full and ample on the divinity and sonship of Christ, embraces the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in one brief and indefinite phrase: "We believe in one God, the Father, &c., and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, &c. &c., AND IN THE HOLY SPIRIT." Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα.

Though Arius himself determined nothing in relation to

the Holy Spirit, it was not long before some of his followers began to err also in reference to the third person in the Godhead. Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium in the year 343, taught that the λόγος, or Word of God, is but the understanding of God, and the Holy Spirit a virtue or *energy* proceeding from him, and not a *person*. His doctrine was condemned by the orthodox in their Councils of Antioch, A. D. 345, of Milan, A. D. 347, and of Sirmium, and also by the Arians in *their* council of Sirmium, A. D. 351. After him, Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, a distinguished Semi-Arian teacher, being driven into exile, founded the sect of the Pneumatomachi, or Fighters against the Holy Ghost, who, after their leader, held, if we may believe Mosheim, that the Holy Spirit was an *energy*, diffused through the Universe, and not a *person* distinct from the Father and the Son. Sozomen, however, represents him as not denying the personality of the Spirit, but as affirming him to be inferior in dignity, a minister and a servant, one of the holy angels of God. (1). This doctrine was embraced by many in Asia, and was condemned by the second General Council assembled at Constantinople by Theodosius the Great, in the year 381. This council defined the doctrine respecting the Holy Spirit, by an addition to the Nicene Creed. After the words, "We believe in the Holy Ghost," they inserted, "the Lord which quickeneth, which proceedeth from the Father, which is to be worshiped and glorified with the Father and the Son, which spake by the prophets." (2). In the eighth century a controversy arose between the Greek and Latin Church, concerning the *procession of the Holy Ghost*, the Latin Church having added to the words "proceedeth from the Father," the words "filioque," "and from the Son." The procession of the Spirit from the Father alone was maintained by the Greek Church, His procession from both the Father and the Son by the Latin. This controversy ended in the eleventh century, in the entire separation of the eastern from the western Churches.

During these protracted controversies, the entire doctrine

(1) See Sozomen, Hist. Eccl., Lib. IV., Ch. xxvii.

(2) Το κύριον, το ζωοποιόν, το εκ του πατρος εκπορευόμενον, το συν πατρι και υιω συμπροσκυνούμενον και συνδοξαζόμενον, το λαλῆσαν διά των προφητῶν

of the Holy Spirit, as revealed in the Scriptures, was fully handled. Extended treatises on the subject, by the early fathers, are still in existence, while others have perished. We have a book on the Trinity, written by Novatian in the third century, which is often ascribed to Tertullian, and sometimes to Cyprian: In the 4th century, two letters of Athanasius on the Holy Ghost, besides various other writings of his against the Arians and on the general subject of the Trinity; twelve books of St. Hilary on the Trinity; a treatise of Didymus of Alexandria on the Holy Spirit, preserved in the translation of Jerome; a book of St. Basil on the same subject, one of Gregory Nyssen on the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, seven books of Faustinus, and three of St. Ambrose, on the same. In the fifth century we have the writings of Cyril, of Theodoret, and others. There is little in the writings which we have placed at the head of our article, which is not found in these ancient authors. The technical language of Theology, now in use on the subject of the Trinity, emanated from them, and the moderns do but repeat what perhaps was as well said by these early fathers.

Of those who have written on the Holy Spirit in our own language, we place first the three volumes of Dr. Owen, notwithstanding the prolixity of his style, his cumbrous details, and the clumsiness of his modes of expression. Some of these faults we have supposed proceeded from his not writing *propria manu*, but with the aid of an amanuensis. Cecil remarks, with justice, that "his scholars will be more profound and enlarged and better furnished than those of most other writers. His work on the Spirit," says he, "has been my treasure house, and one of my very first rate books." We may extend the same remarks to his treatises on Church Government, to his work on the Person and Glory of Christ, and to his great, though diffuse books on the Epistle to the Hebrews, which never have been and never will be superseded. His was a strong, if not an original mind, illuminated as few minds have been since the Apostolic age, and sanctified and tranquilized, though he lived in troublous times, by the indwelling Spirit.

Hurion was a dissenting divine of England, who flourished nearly a century later than Dr. Owen, and who wrote and delivered at the lecture at Pinner's Hall, London, six-

teen sermons on the Divinity, Personality, Procession, Mission, and Works of the Holy Spirit. These discourses the author never lived to finish in the full extent which he had himself intended. Though not so full as the treatise of Dr. Owen, they are an ample and able discussion of his great argument.

John Howe was contemporary through a considerable period of his life with Dr. Owen, and though perhaps his inferior in extent and solidity of theological learning, and in the doctrinal value of his works, he was plainly a man of great power, often of lively eloquence, and deeply imbued with piety.

The treatises of bishop Bull, Defensio, &c., constitute an enduring monument to the learning and ability of one of the most distinguished ornaments of the English church. The earliest of these works was first published in the year 1685, and was received with every mark of favor by the orthodox divines of England and Continental Europe. When he published his *Judicium Ecclesiae Catholicae*, the clergy of France transmitted, through the celebrated Bossuet, their thanks to him for the signal service he had done to the cause of truth. It is only incidentally that these able treatises touch upon the subject of the Holy Spirit, their object being to defend the doctrine of the Nicene fathers, respecting the Son of God, against the Arians, Socinians, Sabellians and Tritheists.

Bishop Pearson's work on the Apostle's Creed, written nearly two hundred years ago, is still a text book in the English Universities—is an elaborate and learned work, and is one of the principal standard books in divinity of the English church. That part of it which treats of the 8th article, we have considered as the best brief view of the doctrine respecting the Spirit it has been our fortune to meet with. The Bampton lectures of the late Bishop Heber, are a valuable contribution to the theology of this great subject. They are better adapted to the modern doubts, in relation to the Spirit and his influences; have more pretensions as it respects style, but seem to us less complete, and less direct in their mode of handling this great theme than the earlier treatises. When he comes to speak of the Spirit's influences, he does not conceal his dislike to those views of grace which have been maintained by the Calvinistic divines.

The two German theologians are added, not because we regard them the highest authority for theological correctness, but for the history of doctrines, to which these writers of modern Germany have devoted great attention, and which we find more perfectly given in these books than any others now before us. To Brettschneider, too, cannot be denied the merit of great learning and acuteness of mind.

With these prefatory remarks, we shall proceed to lay before our readers, with as much amplitude as our present limits will admit, the scripture doctrine respecting the *person, deity* and *office* of the Holy Spirit.

For that we should understand what may be understood respecting the holy Trinity, from whom our salvation proceeds, is not a matter of small importance and unfruitful in good. Nor can we, who are baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, neglect him, whose purifying power is mainly symbolised in the ordinance of baptism, and whose workmanship we are, if we are the children of God. Especially, we who live under the Gospel, which is emphatically the ministration of the Spirit, and have the Spirit promised as a comforter to supply the absence of Christ, who has entered into his glory, should be exceedingly solicitous to know him and the relation he sustains to the Godhead and to us. He is the promise of the New Testament, as Christ is of the Old; the only unpardonable sin spoken of in the Bible, is the sin against him; and if the truth, that God hath not another Son to offer as another sacrifice, be a reason why we should not despise the Saviour, the truth that he hath not another Spirit to make the sacrifice effectual, should be a reason why we may not despise and reject that Spirit.

Is it not true, that even in our orthodox churches at this day, there is much ignorance and skepticism on this important subject? Once, as we have seen, the church of Christ was alive to the honor of the third person of the blessed Trinity, and replete with knowledge respecting him; and centuries ago assembled councils, defended the doctrine of his divinity from the attacks of heresy, and more clearly defined from the teachings of the Scriptures, the faith of the church in relation to it.

There are two sources of hesitation in respect to the

divinity of the Holy Spirit. The mysterious nature of his influences, and the difficulty of admitting his personal existence.

But, if any person is hesitating to receive the doctrine of the Spirit's influence, because it is mysterious, let him consider if it is a thing so incredible that God should operate on man by an immediate power, enlightening his mind, regenerating his nature, sanctifying his heart, receiving the things of Christ, and showing them unto him. Is not God represented, through the Scriptures, as exerting an invisible agency throughout creation, as inspiring men with wisdom, as having influenced and still influencing all creatures in the accomplishment of his wise purposes. And, if there be a first and second person in the Godhead, by each of whom a certain portion of the divine works appropriate to himself are performed, why may there not be a third person also, by whom these more secret and perhaps more mysterious acts, are put forth as his own peculiar work.

If we still hesitate, let us again recollect that we are of yesterday and know nothing; that in our best estate our faculties are limited, and that we cannot find out the infinite and the Almighty to perfection. We measure the divine unity, and the divine persons by earthly standards. Among men, one being is one person, and three persons are three beings; and we infer that if there is a trinity of persons in the Godhead, God is no longer one but three. But let us first remember that this is *our inference*. And that among men in the business of life, and among philosophers in the walks of science, an inference is always set aside by proof. In respect to Christ, the evidence of personality is conclusive. He is God; yet, is he plainly a distinct person from the Father. And if we have admitted this fact, although it is opposed to our preconceived idea of the unity of God, our minds should admit with an easier acquiescence, upon adequate proof, the idea of a third person in the Trinity, the Holy Ghost. The personality of the Son is plain, just because of his incarnation. But, the prophets and patriarchs could believe in a divine Saviour yet to come, who was from eternity the Son of God, and coequal with the Father, when as yet he had not become incarnate; and we have now the same evidence of the personality and

entire divinity of the Holy Ghost, as they had in relation to that Saviour in whom they believed, and by whom they were redeemed.

It has been asserted that the Holy Ghost is a created substance, and this, according to some historians, was the error of Macedonius in the 4th century. Again, it has been asserted that the Holy Ghost is an attribute of the deity, not separate from the Father, or an operation or mode of operation of that of one God, whose very nature excludes the possibility of the so called personal distinctions. (3). But we believe in opposition to these assertions—

1st. That the Holy Spirit is a person, intelligent and active, and not merely an operation or attribute of the Godhead.

A person is plainly different from a thing, an attribute, an operation, or a mode of operation. A person has understanding, a will, choice, affections, and authority; has his own peculiar emotions, sustains relations to other persons, and puts forth acts indicative of his own personal character, and which cannot be predicated, of a thing, an act, or a mere quality. Such a personal character, we proceed to show, is ascribed in the Scriptures to the Holy Spirit of God.

1. He is opposed to those evil spirits to whom a personal existence is ascribed. But the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit troubled him. (4). And the personality of these evil spirits is elsewhere clearly described, where it is said, Then came out a spirit and stood before the Lord and said, I will entice him. (5).

2. As Comforter, he was to supply the place of the Lord Jesus Christ, compensate for his absence, and perform for his disciples that office of teaching and guiding which he had performed while among them. Now as Christ was a person, that which was to supply his place, and perform his office, and be another Comforter, must be a person also. The word itself, translated Comforter, and meaning also

(3) Gregory Nazianzen reduces the various opinions which had been entertained respecting the Spirit to three. *Τῶν δὲ καὶ ἡμᾶς σοφῶν οἱ μὲν ἐνέργειαν ἴσῳ (το πνευμα) ὑπέλαβον, οἱ δὲ κλισμα, οἱ δὲ θεον, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἐγνωσαν ομοιοτητον ἰουῶν.* Orat. quot. in Pearson.

(4) 1 Sam. 16: 14.

(5) 2 Chron. 18: 20.

VOL. I.—No. 2.

2

Advocate, which is a better translation in all the places where it occurs, has been adopted into many languages, and by its termination, derivation and use, always means an intelligent personal agent. (6). Could any attribute of God, or any act, or any class of acts, be entitled to a name so distinct and personal, or entitle the Redeemer to say, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." (7).

3. We are baptized, when we profess Christianity, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Now as (by universal admission,) the Father and Son are self-existing subjects, or persons, and not mere conditions and properties of a subject, the Holy Ghost, united with them in this solemn language, must be equally a person, equally distinct, and equally entitled to a full share of the same honor and worship. How incongruous, to say nothing of the blasphemy implied, to raise to the same level, and to name that which is but an operation of the Father, or an attribute belonging to his nature, with the same distinctness with which we name his own glorious character, and the person of his Son. But the very idea of Baptism implies *an obligation entered into*, at the moment of receiving it, to obey the individual in whose name the baptism is performed; and obligation binds to a person, and not to a thing, to an intelligent agent, and not to a quality which that agent possesses, or to an act which he is putting forth. We are not baptized into the Father and into the Son, and into the power of God, nor into the Father and the Son, and the act of regeneration. The formula of Baptism also implies *honor done* in the highest degree, and *homage or fealty rendered* to the mysterious Three: But this honor and homage cannot be rendered to a thing, to an attribute which has no being of itself, to an act which is a performance and not a subsistence, but must be rendered to the maker of the thing, to the possessor of the attribute, and the performer of the act. All which shows, that if the Holy Spirit is mentioned in such expressions as the formula of Baptism, of benediction, and other like modes

(6) Παράκλητος, *advocatus*, "one who, being called in, stands by the side of others to assist them."

(7) John 14: 16.

of speech, he can be no less distinct and personal in his mode of subsistence than the Father and the Son. But

4. Personal properties and acts are ascribed to the Holy Spirit.

He has *knowledge*, not he is the knowledge of God, but he *has* knowledge respecting the things of God. Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. (8). The Spirit searcheth, that is, has that accurate knowledge which is the result of searching; the Spirit searcheth the deep things of God. (9). He has a *will*. "But all these things worketh that self same spirit, dividing to every man severally as *he will*." (10). He has *affections*. We are directed "to *grieve* not the holy Spirit of God." (11). He has *choice*. The apostles appointed such laws for the church "as seemed good unto the Holy Ghost." (12). Those personal pronouns which are ever used to point out personal subsistence, are commonly used of the Holy Spirit, and various personal acts are at the same time mentioned as performed by him. "The Holy Ghost *said*, Separate *me* Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto *I* have called them." (13). And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that *he* may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of Truth. (14). But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, *whom* the Father will send in my name, *he* shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. (15). Howbeit when *He*, the Spirit of truth, is come, *he* will guide you into all truth, for *he* shall not speak of *himself*; but whatsoever *he* shall hear, that shall *he* speak: and *he* will show you things to come. *He* shall glorify me, for *he* shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. (16). This Spirit, while the personal pronouns are continually used of him, is said to *teach* the disciples all things, to bring all things Christ said to their remembrance to come, to guide them into all truth, to hear from Christ, and to speak to them what he shall so hear, to show them things to come, to receive of Christ, and to show it unto them. All these are acts of an intelligent voluntary agent. The Spirit spake unto Peter, witnessed with the Apostles,

(8) 1 Cor. 2: 11.

(9) Verse 10.

(10) 1 Cor. 12: 11.

(11) Eph. 4: 30.

(12) Acts 15: 28.

(13) Acts 13: 2.

(14) John 14: 16.

(15) Verse 26.

(16) John 16: 13, 14.

refutes calumnies, convinces the world of sin, and "maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." (17). Where in this world can be found men of common sense, who, in their plain and unpoetic writings, have ever spoken thus of mere qualities or acts? Who ever heard of a *groaning, grieving quality*, or who can see any propriety in speaking of a groaning, grieving, interceding act, or operation of God. Or how could the apostle Peter, in the text, speak of a lie told or a sin committed against the Holy Ghost, if that Holy Ghost had no personal being?

We do indeed admit, that not in all instances in which the words Holy Ghost occur in the Scriptures, do they mean a personal existence. Sometimes they indicate only the gifts, graces, or operations of the Spirit. Of such an import are the words where the Spirit is said to be given, poured out, to be doubled, distributed, taken away or quenched, and in some instances the Spirit may possibly mean that renewed nature in man himself which the divine agent, the Holy Spirit, produces. But the constant mode of representing the Holy Spirit as a personal agent, where no figure or allegory seems to be intended, cannot be explained but by admitting his entire personality. There are, says Bishop Heber, but four reasons which could induce any man to write allegory. 1. To perplex or tax ingenuity. 2. To shadow dimly future events. 3. To cloak a disagreeable truth. Or 4. If an allegory or fable affords an illustration of some truth attempted to be taught. But neither of these reasons could operate in a case like this. It was not the object of the inspired writers to perplex, not in this case their object to shadow forth future events, nor to cloak a disagreeable truth, nor to awaken attention by allegory, personification, or fable, to some truth attempted to be taught.

But we proceed, secondly, to show that this Holy Spirit, thus proved to be a person, is God.

The Spirit, as a person, must either be created or uncreated. Now, the Spirit of God, which is in God, cannot be created. "Who knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in man; even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God." (18). In this lan-

(17) Rom. 8: 26. (18) 1 Cor. 2: 11. See Chrysos. Tom. vi., p. 199, 202.

guage, it is implied that the Spirit of God is connected with God and in him, not strictly, but in some such way as the spirit of man is in man, and if so, then the Spirit of God, which we have shown to be a person, is an uncreated person, and therefore God. Again, *he, against whom a sin may be committed*, and *when* it is so committed, cannot be forgiven, is God. But "all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh a word against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. (19.)" Here we see that the sin against the Holy Ghost, is distinct from all other sins—all sins against the Father and against the Son. If this be so, then is the Spirit sinned against, a person distinct from the Father and the Son; and as this is a sin more aggravated than a sin against them, it is plain the Holy Spirit cannot be a person created and inferior, but must be a person divine. The reason why the sin of Ananias, and Sapphira, too, met with a dreadful and instant punishment was, that it was a sin against the Holy Ghost; and the Apostle Peter, having first charged them with lying unto the Holy Ghost, then assured them that they had not sinned against men but against God.

Again, he whose inhabitation in any place, constitutes that place a temple, can be no created being, but must be God. 'Tis not the residence of an angel, nor of man in any place, that entitles that place to the name of temple. Wherever there is a shrine, there is a divinity, and whatever place in the Scriptures is said to be a temple, it is called so because only it is the habitation of God. But, says the Apostle, 1 Cor. 6: 19, "What know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost," and if their body was the temple of the Holy Ghost, because he resided in it, the Holy Spirit is God. And if this argument could be deemed undecisive, we might still remind the objector, that the same Apostle, in a preceding chapter of the same epistle, says, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God. (20)." So that they, who in one place he calls the temple of God, in another he calls the temple of the Holy Ghost,

(19) Matth. 12: 32.

(20) 1 Cor. 3: 16.

which could not be, unless he believed the Holy Spirit to be Divine.

Again, he by whose energetic power Christ was conceived in the womb of the virgin Mary, was no created person, for by virtue of that conception, he, in respect to his human nature, which alone was spoken of at that time, was called the Son of God. The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore, also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God. In this sense, the man Christ Jesus was called the Son of God, in this one passage, as the man Adam is also called the Son of God, because the Holy Spirit stood to his human nature in the relation of father; and if he is called the Son of God, because the Holy Spirit was father to his human nature, the Holy Spirit is God. But, there is another Sonship which Christ stands in to the Father, in his divine nature, of which we do not now speak.

He, *to whom divine attributes* and divine works are ascribed, as really as they are to God the Father, must be God, and to the Holy Spirit are ascribed the attributes of God. Omniscience is ascribed to him. Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. The Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God. To deceive by a lie the Holy Ghost, in the text and context, is represented as an impossible thing, and it is the Holy Spirit that moved the holy men of old, when they published the high mysteries of revelation and foretold future events. Divine power is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, for by him the Apostles and prophets wrought miracles and raised the dead, and by him Jesus himself cast out devils.

In *the formula of baptism*, to which we have before referred, the equality of the Spirit with the other divine persons, is fully intimated. For, if it would be incongruous to associate in this solemn language that which is not a person, with the Father and Son, who are persons, it were blasphemy to place in the same connection with them, in a case like this, a person who is not divine.

We are baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, not into the *names*, as Ambrose long ago remarked, (21) because there is a common nature to

(21) De Spiritu Sancto.

the sacred three. Those three whom the Christians are taught in common to honor, must have something in common between them, and the word name, denotes that they are common in their essential nature. A mere moral union, such as subsists between Christians and God, could not furnish any ground for such language. And since we are taught that the Father and Son are united in nature, and one in essence, the same, since no distinction is made in the phraseology adopted, must be true of the Holy Spirit.

And, finally, divine honor is ascribed to the Holy Spirit in the same breath, and in the same terms with the Father and Son. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all. (22.) Grace be unto you, and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne, the Holy Spirit—so called from the variety of his operations and the perfection of his nature, the number seven denoting at once plurality and perfection—and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness.

Thirdly. The Holy Spirit, who has thus been shown to be a person, an uncreated person, and therefore God, we now proceed to show is neither God the Father, nor God the Son, but is a distinct personal subsistence from either and from both.

He who proceedeth from the Father, is not the Father; and he who is sent by or from the Father, cannot be the Father, by or from whom he is sent. Again, the Holy Spirit is not the Son, for he who receiveth of that which is the Son's, and so glorifies the Son, is not the Son. (23.) And he, whose coming depends upon the Son's departing, and his sending after his departure, cannot be the Son, who departed in order that he might send him. Besides, throughout the New Testament (in particular) is he represented as distinguished from the Father and the Son. He is so in many of the passages we have already quoted. In Corinthians, we are told that there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord, and there are diversities of

(22) 2 Cor. 9: 14.

(23) John 16: 15. Pearson, on the Creed, p. 480. Hurrion, p. 137.

operations, but the same God which worketh all in all. (24.) At the baptism of Christ, the sacred Three, each in his distinctive character, was manifested. The Spirit descended out of heaven, in the form of a dove upon the Son, united then to human nature here on earth, and then the voice of the eternal Father was heard saying, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. (25.) And in Peter's first epistle, we are said to be elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through the sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. (26.) In these and other passages, there are three distinct personal subjects mentioned, equal in honor, power and wisdom, closely conjoined by an union of nature, the most important objects of the supersensual world, the authors of all good, and, together, constituting one God, who is over all, blessed forever. (27.)

Fourthly, we show that there are relations subsisting between the persons of the Godhead, among themselves, of a peculiar nature, and that while they are equal in power and glory, there is a necessary order in which they subsist, and that of the persons, the Holy Spirit is the Third.

We have seen that he is a person, a person uncreated and divine, yet that he is neither the Father nor the Son, but one of the Three, and we proceed now to show that of these three, he is the third. And 1st., as to the order in which they are enumerated, when mentioned in connection, we admit that it is not in the Scriptures uniformly the same. Some particular reason may exist in the nature of the subject handled, why one of these persons should be first mentioned, and so the usual order in which they are named is violated. But, when no such reason exists, the order in which they are mentioned, is that of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Again, though equal in power and glory, we find them revealed to us as sustaining certain official relations in the great plan of redemption, in which there appears to be a subordination of the second to the first, in the performance of this work, and of the third to the first and second. Again, in the Scriptures, peculiar language is

(24) Chap. 12: 5—7. (25) Matth. 3: 16. (26) Chap. 1: 2.

(27) See also Eph. 2: 18. Gal. 4: 4—6. John 14: 26. 15: 26. 2 Cor. 13: 14.

used of one of these persons, which is not used of another, each performs works in common, while each performs acts toward one or the other of themselves, which are not represented as performed by the other two. The Father sends the Son, and sends or imparts, or breathes forth the Spirit, but the Son and Spirit never send the Father, nor does the Spirit ever send, impart or breath forth the Father. Again, the Son, as well as the Father, sends or bestows the Spirit, while the Spirit never sends nor bestows the Son, but is sent forth by both Father and Son, and hence is said to proceed from them.

Now, all these things show that the order of the persons in the Godhead is not arbitrary but necessary; that it is not merely external, but is internal and founded upon something in the nature of God himself, which is the reason why these things cannot be otherwise than they are. Hence, the Father is represented as unbegotten, and unbreathed by either Son or Spirit, and not proceeding from either, but as himself begetting the Son, and breathing forth the Spirit; the Son is represented as begotten by the Father, but not proceeding from him, and not breathed forth by him. He begets not, but equally with the Father, he breathes forth the Spirit. The Spirit begets not, nor is begotten, but proceeds—proceeds, as the Scripture plainly says, from the Father, on which account the Father, in the plan of redemption, sends him forth, and he receives the name Spirit of the Father and of God; but as he also is sent by the Son, and receives the name Spirit of the Son, Spirit of Christ, Spirit of Jesus Christ, we also infer, that in like manner, as he proceeds from the Father, and so is called by his name, he proceeds also from the Son.

In other words, in the Father is the cause why divine properties belong to the Son, and in the Father and the Son, together, is the reason why divine properties belong to the Holy Spirit. Hence, the old divines have said, that the Father is the source and origin of the Deity; (28) that he communicated the Godhead to the Son, and they, together, communicated it to the Holy Spirit; and yet, that there is no priority in time of the first person to the second, of the first and second to the third, because this communication

was from eternity, so that the Father never existed for an instant without the Son, nor the Father and Son without the Spirit, that the three are co-eternal, and have ever existed together, and can no more exist otherwise than they do, than the mind can exist without thought, or mind and thought without consciousness of being. (29.)

If now the reader desire that this mysterious doctrine should be further explained, we can only say, it has been stated to you as it is revealed in the Scriptures, and so far as its understood by us. If it be mysterious, if we yet see much in it that we do not, and cannot comprehend, so is there much which we do not comprehend and cannot, in the heavens above, and the earth beneath, and the world within us. If in the one case, we believe as we comprehend and see, without seeking to silence every doubt, so let us do in the other. Let us in patience wait for a fuller revelation, or if God doth not vouchsafe to give it, let us receive still his testimony, nor think it incredible that the finite should not comprehend the infinite, nor the infant of days the Eternal. Let us, in submission, say, such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it. Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell, what canst thou know? (30.)

Fifthly. As there is an order of the persons in the Holy Trinity between themselves, and peculiar relations sustained by them to each other, so is there a corresponding order in the operations of the persons of the Holy Trinity upon the world without, peculiar, official relations, which they each hold, and peculiar distinctive works, which they each perform.

And here, we remark 1. That all divine works are ascribed to God absolutely, without taking pains to distinguish the persons of the Godhead, when there is nothing to render it important to make the distinction. Thus, God creates the world, upholds it, gives the law, inspires the prophets, redeems his chosen people, regenerates them, and sanctifies and glorifies them. 2. We remark that every

(29) See Appendix at the close of this article, p. 26.

(30) Job 11: 7, 8.

person in the Godhead is the author of every work of God, because there is but one divine nature, which they each possess in common, so that what one person does, he does with the whole wisdom, power and holiness of God, in doing it he represents the whole Godhead, and each of the other persons, by virtue of their essential unity, concurs in it. 3. Still, some of the works of God are more appropriately and are preëminently ascribed to the Father, others to the Son, others to the Spirit. 4. The order in which the several persons operate upon the world without depends upon the order of their subsistence; and therefore it is that the concluding perfecting acts of the Godhead, as Basil long ago remarked, are ascribed to the Holy Spirit. (31.) Without his operations no work, either in the kingdom of nature or grace, is perfect.

These remarks we will a little further illustrate in a number of particulars. To the Father, in an eminent sense, is assigned the works of nature; to the Son, the recovery of men by grace; and to the Spirit, the effectual working of grace in the hearts of men. And in these departments are these several persons of the Godhead more especially employed. Yet, are not the Son and the Spirit excluded from the work of nature, nor the agency of the Father and Spirit from the recovery of men by grace, nor the Father and Son from the effectual working of grace in the heart. Still, in their several departments of the divine operations, each works in his own order. In the work of nature it is the Father's most especial act to create, the Son's to uphold, and the Spirit to put the finishing work to the creating act. Hence, it is said, By his Spirit, he gar-

(31) In the creation of these (angels,) I understand the Father to be the primary cause of the things done, the Son to be the efficient cause, the Spirit to be the completing cause. Basil de Sp. Sanct. Every energy which extends through from God upon the creation, and receives its name in accordance with its manifold design, proceeds (*ex*) from the Father, is carried forward (*dia*) by the Son, and is completed (*ev*) by the Holy Spirit. Gregory Nyssen. For, throughout antiquity, the Father, in the first place, is proclaimed as the first author of all things: And the Son appears as the efficient author: And, thirdly, the Spirit, as the finishing author. Jobius. See also Owen on the Spirit, B. I., chap. iv. Bull Defensio, sec. iv.

nished the heavens. (32.) Man, too, the last and crowning work of God, was the especial work of the Spirit. The Spirit of God hath made me, the breath of the Almighty hath given me life. (33.) Still, more particularly, was the impartation of the moral image of God, the Spirit's work; that image, the restoration of which since the fall, is the peculiar act of the Holy Ghost. Such, too, is the furnishing men with gifts, as Bezaleel, for the works of the temple, and Cyrus for those great acts by which society was revolutionized, and the designs of God in relation to his kingdom advanced.

So and more clearly in the kingdom of grace. The Father elects those who are to be saints, and devises the plan of saving them through his Son; the Son assumes the body which is prepared for him, and carries out by his teaching, obedience, death, intercession, and reign, the plan of the Father; the Spirit creates the human nature of Christ out of the substance of the virgin, endows the man Jesus with gifts, and having first inspired the word, works through the word and directly also upon the heart of man, regenerating it, restoring to it the lost image of God, and perfectly fitting it by sanctification for glory.

From all this, we see the probable reason why the name Holy Spirit is given to the third person, the name Spirit, because as the breath proceeds from the first moment of our independent existence from men, so the Spirit, through that eternity in which God exists, has proceeded from the Father and the Son; and the epithet *holy*, not because of his essential holiness, because as to this he is no more entitled to the name than the first and second persons, but because of the three persons, it is his office to sanctify and make holy the polluted heart.

This leads us to our last remaining topic, in which we propose to speak more particularly than we have done, of the peculiar work of the Holy Ghost.

But it would require a volume, instead of a few brief pages, to represent the various offices of the Holy Spirit, and to record the wonderful works he hath wrought upon the minds and hearts of men. The illumination which has come to the understandings of all men in Christian lands,

(32) Job 25: 13.

(33) Job 33: 4.

by the revelations he has made, and especially the light which has entered into the minds of believers, is but a small part of his work. The sacred Scriptures, that book of wonders, he indited. The sweet strains of David, the lofty poetry of Isaiah and Job; the tender pathos of John, and the powerful reasoning of Paul; and the sublime truths they all taught, are among the proofs of his wisdom and power. But, see him transforming the bold blasphemer and impious atheist, into the humble devoted child of God, working upon the impracticable heart of man a transformation as great as the creation of the world. Count the myriads of redeemed ones who have entered into heaven since Abel, the first who was recovered by his regenerating influences, through the blood of the *Saviour*, down to the hour in which we now speak; remember that just as men are born into existence over the world at this moment, so, throughout Christian lands, he is transforming thousands after thousands by his grace, and preparing them for the kingdom of God, that this process is to continue to the end of time, and you will feel that not only to the redeeming Son, but also to the sanctifying Spirit, are all praises due, not only in this world, but in that which is to come.

We are by nature children of wrath. And all the chosen people of God must undergo a double change, one *relative* in respect to the law which shuts them up under condemnation; and the other *real* in respect to their views and dispositions. The first, their *relative* change, is effected by the second person in the Godhead, by the atoning death, and finished righteousness of the Son of God, by which they are freed from the condemning sentence of the law and are justified before God. The last is effected by the Spirit as an agent, which Spirit it is Christ's to give, and we receive it by virtue of his death. As the Apostle in Galatians says, (34) "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles though Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit, through faith. The work of the third person cannot be

(34) Gal. 3: 13, 14.

performed on the heart of man, till the atoning work of the second hath been undertaken. So that in this too, the proper order of operation is preserved in the work of the God-head.

It is the Spirit who *illuminates* the dark mind of man, and this illumination is *external* by the *word*. The entrance of Thy words giveth light; (35) and *internal* by the Spirit's direct operation on the darkened understanding. (36). Conscious that this internal illumination is by a direct act of God the Spirit, the child of God is continually crying, "Open thou mine eyes that I may see wondrous things out of thy law. (37.) But it is the Spirit's peculiar office to call men into the kingdom of God. And the call is *external*, through the Gospel, "Whosoever *will*, let him come," or *internal* by the Spirit, speaking directly to the *hearts of men*, and in his higher operations, effectually calling them out of darkness into light, and from the power of Satan unto God.

For we may say that there are lower and vincible operations of the Spirit, leading on in the case of those who are the elect of God, to those which are victorious. To those who are not effectually called, the lower and more ordinary influences of the Spirit, when vouchsafed, are not given for their conversion, but for other wise purposes, and when resisted, and the Holy Spirit withdraws his influences, he is not vanquished and overcome, but though the sinner has rejected him, and done despite unto the Spirit of grace, this glorious person has accomplished every purpose he aimed to accomplish in operating on his heart and convincing him of sin and a judgment to come.

But in his higher operations, the Spirit is invincible. In the very work he puts forth, he so takes away the very principle of resistance, that he is not and cannot be resisted. His operation is mighty and efficacious, bearing down opposition and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.

(35) Ps. 119: 130. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. 2 Pet. 1: 21.

(36) And a certain woman, named Lydia, a seller of purple of the city of Thyatira, which worshiped God, heard us, whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things spoken of Paul. Acts 16: 4.

(37) Ps. 119: 18.

This must be so, otherwise man might frustrate the grace of God, defeat the eternal purpose of the Father, and the atoning love of the Son, and God's chosen people might overpower the Holy Spirit, and be lost. If *one* could resist these higher operations of the Spirit, so might *all*, for all have the will to resist, and so heaven, which God designed to fill with redeemed myriads, might not hold a single soul of Adam's race.

But in this mighty and invincible operation of the Holy Spirit, he does no violence to the human will. Liberty consists in acting from choice. If a man turn to God, it must be with his heart. It is the heart that God requires. And the Spirit of God, in *effectually calling*, at once changes us; changes us, not as we would transport stones or drive slaves, but in accordance with our rational nature. Regeneration is an instantaneous work of the Spirit. It occupies but a moment. Down to that moment, we have been fighting against God and contending against his Spirit. That omnipotent agent changes our vile nature, transforms our tastes and our will, and the next moment their choice is to follow his gracious and holy promptings. This act of regeneration, is the *appropriate* act of the Holy Spirit. Under it, man is passive. Yet, the instant after, he immediately concurs, and acts with and under the Holy Spirit, showing thus that he is a child of God, for as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. It is God that worketh in us to will and to do. And this constraining influence is sweet, and delightful beyond expression to the soul thus changed. While Lydia was *listening* to the preaching of Paul, the Lord *opened* her heart.

And thus, it appears that the doctrine of the Semipelagians, that we concur in the act of regeneration with the Spirit of God, and from the first work with this Spirit in changing our own character, must fall to the ground. Of us all, God may say, "I was found of them that sought me not, I was made manifest to them that asked not after me." The doctrine, too, that God has given sufficient grace to all men, is plainly an error. He has given men sufficient light to condemn them and render them inexcusable, but nothing except Almighty power can call them out of darkness into light.

The Christian church, thus constituted by the powerful

work of the Holy Ghost, as a body, and Christian men, as individuals, are temples of the Holy Ghost, in which he permanently resides. We are God's building. But the building is a living one, and the act of preparing it, agreeably to its nature, is called a generation, and to distinguish it from our natural birth, a *regeneration*.

1. The thing therefore thus produced by the act of the Holy Spirit, is a living thing. The building is a living building. We, also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. (38). And if you, reader, have been called by the Spirit of God, you are instinct with this spiritual life. You have a spiritual life, accompanied with joy and peace, and spiritual energy, which is not of nature, but of grace. Do we feel this life of God in the soul of man. Happy are we. It is eternal life already begun. We are passed from death unto life.

2. This new creature of the Holy Spirit, betrays in its own nature its divine parentage. It is the creation of the *Holy Spirit*. There are unclean spirits, and their work, like themselves, is unclean. But, on that which the Holy Spirit touches, he leaves the impress of his own holiness. Be ye holy, for I the Lord your God, am holy. How can we call God our Father, if none of his holiness abide within us. Let us search our hearts. Let us search our Jerusalem with candles, and see if we can find among us the traces of the Holy Spirit.

3. The work of the Spirit is entire. Eventually, it will be perfect in degree. Before we pass into heaven, every stain of sin, every perversity, every jar, will be removed and done away with by the Holy Ghost. But, even in its beginning, his work is entire, affecting the character of the whole man. If we pretend to faith, but are devoid of meekness, humility, or forgiveness; or are attentive upon the outward means, but backbite and defraud our neighbor, the work wrought within us, looks not like the work of the Spirit of God, but the work of Satan.

4. The true work of the Spirit upon the soul is permanent. He garnished the heavens: yet the heavens may pass away. But, when he hath reëdified the fallen temple

of human nature, refitted it, and cleansed it, it is that he may occupy it as his favorite shrine forever. What, know ye not that ye are the temple of God? If any would defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy. More carefully than the cherubim guarded Eden, with their ever-turning sword, does the Spirit watch over his temple, to guard it from defilement, and to remove it too at length to a safer land, to the heavenly Canaan.

5. The Spirit joins us as sons to God. We are his sons, born not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. Our union with God is through the Son, with whom we are joined by the Spirit. For by one Spirit, we are all baptized into one body. And having completed the union, he bears delightful testimony to its reality, and the privileges of it. For ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear, but the spirit of adoption; by which we cry Abba Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God, and if children, then heirs. (39). Soon, very soon, the sins, sorrows and toils of earth will be past, and the sons of God, sanctified by the Spirit, will reach their inheritance to enjoy it forever.

6. God's grace, in regenerating men's hearts, is *preventive* grace. It goes before human action, and changes its nature, otherwise, we regenerate ourselves, and not God us. Yet, is there much to be done by you that have not yet the witness of the Spirit within you. You must hear the Gospel, and give your mind to it. You must hear or you cannot believe, and believe or you cannot be saved. You must pray, cry, strive, and wait. Yea, wait more than they that wait for the morning. And how does the benighted, terror-stricken traveler, on Arabian deserts, who sees a foe behind every sand hill, and hears around him the prowling monsters of the wild, wait for the dawn? In indifference, or in anxiety and prayer. Yet, when the morning rises, and its glad light meets his eyes, it is not he that lifts up the sun from its early couch and rolls away the darkness that encompassed and terrified him. So it is not the waiting and agonizing sinner, who brings the dawn; and yet to him, to him alone it comes. Remember, too, that the Holy

(39) Rom. 8: 15, 16.

Spirit is a free agent, and may be grieved at your obduracy, and give you up. He takes ineffable delight in his own effusions, when they are entertained by the sinner, with that tenderness and interest which is due to the merciful visitations of that Holy One. And who can conceive the horrible crime of offering despite to the Spirit of God. He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy under two or three witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace. Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense saith the Lord. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God. (40.)

Finally, we remark, that from this divine agent alone, do we receive directly our power to believe, to do, and to suffer. With the pious and strong minded Owen, we fully agree, when he says, "He that doth not know, that God hath promised to work in us in the way of grace, what he requires from us in the way of duty, hath either never read the Bible, or doth not believe it, or never prayed, or never took notice what he prayed for." He is a heathen, and hath nothing of a Christian in him, who doth not pray that God would work in him what "he requires of him." The prayer, too, of Augustine, is as scriptural as it is philosophic and sublime. "Give what thou commandest, and command what thou wilt." This should be, and is the constant prayer of the true child of God. And it is the Spirit, that heavenly agent, from whom this ability to obey proceeds.

We have thus completed what we had designed concerning the Personality, Deity, Relations, and Work of the Holy Spirit. We have followed rather the path our subject has led us, than the authors, the titles of whose works appear at the head of this article. Yet, as will be seen, we have diligently availed ourselves of whatever assistance we could derive from these and other sources. That we have not departed from the usual language of the Athanasian

(40) Heb. 10: 28—31.

divines, we were desirous of shewing by an extract from Bretschneider, which we had designed as a marginal note to p. 20. Its length prevented its insertion there. But, as it is a compact, truthful, and clear view of the distinctions and definitions of the older divines on this topic, we add it, for the especial benefit of our more learned readers, as an *appendix* to what we have written.

Definitions of the older Theology, respecting the connection of the Three Persons.

Those remarks or characteristics, by which the three persons are distinguished from one another, in their entire compass, constitute what the old divines called the *character hypostaticus*—(i. e. *personalis*, since ὑποστάσις was often used by the church fathers, in opposition to the οὐσία or φύσις, for the purpose of denoting the persons in the God-head,) (41) or γνωρισματά, ἰδιώματα σχηλικά. The *character hypostaticus* is *complexus notarum, quibus personae divinae inter se differunt*. All the following distinctions are parts of this *character*, which embraces two kinds of characteristics, the *internal* and the *external*, i. e. the *subjective* and the *objective*.

1) The *internal characteristics* (Merkmale) are the relations of the divine persons towards each other, which *exist from eternity among themselves*, by which their subsistence as persons from all eternity was determined; *rationes (subjectivae) trium personarum aeternae, quibus definitur earum subsistentia*. They may be considered in a threefold light, 1) as actions, 2) as properties, and 3) as general ideas; upon which threefold view, a threefold representation of these internal relations is founded.

(41) The church uses the name God. 1) Of the divine substance, οὐσία in which are the three persons; and then she speaks of God οὐσιωδῶς, *substantialiter, s. essentialiter*; to which use are assigned all passages of Scripture, in which it is said there is only one God, e. g. John 17: 3. 2) Of the divine persons (ὑποστάσις), which partake of the divine substance; and then she speaks of God ὑποστατικῶς, *personaliter*; e. g. when Jesus is called God. In this way, have they sought to avoid the objection that it is a contradiction to say, *Deum trinum esse Deum unum*. The opponents of the Trinity, use the word God in this connection in both instances, οὐσιωδῶς, but the church takes it in the first proposition (*Deus trinus*) ὑποστατικῶς, and in the second οὐσιωδῶς.

1. As acts of the three persons towards one another of themselves, they denote the *actus personales* (*act. hypostatice, opera ad intra*, and also, because their operation confines itself to the divine nature, *opera immanentia*.) i. e. *ea operationes internae in Deo, quibus definitur ratio subsistentiae trium personarum.*

a) In the Father the *actus personalis* a) in respect to the Son is *begetting, generare*. The expression *pater generat filium*, is borrowed from the Scriptures, and means that *in patre est ratio, cur filio ab aeterno perfectiones divinae competant*. This is not to be understood of the existence of the Son or of the production of his nature, but of his subsistence as a person, and *generatio* is thus *ea patris ad filium relatio aeterna, quae in patre est ratio subsistentiae filii*. β) *in respect to the Spirit the actus personalis* is the *breathing forth, spiratio activa*, i. e. *ea patris ad spir. S. aeterna relatio, qua pater continet rationem subsistentiae spiritus S. Pater spirat spiritum*, signifies, that *in patre est ratio, cur spiritui divinae perfectiones ab aeterno competant*. The expression *spirare* is not found in the Scriptures, but is a definite technical term of the theologians to express this sense.

b) In the Son the *actus personalis* is, *quod spirat spiritum cum patre, i. e. in filio simul cum patre est ratio, cur spiritui ab aeterno competant divinae virtutes*.

c) In the Spirit, the *actus personalis* in respect to both the Father and the Son is, that he proceeds from both, this term *εκπορεύσθαι, procedere*, signifying *ea spiritus S. ad patrem et filium relatio, qua in his est ratio cur spiritui divinae virtutes ab aeterno competant*. The expression *procedere* is borrowed from John 15: 26, where, however, the language is used of the sending of the Spirit upon the earth. Yet, because in this passage it is simply said that the Spirit would proceed from the Father, the Greek church since A. D. 660, has denied that he proceeds also from the Son; a controversy, which, in the absence of all Scripture proof, is devoid of interest.

2) Those relations which are regarded as the properties (*proprietaes*) of the three persons *in concreto*, denote the *proprietaes personales* (*τροποι υπαρχεως*) *peculiares subsistenti modi, quibus personae divinae inter se differunt*. They are contained in the following propositions: a) As

to the Father: he begets and breathes forth, but is unbegotten, and does not proceed; he is ἀγέννητος, (ἀναγωγος, αὐτοδιδος), ἀπνευστος. b) As to the Son: he is begotten, and does not beget; he, together with the Father, breathes forth the the Spirit, and does not proceed, he is γεννητος, ἀπνευστος. c) As to the Spirit: he begets not, is not begotten, but proceeds; ἐκπορευεται, *procedit*. The explanation of all these formularies is evolved from the very definition of the *actuum personalium*.

3) Finally, those relations, as general ideas, (*notiones*) regarded in *abstracto*, are called *notiones personales*, i. e. *relationes personarum internae in abstracto consideratae*.

a) As to the Father, they are *paternitas* or *generatio activa*, and *spiratio activa*, ἀγεννησία; b) In the Son, *filiatio* or *generatio passiva*, and *spiratio activa*, γεννησις; c) In the Spirit, *spiratio passiva* or *processio*, ἐκπεμψις. These expressions are also sufficiently explained already by the preceding definitions.

II). *The external characteristics*, which belong to the *character hypostaticus* of the three persons, are such acts of the same, having reference to the world, which are ascribed to them individually in the Scriptures, and by which they are objectively (in relation to the world) distinguished from each other. These are called *opera ad extra*, *opera externa* or *transeuntia*, and are *operares creatas spectantia*, *quibus tres personae sese conspicuas fecerunt*. *Transeuntia* they call them, *quia operando transeunt in objecta extra Deum*. They distinguish again two varieties in these acts: 1) *Opera aconomica*, such acts of the three persons as refer to the work of redemption; e. g. the Father conceives the purpose of redeeming men by his Son; the Son carries out this purpose, comes into the world, teaches, &c; the Spirit furnishes Christ with gifts, and works with the word of God and the sacraments, &c. The language is borrowed from Eph. 1: 10. 2) *Opera attributiva s. communia*, *opera ad extra* in the strict sense, *ea opera, quae quidem tribus personis sunt communia, in scriptura sacramenta tamen uni cuidam personae plerumque tribuuntur*. Concerning these they have established the canon: *opera ad extra sunt tribus personis communia*. The Scriptures, for instance, ascribe certain acts sometimes to God generally, (consequently, according to the church system, to all the

three persons), sometimes to the Son and Spirit particularly, e. g. the creation, conservation, governing of the world, the enlightening and recovery of men, the inspiration of the prophets, &c.

“But although,” adds Brettschneider, “these more exact definitions are not contained in the symbolical books of our church,” (meaning the Lutheran church of Germany,) “it would not be prudent to think of altering and improving them. For in this alteration we would, without any advantage, incur the danger of removing either the unity of God or the Trinity of the persons, and consequently the essence of the church system of doctrines.”

Sketches of North Carolina, Historical and Biographical, illustrative of the principles of a portion of her early Settlers. By Rev. WM. HENRY FOOTE. New York: Robert Carter. 1847.

This volume has met with very general approbation and acceptance. For this we are glad, both on the author's account and our own. He, we trust, will be encouraged to prosecute his researches and labors as it regards other portions of our Southern country, and other branches of our population, in which case we will hope to be still further profited by his labors.

Mr. Foote is a chronicler rather than a historian—the Froissart and Rushworth of future times.

His work is valuable and interesting to all classes of readers, but especially to Presbyterians, of which denomination the author is a minister,—concerning whose early settlement in North Carolina, the work mainly treats,—and to whose praise the glorious deeds here recorded will preëminently contribute. To them, the reminiscences of their fathers in the Old North State,—the traditionary anecdotes and personal history of their most useful and honored ministers,—and the preservation of documents fast passing into oblivion,—will stamp upon this volume

inestimable worth. Neither is this interest limited to North Carolina. For as, until a comparatively recent period, the Carolinas were united under one ecclesiastical body, extracts from the minutes of this united Synod from 1788 to 1812, will be found in this volume, together with many historical recollections of the early congregations and ministers in this State.

One important service rendered by this volume, is the consideration given to the Scotch Irish element in the formation of the original population of this country. On this subject we cannot avoid quoting the remarks of a cotemporary, doubtless from the pen of the accomplished historian of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

“So much has been written and spoken respecting the Pilgrims of New England, and so little about people of a different origin, that the impression on the public mind seems to be, that all that was valuable in our population, was to be ascribed to this single source. It was, therefore, gratifying to us, who claim our descent from the Caledonian race, to find a son of the Pilgrims coming forward, with noble disinterestedness, to do justice to another race of people, nearly as numerous as the Pilgrims, and in intelligence, stern integrity, and indomitable energy and patriotism, not surpassed by any people in the United States.

The number of the people of this country, who have derived their origin from the Scotch Irish, cannot be easily ascertained, for two reasons: first, because they did not settle in a body, like the people of New England and lower Virginia, but in various parts of the country; and secondly, because they have possessed, in an uncommon degree, an emigrating spirit. They have been the pioneers in the settlement of most of our Territories and new States, in the South and West. We are acquainted with some places in Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, which at first were almost entirely populated by immigrants from the north of Ireland, in which, at present, there is scarcely to be found a family of that race. This has been owing to the disposition of this people to emigrate in quest of new countries and more fertile lands. This, it must be acknowledged, has had a tendency to retard the march of improvement, and often to break up religious societies in the older States. There has been, however, a compensation in the

benefits conferred on the new countries, by the settlement of enterprising, religious, and industrious men. The progress of the Scotch Irish race, and the number of the descendants from this stock, may, in some degree, be measured by the progress and numbers of the Presbyterian Church in the United States; for it may be asserted, that nine-tenths of this large denomination, including all its branches and divisions, are of the Scotch Irish race. The immigration of this people into America did not commence until nearly a century after the arrival of the Cavaliers in Virginia, and the Pilgrims in New England. Their first settlement was in the States of Delaware, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. The great majority of the first settlers in the south-eastern counties of Pennsylvania, were of this race; and when the Cumberland Valley could be safely inhabited by the whites, it was speedily filled up by this enterprising people. The same population pushed along this fertile valley through Maryland and Virginia, where for a while, they had almost entire possession. And various settlements were formed by them in other parts of Virginia, as on Rockfish, Cub Creek, Buffalo in Prince Edward, and in the county of Campbell, where a large congregation, named Concord, made an early settlement.

North Carolina, in its upper parts, opened a wide field for the numerous emigrants of this restless people; and a very full account is given in this volume of their settlement in various parts of that state. One reason why so many resorted to that State was, that there were no hostile tribes of Indians in that region; but on the western borders of Pennsylvania and Virginia, the incursions of the savage foe were frequent, and their massacres heart-rending. Whole congregations, after fixing their abode in the Cumberland Valley, were driven off by the Indians, and obliged to seek another home. Mr. Sankey's congregation, who settled with him in Prince Edward county, Va., were obliged to fly from their homes near to Harrisburg or Carlisle, by the frequent incursions of the savages. And Mr. Craighead's congregation on the Cowpasture river, in Virginia, were under the necessity of removing to North Carolina.

But when the French war was ended, and peace made with the Indians, or the more hostile tribes driven beyond the Ohio, the tide of emigration turned westward, and the

counties in the west of Pennsylvania were rapidly filled up with a Scotch Irish population; and in this region there is now, probably, a more dense and unmixed population of this race, than anywhere else in the United States; unless the counties of Rockingham, Augusta, Rockbridge and Bottetourt, &c., in the Great Valley of Virginia, be an exception. But a large portion of the first settlers in Georgia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Ohio, were of Scotch Irish descent. In short, with a few exceptions, wherever you find Presbyterians, there you find the descendants of the Scotch-Irish."

These remarks will find ample confirmation in the early history of South Carolina. The Scotch-Irish were among her earliest settlers, and have given origin to the great proportion of the Presbyterian churches in this State.

Our object, however, at present, is not to enter into this most interesting branch of inquiry, nor into a general analysis of the volume before us. We cannot, however, turn our attention to the chief topic of remark suggested by it, without expressing the hope that some one competent to the task will be stimulated by the example and success of Mr. Foote, to do for South Carolina, what he has done for North Carolina, and to give "a local habitation and name" to those records and traditionary memorials of the early history of the Presbyterian church in this State, which, if not at once made permanent and indestructible, will, like the Sybil leaves, soon be scattered and irrecoverably lost. Of one thing we are certain, that the result of such a labor will not be a diminution of that lustre which is shed around the principles and spirit of Presbyterianism, by the piety, patriotism and zeal for education, of its early founders and supporters in other parts of the Union.

One of the most interesting portions of this volume, is the full and satisfactory account it contains of the authenticity and history of the **MECKLENBURG DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE**. Recently, public attention has been turned to this remarkable document, and to the relation in which it stands to the National Declaration drawn up by Mr. Jefferson.

To this subject, therefore, we would call the attention of our readers, as we have some novel views to present for consideration and further inquiry.

A few observations, however, upon the true nature of our NATIONAL DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, will be necessary properly to introduce the subject, and our own theory of the true origin and source of both these remarkable productions.

"This," says the Edinburgh Review, in a passage which should be remembered, (1) "is that famous *Declaration of Independence*, by which the freemen of the New World approved themselves worthy of their ancestors in the Old, —who had spoken, and written, and fought, and perished for conscience and freedom's sake,—but whose descendants in the Old had not always borne their high lineage in mind. We verily think that this 'Declaration' is the most important event in the history of mankind, whether its consequences be regarded on one side of the Atlantic or on the other; and if tyrants are sometimes said to feel uneasy on the thirtieth of January, how much more fitted to inspire alarm are the recollections associated with the fourth of July, in which nothing like remorse can mingle on the people's part, and no consolation is afforded to their oppressors by the tendency of cruelty and injustice to mar the work they stain!"

This declaration, however,—marvellous as have been its consequences,—was not a cause but an effect—not the source from which the fountain was supplied, but itself the fountain whose secret springs had long been accumulating under ground, and finding their way to one common centre. The drops of feeling and the streams of opinion, having converged to a centre, burst forth in this full, clear, and perennial fountain, whose living waters still continue to fertilize the earth.

Many people imagine that the Declaration of Independence forms the date of our liberty. In our opinion, to use the words of another, that Declaration was only the falling of the fruit when it had become (perhaps a little prematurely) ripe. No new light burst upon the people upon the occasion. The separation from Great Britain involved no change in the political theories they had entertained. It was placed upon clear and definite grounds. The general and vague idea of liberty, that dazzling image with the face of a goddess and the heart of a prostitute, entered not into

[1] For Oct. 1837, p. 88, Am. ed.

the question. The colonists had enjoyed the substance from the day they put their feet upon American ground. And it was not the desire to change, but the desire to keep and secure, which produced their Independence. They made little or no change in their domestic affairs, after that object was gained. One of the States at least retains the same form of government, which she had when she was a Province. To talk of the influence of the ambition of a few leaders, seems absurd, when they could do nothing the moment they ceased to appeal to principles, the soundness of which the community acknowledged. The people, that is, the great mass of responsible members of the State, had inherited, they did not acquire, the extraordinary jealousy of their rights, which is apparent through the century and a half of their preceding history; and when they complained, they could put their finger on the spot that was hurt. They asked a remedy. It was refused. They adopted the only alternative which was left. They declared themselves independent.

No one man, therefore, can claim the glory of having originated the Declaration of Independence. It was the embodiment of the growing sentiment and feeling of the American people, and reflects its lustre upon THEM rather than upon its immediate author. "Believe me," said Mr. Jefferson, writing to a friend in 1775 after the battle of Lexington and Bunker Hill,—“there is not in the English Empire a man who more cordially loves a union with Great Britain than I do; but, by the God that made me, I will cease to exist before I yield to a connexion on such terms as the British Parliament propose, and in this, I think I speak the sentiments of America. We want neither inducement nor power to declare and assert a separation. *It is will alone that is wanting*, and that is growing apace under the fostering hand of our king.” There is not, therefore, as Mr. Pickering observes, an idea in the Declaration of Independence, but what had been hackneyed in Congress for two years before. The substance of it is contained in the declaration of rights and the violation of those rights in the journals of Congress in 1774. Indeed, the essence of it is contained in a pamphlet, voted and printed by the town of Boston before the first Congress met. (2).

(2) Pickering's Review, 2d ed., p. 131, 132, in N. A. Rev., 1826, p. 387.

It is altogether a mistake, therefore, to attribute the Declaration of Independence, in its spirit, sentiment, or power, to the magic of Mr. Jefferson's pen. (3.) "Mr. Jefferson, says the *N. A. Review*," had no literary pretensions whatever. "He wrote through life very little. The little he wrote consisted mostly of private letters, which never went out to the people: in his few published writings, there is no extraordinary force or charm of style. As mere literary productions, they would have attracted no attention; they produced effect not as writings, but as *acts*. Who ever thought of attributing the effect of the Declaration to the merit of the style? Who that could enter into the spirit of the paper; would dwell with any interest on the language? It was a simple record of the great *Act*, by which thirteen Colonies shook off the British yoke, and sprang into being as independent States. It was only as an *Act* that it drew attention. The total absence of all pretension to literary merit, was the only literary merit which it could possibly possess, and this it has. The case is substantially the same with all the rest of Mr. Jefferson's writings. There was no magic in his pen. The witchcraft by which he acquired influence lay, like that of the *Maréchale d'Ancre*, in his *mental superiority*. The source of his power, was the energy with which he represented in his feelings and opinions and acts, the *Spirit of the Age*." (4).

(3) In his *Memoirs*, see *wks.*, vol. 1, p. 10, he himself adduces, as instructions sent up to Congress from Virginia, a portion of the very wording of this paper, that was in May, 1776.

(4) *Do.*, 1834, p. 243, when it is added, "It is a common mistake to suppose, that extraordinary skill in some particular accomplishment, which depends in a great degree on study or accidental personal qualifications, such as writing, public speaking, or even the technical art of war, will carry with it a great power over the minds of other men. This may sometimes appear to be the case, because skill of this kind is often combined with the moral energy of character which constitutes real greatness. But even in this case, the talent is the mere instrument of the mighty mind, which can work just as well with the talents of others as its own. It was the same thing to Moses, whether he spoke himself or employed his brother Aaron for a mouth-piece. These talents are in the nature of beautiful arts: we admire their possessors as artists; as men, we can only yield our homage to the superior mind: and the only test of general superiority is the mental energy, which renders the language, writings and conduct of its possessor, a bolder, firmer, truer expression, than any other to be met with, of the opinions and feelings that prevail at the time in the community. In the *talents*, by which individuals are commonly supposed to acquire and extend their influence, he was almost

The triumph of the American Declaration of Independence, was owing not to any one man, but to that combination of men fitted for the great enterprise, whom God—for the ends He had in view,—had raised up and endowed with great abilities for the work. It was not by might, nor by power, nor by wisdom, but by God's overruling providence the conquest was achieved. "It was," again to quote the language of the Edinburgh Review, "the peculiar felicity of the Americans, and of the great cause of civil liberty, of which they were the champions, that among their leaders were to be found both men of the most ardent spirit, and men of the most approved discretion; whilst all were alike firm of purpose, and alike determined to let no differences, nor any personal feelings whatever, keep them apart in the pursuit of their common object. It would be difficult to point out any serious error committed in the whole of their difficult course; and it would certainly be impossible to find instances of the unreflecting violence, and the sudden changes, either among the people or their chiefs, which, in other cases, have brought such discredit upon the popular cause, and removed its triumph to so great a distance."

That the origination of the sentiments contained in the Declaration of Independence, is not to be attributed to Jefferson, is further proved from the evident similarity between it and the Declaration of Independence made at Mecklenburg, in North Carolina, May 19th, 1775, and in the Second Mecklenburg Declaration, made on May 20th, 1775. (5) Of these most interesting documents, a full account will be found in this volume.

"The little village of Charlotte," says Mr. Foote, "the seat of justice for Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, was the theatre of one of the most memorable events in the political annals of the United States. Situated in the fertile champaign, between the Yadkin and Catawba rivers, far above tide-water, some two or three hundred miles from the ocean, and in advance of the mountains that run almost parallel to the Atlantic coast, on the route of that emigra-

wholly deficient: he had no military taste or skill; he never spoke in public, and had no particular power in writing."

(5) See Foote's *Hist. of N. C.*, p. 37, 38; and see also Jones's *Defence of North Carolina*.

tion which, before the revolution, passed on southwardly, from Pennsylvania, through Virginia, to the unoccupied region east of the Mountains, on what is now the upper stage route from Georgia, through South Carolina and North Carolina, to meet the railroad at Raleigh,—it was, and is, the centre of an enterprising population. It received its name from Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg, whose native province also gave name to the county, the House of Hanover having been invited to the throne of England.

The traveler, in passing through this fertile, retired, and populous country, would now see nothing calculated to suggest the fact that he was on the ground of the boldest Declaration ever made in America; and that all around him were localities rich in associations of valor and suffering in the cause of National Independence, the sober recital of which borders on romance. Every thing looks peaceful, secluded, and prosperous, as though the track of hostile armies had never defaced the soil. Were he told, this is the spot where lovers of personal and national liberty will come, in pilgrimage or imagination, to ponder events of the deepest interest to all mankind, he must feel, in the beauty and fertility of the surrounding region, that here was a chosen habitation for good men to live, and act, and leave to their posterity the inestimable privileges of political and religious freedom, with abundance of all that may be desired to make life one continued thanksgiving.

There was no printing press in the upper country of Carolina, and many a weary mile must be traversed to find one. Newspapers were few, and, no regular post traversing the country, were seldom seen. The people, anxious for news, were accustomed to assemble to hear printed handbills from abroad, or written ones drawn up by persons appointed for the purpose, particularly the Rev. Thos. Reese, of Mecklenburg, North Carolina, whose bones lie in the grave-yard of the Stone Church, South Carolina. There had been frequent assemblies in Charlotte, to hear the news and join in the discussion of the exciting subjects of the day; and finally, to give more efficiency to their discussions, it was agreed upon, generally, that Thomas Polk, Colonel of the Militia, long a surveyor in the province, frequently a member of the Colonial Assembly, well known and well

acquainted in the surrounding counties, a man of great excellence and merited popularity, should be empowered to call a convention of the representatives of the people, whenever it should appear advisable. It was also agreed that these representatives should be chosen from the Militia districts, by the people themselves: and when assembled for council and debate, their decisions should be binding on the inhabitants of Mecklenburg."

Alluding to the deep feeling of discontent produced in the public mind by the arbitrary attempt of Governor Martin to prevent the assembling of a Provisional Congress for the Province of North Carolina, at Newbern, the author remarks:

"In this state of the public mind, Col. Polk issued his notice for the Committee men to assemble in Charlotte, on the 19th May, 1775. On the appointed day, between twenty and thirty representatives of the people met in the Court House, in the centre of the town at the crossing of the great streets, and surrounded by an immense concourse, few of whom could enter the house, proceeded to organize for business, by choosing Abraham Alexander, a former member of the Legislature, a magistrate, and ruling elder in the Sugar Creek Congregation, in whose bounds they were assembled, as their Chairman; and John McKnitt Alexander, and Dr. Ephraim Brevard, men of business habits and great popularity, their clerks. Papers were read before the convention and the people; the handbill, brought by express, containing the news of the battle of Lexington, Massachusetts, on that day one month, the 19th of April, came to hand that day, and was read to the assembly. The Rev. Hezekiah James Balch, pastor of Poplar Tent, Dr. Ephraim Brevard, and William Kennon, Esq., addressed the Convention and the people at large. Under the excitement produced by the wanton bloodshed at Lexington, and the addresses of these gentlemen, the assembly cried out, as with one voice, 'Let us be independent! Let us declare our independence, and defend it with our lives and fortunes!' The speakers said, his Majesty's proclamation had declared them out of the protection of the British Crown, and they ought, therefore, to declare themselves out of his protection, and independent of all his control."

A committee, consisting of Dr. Ephraim Brevard, Mr.

Kennon, and Rev. Mr. Balch, were appointed to prepare resolutions suitable to the occasion. Some drawn up by Dr. Brevard, and read to his friends at a political meeting in Queen's Museum some days before, were read to the Convention, and then committed to these gentlemen for revision.

The excitement continued to increase through the night and the succeeding morning. At noon, May 20th, the Convention re-assembled with an undiminished concourse of citizens, amongst whom might be seen many wives and mothers, anxiously awaiting the event. The resolutions previously drawn up by Dr. Brevard, and now amended by the Committee, together with the by-laws and regulations, were taken up; John McKnitt Alexander read the by-laws, and Dr. Brevard the resolutions. All was stillness. The Chairman of the Convention put the question:—'Are you all agreed?' The response was a universal 'ay.'

After the business of the Convention was all arranged, it was moved and seconded that the proceedings should be read at the Court House door in hearing of the multitude. Proclamation was made, and from the Court House steps Colonel Thomas Polk read, to a listening and approving auditory, the following resolution, viz :

THE MECKLENBURGH DECLARATION.

Resolved, That whosoever directly or indirectly abetted, or in any way, form, or manner, countenanced the unchartered and dangerous invasion of our rights, as claimed by Great Britain, is an enemy to this country, to America, and to the inherent and unalienable rights of man.

Resolved 2d. That we, the citizens of Mecklenburg county, do hereby dissolve the political bonds which have connected us with the mother country, and hereby absolve ourselves from all allegiance to the British crown, and abjure all political connection, contract, or association with that nation, who have wantonly trampled on our rights and liberties, and inhumanly shed the blood of American patriots at Lexington.

Resolved 3d. That we do hereby declare ourselves a free and independent people; are, and of right ought to be, a sovereign and self-governing association, under the control of no power, other than that of our God, and the General

Government of the Congress;—to the maintainance of which independence, we solemnly pledge to each other our mutual coöperation, our lives, our fortunes, and our most sacred honor.

Resolved 4th. That as we acknowledge the existence and control of no law, nor legal office, civil or military, within this country; we do hereby ordain and adopt, as a rule of life, all, each, and every of our former laws; wherein, nevertheless, the crown of Great Britain never can be considered as holding rights, privileges, immunities, or authority therein.

Resolved 5th. That it is further decreed that all, each, and every military officer in this county, is hereby retained in his former command and authority, he acting conformably to these regulations. And that every member present of this delegation, shall henceforth be a civil officer, viz: a Justice of the Peace, in the character of a committee man, to issue process, hear and determine all matters of controversy, according to said adopted laws; and to preserve peace, union and harmony in said county; and to use every exertion to spread the love of country and fire of freedom throughout America, until a general organized government be established in this province.”

A voice from the crowd called out for ‘three cheers,’ and the whole company shouted three times, and threw their hats in the air. The resolutions were read again and again during the day to different companies desirous of retaining in their memories sentiments so congenial to their feelings. There are still living some whose parents were in that assembly, and heard and read the resolutions; and from whose lips they heard the circumstances and sentiments of this remarkable declaration.”

THE SECOND MECKLENBURG DECLARATION.

“The Convention had frequent meetings, and on the 30th of May, 1775, issued the following paper, viz:

‘CHARLOTTE, MECKLENBURG COUNTY, }
May 30th, 1775. }

‘This day the committee of the county met and passed the following *Resolves*:—Whereas, by an address presented to his Majesty by both houses of parliament, in February last, the American Colonies are declared to be in a state of actual rebellion, we conceive that all laws and

commissions confirmed by, or derived from the authority of the king or parliament, are annulled and vacated, and the former civil constitution of these Colonies for the present wholly suspended. To provide, in some degree, for the exigencies of this county, in the present alarming period, we deem it necessary and proper to pass the following resolves, viz:

'1st. That all commissions, civil and military, heretofore granted by the crown, to be exercised in these colonies, are null and void, and the constitution of each particular colony wholly suspended.

'2d. That the Provincial Congress of each province, under the direction of the great Continental Congress, is invested with all legislative and executive powers, within their respective provinces, and that no other legislative power does, or can exist, at this time, in any of these colonies.

'3d. As all former laws are now suspended in this province, and the Congress have not provided others, we judge it necessary for the better preservation of good order, to form certain rules and regulations for the internal government of this county, until laws shall be provided for us by the Congress.

'4th. That the inhabitants of this county do meet on a certain day appointed by this committee, and having formed themselves into nine companies, viz: eight in the county, and one in the town of Charlotte, do choose a Colonel and other military officers, who shall hold and exercise their several powers by virtue of this choice, and independent of the crown of Great Britain and the former constitution of this province.'

[*Then follow eleven articles for the preservation of the peace, and the choice of officers to perform the duties of a regular government.*]

"16th. That whatever person shall hereafter receive a commission from the crown, or attempt to exercise any such commission heretofore received, shall be deemed an enemy to his country; and upon information to the captain of the company in which he resides, the company shall cause him to be apprehended, and upon proof of the fact, committed to safe custody, till the next sitting of the committee, who shall deal with him as prudence shall direct."

The first great impulse having been given to the spirit of independence by these remarkable declarations, it was not

long before their happy influences began to manifest themselves in other and better forms. On the 4th of April, 1776, the Provincial Congress of North Carolina met at Halifax. On the 8th, a committee was appointed "to take into consideration the usurpations and violence committed by the king and parliament of Great Britain;" and on the 12th, four days afterwards, the committee submitted an able report, concluding with the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the delegates from this colony, in Continental Congress, be empowered to concur with the delegates of the other colonies in *declaring independence*, and in forming foreign alliances; reserving to this colony the sole and exclusive right of forming a constitution and laws for this colony, and of appointing delegates from time to time (under the direction of a general representation thereof,) to meet delegates of the other colonies for such purposes as shall be hereafter pointed out."

This resolution was, on the same day it was proposed, unanimously adopted; and IS THE FIRST PUBLIC DECLARATION FOR INDEPENDENCE BY THE CONSTITUTED AUTHORITIES OF A STATE. It was presented to the Continental Congress, May 27th, 1776, nearly six weeks before the National Declaration.

Now, the similarity between some parts of this Mecklenburg Declaration, of which the late John Adams says, that "the genuine sense of America, at that moment, was never so well expressed, (6),—and of the celebrated Declaration of Independence, is very striking, and has given rise to the opinion that the Declaration of Independence, framed by Mr. Jefferson FIFTEEN MONTHS AFTER IT, was framed in the knowledge of this model, although in a letter to Mr. Adams, Mr. Jefferson positively denies even the authenticity of the paper. (7).

The authenticity of the Mecklenburg Declaration, is, however, placed beyond doubt, (8) while the similarity between it and the present Declaration, in their general spirit and in some of their most remarkable expressions, is equally incontrovertible.

(6) See Jones' Def., p. 297. (7) See *ibid.*, p. 2-4.

(8) See Foote's History of N. C., ch. i. and ch. xv.; and in this work also will be found instructions prepared by Dr. Brevard, the author of the Declaration, for those who composed the Mecklenburg Convention, which are perfectly consonant in spirit with the Declaration itself. See ch. iii., p. 68, &c.

How, then, is this similarity to be accounted for?

It may be accounted for in one of two ways: either by the supposition, that notwithstanding his positive disclaimer, Mr. Jefferson HAD BOTH SEEN AND USED THIS PAPER, —or that both papers may be traced up to a common source. To this latter conclusion, we are led by feelings of charity towards the character of Mr. Jefferson, to whom, notwithstanding all his enmity to Christian truth, injustice should not be done.

The sentiments and expressions, common to both Declarations, are traceable to a source, with which it can be shewn that both parties *were* familiar, and from which, therefore, without collusion, both parties might have derived the sentiments and language common to both papers.

THERE IS SUCH A SOURCE. And that it was known and familiar to the respective authors of these two declarations, is happily beyond doubt. Charity, therefore, will rejoice in being able to give to the respective authors of these two declarations, all the honor to which they are unquestionably entitled, while truth and justice require that the ultimate honor due to the noble sentiments contained in both, should be given to whom it will be found owing. It has, indeed, been said that the sentiments in question had become general and were the common property of the nation. Now, to some extent, this was doubtless the case; (9) but that they had become common and familiar, is not in evidence before us, and may, or may not, be true. But, be this as it may, it will be our object to point out a source

(9) In the Charleston Mercury, for July 4th, 1847, speaking of South Carolina, it is said: "But while others halted and hesitated, it was the proud destiny of South Carolina to set the first glorious example of open resistance. She was then, as ever, in the van of freedom's battle, and nine years before Boston immortalized herself by destroying the tea, her citizens, acting under orders, seized the King's Fort, captured the odious Stamps, put them on board one of his ships in the harbor of Charleston, and expelled them forever from the country. She nullified the act, and it was repealed. She was again shoulder to shoulder with Massachusetts in 1775, when that Colony resisted the Tea Act, and was, in fact, the first to declare her independence. On the 10th February, 1776, Christopher Gadsden, in her General Assembly, raised the first voice heard in its favor in this country, and on the 26th March following, the same Assembly adopted the first Constitution ever made in America, establishing a government, and vesting it with all the powers incident thereto. The Preamble is an eloquent and virtual Declaration of Independence, referring to nearly the same causes of complaint, reciting the same wrongs, and proclaiming the same reasons, as are set forth in the General Declaration of the Colonies, with a striking similarity of tone and language."

from which these sentiments, and the language in which they are here conveyed, and the general form, style, and manner of these declarations, respectively, may have been derived; and if it shall appear that WE ARE INDEBTED IN SOME GOOD MEASURE FOR THE SPIRIT, METHOD, AND LANGUAGE OF THESE CELEBRATED DOCUMENTS, TO A RELIGIOUS, AND STILL MORE, TO A PRESBYTERIAN ORIGIN, the fact will, we trust, confirm our attachment to a system of doctrine and of polity, of which, even its opponents testify that it has ever been found on the side of liberty and freedom, both civil and religious, and ever ready to "contend, even unto blood," for the defence of truth and freedom.

The source, then, to which we would trace the spirit, sentiments, order of arrangement, and to some extent, the very language of these celebrated declarations, is no other than the solemn leagues, bands and covenants, entered into by our forefathers, at the period of the reformation, and especially those adopted by our Presbyterian forefathers, in Scotland and in Ireland. That there is in these National Covenants a similarity—in thought, in word, in style, and in arrangement—to the Mecklenburg and National Declarations of Independence, will be the first position we shall attempt to establish; and that the knowledge of these documents, and consequently, of their spirit, manner and arrangement, was possessed by both Mr. Jefferson and Dr. Brevard, the authors of these declarations, respectively, will be the second point which we shall endeavor to sustain.

First, then, we will endeavor to shew that the Confessions, Covenants, and Bands, adopted by our Presbyterian forefathers in Scotland and in Ireland—in style, in order, in spirit, in general sentiment, and in some of the most remarkable expressions,—are strikingly similar to these two Political Declarations of Independence.

The documents are similar in their *object*, which was TO SECURE UNION, by a public testimony to common truths; by a common exposure to the danger to which such testimony made its subscribers inevitably liable; by the necessity of common prudence, watchfulness and devotion; and by the strength derived from such a combination and such entire consecration to the cause at stake.

The documents are similar in the *order* pursued in their arrangement. In both the religious and the political documents, there is first a general introduction,—then an enu-

meration of grievances, against which protest is made,—then a declaration of independence and resistance,—and, finally, a vow of mutual devotion, fidelity and determination.

These documents are similar also in their respective titles. The first Scottish paper, “subscrit” in 1580, 1581, and 1590, is called a “A General Confession,” or “General Band for maintainance of the trew religion and the king’s person and estate.” (10). The second paper issued by the Scottish Church, in 1588, 1590, is denominated “A General Band of Maintainance of the trew and Christian Religion,” and which was also subscribed by all classes. (11). The third paper adopted by this church, in the year 1638, and subscribed by the nobles, barons, &c. in that year, and generally in 1639, is entitled “The General Confession of Faith, together with a Resolution and Promise,” &c. (12).

Now, these titles are only *modernized*, to use Mr. Jefferson’s own phrase, (13) in the title given to the political papers in question, both of which are termed “Declarations,” that is “Confessions;” and both of which embody a “mutual pledge,” which is, in other words, a “band.”

Again, the analogy between the religious and the political declarations, is seen in the adaptation of both for being engrossed upon parchment, in order to have the names of parties—willing to commit themselves to the hazard of all consequences—subscribed upon it, which was, in both cases, accordingly done.

The *circumstances* in which both were drawn up and subscribed, were also very analogous. In both cases, the grievances endured were manifold;—in both, the power to which the parties were opposed was terrible; in both, the chances of defeat were great,—and in both, the danger incurred was most imminent.

There is a further similarity between the religious and political documents,—inexplicable on any other supposition, than that of precedent,—we mean a similarity in the language employed in both documents. This will appear from the following tabular view :

(10) See in Dunlop’s Collection of Confessions of Faith, vol. 1, p. 103, &c.

(11) *Ibid.*, p. 108.

(12) This is what is known as “The National Covenant.”

(13) See quoted below.

THE RELIGIOUS DECLARATIONS.
— general Band.

— we believe with our hearts, confess with our mouths, subscribe with our hands, and constantly affirm before God, and the whole world.

Third Scottish Decl. and First Scottish Decl.

We resist and refuse the usurped authority of that Roman Antichrist, all his tyranny, laws, &c. against our Christian liberty, and the consciences of men. *See Do.*

— and viewing the imminent danger threatened to the said religion, as well by foreign preparations for prosecuting of that damnable conspiracy against Christ and his evangel. *(Here follows a long list of grievances and usurpations.) See Do.*

And swearing by the great name of the Lord our God, that we shall defend the same under danger both of body and soul.

We protest and promise solemnly with our hearts under the same oath, hand, write and pains, that we shall defend with our gear, bodies and lives, &c. — *First Declaration.*

Faithfully and upon our truths and honours, bind and oblige us to others, &c. to expose and hazard our lives, lands and goods, in defence of the said true religion, &c. and generally to assist and defend every one of us one another, as we shall answer to God upon our honors, and to the world upon our truths and honors, &c. — *Second Declaration.*

And swearing by the great name of the Lord our God and (as above), . . . We protest and promise with our hearts, that we shall defend with our goods, bodies and lives, the liberties of our country against all enemies, &c. — *Third Declaration and the National Covenant.*

THE MECKLENBURG DECLARATION.

— dissolve the political bands which have connected us with the mother country, and hereby absolve ourselves from all allegiance, and from all political connection.

— unchartered and dangerous invasion of our rights,
— the inherent and inalienable rights of men.

— trampled on our rights and liberties, and inhumanly shed the blood of American patriots at Lexington.

THE NATIONAL DECLARATION.

— dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another.

— we utterly dissolve all political connexion, reject and renounce all allegiance.

— a decent respect to the opinions of the world require that they should declare, &c.
— let facts be submitted to a candid world.

— a history of unremitting injuries.

— a long train of abuses and usurpations.

— inherent and unalienable rights.

— [See the omitted paragraph on the Slave Trade, and the catalogue of usurpations and injuries.]

We do hereby declare ourselves to be a free and independent people, are, and of right ought to be, a sovereign and self-governing association.

[Compare also Resolution 4th with the preamble of the National Declaration.]

We solemnly pledge to each other our mutual cooperation, our lives, our fortunes, and our most sacred honour.

We assert these Colonies to be free and independent States, and do all things which independent States may of right do.

— It is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government.

Appealing to the supreme Judge for the rectitude of our intentions, with a firm reliance on the protection of Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honour.

N. B. — This analogy might be enlarged, and especially between the 2d and 3d.

The analogy between these celebrated documents, will be further manifested by their *spirit*. This is in all the same bold, conscientious, and, therefore, fearless spirit; — a spirit confident of the truth of the positions it assumes, of the rectitude of its principles, of the equity of its demands, and of the assured certainty of ultimate triumph.

In both cases, the same tyranny had been exercised, and the same despotism endured. In both, there was the same enlightened view of rights and duties, of truth and privilege. In both, there was the same determination to endure no further tyranny, to assert their rights, to resist all oppressive acts, and to contend earnestly, even unto blood, for their civil and religious liberties.

We have thus given an outline of some prominent characteristics, in which the the Religious Declarations of our Presbyterian forefathers, exhibit a similarity to the two celebrated American Political Declarations; a similarity, not to be accounted for by any accidental causes. It can only be explained, therefore, by the supposition that the authors of the latter declarations were acquainted with the former, and being fired by their spirit, and captivated with their style, order and method, with the force and beauty of their thoughts, the grandeur and sublimity of their sentiments, the deep and powerful impression they were *adapted* to produce, and *had actually* and indelibly made, and by the transcendently noble results to which they had given birth, had made them the models of their compositions and the fountains from which they drew their inspiration.

Is this supposition credible, considering that both of these political declarations are of American authorship, and that one, at least, is the production of a man bitterly opposed to every thing of a religious character? To this we might reply, that from the public and *national* character of these religious declarations, there is nothing improbable in the supposition that they were some or all of them known to these gentlemen, inasmuch as they are still found in the established confessions of several branches of the Presbyterian church in this country. Charity also favors the supposition, since it opens up a way of explaining the perfect identity in many remarkable words and ideas between the Mecklenburg and the National Declarations, without involving the character of Mr. Jefferson, in the charge of perfidious dishonesty, which his denial of any knowledge of

the Mecklenburg Declaration and his attempt to prove that it is spurious, (14) would otherwise render inevitable.

But, we can go beyond mere conjecture, and offer proof to shew that such acquaintance, on the part of Dr. Brevard and of Mr. Jefferson, with these religious declarations, was perfect.

As it regards Dr. Ephraim Brevard, the author of the Mecklenburg Declaration, we have full and interesting information in the volume of Mr. Foote. (15.) Dr. Brevard was one of seven sons of a widow, who were all in the rebel army, and was taken prisoner at the surrender of Charleston, in May 1780. He has left behind him a paper of instructions for the delegates of Mecklenburg county, fired with the noblest spirit of the revolution, which he has here embodied in a most condensed form, and expressed forcibly. Of him, Mr. Foote says, "he thought clearly—felt deeply—wrote well—resisted bravely—and died a martyr to that liberty none loved better and few understood so well." This eulogium is merited by the Mecklenburg Declaration, which he drew up and submitted to the meeting, by which it was adopted with a universal "aye," and which led in April 4th, 1776, to the promulgation by the Provincial Congress of North Carolina of the first public Declaration of Independence by the constituted authorities of a State. (16). "Whence, then, came those principles of civil and religious liberty, which struck so deep in the soil of Carolina, and led to the outpouring of the first blood shed in the revolution on the Almac—and to the first Declaration of Independence by a county and by a State? (17). Suffice it to say, the inhabitants of Mecklenburgh county, were Presbyterian emigrants from the North of Ireland. (18). Trained in religious things by the strict doctrines of the Reformation, their settlements were made in congregations, and their places of worship so arranged as to accommodate all the families. Their descendants now assemble where their fathers worshiped before the Revolution. Their forms and creed were the forms and creed of their ancestors, who were eminently a religious people; and their Confession of Faith has descended as a legacy from the emigrants, to go down to the latest posterity."

(14) See his letter to John Quincy Adams, in Jones's Defence of the Revolutionary History of N. Carolina, Introd.

(15) Ch. i. and ch. iii.

(16) Foote, p. 43.

(17) Do., ch. i. and ii.

(18) See do., p. 187 and 201.

“But, the question arises with increased force, who were these people, and whence did they come? In what school of politics and religion had they been disciplined? At what fountains had they been drinking such inspirations, that here in the wilderness, common people, in their thoughts of freedom and equality, far outstripped the most ardent leaders in the Continental Congress? Whence came these men, that spoke out their thoughts, and thought as they spoke; and both thought and spoke unextinguishable principles of freedom of conscience and civil liberty? That they were poor and obscure but adds to their interest, when it is known that their deeds in the Revolution were equal to their principles. Many a “life” was given in Mecklenburg, in consequence of that declaration, and much of “fortune” was sacrificed; but their “honor” came out safe, even their great enemy Tarleton being witness. They did not get their ideas of liberty and law from Vattel, or Puffendorf, or the tomes of English law. From what book, then, did they get their knowledge, their principles of life? Ahead of their own State in their political notions, as a body, they never wavered through the whole Revolutionary struggle; and their descendants possess now just what these people asserted then, both in religion and politics, in conscience and in the state.”

“In less than one quarter of a century after the first permanent settlement was formed in Mecklenburg, men talked of defending their rights, not against the Indians, but the officers of the crown; and took those measures that eventuated in the CONVENTION of May 20th, 1775, to deliberate on the crisis of their affairs. Of the persons chosen to meet in that assembly, one was a Presbyterian minister, Hezekiah James Balch, of Poplar Tent; seven were known to be elders of the church—Abraham Alexander, of Sugar Creek, John McKnitt Alexander and Hezekiah Alexander, of Hopewell, David Reese, of Poplar Tent, Adam Alexander and Robert Queary, of Rocky River, (now in the bounds of Philadelphia), and Robert Irwin of Steel Creek; two others were elders, but in the deficiency of church records, their names, not known with certainty, but the report of tradition is, without variation, that *nine* of the members were elders, and the other two are supposed to have been Ephraim Brevard and John Phiifer. *Thus, ten out of the*

twenty-seven, were office bearers in the church; and all were connected with the congregations of the Presbyteries in Mecklenburg.

These Presbyterian settlers in Mecklenburg had been instructed by the Rev. Mr. Craighead, from Ireland, (19) and who settled there in 1766, "the solitary minister between the Yadkin and Catawba."

In this retired country, he found full and undisturbed exercise for that ardent love of personal liberty and freedom of opinion, which had rendered him obnoxious in Pennsylvania, and was in some measure restrained in Virginia. He was ahead of his ministerial brethren in Pennsylvania, in his views of civil government and religious liberty, and became particularly offensive to the Governor for a pamphlet of a political nature, the authorship of which was attributed to him. This pamphlet attracted so much attention, that in 1743, Thomas Cookson, one of his Majesty's justices, for the county of Lancaster, in the name of the Governor, laid it before the Synod of Philadelphia. The Synod disavowed both the pamphlet and Mr. Craighead; and agreed with the Justice, that it was calculated to foment disloyal and rebellious practices, and disseminate principles of disaffection."

"In Carolina, he found a people remote from the seat of authority, among whom the intolerant laws were a dead letter, so far divided from other congregations, even of his own faith, that there could be no collision with him; on account of faith or practice; so united in their general principles of religion and church government, that he was the teacher of the whole population, and here his spirit rested. Here he passed his days; here he poured forth his principles of religious and civil government, undisturbed by the jealousy of the government, too distant to be aware of his doings or too careless to be interested in the poor and distant emigrants on the Catawba."

"Mr. Craighead had the privilege of forming the principles, both civil and religious, in no measured degree, of a race of men that feared God, and feared not labor and hardship, or the face of man; a race that sought for freedom and property in the wilderness, and having found them re-

(19) *Facts*, p. 183.

joiced—a race capable of great excellence, mental and physical, whose minds could conceive the glorious idea of Independence, and whose Convention announced it to the world, in May, 1775, and whose hands sustained it in the trying scenes of the Revolution.”

When, therefore, we have proved that Dr. Brevard was a Presbyterian of Scotch-Irish descent, a graduate of Princeton, (a Presbyterian college,) and a ruling elder in the church, we have proved that he was *ex-officio* familiar with those standards in which these national religious covenants are embodied, and that nothing, therefore, could be more natural, than that being imbued with their spirit and versed in their style and order of arrangement, he should have drawn from them the models of his own covenant and declaration.

And, now, as it regards Mr. Jefferson, though it might seem impossible to connect him with these religious documents, yet, strange to say, he has himself in his own Memoir preserved the facts, which afford the strongest confirmation of our position. In the first place, he tells us that from the age of nine, his “teacher was Mr. Douglas, a clergyman from Scotland, and that on the death of his father, he went to the Rev. Mr. Maury.” “It was,” he adds, “my great good fortune, and what probably fixed the destinies of my life, that Dr. William Small, of Scotland, was then (that is when he was at College,) Professor of Mathematics, &c. * * * He, most happily for me, became soon attached to me, and made me his daily companion, when not engaged in the school. * * * With him, (Governor Fanquier,) and at his table, Dr. Small and Mr. Wythe, and myself formed a private quarree, and to the political conversations on these occasions I owed instruction.” (20.)

It is thus apparent that the attention of Mr. Jefferson would be early drawn, *by those necessarily familiar with them*, to the National Covenants, as models of that free, independent and daring spirit, which the condition of this country then demanded. And that such was the case, would appear from these further facts, also stated by himself: “The next event which excited our sympathies for Massachusetts, was the Boston port bill, by which that port was

(20) See Memoirs in wks., vol. 1, p. 2.

to be shut up on the 1st of June, 1774. This arrived while we were in session, in the spring of that year. The lead in the House, on these subjects, being no longer left to the old members, Mr. Henry, R. H. Lee, F. L. Lee, three or four other members, whom I do not recollect, and myself, agreeing that we must boldly take an unequivocal stand in the line with Massachusetts, determined to meet and consult on the proper measures, in the council chamber, *for the benefit of the library in that room.* We were under conviction of the necessity of arousing our people from the lethargy into which they had fallen, as to passing events; and thought that the appointment of a day of general fasting and prayer, would be most likely to call up and alarm their attention. No example of such a solemnity had existed since the days of our distress in the war of '55, since which a new generation had grown up. *With the help, therefore, of Rushworth, whom we rummaged over for the revolutionary precedents and forms of the Puritans of that day, preserved by him, we cooked up a resolution, somewhat modernizing their phrases,* for appointing the first day of June, on which the port bill was to commence, for a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer, to implore Heaven to avert from us the evils of civil war, to inspire us with firmness in support of our rights, and to turn the hearts of the king and parliament to moderation and justice. To give greater emphasis to our proposition, we agreed to wait the next *morning on Mr. Nicholas, whose grave and religious character was more in unison with the tone of our resolution, and to solicit him to move it.* We accordingly went to him in the morning. He moved it the same day; the 1st of June was proposed; and it passed without opposition. The Governor dissolved us, as usual. We retired to the Apollo, as before, agreed to an association, and instructed the Committee of the other Colonies, to appoint deputies to meet in Congress at such place, *annually,* as should be convenient, to direct, from time to time, the measures required by the general interest: and we declared that an attack on any one colony, should be considered as an attack on the whole. This was in May. We further recommended to the several counties, to elect deputies to meet at Williamsburg, the 1st of August ensuing, to consider the state of the colony, and particularly to appoint delegates to

a general Congress, should that measure be acceded to by the committees of correspondence generally. It was acceded to; Philadelphia was appointed for the place, and the 5th of September for the time of meeting. We returned home, and in our several counties invited the clergy to meet assemblies of the people on the 1st of June, to perform the ceremonies of the day, and to address to them discourses suited to the occasion. The people met generally, with anxiety and alarm in their countenances, and the *effect of that day through the whole Colony was like a shock of electricity, arousing every man, and placing him erect and solidly on his centre.* They chose, universally, delegates for the Convention. Being elected one for my own county, I prepared a draught of instructions to be given to the delegates whom we should send to the Congress, which I meant to propose at our meeting. In this I took the ground that, from the beginning, I had thought the only *one orthodox or tenable*, which was, that the relation between Great Britain and these Colonies was exactly the same as that of *England and Scotland*, after the accession of James and until the union."

From this paragraph, it is evident 1, that from educational feelings, Mr. Jefferson was led to estimate as very great and very essential, the influence of religion in calling up and alarming the slumbering patriotism and devotion of the people; 2, that from previous knowledge he was at once led to look for models in the covenants and declarations of the Puritans, and especially the Scotch Reformers, which he terms very emphatically "revolutionary precedents and forms." 3. That to give his plans greater effect, he committed them to the advocacy of one whose "grave and religious character" was known; 4, that he invited the clergy (as they were wont to do in those olden times of reformation,) "to meet assemblies of the people, and address to them discourses suited to the occasion;" 5thly, that he records the effect of this combination of religious forms, language and influences to have been, "that the effect of the day was like a shock of electricity, arousing every man, and placing him solidly on his centre, and 6thly, that "the only ground he considered orthodox or tenable" "from the beginning was" "that the relation between Great Britain and these Colonies was exactly the same as that of England

and Scotland, after the accession of James and until the union," that is *the very period* when the National Declarations in question were produced and acted upon.

It appears to us, therefore, a most reasonable and charitable conclusion, that both the Mecklenburg and the Jefferson Declarations are traceable for their manner, spirit, design, order, and language, to the Declarations of the Reformers; and that it is to them, and not Mr. Jefferson, (21) we are indebted for whatever "like an electric shock aroused the country" to revolutionary effort. It may be a confirmation of this theory to remark, that it has suggested itself to other minds.

In his work on "Ecclesiastical Republicanism," the Rev. Dr. Smyth says: "Let any man, we again say, attentively compare the solemn leagues and covenants, by which the continental and Scottish reformers, and the puritans and non-conformists at a later period, pledged themselves to one another by their lives, property, and sacred honor, and bound themselves to spend and be spent in the cause of civil and religious freedom, with our declaration of independence, and he will, we think, allow, that in the former, we have the plan, the spirit, and the prototype of the latter."

The Rev. John McLeod, in a recent discourse on Protestantism, (22) says: "And we have ourselves heard another distinguished civilian (Hon. Gulian C. Verplanck) of our own State, in a public address, trace the origin of the Declaration of American Independence to the National Covenant of Scotland. Nor was it a mere flight of fancy. The Scottish reformers from popery had drunk deep at the fountains of protestantism, as they had been opened on the continent of Europe, and especially in republican Geneva; or, rather, they had drunk, along with the continental reformers, at the same open fountain of God's word. They succeeded the reformers of the Continent in the movement against antichrist, and had all the advantage of their lights.

(21) And yet this is the substance of the famous inscription prepared by Jefferson for himself.

Here lies buried
THOMAS JEFFERSON,
Author of the Declaration of Independence,
Of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom,
And Father of the University of Virginia.

(22) N. York, 1843, p. 21, 22.

Their covenants were bonds of union among themselves, and public declarations of the grounds of their opposition to the anti-christian system, in all its parts. And they were distinguished, *first*, as connecting civil and religious liberty together in the definitions which they made—and, *secondly*, in combining all classes of the community in the effort to secure them. As first formed, and afterwards renewed at various crises of their history, the National Covenant of Scotland was a declaration of the independence of the Church of Christ, as a distinct community from the State; and of both church and state from all foreign control. It was subscribed by the mass of the people, as well as the privileged orders. And as ultimately embodied with additions, in the solemn league and covenant, it became the constitution of the British empire. Under it, the Presbyterians of Scotland and the North of Ireland, the Puritans of England, of whom the majority were Presbyterians, and all other protestants who chose to receive it, united together in the strife for liberty, which had already commenced.”

Thanks be to God for that blessed word and that holy faith, which, in proportion as they are pure and undefiled, foster the spirit of freedom, nourish and sustain liberty, civil and religious, and nerve the heart to fight valiantly and dare every thing in defence of “inherent and inalienable rights.”

How forcibly also are we taught that righteousness exalteth a nation, and that godliness has the promise of the life that now is as well as of that which is to come, and that he is the best patriot who is most deeply imbued with the spirit of the Bible.

How forcibly also are we taught by these facts, that infidelity is as powerless to effect great good as it is powerful to do great harm; and that even infidels are obliged to use the sword of the Spirit when they would accomplish noble and self-denying achievements.

How are we led to value the spirit and principles of the Reformers, from which, as from the two breasts of freedom, the sincere milk of civil and religious freedom have so freely flowed.

We are also taught that religious freedom must, in the nature of the case, and has, in fact, always preceded civil freedom. And to prove that this connection between civil

liberty and pure Christianity, is not incidental, we may refer to the history of Europe. The dawn of religious light at the Reformation was equally the dawn of political enlargement. In proportion as the reformation in religion advanced in any nation, so did that nation partake of the blessings of civil liberty. Spain felt the rise and quick suppression of the reformed opinions, and she continues passively to wear the chains of despotism. In Switzerland the doctrines of a pure religion flourished, and its cantons formed an asylum for the persecuted. Holland cherished the spread of Protestantism, and was repaid in political freedom. France, displays the alteration of change; now struggling for the reformed faith and enjoying the rights of freedom, and again submitting to the corruptions of faith and the usurpation of tyranny. In Britain the blessings of pure Christianity and of civil rights have prospered together. The foundations of British freedom were securely fixed in the great Christian principles of the revolution, and it has been through the careless observance of these that the goodly fabric has risen in strength and in beauty; and what is American freedom but the everflowing stream of this fountain.

Finally, how noble is the testimony here given to the genius and character of Presbyterianism. Even were it as true, as it is untrue, that it has "written no poem" and achieved no literary triumph, IT HAS DONE MORE. IT HAS PROVED ITSELF TO BE THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH AMID ERROR AND DEFECTION. IT HAS FOUNDED EMPIRES IN THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM AND LIBERTY, AND HAS GIVEN BIRTH TO DECLARATIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS WHICH ARE THE WONDER OF THE PRESENT, AND WILL BE THE ADMIRATION OF EVERY FUTURE AGE.

"*Tancred, or the New Crusade, a Novel.* By B. D'ISRAELI, M. P., Author of "*Coningsby*," "*Sibyl*," "*The Young Duke*," &c. &c. Philadelphia: Carey & Hart, 1847. 8 vo., pp. 127.

A novel reviewed in a religious periodical? And why not? Has the religious world, has the church nothing to

VOL. I.—No. 2. 8

do with the most extensive, and perhaps influential branch of popular literature? If Christians are to be in the world, though not of it; if the church is to purify and regenerate it, an acquaintance with all that either hastens or retards this object is necessary. To shut our eyes, because an evil is before them, is not to remove it. It is untrue, that the abuse of a thing is no argument against its use. It often is. It is an equally fallacious mode of reasoning, to abstain from correcting abuses, because the thing is wrong in the abstract. It may be the entire removal is impossible, or very remote; to lessen the evil is then right. Nothing has originated more errors than the worship of truth in the abstract, without regard to attendant circumstances and consequences. God is Truth, but Truth is not God. Many men neglect the distinction, and lose themselves in the vain pursuits of an unreal phantom. Nearly all essential truth is directly revealed, and does not find its roots in right reason, or any other fallacious technicality of perverted metaphysics, but in the positive will of God. We are not left to blind guides. Many truths relative and consequential, are untouched by the inspired writers, and in these, we are referred to our judgment and reason, exercised in connection with circumstances and results. Our Saviour found the empire under a galling despotism, yet he neither advocated resistance nor forbid change; slavery was then a heavy yoke, — yet he neither authorises those insane ravings of the Abolitionists, nor hinders that amelioration which the institution has undergone in our day. He did not condemn the then existing law, which gave the master power over the life of his slave; nor has he interfered with the right we now exercise, of making it murder.

It is with this principle before our minds, that we must look at the wide field of fictitious literature. That its abuse has been so extensive and injurious as to make us wish it had no existence, we readily admit. We would be willing to part with even Walter Scott, if the whole vile crew of French immorality, German dreams, and English nanby pambyism could vanish with him. This we know to be impossible; the flood is on the increase and likely to grow. It is somewhat singular, that in a matter-of-fact utilitarian age, the thirst for imaginative writing and improbable fiction should pervade so entirely the universal mind. It may

be that the very common place uniformity of civilized life, craves the food, to supply the stimulant withdrawn with the stirring dangers and unsafe existence of the past. It may find a deeper root in the actual unrealities of the age;—for we live at a period whose most prominent feature in words, is cant—in actions, humbug.*

Cant is defined by a recent writer, as “the saying one thing while we mean another.” It is not the meaning given by any of the lexicographers, but it is the meaning society has been attaching to it for some two centuries. We have cant in thought as well as speech;—a persuading ourselves that we think one way, when in fact we do not; but in quite the contrary way. Humbug is equally the trait of the age. It is by seeming that we most succeed; the real and the true seldom find favor or reward. The press, that instrument of so much power, is its exponent. This living of two lives, thinking in two trains, and acting two characters, has pervaded the genius of the age, and enstamped itself on its literary taste. Hence, the life of plodding utility, is found united to the highest relish for ideal creations, as unlike the realities of existence, as the core of the fabled apple, to its inviting rind.

Account for it as we may, the fact is before us; and the question recurs, will we pass by in silence this mighty engine? or examine calmly, whether if we cannot correct the evil entirely, we cannot lessen the poison, by passing it through the same crucible of criticism, which sifts the more solid pages of theology, science and history.

Romance writing has assumed and holds no secondary place in the departments of literature. We do not scout it so strongly when clothed in verse. Milton is full of fiction, and Homer and Virgil, who still hold a place in the preparatory studies of the clergy, are our first romances. It is only of late, however, that novel writing has been made the vehicle of philosophy and religion; and it is in our own day, that we must look for the evils that render it not merely the waste of precious hours, but the corrupter of morals and the advocate of infidelity and rationalism. English fiction,

* A French gentleman made a tour through England in 1810, 1811, and published his journal 1815. He says in it, that he has heard Englishmen complain that they had no word to translate Charlatanism — he suggests *quackery* — I think we have coined a better.

as we now understand it, may look upon De Foe and Richardson, Fielding and Smollett, as its fathers. Their works partake of the character of their age—they are matter of fact, life-like tales, with little exaggeration, and less cant. Vice is vice; vulgarity, vulgarity, and virtue, virtue. There is no confusing and blending. A blackguardism comes out in its broadness; and offends, but hardly fascinates. Vice is not hidden in fine drawn and skilful labyrinths of philosophical subtilities. We are not carried, step by step, through the heart-struggles, the loosening of ties, the gradual doubt, the artful sophistries, all our sympathies enlisted, our hearts almost substituted for the tried hearts, until the final fall, at which we do not shudder, and but partially mourn. The Roderick Random and Tom Jones were vice as it really is,—not Ernest Maltravers and Paul Clifford, with noble thoughts thwarted, and high impulses, impelling, not succumbing to guilt. Villany they depicted; but it was natural, repulsive villany. The poet was right, when he wrote of natural vice:

"Tis of so hideous mien
To be hated needs but to be seen."

The modern novelist presents it, but in attractive garbs of light; the mien is not hideous; we are often absorbed in its personifications, long before we recognize its presence. We even discover its character, only when we have learned to doubt its heinousness. There are other, and equally striking distinctions between the two schools. In the old, the merit consisted in the tale; its attractions were excitement and suspense; but still the excitement incident to the then events of the every day world. There was not only what Bulwer calls the *vraisemblable*, but there was the *vrai*. Not what men and women, acting out the impulses of their nature, would do, in such and such interesting but improbable circumstances, but what they actually did, in daily recurring events. They were not strong caricatures, with distant points of resemblance; but striking likenesses, with the merest tinge of exaggeration. In the modern, the tale itself is usually built on opposite principles; the events and circumstances are unusual and improbable, if not impossible in the present. The characters are designed to

think, feel, and act as men and women would under such influences. Whether they attain this end, and produce even the *vraisemblable*, we will not discuss here. The tale is a very unimportant portion of modern novels. They are fast driving the essayists out of the field; they are seeking to be the heralds of history; have volunteered to science as her pioneers; appropriated philosophy nearly altogether; patronized morals, and have even wandered, with a pretty knowing air, into theology itself. For good or for evil, they cannot be neutral. Time will show the result; but the present is ours, and we may examine the field. If there are open enemies, we can fight them; false friends, we can unmask them; traitors, we can tear down their borrowed colors, and place them under their proper banner. We cannot, and ought not to suffer, this mass of attractive, glittering metal, with its gold and its dross all commingled; its diamond sparkling, amid the putrid corruption that surrounds them, as Sinbad in the fabled valley; its good and evil, undefined and unmarked, to go out into the world without some effort to give an antidote with the poison; to sift the blended material; admire, and be just to genius and to virtue; and strike with a bold hand at error and vice, no matter how brilliant the exterior.

It is said that there are seeds that never produce of their kind, in the same perfection as the fruit of which they come. The moral and intellectual world much oftener presents this singularity. You cannot judge of the roots from the tree; and I have no doubt there are many who will hesitate to admit, what we believe to be true, namely, that Sir Walter Scott is the father of this new school. They do not find in him any such settled purpose; they see no favorite schemes of philosophy prominent in his tales; they see much of the old school, but they may see the germ of the new. Whether he designed it or not, his works are eminently political in their character and tendency. High tory views and high church doctrine, found in his romantic heart their warmest and most attractive advocate. The magnificent proportions of his gothic mind, the high loyalty of his feudal heart, the very superstitions of his nature, gathered round the history of those views and doctrines a castellated rampart of semiveritable recollections, whose glittering arches and stained glass shaded fallacy into truth.

Linked as all this was with his very being, it was subservient to a sound judgment, a pure and healthy morality, and an unusual portion of that logical ability to reason from known premises, called common sense. He never fell into mystic dreams about religion, nor confounded it with morality. Vice never charms by its beauty, though he makes us sometimes love or admire the sinner; it is never the vicious traits, but always some redeeming virtue which attracts. He has been followed, but not imitated; copied, but unfaithfully; emulated, but never equalled. His success gave at once a thirst to the reading world for this kind of composition, and a hint to the writing world, of a more attractive and far less laborious vehicle for philosophy and metaphysics. No time has been lost, and we now stand in the centre of a vast stream of the most various complex and compounded materials that ever the world saw. So subtle, that it leaks and searches into every crevice; so unpretending as to startle no one; so shallow as to tempt all; so deep as to overwhelm many; and so spiced to the natural taste, that its black currents and corrupt pools lose all their terrors. We have spoken of Sir Walter Scott's superstition; it was of the heart, not of the head; it was generated, and existed in the ideal life of his antique soul, but had little place in his modern and practical brain. One of his superstitions,—if it is one,—was, that the middle of every century is restless and troubled. History has some most remarkable pedestals, on which to rest the induction; and the history of to-day, gives prophetic note that the IDES of the 19th, may yet witness a fiercer conflict than the warning past.

There is a restless spirit of speculation, inquiry and demand abroad on the face of the great human mind; and a dark cloud of doubt overshadows and blackens the glassy surface of its deceitful billows; while their long swells, and the deep mutterings of antagonistic principles, give fearful portent of the storm that may soon toss it into the wildest strife.

It is the great struggle of the past and the future,—and the Now is the battle field.

When America parted with the dominion of the mother country, our fathers exhibited profound moderation and wisdom in their *actions*. They left a large infusion of con-

servative cement both in the State fabric and in social life. Their theoretical views, they put forth in the Declaration of Independence and other instruments of writing, which contain many excellent things no doubt, and, naturally, some hard to prove. Our ancestors acted promptly on the easy and certain, and these matters "hard to be understood" they left,—*in the Declaration*. The ingenious gentleman who induced the obdurate monkeys to restore his caps on imitative principles, must have published the story as a parable. The continental nations have always been as prone to imitate us,—the imitation is too exact to fulfil the spirit, though it complies with the letter of the design. They forget we stood at the bottom of the tree and picked up our caps. They on the top threw theirs away entirely; and France mounted instead the bloody red cap, which, in very mockery, is called liberty. We are not going to trespass on history. We have come here, as to the starting point, whence grew that startling spirit of radicalism,—(not in politics only,) whose rude and desolating progress, has awakened many a pure but frightened heart, to look back on the past, and cling to every form of conservative energy which seems to promise safety for the future; and hoary fallacies are disinterred, to bolster the failing hopes of the regeneration of freedom, as Louis Phillippe dug up the bones of the Emperor, to place beneath his tottering throne.

Philosophy has ever offered her aid to religion. She has never deemed that she needed strength herself. But religion, knowing her work, is by to sustain in the hour of trial the substantial and real philosophy, which belongs to a practical and common sense world, conscious of its own transient existence, and seeking in this life no more than a comparative excellence, leaving perfection to the strong nurture of eternity. Two schools stand up in deadly conflict, and scorn her offered compromise. The one looks to man's self-regeneration; the other goes back for defence to old feudal citadels, long since deemed untenable. There are allies, who taken with their seeming purposes rally around each, with their separate scheme of philosophical hope. And others, who vainly mediate to settle these jarring elements on principles at all common to either. They will never meet, but on principles known to

neither. They can find no common ground, until they learn the great truth which strikes away the basis of all their hopes, and makes their struggle groundless. In the doctrine of human depravity and the vicarious atonement alone can this conflict cease. *There* radicalism learns that self-regeneration is a hopeless dream; and conservatism finds its only citadel. The baseless faith in antique forms vanishes before the ever living, ever youthful principle of sober gospel truth, "the same yesterday, to day and forever;" while its unspeakable mysteries rebuke with their hidden glories the prying progress of rationalism.

But we know not the day or the hour fixed by infinite wisdom for the final triumph of the church; and, until then, this worldly conflict is full of interest to us. We have glanced at it, because in the fore front of its literary exponents is found the novelist. In France, he strives to put out the line of demarcation between vice and virtue. Human and sinful passions become objects of worship, and a sensual and devilish materialism strikes at once at the root of morals and the foundations of society. The incarnate wickedness of Sue's Salamander horrifies every better impulse of the heart, until its base atrocity sinks into insignificance by the leveling Fourierism of the Wandering Jew, with its awful picture of lust in the very arms of death. The horrible idea never could have been generated in any but a Frenchman's breast, nor there, until every principle of morality was cast loose, and innate depravity raged with all the energy of hopeless hell. In Germany, the mind has dreamt on, wandering in sleepy haziness to the hidden places of metaphysics, until religion and philosophy have blended into one; and the helpless, heavy dreamer gazes on the active world with unmitigated doubt. The English mind has borrowed from both, and we have a delightful melange of dreamy, mysterious and refined vice; the tone, it is true, is lowered;—the English stomach is not yet able to stand the unqualified putridity of French morals. Mr. Bulwer, or rather Sir Edward, has made some decided strides; but his present domestic position, seems so natural a fruit of his philosophic dreams, that we hope the tree will be judged accordingly, and his country exhibit new proofs of that fine old prejudice of which he complains in "England and the English," that prefers the rule of a mediocre

statesman, with domestic virtue, to the sway of genius without it. It is true, he has written more than one book of sound and healthy principles;—and some of nearly neutral tint; but Paul Clifford strikes at the root of social order; Ernest Maltravers, at that of social virtue; and Eugene Aram, at the principles of justice. “The Student” is filled with the vain dreams of human perfectability, and the vainer dreams of a salvation without Christ. In all, he has borrowed largely from the French and German schools, though he has brought to the task powers infinitely more acute, and allurements more refined, but therefore, only more insidious and dangerous. This habit of following the continental mind, is not new in England, while it betrays no want of originality,—for in every instance it has worked the borrowed mine, far more thoroughly and understandingly. Even Shakspeare has taken many of his plots from Italy; and Milton followed Dante for a moment, only to pass him to an immeasurable distance. This may, in part, be owing to the want of that encouragement by free governments to literature, which despotisms have generally granted. They are forestalled, but not surpassed. It is a great mistake, that literature has ever flourished under free governments.

Judge Meek, in an oration, delivered before the societies at Franklin University, in lauding our institutions, falls into this error. History refutes him at every step; Homer lived in the days of Grecian despotism; Horace and Virgil, under the Emperors; Dante, Cervantes, Tasso, Alfieri, and a host of European giants, all under despotic governments; Shakspeare, under England’s almost absolute queen; Bacon, under her tyrant successor. This is not unnatural. Free governments take their tone from the uneducated and unrefined masses, who confine their attention to the useful and immediately practical; the natural, and not the intellectual and spiritual. They pay the taxes and bear the burden, and are chary of applying revenue to objects whose good is remote and reactive;—not within the scope of their vision, and almost beyond the province which uneducated reason can traverse.

In despotisms, the rich bear comparatively the smaller portion of the taxation, and are more indifferent to the disbursements; they give tone to the government; they are

refined and educated; they can appreciate and understand remote benefits, and comprehend the action of mind on matter; the utility of elevated refinement and the supremacy of the spiritual and intellectual over the base and material. It is not, therefore, wonderful that they have encouraged literary effort, wherever free from political inquiry and the consideration of abuses. But to return—if the profane novels are lending their aid largely to a systematic overthrow of moral restraint and Christian truth, are the religious novels doing any thing to counteract the evil? We think not. We do not pretend to say that religious novels cannot be written, which may produce good. The Christian world seems agreed that they can; else, why do they create and feed a taste for this species of literature among the young, as is evinced in the quantity of moral fictions daily issued for their use;—and even build romantic stories upon bible histories, so that children much prefer them to the Scripture narrative, because “they contain so much more.”

We do not mean to say, that some useful religious novels are not now in print; but we do say, that so far as our acquaintance with them extends, religion has been made so subservient to the tale and its romantic interest, that its good influence is very questionable. In most of them, the tale and the religious instruction run along in parallel lines, but never intermix. The tale is independent; the religion interspersed, in the shape of dry essays, most generally skipped by the impatient reader, who finds them particularly prosy, while they delay his approaches to the catastrophe. Some, as Dunallen, are pieces of mawkish, ridiculous sensibility, without a good practical thought, or an action in accordance with sound common sense. Others, like Coelebs, sicken us with their tedium, and are consigned, as that would be, but for the authoress's name, to a very early oblivion.

We have wandered over the field of fictitious literature, it must be confessed, in a rather desultory manner, and it is time to come to the author and book before us. The younger D'Israeli, is one of the writers we have mentioned, who resorts to fiction only, or at least principally, to enforce views in politics, religion and philosophy, which, in this light and superficial age, would hardly obtain a hearing,

unless in company with incident and excitement. We have long been of opinion, that he is in literature, rather an over-rated man. His first essay in *Vivian Gray* promised well; it was a defective work, but still contained genius, that induced the world to augur favorably of the future. His subsequent works, though superior, have not fully met the public expectation. *Venetia* was a singular attempt to define what Byron might have been, divested of the incidents and circumstances which surrounded him, and which enter legitimately into the consideration of every character, and are a part of its composition; or, what he might have been, had he lived long enough to divest himself of their influence. This attempt fails, as have all others, to rescue from merited contempt and abhorrence, the character of a man like his own *Corsair*, of

“One virtue with a thousand crimes.”

CONINGSBY is chiefly political; but loose and indefinite in its views, and indicates that doubt and indecision that marks a period which questions all things in the present, without a sufficient clearness in the perception of the future, to offer any sure substitute for what it destroys. There is in it a strong leaning to the past, and a hankering after the barbarous massiveness of feudalism, generated by the inability to perceive any other conservative influence to preserve from utter materialism the active radicalism and soulless utilitarianism of to-day. The work before us touches more largely on religious notions than the former ones, though several favorite views in politics and philosophy are again advanced. We do not deny to Mr. D'Israeli a considerable share of talent, notwithstanding the opinion we have expressed as to his reputation; and the work we are considering contains more thought and juster views than any other from his pen. The want of clearness and practical distinctness is however still apparent, and results, we think, largely from the bent of the age, to which we have more than once alluded. Mr. D'Israeli is only one of its exponents, and feels with his cotemporaries, but does not comprehend the unsatisfying character of all philosophy and metaphysical inquiry, not based directly and faithfully on Revelation.

The yearning after truth, without a conception of its fountain, imparts to the heart active impulses in research, while the labyrinthine path of unaided reason leads hopelessly to interminable disappointment. Divided with the excitements of ambition and the delights of fashionable society, this feeling, in such men, exhausts itself in the visionary speculations of imaginary life, instead of racking the soul through the uncertain and painful spiritual existence of a Channing, or the ceaseless instability of poor Blanco White. Oppressed with the material spirit of the age, our author is ignorant where to find relief; and partaking unconsciously the evil, seeks in principles, equally unspiritual, though seemingly elevated by an apparent, but not real sympathy with the moral and intellectual, to find the remedy for the sordid principles of action daily developed around him.

A slight sketch of the book will enable us better to illustrate; and our views will be enforced as we reach the passages on which they are founded.

TANCRED, the hero, is the son of a duke, reared in seclusion and with care, and free from the usual temptations of the wealthy nobility. Upon coming of age, to the astonishment of his parents, he exhibits an earnest desire to visit the Holy Land, for objects we will presently quote, and whose visionary character, though singular, are easily imaginable in an Englishman, kept by circumstances from those channels, in which the hypochondria of the nation usually dissipates itself. Reared on the viands, prepared by "an hereditary *chief*, who gave dinners of the time of the continental blockade," dyspepsia, the natural disease of his people, naturally supervened; of nervous temperament, its determination was to the brain, instead of the stomach; monomania, rather than liver complaint, ensued; the Asian mystery, in the place of *gastro enteretis*. Most of the youthful English noblemen expend this by "going to the Jews," as Lord Eskdale remarks; Tancred, never having formed their acquaintance, wishes to go to Jerusalem. He first indicates his purpose to the duke, his father, in a conversation, part of which we quote:

Tancred is speaking:—"I cannot find that it is part of my duty to maintain the order of things, for I will not call it system, which at present prevails in our country. It

seems to me it cannot last, as nothing can endure, or ought to endure, that is not founded on principle; and its principle I have not discovered. In nothing, whether it be in religion or government, or measures, sacred or political or social life, do I find faith; and if there be no faith, how can there be duty? Is there such a thing as religious truth? Is there such a thing as political right? Is there such a thing as social prosperity? Are these facts, or are they mere phrases? Is truth in our church? Why, then, do you support dissent? Who has a right to govern? The monarch? You have robbed him of his prerogative. The aristocracy? You confess to me that we exist by sufferance. The people? They themselves tell you they are nullities."

"You are going into first principles," said the duke. "Give me, then, second principles," replied his son; "give me any."

The astonished duke tries the "general prosperity" argument, and *inter alia*, the rail roads, with their attendant benefit of furnishing work to the poor.

Tancred replies:—"I see nothing in this fresh development of material industry, but fresh causes of moral deterioration. You have announced to the millions, that their welfare is to be tested by the amount of their wages. You propose for their conduct the least ennobling of all impulses; if all the vices of a middle class are to be attributed to such an absorbing motive—why are we to believe that the people should be more pure, or that they should escape the catastrophe of the policy that confounds the happiness with the wealth of nations?"

The duke suggests, "You should not forget we live in an artificial state."

The son retorts: "So I often hear, sir; but where is the art? Art is order, method, harmonious results, obtained by fine and powerful principles. I see no art in our condition. The people have ceased to be a nation. They are a crowd, and only kept in some rude provisional discipline by the remains of that old system which they are daily destroying."

There is a good deal of truth in many of these propositions; though whether "the remains of that old system would effect the regeneration Mr. D'Israeli here and elsewhere evidently thinks they are capable of, is matter of con-

siderable doubt. It is past and can never return. It was better than the present perhaps. If the substitute in the future will be as good, can be solved by time alone.

But Tancred has desires quite beyond feudalism. The old duke, very much puzzled, anxiously inquires his wishes, and his son exclaims :

“If an angel would but visit our house as he visited the house of Lot !”

“Angels have performed their part,” said the duke, “we have received instruction from one higher than angels. It is enough for all of us.”

“It is not enough for me,” said lord Montacute. It was not enough for the Apostles ; for though they listened to the sermon on the mount, and partook of the first communion, it was still necessary that HE should appear to them again and promise them a Comforter.” The duke is still more perplexed, nor does his son’s final developement of his plan much relieve him. He proposes to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre. All divine revelations having been made in the Holy Land, he thinks in the sacred locality alone can he expect to learn “What is DUTY and what is FAITH ? what ought I to Do and what ought I to BELIEVE ?”

The mother is very much opposed to his going to Jerusalem, for fear of the fever and the Arabs. Various methods of prevention are resorted to. A bishop, high in influence, at her request, attempts to dissuade him. In vain,—“the bishop was as little able as the duke to indicate the principle on which the present order of things is founded ; neither faith nor its consequence, duty, were at all illustrated or invigorated by his handling.” Lord Eskdale, a man of tact and worldly experience, advises that they should consent to his project, consume as much time as possible in preparation, and meanwhile subject him to the allurements of society. The plan nearly succeeded more than once. He becomes interested in a “Lady Constance, who talked like a married woman, was artificial, yet easy, and having *guanoed* her mind by reading French novels, had a variety of conclusions on all social topics, which she drew forth with unfaltering promptness, and with the well arranged air of an impromptu.”

He was soon cured of this penchant, by her indicating

the character of her mind and attainments in the course of a morning visit.

"After making herself very agreeable, lady Constance took up a book which was at hand, and said 'Do you know this?' And Tancred, opening a volume which he had never seen, and then turning to its title page, found it was 'The Revelations of Chaos,' a startling work just published, and of which a rumor had reached him."

"No, I have not seen it."

"I will lend it to you, if you like. It explains every thing."

"It must, indeed, be a very remarkable book," said Tancred. "To judge from the title, the subject is rather obscure."

"No longer so," said lady Constance. "It is treated scientifically; every thing is explained by geology and astronomy, and in that way. It shows you exactly how a star is formed; nothing can be so pretty! A cluster of vapor—the cream of the milky way—a sort of celestial cheese—churned into light—you must read it,—'tis charming."

"Nobody ever saw a star formed," said Tancred. "Perhaps not. You must read the 'Revelations;' it is all explained. But what is most interesting, is the way in which man has been developed. You know all is development. The principle is perpetually going on. First, there was nothing; then there was something; then—I forget the rest—I think there were shells, then fishes; then we come,—let me see, did we come next? Never mind that, we came at last. And the next change, there will be something very superior to us,—something with wings. Ah! that's it; we were fishes, and I believe we will be crows. But you must read it."

"I do not believe I ever was a fish," said Tancred. "Oh! But it is all proved: you must not argue on my rapid sketch; read the book. It is impossible to contradict any thing in it. You understand, it is all science; it is not like those books, in which one says one thing and another the contrary, and both may be wrong. Everything is proved,—by geology, you know. You see exactly how every thing is made; how many worlds there have been; how long they lasted; what went before, what comes next. We are a link in the chain, as inferior animals were that preceded

us: we, in turn, shall be superior; all that will remain of us will be some relics in a new red sandstone. This is developement. We had fins,—we may have wings.”

“I was a fish, and I shall be a crow,” said Tancred to himself, when the hall door closed on him. “What a spiritual mistress! and yesterday, for a moment, I almost dreamed of kneeling with her at the Holy Sepulchre.” We offer no excuse for this long extract; those who have read that most puerile of puerilities, “the Vestiges of Creation,” will appreciate what we think is the best criticism of its merits we have seen, and which is about as grave as the work deserves.

Tancred next forms an acquaintance with Sidonia, who with several other characters in *Coningsby*, reappears in this work. By the way, Sidonia is a favorite with Mr. D’Israeli. We have seen several attempts to indicate his prototype; none of which satisfy. We think he is designed to represent the author’s ideal of his own character, invested with the wealth and position of one of the Rothschild’s.

He naturally agrees with Tancred, in the belief that the spirit of regeneration can only be revived in the locality of its origin, and the “Asian Mystery” is with him a verity. In Tancred, we can easily understand it; but as an expression in the mouth of such a character as Sidonia’s or indicated as an article of the author’s faith, the problem is insoluble. If there is any serious idea, it seems a kind of cross between Rabinical expectations and Millenium fanaticism, though before the book closes, it takes an infusion of Mahometanism, with some tincture of Pagan Mythology.

It may be, he had no more serious notion than to add a little cant to his favorite character, so as to assimilate him more nearly to his age.

Tancred again finds a fascinating object, in lady Bertie and Bellair, “because she had a soul,” as he says, “still of a celestial hue.” They are now in the 19th century. Nobody now thinks about heaven. They never dream of angels. All their existence is concentrated in steamboats and “railways.”

Spiritual as was his nature, Tancred very nearly carries a married woman as his companion to the Holy Sepulchre, when he is roused from his dream by her projecting a rail road to Jerusalem; and shortly after is totally disenthralled,

by discovering his "caelestial" mistress was an inveterate stock gambler.

During his enthrallment, he dines with Sidonia, whose service and dinner are described very admirably. The table talk is interesting, and worth a perusal, as illustrative of the mixture of good and evil, truth and error works of this character exhibit.

Tancred announces his intended departure, in a very singular sneer for an Englishman to indulge: "I go," he says, "to a land that has never been blessed with that *"fatal drollery,"* called a representative government, though Omnipotence once designed to trace out the polity which should rule it." The author has given us a happier, because truer epithet, in the phrase *"statistical imposture,"* which occurs in some remarks on the House of Commons. We concur, too, in the following views put into Tancred's mouth: "We live at present under the empire of general ideas. But the public have not invented these ideas. They have adopted them from convenience. Men obey a general impulse; they bow before an external necessity, whether for resistance or action. *Individuality* is dead."

Sidonia makes some good remarks on the doctrine of development, and advances his favorite theory of races: "All is race," says he, "there is no other truth," which is certainly a very wholesale dogma. "Races, to preserve their purity, must live in deserts, and never mix the blood;" all of which is the platform for another favorite theory, namely, that the Jews and Arabs are the great races of mankind.

Tancred, after his last disappointment, hastily procures his letters of credit and recommendation, and departs for Jerusalem, that holy city, which, according to Mr. D'Israeli, "will ever remain the appanage either of Israel or Ishmael," and which even a scion of the house of Coburg would be no more likely to retain than the Godfreys and Baldwins of old.

There he kneels at the tomb of the Saviour; but the expected angel fails to appear. As some solace to his disappointment, he forms an acquaintanceship with a most angelic Jewess, with whom he holds converse, worth reading, as exemplifying the loose views of this new class of theological teachers. It is too long to extract; the lady occupies pretty high ground in relation to the race of Israel; puts some

very puzzling questions to her new acquaintance, and concludes that they have in common some points of interest. "We agree," she says, "that half Christendom worships a Jewess, and the other half a Jew." "Now, let me ask you one more question. Which do you think should be the superior race, the worshiped or the worshipers?"

The visit to the Sepulchre having produced no revelation, he proceeds to Mount Sinai, where Mr. D'Israeli's prejudices of race might well fix a higher local spirituality than even in Jerusalem. On the way, he is captured by Arabs, instigated by one Fakredeen; the most delightful compound of self-admitted rascality and confessed scoundrelism imaginable; whose life is intrigue, and whose luxury is his debts, "the dear companions," as he calls them, "that never desert me." All my knowledge of human nature is owing to them: it is in managing my affairs that I have sounded the depths of the human heart, recognized all the combinations of human character, developed my own powers, and mastered the resources of others. O! my debts, I feel your presence like that of guardian angels! If I be lazy, you prick me to action; if elate, you subdue me to reflection; and thus it is you alone that can secure that continuous yet controlled energy, which conquers mankind."

This gentleman finds many a prototype in English society; but we think him far too civilized for an eastern atmosphere. Upon acquaintance, he becomes quite captivated by Tancred,—"*mesmerized*," he says, and permits him to prosecute his pilgrimage to Sinai. We wonder he did not first try the prophet's tomb at Mecca, after the views expressed to Fakredeen.

"How do you know," said the prince, "that Mahomet was not inspired?"

"Far be it from me to impugn the divine commission of any of the seed of Abraham," replied Tancred, "There are doctors of our church, who recognize the sacred office of Mahomet, though they hold it to be what divine commissions, with the great exception, have ever been, limited and local."

At Sinai, Tancred at length sees the angel, who is evidently a modern angel of the nineteenth century, with a nice combination of practical sense and unreal humbug, quite suited to the times.

Speaking of what Mr. D'Israeli calls "the Intellectual Colony of Arabia," and common people, "Christendom," he remarks with a good deal of truth :

"Discontented, they attribute their sufferings to the principles to which they owe all their happiness, and in receding from which they have become proportionably miserable. They have hankered after other Gods than the God of Sinai and of Calvary, and they have achieved only desolation. Now they despair. But the eternal principles that controlled barbarian rigor, can alone cope with morbid civilization." The remedy is by no means made clear by the celestial intelligence. He proceeds thus: "The equality of man can only be accomplished by the sovereignty of God. The longing for fraternity can never be satisfied, but by the sway of a common Father. The relations between Jehovah and his creatures can be neither too numerous nor too near. In the increased distance between God and man, have grown up all these developements that have made life mournful. Cease, then, to seek in a vain philosophy the solution of the social problem that perplexes you. Announce the sublime and solacing doctrine of *theocratic equality* ;" which doctrine, with the wisdom common to oracles, the angel leaves undefined, both in comprehension and detail.

The result of this interview is a violent fever, during which Tancred is visited by the beautiful Jewess, (who by the way rejoices in the name of Eva,) and has his case treated with a little quackery, which I dare say the faculty will condemn ; but the patient got well.

He has another theological and metaphysical talk with his mistress, which was probably interesting to them, and may be to our readers ; but we have only space to say that it closes with Tancred's annunciation of his project for European regeneration :

"Send forth," says he, "a great thought," from the East of course, "and you again remodel all their institutions, change their principles of action, and breathe a new spirit into the whole scope of their existence."

Eva replies, "It is impossible. Europe is too proud, with its new command over nature, to listen even to prophets."

Tancred derides their command over nature, and quotes

the potatoe rot, as "already shaking empires, and threatening the fate of nations."

Here the lovers part, and Tancred visits Fakredeen, who proceeds with him to see the queen of "the Ausary." The locality of this people is unknown to us; but from certain indications, we are disposed to fix it in the Moon.

They are well received, and introduced to a temple of the old heathen gods, where our spiritual hero comes within an ace of worshipping Apollo.

The queen is much smitten with him, and endeavors to detain him. He escapes, of course, by one of those convenient accidents proper to novel writers, and makes his way to Jerusalem, pretty well cured of his dyspepsia by the air and exercise, of which he had partaken liberally. In his first interview with Eva, after his return, she charges him with change:

"You no longer believe me in Arabia."

"Why, thou art my Arabia!" said Tancred, advancing and kneeling at her side. "The angel of Arabia and of my life and spirit! Talk not to me of faltering faith; mine is intense. Talk not to me of leaving a divine cause. Why, thou art my cause, and thou art most divine."

A few words of tenderness follow; her head sinks on his shoulder, and she faints. At this most interesting juncture, Tancred hears his name shouted, and his suite appear with the information that his father and mother are in Jerusalem.

The tale readers are left in the lurch. How the duke and duchess relished the idea of a Jewess daughter-in-law? whether Tancred married her, or got cured of his love-fit, as he had been of his dyspepsia? or even whether the young lady survived the fainting, are matters unrevealed. It is true, we may believe the latter, on the modern faith, that death for love, like angels' visits, has ceased; but, as it may be a part of the "Asian mystery," it is unsafe to rest wholly on this supposition.

We think, on the whole, the book as worthy a perusal as any of its class. It has some truths; some speculations, curious and interesting, as exhibitions of the struggle of the natural heart, to find out its own pathway to immortality, and strikingly develops the tendency of spiritual yearnings without gospel light, to press towards the tangible for consolation and hope, putting aside God's simple plan, and

urged by the materialism of the age to find in the substantial and earthly, sympathies more accordant with mere human nature. This "Asian Mystery" is, we suppose, connected with the feeling, and the "universal theocracy" is Rome a little spiritualized.

We are pleased with the strong pride of race, exhibited by one, whose affinities are with a people, hitherto maligned, persecuted and degraded; and though we do not know how far the claim of universal power, set up for them in *Tancred and Coningsby* is true, yet we are aware, they exercise a large influence on the present political relations of the world.

It is difficult to define any one thing, particularly, as the design of this publication; the "Asian Mystery" will hardly answer before the Millennium, if then; but in the mean time, we see no harm in Mr. D'Israeli's using it for any purpose to which he can make it available. Even as a party watchword in parliament, it is no more of a humbug than many in daily use. A disappointed politician and literary dandy like "Young England," may find it, and "Theocratic Equality," quite as intelligible as Pusey's "Via Media," or Sir Robert Maynooth's grant, and make as much capital out of it.

We cannot close, without a notice of the green spots in the land of *Mirage*, through which we have come. These are *Freeman* and *Trueman*, two unsophisticated footmen from the duke's estate, who move over the romantic and dreamy East, armed with their traveling knives and forks, very much harassed with not having their "meals regular," perplexed for "blacking for my lord's boots," and maintaining it to be better for him to turn Turk than Papist, it "being in a manner more constitutional," because Turkey has a right, and the pope none, to send an ambassador to the queen.

"I should not like to turn Turk," though, said *Trueman*, very thoughtfully.

"I know what you are thinking of John," said Mr. *Freeman*. "You are thinking if anything were to happen to either of us in this heathen land, where we should get Christian burial."

"Lord love you, Mr. *Freeman*, no I was'n't. I was thinking of a glass of ale."

"Ah!" sighed *Freeman*, "it softens the heart to think of

such things away from home. Do you know, John, there are times when I feel very queer,—there are indeed. I caught myself a singing 'Sweet Home' one night, among these savages in the wilderness. One wants consolation, John, sometimes,—one does indeed; and for my part, I do miss the family and the home-brewed."

We agree with Freeman, "the family, if not the home-brewed," is worth all Mr. D'Israeli's philosophy, "the Asian Mystery" included; though we would not despise Sidonia's "Sevres porcelain," or the good dinner spread therein, or any other indication of progress in physical science. In religion and morals, we doubt all improvements, not known to certain fishermen who lived some eighteen hundred years ago.

ARTICLE III.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America met, agreeably to appointment, in the First Presbyterian Church in the city of Richmond, Virginia, on Thursday, 20th May, 1847, and was dissolved, according to the forms of the Constitution, on Monday evening, the 31st of the same month. It is a gratifying circumstance that, whatever discrepancies of opinion exist in regard to the wisdom or propriety of its acts, no imputation has yet been cast upon its *spirit*. Every thing was "done decently and in order."

An eye-witness of all its proceedings, we cheerfully concede to it a large share of Christian courtesy and brotherly affection, and, as a natural consequence of this temper, its debates were distinguished by the dignity, sobriety, calmness and moderation, which became the ministers of the religion of Jesus. Its history, indeed, furnishes—according to the view which we shall take of some of its decisions—fresh proofs of the fallibility of man in his best estate; yet, while we censure what we deem to be wrong, we love to linger in memory upon its delightful sessions—to recall

discussions, in which the temper was always better than the argument—good as the argument sometimes was—and to dwell upon the faces of friends, honored as brethren for Christ's sake, and respected, as men, for those sterling qualities of the head and the heart, which dignify and adorn society,

But the cup of human pleasure is seldom unmixed. Our recollections of this Assembly are tinged with sorrow, when we encounter upon its roll, the name of a brother, beloved in the Lord, who was sitting for the last time in an earthly court of the Redeemer. Our readers must excuse us for dropping a tear at the grave of PRICE. Though unknown, perhaps, to many of them, he was known to us—and we have often admired in him “a combination and a form,

Where every god did seem to set his seal
To give the world assurance of a man.”

His noble frame was a true index to his noble heart—the home, if ever earthly bosom were the home, of generous sentiments, of warm affections, and of manly impulses. We have felt the cordial grasp of his hand—we have shared the hospitality of his roof—we have gone with him to the house of God—we have been cheered by his playfulness in the social circle, and the relations of the past, and the love which we bear to his name, exact from us no less an offering than the humble tribute which we here pay to his memory. He is joined, we trust, to the General Assembly and church of the first-born. Cut down in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, when his thoughts were turned to his family, his friends and his home. The suddenness of his departure, proclaims with awful emphasis: “Be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye know not, the Son of Man cometh.”

DR. HODGE'S SERMON.

The Assembly was opened with a sermon by Dr. Hodge, on the support of the clergy, from 1 Cor. ix.: 14. “Even so hath God ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.” The principal point which the preacher seemed anxious to establish was, that the obligation of furnishing this support rests, not “on the indi-

vidual congregation which the minister serves," but "upon the church as one, and the church as a whole." He contended for "nothing so visionary as that every minister, in every part of the country, should receive the same salary." Much less did he contemplate the endowment of the clergy by "a permanent fund, from the interest of which all salaries should be paid. The principle, said he, "which we wish to establish, would be fully satisfied, if our Board of Missions, instead of giving a tantalizing pittance, were authorized and enabled to give an adequate support to every minister in its service, devoted to his work, i. e., not engaged in any secular employment, but consecrating his whole time to the service of the church."

The doctrine of this discourse seems destined, for a season at least, to a growing popularity. It was evidently received with great favor by a large portion of the Assembly. The melancholy failure of the churches, under existing arrangements, to fulfil their obligations to their pastors, has prepared the mind of the ministry for *any* principle, *any* plan, not obviously false or foolish, which should give a reasonable hope of efficiency and success.

That we are greatly at fault somewhere, is beyond all question—but if the source of the evil is to be found in the spiritual condition of the churches, as we are inclined to believe that it is, the remedy should be obviously sought, not in a change of plan, but in serious and scriptural efforts to elevate the standard of piety. We want—*not wiser schemes, but more life*. If the hearts of our people were pervaded with love to God, commiseration for the souls of men, and attachment to the ordinances of the Gospel—if they had a juster appreciation of the interests of eternity, the glories of redemption, and the vanity of earthly things, the silver and the gold would not be wanting—God's house would not be left desolate, and the ministers of Christ would be free from anxiety about their daily bread. It is possible, indeed, that arrangements might be devised, by which a larger and steadier revenue might be secured, without a corresponding improvement in piety—there might be more effort without more life or zeal. But we doubt whether such a state of things is at all desirable. The efforts of the church should be healthful, not spasmodic, the result of its *life*, and not of *machinery*.

We are clear, however, that the system contemplated by Dr. Hodge, whatever might be its success among us, as a matter of financial policy, and whatever has been its success among other denominations that have partially adopted it, is not the system contemplated in the standard of our own churches. The question, upon whom does the obligation to support the ministry devolve, is answered by our Constitution, in the form which it prescribes for the prosecution of a call, and in the arrangements which it makes for planting the Gospel in vacant and destitute parts. The doctrine is obviously implied, that this obligation rests, *not upon the church as one and the church as a whole*, but upon the *party*, whoever it may be, that calls a minister to his work. If a church calls him as a pastor, that church promises to support him,—first in the call, and afterwards when the pastoral relation is instituted. If a Presbytery calls him, as an evangelist, to its vacant and destitute fields, that Presbytery engages to support him; and if the General Assembly calls him to plant churches where the name of Christ is not known, the General Assembly must support him. This last, is the only case in which the obligation rests upon the church as one and the church as a whole, and then, it is only because the church as one and the church as the whole is the party who immediately employs him in his work. The settled principle of our church seems to be directly the reverse of that for which Dr. Hodge has contended in his sermon. The change contemplated is radical, and it becomes us to pause before we overturn our ancient foundations to get quit of evils which attach, after all, not so much to our *system* as *ourselves*.

While, however, it is the obvious principle of our government, that those who employ a minister are bound to provide for his support, it is equally an article of our creed, that the strong should assist the weak. Where congregations are too feeble, or too poor, to assume the obligations of the pastoral relations, of themselves, it is their privilege to apply for aid to their wealthier brethren, and the duty of their brethren to grant it. God has indeed rendered it incumbent upon them to support the institution of the Gospel among them; but he has not required of them to make brick without straw. He has given them the right to levy contributions upon the rich when their own resources are

inadequate. Upon *this principle*, and not upon the doctrine, that it is the duty of the church in its collective capacity to provide for the maintenance of the clergy, the Board of Missions has been founded. It was designed to be a bond of communion between the affluent and needy—an organ, through which the poor might ask, and the rich might grant, whatever aid the exigencies of the Gospel demanded. The principle of the Board is a just one, whether the Board be a wise arrangement or not; and we do not see but that our system of ministerial support is as perfect in theory as the wit of man can make it.

While it institutes a near and tender relationship between every pastor and his charge, it binds the charges together in ties of mutual charity and dependence, which bless alike the givers and the receivers. It is a plan, as it strikes us, in beautiful accordance with the spirit of the Gospel—it preserves the unity of the church, without disturbing the free and healthy action of its parts.

Our object, however, is not to discuss the general question, but to express our dissent from the cardinal principle of Dr. Hodge's sermon. When the edition of Chalmers's *Economicks*, by the Board of Publication, made its appearance, we read the preface with regret. Our conviction was and is, that any thing analogous to the Sustentation Committee, there contemplated, was fraught with danger—and our apprehensions are far from being diminished by the able and elaborate efforts of one of the ripest scholars and soundest divines in our church, to establish the principle upon which such a Committee might be justified. We see no method of carrying out these general schemes, without a change in the whole system developed in our standards; and as we do not believe that the gain will be equal to the risk, we have felt it our duty to indicate our fixed and settled purpose to abide by the ancient landmarks. We appreciate the motives of our brethren—they are pure, honorable and noble—but to err is human. And we submit to them in candor, whether it is not as much the duty of the church as one and the church as a whole, to select and appoint ministers, as it is to support them—whether the right of election and the right of patron are not inseparable; and if the people delegate one to a central committee, we would farther inquire, how long they are likely to retain

the other. It is better to bear the ills we have, than fly to others that we know not of.

PRESBYTERIAL AND SYNODICAL COMMISSIONS.

The question concerning the right of our primary courts to act by commission, was brought before the Assembly by a very able and elaborate report of Dr. Hodge, on a resolution, referred by the last Assembly to a special committee, consisting of himself and Drs. Lindsley, Musgrave, McFarland and McDowell, affirming it to be contrary to the Constitution and uniform practice of the Presbyterian church in the United States, for any ecclesiastical judicatory to appoint a commission to determine, judicially, any case whatever. This question was originally brought before the Assembly of 1846, upon a review of the records of the Synod of Virginia. Two Presbyteries, within the bounds of that Synod, Winchester and Lexington, had claimed and exercised the power; and their action having been approved by the Synod, the point was made in the Assembly, embraced in the resolution to which we have referred. The report of Dr. Hodge furnishes conclusive proof that the appointment of such commissions is contrary neither to the Constitution nor the uniform practice of the church. A motion was first made to adopt the report, and after an earnest and animated discussion, that motion was laid upon the table, for the purpose of moving the indefinite postponement of the resolution submitted by the previous Assembly to the committee, and the final disposition was the indefinite postponement of the whole subject. The Assembly, by this vote, refused either to affirm or deny that our primary courts possess the right in dispute.

The question before the Assembly was not as to the *right* to appoint committees or commissions—this was universally conceded—but as to the *powers* with which they might be legitimately invested; the precise point in dispute was—whether a *court* could resolve itself into a portion of its own members. Now, to us, this question seems perfectly plain—the commission contemplated in the resolution of 1846, is not a separate and independent body, entrusted with delegated powers—it is in no proper sense, an *agent* of the court which appoints it; but it is the *court* itself, resolving to be constituted *as such*, with less than a

majority of its members. The appointment of certain persons by name precludes none others from attending; all the members of the court are, de jure, members of the commission; the only object of the appointment is to render it certain that *some* shall attend, by making it their special duty to do so.

When any ecclesiastical judicatory, therefore, nominates a commission, it does nothing more than issue a command to the individuals specified to attend at the time and place, and for the purpose mentioned, and at the same time to declare that these persons so attending, shall constitute a quorum of the court, even if none others should be present. This seems to us to be a true statement of the case, and if commissions are to be condemned, we are at a loss to determine upon what principle the provision of our government, making the quorum of a court consist in many cases of a very small fraction of its members, can be defended.

It is quite a mistake to suppose, as some in the Assembly seem to apprehend, that the right to appoint a commission is founded upon the right to *delegate power*. According to this view, there would be no necessity that the members of the commission should be members of the court.

If a Session, Presbytery or Synod, possessed inherent powers; which it could legitimately entrust to others, we see not why it should be restricted in entrusting them to agents exclusively selected from itself. But the truth is, the right to delegate power pertains to no ecclesiastical judicatory at all. Christ, according to all Protestant confessions, is the head of the church; and all the powers of all its courts are derived from him. These courts are his agents to do his will—and if a delegate cannot transfer his commission, no more can they commit their functions to any other hands. They are to do *themselves* the work which their master has imposed upon them. Possessing no original and inherent jurisdiction, all their powers are restricted to themselves. If a commission were an agent, acting with delegated powers, we should unhesitatingly pronounce it to be unlawful.

And here we would respectfully ask of those, who, upon this ground, denied the right of our primary courts to act by commission, upon what principle they justify the appointment of Boards to do the principal business of the

church? These Boards are possessed either of delegated powers or of none at all. Now, if the church has no original, inherent powers to delegate, how can these organizations be consistently defended? If the church has original and inherent powers to delegate, then why may they not as well be delegated to commissions as to them. It seems to us, that the line of argument pursued in the Assembly against the doctrine of Dr. Hodge's report, is fatal to the whole system of machinery which our church has adopted. It proceeded, it is true, upon a mistaken hypothesis in regard to commissions, and therefore proved nothing in reference to *them*; but if just and conclusive in its principles, it achieves a much wider destruction than its authors originally contemplated.

M'QUEEN CASE.

On the afternoon of Tuesday, the 25th of May, judicial case No. 1, was taken up, being a complaint on the part of Rev. Colin McIver and others, against a decision of the Synod of North Carolina, confirming a decision of the Presbytery of Fayetteville, restoring the Rev. Arch. McQueen to the functions of the Gospel ministry. The history of this case is probably known to most of our readers. Mr. McQueen had been suspended from the ministry and excommunicated from the church, for marrying the sister of his deceased wife. In the fall of 1844, or the spring of 1845, (we have not the records before us,) he applied to the Presbytery of Fayetteville to be restored to the privileges of the church and the office of the ministry. This request was refused; of this refusal, he complained to the Assembly of 1845, and that Assembly having heard the complaint, came to the following remarkable decision:

“*Resolved*, That the prayer of the memorialist be granted, so far as that this General Assembly recommend to the Presbytery of Fayetteville to re-consider their decision in the case of the Rev. Archibald McQueen; and if in their judgment it should appear conducive to the peace of the church and the promotion of religion to the region around them, to restore Mr. McQueen to the communion of the church and to the exercise of the functions of the Gospel ministry, on the ground that in his case the ends of discipline are attained, by the operation of the sentence un-

der which Mr. McQueen has been lying for a period of three years.”

The matter having been thus remanded to the Presbytery, the Presbytery referred it to the Assembly of 1846, and by that Assembly the reference was indefinitely postponed. The Presbytery again took up the subject of his request, complied with the recommendation of the Assembly of 1845, and restored him to the privileges of the church and the functions of the ministry. Rev. Colin McIver and others, complained of this decision to the Synod of North Carolina—the Synod sustained the Presbytery, and the complainants then arraigned the decision of the Synod before the last Assembly. The Assembly refused to entertain the complaint, on the ground that it had no jurisdiction in the case. “Whereas,” is the language of the decision:

“Whereas, the Rev. Archibald McQueen prosecuted a complaint before the Assembly of 1845, against the Presbytery of Fayetteville, for refusing to restore him to the exercise of the Gospel Ministry, and did at the same time memorialize that Assembly to decree his restoration; and whereas that Assembly did take up and judicially entertain the said complaint, and pronounced judgment in the case by authorizing and recommending the Presbytery to restore said Archibald McQueen to the Gospel Ministry, provided that in the judgment of the Presbytery it was wise to do so; and whereas the Presbytery, in the exercise of the discretion thus confided to them, did restore Mr. McQueen; therefore,

Resolved, That the complaint of the Rev. Colin McIver and others, against the Synod of North Carolina, for having sustained the action of the Presbytery of Fayetteville, in restoring the said Archibald McQueen, in accordance with the judicial decision of the Assembly of 1845, cannot be entertained by this house, and is hereby dismissed.

In making this disposition of the above mentioned complaint, this General Assembly wishes it to be distinctly understood that they do not mean either to retract or modify any judgment hitherto expressed by any Assembly respecting the offence for which Mr. McQueen was suspended from the exercise of the Gospel Ministry. They simply declare that his case cannot be regularly brought before them by this complaint.”

It will be seen from the terms of this decision, that the

question of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of such marriages, and the degree of turpitude involved in them, was not before the house; neither did the Assembly directly or indirectly mean to affirm that the restoration of a minister, under such circumstances, was constitutional and right. But it was conceived, that the General Assembly of 1845, had really decided the case; so that while the complaint was *formally* against the decision of the Synod of North Carolina, it was *truly* and in *fact*, against the decision of the Assembly of '45. It is evident, that if that Assembly had *reversed* the action of the Fayetteville Presbytery, and fully sustained the complaint of Mr. McQueen, no complaint could have been constitutionally made to any succeeding Assembly. This action, whether wrong or right, would have been final. Now, this is precisely what the Assembly of '47 maintained, that the Assembly of '45 *virtually* did. It recommended to the Presbytery of Fayetteville, to re-consider the decision, and to *restore* Mr. McQueen upon certain specified conditions, of which the Presbytery was to be the judge;—affirming, at the same time, that in his case the ends of discipline had been answered by the operation of the sentence under which he had been lying for a period of three years. The Presbytery re-considers the matter, and judges that the conditions are fulfilled. What then? They are advised by the Assembly to *restore*—they *do*—and the question is, can a complaint legitimately lie against an act of compliance with the advice of a superior court. It is *virtually* the *Assembly's* act. The Presbytery was nothing but its organ, and the whole responsibility rests upon it. This, as we understood it, was the view taken of the McQueen case, by those who voted in the majority in the last Assembly: and consequently nothing was, in fact, decided but the question of jurisdiction. The Assembly said nothing more than that it could not undertake to censure a court for obeying the will of its superior.

We are inclined to think, however, that this view is not in accordance with the facts; and that the complaint might have been entertained and issued on the ground, that under the recommendation of 1845, the Presbytery had actually decided *not* to restore Mr. McQueen, and that the case complained of was really a *new* one. The Assembly of '45, recommended that the Presbytery should re-consider its

proceedings—the re-consideration accordingly took place, and the decision substantially was, that the peace of the church and the promotion of religion in the region round about them, required that Mr. McQueen should be restored, if restored at all, *not* by *them*, but by the General Assembly itself. They, consequently, refer the matter to the Assembly. It was not, as we understood it, a reference “for *advice*, preparatory to a decision”—that they had from the Assembly of '45, but a reference for “*ultimate trial and decision*” by the Supreme Court. By this reference, according to our Discipline, “they totally relinquished the decision, and submitted the whole cause to the final judgment of the superior judicatory.” The case completely passed out of their hands. As to *them*, it was finally and irreversibly disposed of, unless it had been sent back by the higher Court. The Assembly of '46, took up this reference, and decided that it should be indefinitely postponed, which was, in effect, saying, that its farther consideration should be forever dropped. The matter ought here to have ended. Subsequently to the dissolution of the Assembly, the Presbytery of Fayetteville takes up the case again—the very case which by its own previous action it had put beyond its reach; and which the Assembly of '46 had declared should be no longer agitated. Now, by what right does this Presbytery presume to re-consider a *second* time? Not by the advice of the Assembly of '45, for the *re-consideration* then recommended, had already taken place? It was evidently an irregular proceeding—and however the authority of the Assembly of '45 may be pleaded in its favor, it was beginning the case *de novo* upon its own merits; and the action of the Presbytery was, consequently, a legitimate subject of complaint. This is the light in which the thing strikes our minds.

Besides, it would have been more satisfactory to all parties to have issued the case according to the forms of the Constitution, although the verdict would probably have been precisely the same as the present decision. There would, then, have been no ground for the imputation, which, however unjustly, has yet been insinuated, that the Assembly was disposed, either from motives of tyranny or impatience, to deprive the people of their rights. The sense of justice in the proceedings would have been more completely met,

though equal dissatisfaction might have been incurred by the final issue. We have no doubt ourselves that the Assembly acted honestly and in good faith, though we do not believe that the action was right.

As to the recommendation of the Assembly of 1845, it was evidently in gross defiance of the letter of our standard. It is true, that incest is a crime which admits of various degrees of turpitude, but according to our covenanted articles, *all* the degrees of it, even the lowest, are distinguished by this circumstance, that they are incompatible with the marriage relationship. Parties connected with each other by the prohibited ties of affinity or blood, can never enter into the marriage contract.*

It is no doubt a more aggravated crime to marry a mother, a sister, or an aunt, than to marry the sister of a deceased wife—but all the cases agree in this, that the marriage is invalid. It is null and void, from the simple fact that the parties are incompetent to make the contract. This is the *doctrine*, whatever may have been the *practice* of our church. The only satisfactory evidence, therefore, which can be furnished in case of incest, that the parties have repented, consists in separation. They cannot live together as man and wife. It is just as wicked to perpetuate the contract as it was to make it. Hence, according to our standard, Mr. McQueen has never repented, and the ends of discipline have consequently never been answered in the punishment to which he has submitted. He is as guilty to day as he was when the Presbytery deposed him. If the law of the church is more stringent, upon this subject, than that of the bible, it ought to be changed; but as long as we profess to believe that our standards faithfully exhibit the mind of the Spirit, our practice and our creed ought to be consistent. There is something revolting in the thought, that we should extend to men the hand of Christian fellowship, and commit to their charge the solemn functions of the ministry—that we should hail them as brethren in Christ Jesus, and enjoin upon the people to receive the word of the Lord at their mouths, when, according to the Confession which we have published to the world, they are living in the daily commission of gross and flagrant iniquity.

* Vide Confession of Faith, chap. xxiv., 44.

Such trifling is horrible and monstrous. It were better that the whole law of marriage were expunged from our standards, than that we should be systematically guilty of the bad faith involved in professions which are not believed or never meant to be enforced. If it is our purpose to tolerate incest, let us cease to pronounce it to be a crime. Let us be consistent, and not make our church the jest of the mocker, and the scoff of the profane.

REPORTS OF THE BOARDS.

A very important part of the business which comes before every Assembly, consists in the reports of its various Boards. They are the organs through which the church is endeavoring to discharge her duty, in reference to the wants of a famishing world. To supply the destitutions of our own lands—to plant the Gospel in the dark corners of the earth, amid the habitations of cruelty, idolatry, and crime—to rear an educated ministry, and to furnish the church with a literature worthy of its creed; these are the objects contemplated in the system of agencies which the Assembly has felt called, in the providence of God, to establish. These are objects worthy of the church, and any body which professes the name of Christ, and looks with cold indifference upon the moral desolations of the world, is a stranger to the spirit of the Gospel, profoundly ignorant of the true vocation of the church, and has reason to tremble at the righteous judgments of the Lord. A church which *cannot* send the Gospel to the heathen, is self-condemned as to its polity—a church which *will* not send it is *dead*. But while we cordially approve the objects contemplated by the Assembly, in the organization of its Boards, we are not satisfied that the schemes actually adopted are in exact accordance with the distinctive principles of our government. It seems to us that all the advantages of division of labor, which, it must be confessed, belong to the present system, might be secured with a less cumbrous and complicated apparatus. We would gain, if nothing more, in simplicity, by dropping the *Board* and retaining only the Executive Committee. The responsibility of the Committee, on the present plan, is indirect and circuitous—it reports to an intermediate body, no more competent to investigate its acts, than the Assembly itself. Why not make it the immediate creature of the

Assembly itself? What is the *use* of the Board as distinct from the committee? We pass, every year, through the solemn formality of electing Directors, and yet, it is morally certain that these Directors contribute nothing to the efficiency of the system—while they *may* be a shield between the Assembly and the *real agents* in the case. There is something ludicrous in the importance which we seem to attach to the *Boards*, when in point of fact, the Executive Committee are Boards, Committees, and every thing.

But whether our plans be good or bad, they never can be successful, until there is a fuller comprehension of the true vocation of the church. As long as our people refuse to be strangers and pilgrims upon the earth, they will cling to the beggarly elements which render earth desirable. The spirit of the world is in the church, and until that spirit is expelled, we can expect no sacrifices for the Gospel—no labor and zeal and self-denial worthy of the cause of our Divine Master. We want a baptism of the Holy Spirit. The heart sickens at the recital of vacancies and destitutions, perpetuated, in many cases, by the *avarice* which God curses as idolatry—and we shudder at our state when a large proportion of our churches contribute *nothing* to spread the Gospel among the perishing and the lost. God grant that the Spirit of all grace may be poured out upon our wide spread communion; and that our diligence, fervor and zeal, may correspond to the immense benefits which we profess to have received, and which God commands us to make known to others.

On Monday, the 24th of May, the Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions was presented to the Assembly, and referred to the Special Committee, consisting of the Rev. A. O. Patterson, D. D., Rev. H. K. Wilson, Jr., and Mr. Charles W. Harris, who subsequently reported the following resolutions, which were adopted:

1st. Resolved, That the Report of the Board of Foreign Missions be approved, and be referred to the Executive Committee for publication and distribution among the churches.

2d. Resolved, That the General Assembly has abundant ground of encouragement and devout thanksgiving to the great Head of the Church, in the evidence of success which has attended the operations of the Board during the ecclesiastical year.

3d. Resolved, That as God in his providence is opening many effectual doors, and spreading out before our Board of Foreign Missions many interesting and extensive fields, and inviting them to enter and take possession, it is the imperative duty of the church, with combined and more vigorous efforts, to promote the work in which we have embarked.

4th. Resolved, That as there are adequate pecuniary resources in the churches, under the care of the General Assembly, if called forth, to meet all the engagements of the Board, it be recommended to them to extend the sphere of their operations, as far as practicable, in strengthening existing stations and in establishing new ones.

5th. Resolved, That whilst it is our duty to labor and pray with increased energy and zeal for the conversion of the heathen, the Assembly recognizes its obligations to increase its efforts in behalf of Papal Europe, as well as the seed of Abraham, remembering that all the kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.

6th. Resolved, That whilst the Assembly learn with pleasure that there has been a considerable increase in the amount of contributions from the churches to this cause last year, it is with painful regret they learn that a large proportion of our churches, instead of sustaining their own Board, direct their contributions through other and foreign channels.

7th. Resolved. That all the churches under the care of this General Assembly are expected, as a matter of duty and consistency, to contribute systematically and annually, to the funds of this Board.

8th. Resolved, That it is recommended to the Board to adopt measures to secure the object referred to in the preceding resolution, by a wise system of agency or otherwise, and that it be recommended to the Presbyteries, efficiently to cooperate in this matter.

9th. Resolved, That recognizing our dependence upon the blessing of God and the Holy Spirit, for the success of this great enterprise for the conversion of the world, it be earnestly recommended to all the churches under our care to cultivate the spirit of prayer, and more earnestly and unitedly to seek the divine blessing upon the efforts of this Board, as well as of other institutions, especially in the monthly concert.

On Tuesday, the 25th of May, the Annual Report of the Board of Missions, (the Domestic Board,) was submitted to the Assembly and referred to a Special Committee, consisting of Dr. Snodgrass, Dr. Chamberlain, Messrs. Price, James Johnston and Cayce, who subsequently presented the following report, which was adopted :

1st. Resolved, That the report be approved, and it be published under the direction of the Board. Also, that the Board furnish the stated Clerk of the Assembly with an abstract to be published in the Appendix to the Minutes.

2d. Resolved, That the increase during the past year in the amount of pecuniary contributions, in the number of Missionaries commissioned, and in the good result of their labors in various respects, has been such as the Assembly may well recognize with gratitude, and receive as an encouragement to the renewed and more vigorous prosecution of the interests of this important cause.

3d. Resolved, That in the judgment of this Assembly, the enterprise of Domestic Missions has never stood sufficiently high in the estimation and affections of the American churches. In its relation to the wide extent of our territory, the rapid increase of our population, the efforts that are made to scatter the seeds of error in our new settlements, and the influence which our country is to exert upon the character and destiny of the world, it is the great enterprise which should enlist the sympathies and secure the active coöperation of the patriot, the philanthropist, and the Christian.

4th. Resolved, That this Assembly reiterates the testimonies of former Assemblies to the vast importance of this object, and calls upon the Synods and Presbyteries to take such measures as to them may seem best calculated to secure the largest possible contributions to the funds of the Board which has this interest in charge.

5th. Resolved, That in view of the increasing importance and magnitude of this branch of our benevolent operations, a sermon be delivered on this subject at some convenient time during the session of each Assembly.

6th. Resolved, That the Assembly have heard with pleasure of what has been done by this Board, in its capacity as a church extension committee; and they express the hope that the funds placed at the disposal of the Board for

this object the coming year, will be greatly increased in amount.

On Friday, the 28th May, the Board of Education made its report, which was committed to Dr. Chamberlain, Dr. Jones, and T. R. Lee, who subsequently brought in the following resolutions, which were adopted :

1st. Resolved, That this Assembly reiterate their conviction of the importance of ministerial education in its relations to all the enterprises of the church and the conversion of the world.

2d. Resolved, That this Assembly solemnly recognize the sovereign grace of God in calling the sons of the church into the ministry, and also acknowledge the obligations of his church to use all scriptural and proper means to increase the number of candidates, especially by prayer to the Lord of the harvest, ministerial instruction, parental consecration, Christian education, and pecuniary assistance to those who may need it.

3d. Resolved, That it be especially recommended to our ministers and churches, not only to pray for an increase of laborers, but also to remember in their prayers the youth of the church, who have already commenced their preparatory studies, and who are naturally exposed to many temptations which the Spirit of God alone can enable them to resist.

4th. Resolved, That the Presbyteries be enjoined to use increasing vigilance in the examination of candidates, and to retain a strict pastoral supervision over them throughout their entire preparatory course; and that the Board of Education be enjoined to continue the plan of personal visitation and correspondence, and to use their best endeavors to promote a high standard of ministerial qualification.

5th. Resolved, That the Board of Education exercise the same pastoral care over the candidates for the ministry, who are sustained by the permanent funds of the General Assembly, as over those who are sustained by the annual collections of the churches.

6th. Resolved, That the Annual Report be committed to the Board for publication.

The Report of the Board of Publication was made on Thursday, the 28th of May, and referred to Messrs. Lowrie,

I. E. Kerr, and McVean. The following is the action of the Assembly upon the Report of this Committee.

1st. *Resolved*, That the Report be approved and published under the direction of the officers of the Board.

2d. *Resolved*, That in the opinion of the Assembly, the affairs of this Board have been conducted with judgment, energy and success, calling for the continued and increased confidence of the churches in its operations as a means of usefulness.

3d. *Resolved*, That the Assembly cordially approves the plan proposed by the Board for circulating its books, and earnestly recommends it to the immediate attention of the churches.

4th. *Resolved*, That the Assembly is highly gratified that the Board has entered into a system of colportage, as an agency for the circulation of its books; and while repeating the recommendation of former Assemblies, that funds be raised by Synods and Presbyteries, for the establishment of Depositories, owned and managed by themselves, the Assembly would further recommend that they employ, in connexion with these depositories, the Colporteurs appointed by the Board.

5th. *Resolved*, That the Assembly approves of the charter obtained by the Board, and orders, that in accordance with the terms of the charter, it shall be hereafter known by the name of "The Presbyterian Board of Publication."

6th. *Resolved*, That the Assembly also provides, in accordance with the requirements of the aforesaid charter, that the annual meeting of the Board of Publication in the year 1848, on the day when the Board meets to recognize and elect its officers, it shall proceed to elect, by ballot, three persons in the room of the three first named of the Trustees of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, incorporated by the aforesaid charter; on the day of the annual meeting in 1849, it shall proceed in like manner to elect three persons in the room of the three first Trustees named in the charter aforesaid; and on the day of the annual meeting of the Board of Publication in 1850, it shall elect in the same manner three persons in the room of the three remaining Trustees of the aforesaid Board; and thenceforward, annually electing three persons in the room of that class which

has served three years; provided always, that the same persons shall be reëligible.

cation may also, at any of its regular meetings, elect persons to fill vacancies occasioned by death, resignation, or other-

7th. Resolved, That the Presbyterian Board of Publi-wise.

The Reports of these various Boards, upon which we have presented the action of the Assembly, we hope that our readers will carefully peruse. They show in what measure the church is fulfilling her obligations to her Head. The business which *they* bring before the *Assembly* is emphatically *the* business which should employ its most anxious thoughts and ardent prayers; and we are inclined to think that the proceedings which take place upon them are made too much a matter of form. The Assembly has confidence in its Boards, and therefore hardly takes the trouble to go into that minute consideration of facts and details which might exert a salutary influence upon the hearts of its members. At the last Assembly, we thought we could discover the symptoms of a change; and we hope, hereafter, that a deeper interest will be awakened in matters that so preëminently pertain to the spiritual prosperity of Zion.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.

The Board of Education, to whom the subject of Parochial Schools was committed by the Assembly of 1846, made, on Saturday, May 22d, an extended and elaborate Report, which was referred to Drs. Hodge, Jones, and Jane-way, together with Messrs. Snowden and McIlvaine. The action of the Assembly is embodied in the following resolutions:

1st. Resolved, That the Report be committed to the Board of Education, in order that it may be printed and circulated among the churches.

2d. Resolved, That this Assembly do hereby express their firm conviction that the interests of the church and the glory of the Redeemer, demand that immediate and strenuous exertions should be made, as far as practicable, by every congregation, to establish within its bounds one or more primary schools, under the care of the session of the church, in which, together with the usual branches of secular learn-

ing, the truths and duties of our holy religion shall be assiduously inculcated.

3d. Resolved, That this Assembly do hereby earnestly call upon all the Synods and Presbyteries under their care, to take the subject of Christian education under consideration, and to devise and execute whatever measures they may deem most appropriate for securing the establishment of Parochial and Presbyterian Schools in our bounds.

4th. Resolved, That a committee, consisting of one minister, and one ruling elder, be appointed by each Presbytery, to collect information as to the number and condition of schools within the bounds of Presbytery; the number of children under fifteen years of age belonging to their congregations; the state of public opinion in respect to education; the ability of the churches to sustain teachers and build school houses, and whatever other statistical information relating to education they may deem important; and that these committees forward their reports to the Board of Education, on or before the 1st Jan., 1848.

5th. Resolved, That this whole subject be referred to the Board of Education, and that the Board is hereby authorized to expend whatever moneys are committed to them for that purpose, in aid of the establishment of Parochial and Presbyterian Schools.

6th. Resolved, That it be recommended to the Board of Publication, to make inquiries on the subject of elementary school books, with a view of adapting them, as far as practicable, to a system of religious instruction, and that the Board report on this subject to the next General Assembly.

On one of the nights during the sessions, Dr. Hodge preached a sermon upon the subject, which was heard by many with profound interest, and seemed to give additional impulse to the cause. The Assembly has entered upon a grand experiment. Our only fears arise from the condition of the country and the habits and associations of the American people. Religion *must* be a part of education; and if it cannot be made so without committing education to the church, why then, the church must take charge of it. The State has advantages in some respects which the church does not possess; but if the distinctive principles of Christianity are to be excluded from the schools of the State, these schools must be abandoned. The great problem to

be solved in this country, is the introduction of religion, THE WHOLE RELIGION OF THE BIBLE, into the public institutions of learning. That problem *must* be solved, or the church will be driven to establish institutions of her own. We hope in some future number to recur to this subject, and therefore shall dismiss it for the present.

DEMISSION OF THE PASTORAL OFFICE.

The subject of the demission of the pastoral office, referred by the previous Assembly to this, was committed to Messrs. Junkin, Pryor, Hoyt, Bullock, and Snowden. Dr. Hoge was subsequently added to the committee. The Assembly finally determined to send to the Presbyteries the following sections, to be embodied as a part of the Constitution of the Church :

“*Resolved*, That it be referred to the Presbyteries, whether the following sections shall be added to the 15th chapter of our Form of Government, viz :

XVI. The office of a Minister of the Gospel is perpetual, and cannot be laid aside at pleasure. No person can be divested of it but by deposition. Yet, from various causes, a minister may become incapable of performing the duties of the office ; or he may, though chargeable with neither heresy nor immorality, become unacceptable in his official character. In such cases, he may cease to be an acting minister.

XVII. Whenever a Minister from any cause, not inferring heresy or crime, shall be incapable of serving the church to edification, the Presbytery shall take order on the subject, and state the fact, together with the reasons of it, on their records. And when any person has thus ceased to be an acting minister, he shall not be a member of any Presbytery or Synod, but shall be subject to discipline as other ministers. *Provided always*, that nothing of this kind shall be done, without the consent of the individual in question, except by advice of the Synod.

Nothing to us can be plainer than that he who has mistaken his call, should be permitted to retire from the labors and obligations of the ministry. He should retrace his steps. We entertain no doubt that the low views, which have too extensively prevailed, in regard to the nature of a call to the sacred office, have induced many to assume its

responsibilities whom the Lord never sent. The doctrine has been proclaimed, and proclaimed in high places, that every young man of talent and education, who could plead no clear and definite vocation to secular employments, was bound to become a preacher. The Education Societies, too, have multiplied temptations—first by making the ministry an object of desire, as a convenient means of procuring an education—and then by shutting up the candidates to the necessity of actually entering upon its duties, under the penalty of being burdened with debt. In the by-laws of our own Board, under the head of candidates and appropriations, it is provided, among other things in the 14th Article, that “if any candidate fail to enter on, or to continue in the work of the ministry, unless he can make it appear that he is providentially prevented, he shall refund, with interest, all the money he may have received of this Board.” This rule ought to be repealed. It presents a motive of interest to the young man who has mistaken his vocation, to prevaricate with his conscience, his church, and his God. It makes honesty a *sacrifice*. In our view, it would be infinitely better, that all the funds should be lost, than that a single man, without the anointing of the Spirit, should be induced, by the stringent application of a rule, however wisely intended, to curse the church with unbidden ministrations. We should give to the uncalled no facilities for entering the ministry. We should give them all possible encouragement in renouncing it. We hope, therefore, that the Presbyteries will act upon the overture submitted by the Assembly, and that something may be done to lessen an evil which cannot be wholly prevented.

CHRISTIAN UNION.

Memorials from the Synods of Pittsburgh and Wheeling, on the subject of Christian union, together with extracts from the records of the Synod of Virginia, were referred to a Special Committee, consisting of Drs. Hoge and Paxton, and Messrs. Allen, Houston and Ewing, who subsequently presented the following report :

The Committee on the Minutes of the Synod of Pittsburgh, Wheeling and Virginia, respecting Christian Union and intercourse, have considered the subject, and submit the following report.

"It is well known that the manifestation of unity among evangelical Christians, occupies a distinguished place in the public mind at the present time. Nor can it be alleged that it deserves not the consideration which it has received.

The Convention held last year in London, has greatly increased the attention given to this subject among Protestants; and it is hoped the results of that meeting may be extensively and permanently beneficial. If real Christians, who hold fast the form of sound words, and feel the purifying and elevating power of truth, shall perceive more clearly their substantial agreement, love one another more fervently, and cooperate in the work of faith and labor of love more extensively and zealously, the advantage to the common cause of Christianity will be real and great.

We would by no means call in question the organization or operation of that branch of the Christian alliance, which has been constituted in our country; but would rather bid those brethren God speed in their legitimate efforts, and pray that the blessing of the God of Peace may abide with them always. Still, it may be inquired, whether some plan of intercourse and combined effort may not be adopted, which may specifically include those denominations who hold the same faith, and the same ecclesiastical form of government and discipline, substantially and truly, which we hold, that may greatly contribute to more intimate and complete unity in sentiment, affection and practice. If this can be accomplished in a considerable degree, in a way which will be safe and will not interfere at all with denominational peculiarities and interests, it will be much gain to the cause of truth and charity. And thus, not only entire apostacy from true Christianity, in its various forms, but errors of dangerous tendency may be more effectually resisted, and the system of salvation by free and sovereign grace, may be more favorably exhibited before the Christian public.

It is to be particularly observed, however, that such a plan should bear no relation whatever to the amalgamation of those denominations who may be willing to enter into such an arrangement. This must be left to each in its own ecclesiastical capacity. Only that unity which is consistent with denominational distinctions should be embraced in the plan. - It is, therefore, respectfully recommended that the Gene-

ral Assembly offer for consideration to the supreme judicatory of those denominations in the United States, who are of the description above mentioned, the following propositions.

1. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, the Synods of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Associate Presbyterian Church, the Reformed Dutch Protestant Church, and the German Reformed Church, will appoint both ministerial and lay delegates, in such numbers as they shall deem proper, to meet in conference, at such time and place as shall be hereafter designated, and consult and decide respecting a suitable plan of intercourse such as may be deemed profitable and safe.

2. The results of this conference shall be reported to the several bodies, and shall be regarded as adopted only so far as they shall be approved by each body.

3. This Assembly will appoint a committee who shall have the charge of previous arrangements, so far as we are concerned, and shall be authorized to communicate with the bodies above named, and confer with any committee by them appointed."

The committee contemplated in the third proposition, consists of W. W. Philips, D. D., J. W. Alexander, D. D., Dr. Snodgrass, Dr. Krebs, Dr. Potts, Mr. Lenox, Mr. Oliphant and Mr. Steel.

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE.

The letters from the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, and the General Assembly of the Church of Ireland, were presented by the stated Clerk, on the second day of the sessions, and referred, without being read, to the Committee on Foreign Correspondence. When the answers of the committee were reported, the reading of these letters was called for. They were occupied almost exclusively with the subject of slavery—and as the terms, particularly of the Irish letter, were any thing but decent and conciliatory, there was a strong disposition at first to resist the reading, on the ground that it ill-comported with respect for ourselves and the dignity of the Assembly, to listen to lectures, in which it were hard to say whether ignorance, vulgarity or fanaticism, were the predominating element. The letters, however, were finally read, and the answers adopted. The substance of these answers was

briefly this, that our correspondence with Ireland and Scotland must cease, unless Ireland and Scotland shall be content to drop the subject of slavery. We desire no instruction from foreign lands — we know and understand our duty.

These letters assume what never can be proved from the Word of God, nor the light of nature, that slavery is essentially a sin. That there are abuses connected with the institution, may be freely and honestly conceded; but let it be remembered that in this fallen world, disfigured with the curse of the Almighty, the nearest, tenderest, holiest relations of life are liable to enormous perversions, and may be made the parents of unspeakable wretchedness, the occasions of aggravated crime. To infer that the Presbyterian church in this country, because it tolerates slavery as an existing institution, licenses the cruelty of tyrants, or approves the oppression which inhumanity may inflict, is foul injustice and reproach. We stand upon the platform of the Bible; God's word recognizes the relation of master and servant, as a relation that may lawfully subsist, and defines the duties incumbent upon the parties. The church, as a spiritual body, should attempt no more, and can do no less.

There are two extremes of opinion, against which we should guard. The first is, that slavery is exclusively a civil institution, and that the church possesses no jurisdiction in regard to it. The second is, that as it is a natural evil, like poverty or disease, a state pregnant with temptations and inconveniences, the church should endeavor, by wise and judicious means, to effect its ultimate abolition. Both propositions are false. Though a civil and political institution, it is the subject of moral duties; and the church has a right to exact the faithful performance of these duties from all her members who are masters or slaves. Cruelty to a servant, is as much the subject of ecclesiastical censure as cruelty to a wife. The church must rebuke *all* sin in all the relations of life. The slave she must require to be faithful; the master, merciful and just.

As to the other opinion, it mistakes entirely the true vocation of the church. It is a spiritual body, and has no right to interfere directly with the civil relations of society. Whether slavery shall be perpetuated or not, whether arrangements shall be made to change or abolish it, whether

it conduces to the prosperity of states or hinders the progress of a refined civilization, these are questions not for the church but the state—not for ministers but statesmen. Christian men may discuss them as citizens and patriots, but not as members of the Church of Jesus Christ. As it is clear from the bible, that slavery is not a sin, the church, *as such*, has no more right to seek its extinction than to seek a change in the political structure of a nation. We might just as consistently demand from the Church of Scotland, or the Irish Assembly, the adoption of measures to subvert the monarchy and peerage of the realm, as they can exact from us the institution of efforts to abolish the condition of the slave. As Christian men and as Christian ministers, we are bound to seek not the freedom but the salvation of our race. We are to know no man after the flesh; the pardon, conversion, holiness and peace of all mankind, whether bond or free, male or female, these are the objects of the church's prayers and the church's zeal. Her mission is accomplished, when she has brought them all, as well the master and servant as the husband and wife, to the knowledge of Christ, and trained them by the word, the ministry, and ordinances for the inheritance of the saints in light—their political and social relations here, are not within the province of her immediate labors. She has no commission to make the poor rich, nor the rich poor, the bond free, nor the free bond—it is not her province to subvert monarchies and institute republics, nor to overturn republics and establish despotism—she is to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God, the things that are God's.

If the churches of Ireland and Scotland could be induced to recognize these principles, a pleasant and profitable correspondence might be conducted with them. We honestly believe, however, that the gain would be greater to them than to us. The leaders of the Free Church have displayed a moral heroism and magnanimity, which are worthy of all praise; but as a church, upon the primitive plan, untrammelled by the state, trusting in God and supported by the voluntary contributions of the people, we are more than half a century older than they are. Scotland has just emerged from a dreary bondage, and though delighted with her freedom, there are still symptoms that she lusts for the flesh pots of Egypt. The Free Church has never re-

nounced the *principle* of alliance with the State. She is still afraid to commit her ministry to the liberality and affections of the people, and seeks in funds and splendid endowments, the patronage from Mammon which she was obliged to relinquish from Cæsar. It has evidently much to learn; and we, of all others, are the people whom the providence of God has qualified to teach her. Ours is, and by the blessing of God, always shall be a *free church*. We wish neither state patronage nor permanent endowments. We have no treasury but the pockets of God's people, and our ministers go forth to the work of the Lord without purse or scrip, in firm reliance upon his gracious providence and the love which his children bear to his name. We know of not a single element, essentially characteristic of a church, in which Scotland can claim a superiority to us. Accidental advantages she may possess. Profounder scholarship and more varied learning may distinguish her divines, but in the practical exemplification of the true theory of a church, it is no arrogance to say, that we are far, very far, in advance of her. Still, the freshness of her zeal, and the warmth of her first love, might exert a salutary influence on us, if a fair and honorable correspondence could be maintained.

But if she and her sister in Ireland choose to become abolition propagandists, and to denounce the country and constitution which we love, then we should not submit to insults, which are none the less arrogant, because they pretend to be Christian admonitions, and we should not listen to counsels which cannot be consistently carried out, without shaking our glorious union or laying our Republic prostrate in the dust. A correspondence, purchased at such a price, is quite too dear for American freemen and American Christians—we should deserve the castigation we receive, if while the Bible sustains us, we could tamely consent to be impleaded at the bar of a Scotch or Irish Assembly, as a pack of reprobates and sinners—to have the vocabulary of reproach exhausted upon our heads and the curse of heaven denounced against ourselves and our children. Christianity and nature forbid us to bear it. The sympathies of the world, we know, are against us; we are blackened and reviled upon the right hand and the left, but we have the testimony of a good conscience, the earnest of

God's approbation, and we ask no more. Our position cannot be successfully assailed, without impugning the authority of the scriptures. We stand or fall with them.

In the present position of affairs, the probability is that the cessation of the correspondence would be of advantage to the Free Church itself. Its connection with us has been trying to the last degree. The pressure of public opinion, instigated by infidels, fanatics and abolitionists, has been tremendous against it, in consequence of the comparatively moderate tone which its master spirits have given to its testimonies and deliverances on the subject of American slavery. This dead weight, which its fellowship with us imposes, it would no longer be doomed to carry, if the correspondence were brought to a close.

WAR WITH MEXICO.

The Assembly near the close of its sessions, adopted appropriate resolutions, in reference to the war with Mexico. We commend this subject to our churches. The signs of the times are ominous that peace may be even more disastrous than the war. Those who have an interest at the throne of grace, should beseech the God of heaven to interpose and to save our union from dismemberment and our country from disgrace. To His hands we would humbly commit our destinies, and we close with the fervent prayer, that He would give to our Senators wisdom, to our magistrates fidelity, and to all our people the fear of His own Almighty Name.

ARTICLE V:

An Effectual Control of the Will and Conduct of Men by the Spirit of God, compatible with their free agency and accountability.

This subject involves two questions. 1. Does the Spirit of God effectually control the "will and conduct of men?" 2. If he does, is the "free agency and accountability of man" thereby destroyed or infringed? The design of the

following article, is to show that the former of these questions should be answered in the *affirmative*, and the latter in the *negative*.

Man sustains to his Maker two relations. He is a free moral agent, and at the same time dependent upon the Spirit of God for every holy affection. In the former relation he is *active*, and in the latter he is in one sense *passive*. He is passive because dependent and acted upon, and not in such a sense as to be free from obligation. We are none the less bound to repent, because "Christ is exalted a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance," and none the less bound to love, because love is "the fruit of the Spirit." Our obligations rest upon the gifts of reason, conscience, and power of choice, heightened by the light of Revelation and the influences of the Holy Spirit; and are not cancelled either by our dependence or depravity. If disinclination could destroy obligation, then there could be no crime in the universe; and all punishment, even that of lost spirits, would become the oppression of a tyrant.

On the other hand, if we be under the influence of a "carnal mind," which is "enmity against God," we must be dependent on the agency of the Holy Spirit for holiness, and Jehovah himself cannot render it otherwise. He cannot confer upon any one of his creatures absolute independence without undefining himself; nor can he endow man with self-creating energy, a power which no being, either created or uncreated, ever possessed. And were it true that depraved creatures were independent, all would be lost. If God has neither power nor right to control the will and conduct of men, so as to render them holy, he cannot guarantee the prosperity of the universe for one hour; and all his predictions bearing upon the "latter day glory" are mere conjectures. All his plans may be thwarted; all his ends may fail of their accomplishment, and the Great I Am may yet become as miserable as he is now happy and glorious. If God cannot effectually control my will and conduct, I for one would sink at once into the faintness of despair. But in so far as men are dependent, they are in one sense passive; they are subject to the control of another. In the inception of that control, which causes right affections or a right will, we must be passive, though in the affections themselves we are active. This must be true,

unless we are independent; unless we have absolute control over our own carnal minds, and can change our own affections; unless we do more than the Omnipotent God, who says of himself, "I Am that I Am."

To show this entire dependence of men, and the necessity that exists that their minds should be controlled by the Divine Spirit, in order to holiness, we might safely appeal to the "law and to the testimony;" but as our opponents are wont to challenge us to the field of reason, it may be more conducive to the interests of truth, that we meet them on the ground of their own selection.

Men have not often ventured to deny that every thing in the natural world occurs according to the controlling agency of an all-wise and holy God. But many are slow to admit the existence of such a Providence in the world of mind. To suppose a Providence here, extending to every moral being, and so controlling his every action as to give certainty to his final character and condition, they contend would infringe upon the liberty of the creature, and tarnish the holiness of the Creator. "If," say they, "God controls the human will, so as to render it certain that man will act in a certain way, it is equally certain that he will not act in another, and morally impossible that he should. This providential certainty in their view, is to establish a necessity in actions incompatible with freedom and accountability. They, therefore, have recourse to what they call the "self-determining power of the will."

Says Mr. Fletcher: "And what is the will but the willing capacity and self-exerting, self-determining power." (1).

Now, if man possesses such a power, and if his depravity consists in the selections of a perverse will, why may he not at once and forever control his corrupt nature, and thus supersede the necessity of being regenerated and sanctified by the Spirit of God? But however reasonable and consistent it may appear, that those who contend for a "self-determining power" should reject the aid of the Divine Spirit in the production of a holy nature, they are not wont to do so. What, then, do they mean by the power in question?

The question which, since the days of Arminius, has divided the Calvinistic and Arminian writers on the subject

(1) Checks, vol. 1, page 91.

of moral freedom, has been whether the acts of the will become what they are from antecedent causes, or whether they become so by a self-determining power of the will itself. In other words, whether when the question is asked, why a man chooses riches rather than poverty, is it a sufficient answer, to say that he has the faculty of will and power of self-determination either way; or is it a more correct and satisfactory solution of the problem, to reply that he was induced by certain reasons or considerations, which served as motives in determining his choice? Now, it is true that this question appeals to consciousness; and no one therefore can answer for another. But, judging from experience, can the question receive more than one answer? What rational being ever yet made a choice, without some reason for so doing? It matters not what that reason or motive may be; whether a previous inclination, a dictate of the understanding, or some attractiveness in the object chosen; still, if it be something antecedent to the putting forth of the volition, that induces the will to select one thing rather than another, then is it controlled by other causes than its own "self-existing, self-determining power."

Now, if the Spirit of God does, or even can, change the inclination, illumine the mind, or in any way render holiness attractive, he can, with propriety, be said to control the "will and conduct of men." The understanding may be so enlightened, the inclination so changed, and the affections so sublimated and purified, as to render his people emphatically "a willing people in the day of his power."

Nor does the doctrine of the equipoise or indifference of the will, supersede the necessity of the Spirit's control in the generation and completion of a holy nature.

If the will be unbiassed, and if it have no self-determining property, then, independent of the Divine Spirit, or some other extrinsic agency, it must remain motionless forever. But such a state cannot be truly predicated of an active will. In order to the putting forth of a volition, an object must be viewed with a previous corresponding relish or disrelish. On any other supposition, choice must proceed from perfect incertitude, which would be an absurdity. The motion or activity of a rational sensitive being, must always be toward the object, or combination of objects, which has something to excite its volitions.

These views of the will are so fortified by truth, that their strongest and most virulent opponents are frequently led, unconsciously, to admit their correctness. Says Mr. Fletcher: "Nor is this freedom derogatory to free grace: for as it was free grace that gave an upright free will to Adam at his creation; so, whenever his fallen children think or act aright, it is because their free will is mercifully prevented, touched and so far rectified by free grace." (2).

Now, according to the position here assumed, what becomes of the will's "self-determining power?" Can it be said to have such a power, or the subject of it to be absolutely free and independent, when, in order to a single right thought or action, an extrinsic agency must be brought to bear upon it? The advocates for such a property in the will, ought certainly to relinquish the appellation of power which they have given it, when, like Mr. Fletcher, they are driven to admit that the will is "mercifully prevented, touched and rectified," or, in other words, controlled by a power not its own.

And Dr. Taylor, although he contends for "a power to act, despite all opposing power," as necessary to moral agency, admits that "of all specific voluntary action, the happiness of the agent in some form is the ultimate end."

Now, this latter clause, we hold to be a virtual relinquishment of what is claimed in the former part of the sentence, and is a clear admission of what Edwards, and others of the same belief, have contended for. It admits that man has no power to choose that which he does not consider as in some way conducive to his own happiness. And if he has no such power—if he is thus limited to one class of motives—and if it be the idea of happiness that gives to that class all their force, then, why not grant at once, that the strongest of these will always govern the will? If in the contemplation of two certain courses of action, the only thing that can excite volition is their tendency to promote our ultimate happiness, who does not see that of the two courses, the one which in our view will most effectually secure the desired object, will always determine our choice, and thus render the will subject to the "strongest motive," or to that "view of the mind which has the greatest degree of previous tendency to excite volition."

(2) Checks, page 72.

Mr. Tappan, also, who argues that the only escape from necessity, is in the conception of a will which may "act without reference either to reason or passion, shows the nullity of that for which he contends, by the extent of his own concessions. After assuming this position, he again says: "The will has efficiency or creating and modifying power in itself; self-moved, self-directed. But then without reason and sensitivity, the will would be without objects, without designs, without rules, a solitary power, conscious of a liberty to do, but not knowing what to do." (3). He might, with almost equal propriety, have spoken of the self-moving power of the ship, which, unless unmoored, propelled, and guided by an extrinsic influence, must remain stationary forever. It is certainly very incorrect to affirm that the things or agencies which graciously furnish the will with "objects, designs, rules, and also teach it what to do," can have no influence in controlling its preferences.

We, therefore, feel bound to adhere to the position assumed at the commencement of this article, that dependence is a necessary attribute of created being. Perfect independence and self-sufficiency belong to God alone, and can never be transferred or communicated to another, without undeifying himself, and exposing the interests of the universe to anarchy and misrule. All power of creatures, must, in the nature of things, be subject to many "touches, preventions, rectifications," and limitations. They have, from the fact of their being creatures, a passivity or susceptibility of being controlled by an influence not their own. This liability to extrinsic influence, is a *primum* reason why the actions of the same man and of different men, are so opposite in their character and tendency. Suppose what power of will you please, there is no rational man whose will and conduct are not greatly affected by the circumstances in which he is placed. These circumstances are often utterly beyond his control, and thus demonstrate the reality of an extrinsic influence in determining his preferences. To deny this liability or passivity, and to contend for a "self-determining, self-moving power," is to reduce the idea of a Divine Providence to a mere fancy. And to reject the effectual control of the will and conduct of men by the Spirit

(3) Review of Edwards, page 244.

of God, is to leave a guilty world amidst the wars of corruption, tossed by the tempest of unsanctified passions, and without one ray of hope that a haven of purity, of rest and of safety, will ever be reached.

But some of my readers may be ready to ask how can such control on the part of Deity, over the moral as well as the natural world, be maintained without an impeachment of the divine holiness. It is constantly urged by those who hold to a self-determining power of the will, that if volition be determined by antecedent causes, which are subject to the divine control, then is God the author of sin. To this objection, we prefer replying in the language of another. Says President Edwards, "It would be strange arguing, indeed, if because men never commit sin, but only when God leaves them *to themselves*, and necessarily sin when he does so—and therefore their sin is not *from themselves*, but from God: and so that God must be a sinful being: as strange as it would be to argue because it is always dark when the sun is gone down, and never dark when the sun is present, that therefore all darkness is from the sun, and that his disk and beams must needs be black." (4). This quotation, we contend, shows in a manner which ought to be satisfactory, the absurdity of the objection. Holiness is the result of divine agency, and sin springs from the want of that agency. Thus, when God exerts any positive control over the human soul, holiness is produced. But when he withholds or withdraws that control, sin ensues. His connexion with the origin of sin is not that of authorship, but of non-prevention. In one sense, indeed, God is the Creator of all things; for if he had not put forth his energies in the work of creation, there could have been no sin. He is the author of sin in the same sense as the exemplary parent is of the iniquities of his children, or as the venerable framers of our Constitution are the authors of all its alleged violations.

But who will be so ungenerous as to contend, that to be the cause or rather the occasion of sin in this sense, is to be either its author, or in any way tainted with its pollution?

But before proceeding farther in replying to objections of

(4) Edwards' *Freedom of the Will*, p. 251, part iv., sec. ix.

this kind, it becomes our duty to notice another popular position, which virtually destroys "the effectual control of the Spirit of God over the will and conduct" of even the best men.

Says Dr. Duffield, "Regeneration, which is the commencement of spiritual life, consists in a voluntary act of faith, under the influence of moral suasion only. The soul is active, not passive, in regeneration. There is no Almighty efficient agency of the Holy Spirit on the soul effecting this change, and producing in the soul a holy principle." (5).

This is to make the new birth, apart from conviction, a mere natural process. And that the speculations which have flooded the church for the last fifteen years, about the instrumentality of light, have grown out of some such notion, cannot be questioned.

Our first objection to this position is, that it wants that boasted uniformity which is said to characterize all the operations of nature. If regeneration be merely a result of increased light or "moral suasion," then, why do persons under very unfavorable circumstances so often become Christians, whilst the children of the church frequently live and die in sin? And why are persons so frequently, without any apparent natural cause, brought under the sanctifying influence of Divine Truth? And why is a whole community aroused, and hundreds within a few weeks converted by an influence which was first felt by a few wrestling spirits, who can trace these feelings to no natural origin? There are changes in the disposition, which are brought about by natural laws. The ardor and precipitancy of youth give way to the deliberation and cautiousness of old age. But the change here is gradual. In the case under consideration, the greatest of all revolutions is effected in an instant; for it is a matter of experience as well as of observation, that man is an enemy to his Maker until he loves him supremely, and therefore must pass from one state to the other in a moment. This change, in the bible, is compared to things wholly supernatural, a new creation, new birth, a resurrection, &c. And is there no reference in all these to a direct agency of the Spirit of God

(5) Vide Art. 7th on Regeneration.

upon the soul, "producing" in it a "holy principle," so that it shall now and henceforth, at the bidding of motives, breathe supreme affection to God, when before, the same motives or truths could awaken nothing but enmity? Do they simply refer to the effects of truth in the work of conviction? Surely the metaphors are too forcible for such effects. If the Spirit of God does nothing but hold up the truth to the heart and conscience by "moral suasion," until the truth, by its own power, produces that "voluntary act of faith" which is "the commencement of spiritual life," where is the exhibition of mighty power? The change is spoken of as a manifestation of no less power, than the putting forth of that omnipotent energy which awoke the universe into being: "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." Now, do "moral suasion," or the means of grace, however forcibly applied, contain in themselves this marvellous agency? Thousands are strongly plied by the truth, and even deeply convicted, whose impressions are like "the morning cloud," and because they are not permanent, no one speaks of the mighty power of God in their case. Is not the allusion, then, to that "Almighty and efficient agency of the Holy Spirit on the soul," by which it receives, "a holy principle."

We can easily conceive how light can produce belief, and how increased knowledge may deepen conviction; but in what way either, however great, can produce a "holy principle," who can tell? Satan and many of his liege subjects, have both. Intelligence certainly has no perceptible tendency to engender spiritual life. But it may be said, as it seems to be believed, that God gives to the truth that tendency in some imperceptible way. Men sometimes pray that God would make his word the "sword of the Spirit, as if he had power to communicate to it some new properties. But this form of expression, whatever may be the devotion with which it is uttered, is certainly very objectionable. God produces truth by the establishment of certain facts or relations upon which it depends. But once it has become truth, it cannot be altered, or in any way affected, but by changing the circumstances upon which it rests. This is the case with all truth. God no more upholds or ener-

gizes the properties of Divine Truth, than he does those of mathematical verities. It is not for him to create, destroy or affect in any way the truth that the half is less than the whole, or that three and three make six. Nor has the truth that Christ died for sinners any natural or inherent power in itself; and when any thing is done to carry it home to the human mind, it is not accomplished by an operation upon the truth, in consequence of which it becomes so "suaviter in modo" as to produce "spiritual life," but by an operation upon the mind itself. As however truth is God's chosen instrumentality for slaying the enmity of the human heart, it is called the "sword of the Spirit." But the hand which wields successfully this instrumentality of heaven's own choosing, communicates no new properties to the word, but simply bursts asunder by it those brazen folds which sin has gathered around the human heart. What is it that keeps out the truth from the heart and conscience of the Gospel-hardened sinners? Nothing but unbelief, arising from the disordered state of the soul. As then the hindering cause lies not in the word, but "in the material upon which it operates, where but to the seat of opposition must the removing power be applied? And what says the bible? Not I will exert my mighty power upon truth by which it becomes capable of engendering "spiritual life," "but I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh." Not I will call truth or "moral suasion," in the absence of the "Almighty efficient agency of the Holy Spirit," to produce "in the soul a holy principle," but that "it is God that worketh in you to will and to do."

2. We promised to show the compatibility of the control here contended for, with the free agency and accountability of men.

To this task we may not be fully adequate, at least to the satisfaction of all minds. Nor would we regard a failure here as at all affecting the truth of views already presented.

Many truths can be established and are universally believed, which cannot be fully explained. If, therefore, the facts of a divine control and free moral agency are both clearly taught, whether the appeal is to reason or Revelation, their apparent incompatibility should affect the truth of neither.

But let us examine into the truth of this alleged conflict.

In communicating ideas to the mind by inspiration or immediate suggestion, there appears to have been nothing that suspended or trampled upon man's mental energies, or that in any way conflicted with the free exercise of his rational and moral powers. It was simply above and beyond those modes in which men act upon each other. And so in the communication of a "holy principle" to sinful men, there is nothing in the immediate and direct operations of the Spirit of God that suspends or tramples upon the laws of moral agency. It is above and beyond any power man can exert, but is exercised in perfect harmony with all the laws of free, accountable mind. Rational men, whatever may be their course of action, are ever governed by motives. And what the Spirit of God does in the production of a holy nature, is to bring the mind under the direct and complete control of those motives which the Gospel presents. So that there is nothing in this view of the subject that at all conflicts with the principles of sound philosophy.

We therefore hold that God controls the will and conduct of his people, by the infusion of a holy disposition, without interfering with their free agency.

But, it may be asked, does God exercise this direct control over the wicked? We know not how to answer this question more satisfactorily than by reference to the Scriptures. "Ye men of Israel hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain. (6).

The enemies of our Saviour seemed to have acted freely in doing those very things which God's determinate counsel had previously arranged. This fact, if the bible can do it, settles the question whether the free and responsible actions of even bad men are embraced in God's counsel, and are under the control of his providence. But if under this control, it is asked how can they be sinful? Our answer to this question is, that every action must be judged of by

(6) Acts 2: 22-3.

its nature, and this nature is to be ascertained by comparing it with that rule of duty which God has adopted for the government of his subjects, and not from any disinclination of the actor which the divine sovereignty has not seen proper to control.

But an action which is subject to God's control, must be certain; and this certainty is said to be incompatible with freedom.

This latter assertion, however, we hold to be untenable.

It was previously certain that the Messiah should be "a king," who should "reign in righteousness;" that he should be "holy;" that he should continually "see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied," in despite of all the temptations by which he was destined to be assailed. But did this certainty impair his freedom or render his integrity less divine? It is impossible, we are assured, for God to lie; but is he not therefore free in his attachment to truth? The mere certainty of the action can surely never destroy the freedom of the actor. Were this the case, there could neither be holiness in heaven nor sin in hell. God and holy angels, all admit, will retain their rectitude forever, but do they therefore cease to be free? It is not generally doubted that Satan and his emissaries will remain inclined "to evil, only evil, and that continually;" but does this certainty destroy their freedom, take away their moral character, and render them no more criminal than the tempest or the earthquake? There cannot be a greater mistake than to suppose that uncertainty is necessary to freedom. Was not Ahab *free*, when he determined to go up to Ramoth Gilead, though the event of his going was made so certain as to become the subject of prophecy? Was not Judas free and accountable, when he deliberately betrayed his Master, though his wickedness was clearly predicted by the Saviour, and was one of the causes of his crucifixion?

But this subject may still have things connected with it which are "hard to be understood." If so, let us willingly submit to the partial darkness of our present state, and permit them to be reserved as the lessons of eternity.

Let us not however call in question either the fact that man is free, or that all his actions are subject to the Divine control. Both propositions may be true, though the light of eternity may be necessary to show a perfect compati-

bility. What we do not know, we should never permit to nullify or weaken the force of what we do know. We all know that we are free agents, because conscious of freedom, and because God treats us as accountable beings. We know also that he presides over all his creatures, and over all their conduct, because he has clearly revealed this truth, and because reason teaches us that creatures must necessarily be dependent on their Creator. Instead, then, of calling in question what we may not fully understand, let us remember our weakness, and take our seat at the feet of Him who speaks to us on this subject, both from the volume of reason and of Revelation. Nothing can be more unwise than the rashness of that man who denies his responsibility, because he is unable to reconcile it with his dependence on God; and therefore is ready to say, "Why doth he yet find fault?" And no less disastrous is the error of him who, because he is free and accountable, arrogates to the creature a self-control that would dethrone the Creator. Let us, then, lay hold with unshaken confidence upon what God has so distinctly declared, that he "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will; that the wrath of man shall praise him, and that the remainder of wrath he will restrain;" while at the same time, he "will bring every work into judgment," and render to every man according to that which he hath done.

ARTICLE VI.

THE POETRY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

We approach the subject of the Pentateuch with all the veneration due to the earliest record of our race; but not with those views which belong to other places or occasions. It is not our object to enquire into its authenticity—whether it was written wholly, or in part, by Moses—whether by a cotemporary and witness of the events it relates, or after the return of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon—all of which have been subjects of controversy amongst biblical critics. Neither are we to examine its religious character;

how far "it was written for our learning." But we are limited to the consideration of its poetry; and a richer mine of all that is sublime and beautiful in poetical conception cannot well be imagined.

In its composition it could have borrowed nothing from art. Its scope was too comprehensive; its destination too remotely prospective; its interest too unlimited to need the helps which ordinary genius requires for the perfection of its labors.

The modern poet invokes the aid of his muse. But whatever of poetry is contained in the Pentateuch proceeded from the inspiration of God; and we are to view its author now, not as a prophet, or leader, or lawgiver, "whom the Lord knew face to face," but as one endowed with powers to depict scenes and events, in which the great and ultimate designs of man's creation had their origin.

Neither will we stop on the present occasion to enquire what Poetry is; whether it exists in the creations of fancy, or whether its element is feeling and sympathy. For there is a poetry independent of either, the poetry of events; a poetry of sublime scenes and mighty actions; a poetry in the sweet episodes which the heart interweaves in the romance of life; a poetry in the undisturbed dreams of youth, and in the diversified ills that mingle in the realities of life. These may furnish topics to the poet, and warm his imagination with kindred emotions, but they have a separate existence, and can borrow nothing from it.

They give to poetry a far higher character than that of being merely the vehicle of fable and fiction, and ally it rather with truth, which is the very soul and essence of all moral and intellectual beauty.

If the Pentateuch were now read by us for the first time, when taste for composition is refined, and our ideas of poetical conception elevated by the high standards with which we are become acquainted—if we were required to read it merely as a history, independent of its claim to our religious veneration, we would pronounce it the greatest effort that the mind has ever produced. For it belonged to one, and only one, and that an inspired writer, to portray the wonders of creation, and to reveal the great first cause from which it proceeded. It belonged to him to describe the stupendous miracles, by which the power of the great Jehovah was first

manifested, as well in the order and harmony of the universe, as in the moral government of *this world*, itself but an atom in the great scale of creation. But that sublime composition is too often read merely as a history, as the alpha in the great series of human chronicles, without any regard to it except as a matter of interest in its prospective relation to the events of the future, traceable even to those in which we ourselves are interested.

It is indeed a great history, the depth and comprehensiveness of whose views human wisdom can neither fathom nor discern. People dwell with interest on the early history of their country. They venerate the names of its benefactors and treasure up every memorial of them. But after all, these bear the stamp of human fallibility. The institutions of men are necessarily imperfect, their superiority being only known by comparison. But the Pentateuch contains the record of a people, chosen by heaven to be the instrument of its great designs, in whose fortunes and destinies all mankind ever have had, and ever must have, an unavoidable interest; a people whose laws and institutions, civil, religious and political, derived their sanction from the immediate authority of the great lawgiver of the universe.

But is it merely a record of events, depending on their magnitude for its success? Does it seek only to inform and instruct, without any of those aids by which the mind is beguiled into the pursuit of truth? On the contrary, it has all the charms of an epic of the most elevated character. But in venturing this opinion, we wish not to be misunderstood. We do not assert that the Pentateuch is a poem, for this would be repugnant to its sacred character, and derogatory to it as an inspired work.

If the same degree of intellectual culture had prevailed at the time it was written which now characterizes the civilized world, it might in all probability have assumed a totally different character, rejecting all imaginative ornament, and addressing the graver faculties of thought in plain and didactic language. But, as this was not the case, that style and form of expression was adopted which was best calculated to affect the hearts of those to whom it was first addressed. Having served that purpose, "it has descended to us without any diminution of its original interest, and is

now as delightful and instructive to the most enlightened, as it ever could have been to the mass of mankind.

With this qualification, we venture to repeat what was before said, that the Pentateuch is characterized by all the charm and interest of an epic of the most elevated character.

Its *personages* are the patriarchs of the whole human family. Its *period* the beginning of time. Its opening scene the universe. Its *successive localities*, paradise, the shoreless waters; the wilderness, Sinai, Canaan. Its *story*, one of undying interest, addressing itself, in all its relations, to the heart of every human being, and becoming more vivid in its influence, in proportion to the development of those truths and principles of which it was prophetic. Its *machinery*, not heroes, nor princes, nor deified mortals: but the Creator and Sovereign of all things, and his ministering angels. *Miracles*, equalled only in sublimity by the magnitude of the purposes for which they were designed. Its *plan* or story is simple and sublime. The creation of the universe; the origin of man; his being declared the subject of a moral government; his obedience and fall; its evil consequences in the degeneracy of his race; their destruction by the deluge; the preservation of one family to replenish the earth; the selection of an obscure individual, to whom a promise was made direct from heaven, that through him all the nations of the earth should be blessed; the peregrinations of that individual, the incidents which befel him and his immediate descendants; the romantic fulfilment of that prophecy which declared to him that his seed should be "strangers in a land not theirs," and also their escape from it with great substance; the marvellous history of the Jews; the divine mission of Moses, his miracles and institutions; his successful leading of the hosts of Israel to the land which had been shewn to the father of their race, as their inheritance, and lastly, the tendency of every event described, and the bearing of every character introduced, upon the accomplishment of the mysterious promise which they and their posterity were now to realize, and the wonderful connection of all these events with the coming of the Messiah, so fully confirmed by himself afterwards, in his own reference to Moses, as testifying of him.

We have spoken of the miracles. Now those, particu-

larly in the Book of Exodus, of which its author was both witness and agent, are of the most picturesque and poetic character. The flame issuing from the bush, without consuming it; the pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night; the overwhelming of Pharaoh's army; the fountain gushing from the frowning rock of Horeb, and the delivery of the law, amidst smoke and clouds and thick darkness. These are incidents which, considered independently of their historical importance, and merely as fictions, would be graphic and striking; and it might well be asked what imagination, however rich in invention, could have ever combined such a splendid series of illustrations connected with such important subjects. They are treasured up in our nursery recollections, for having charmed our infant fancies, before the mind could comprehend their sublime truths, which with fairy charm, they beckoned us to seek after.

Heathen writers, who could have no idea of a miracle, except as fabulous, make no mention of any of them in their reference to the Israelites. Justin attributes the failure of Pharaoh's army to natural causes, "domum redire tempestatibus compulsi sunt;" and Tacitus, speaking of the journey of the Israelites through the wilderness, says that nothing distressed the people more than the want of water; when Moses, espying a herd of wild asses grazing in a grove near a rock, (Horeb of course,) immediately followed them, and was led to an abundant stream of water.

But, to return, no one can doubt that the author of the Pentateuch was a poet of high order. Indeed, the book of Job,* so rich in language and imagery, has been attributed to him. Mr. Stackhouse says, "that the most general opinion is, that it was written by Moses, during his abode in Egypt, or in his flight into the land of Midian, with an intent to encourage the Jews under the severities of Egyptian bondage." And there is no doubt, as its title imports, that the ninetyeth Psalm was written by him; and what can be more sublime than its introduction, "Lord thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations," &c.

"Tu constans stabilisque manes, convallibus imis
Montibus et summis, sideribusque prior."

* The Book of Job is, perhaps, the first dramatic piece that was ever written. It is evidently a tragedy, and the design of it is to shew, *cur malis bone et bonis male*.—Dr. Conybeare. See Spence's Anecdotes, 332.

What production of antiquity can compare with the song of deliverance and thanksgiving at the red sea. Mr. Rollin says, that neither Virgil nor Horace ever wrote any thing comparable to it. "No man," says that distinguished writer, "can set a higher value than I do on those two great poets; nevertheless, when I read what Virgil wrote in praise of Augustus, and what he makes the priest Evander sing in honor of Hercules, though these perhaps are vastly fine, they seem groveling to me in comparison with the song in question. Virgil, methinks, is all ice; Moses, all fire. The same may be affirmed of the fourteenth and fifteenth odes of the fourth book, and the last of the Epodes of Horace."

The poetry of the Pentateuch borrows nothing from fiction or invention. Its facts and incidents are too lofty, and follow each other in too rapid succession to require such subordinate aid. Neither is it indebted to the ornaments of phrase, for nothing can be more simple, unaffected and artless than its language. Both its inspired character and its antiquity place it above such artificial helps, as might afterwards have been required to give perfection to mere human compositions: although he occasionally displays great sagacity in leaving to the imagination circumstances, the withholding of which, in manner interrupts the train of his narrative, and which there were reasons for not particularly relating. As, for instance, the fifth chapter of Genesis embraces a period of many generations, from the days of Adam to those of Noah. That interval was one of appalling wickedness, beginning with the fratricide of Cain, and growing so in magnitude, as to grieve the Lord that he had made man upon the earth. Now, Moses, instead of revolting details, mentions but the first act of wickedness, and leaves the mind to conceive its progress and unbridled extent, by representing the Lord as determining upon the end of all flesh.

We have spoken of the style and expression as artless and natural. Longinus quotes the celebrated words: "Let there be light, and there was light," as a perfect example of the sublime. Indeed, uniformity and conciseness are characteristic throughout. They even veil the profuseness of mental imagery, so that its richest embellishments seem to be but the artless language of truth. It was the thought

or image in his mind, and not the words to express it, that occupied the writer of the Pentateuch.

Some of its topics are unquestionably the greatest that ever elevated the genius of man. Others, of a totally different character, are pictures of the most artless simplicity of pastoral and patriarchal life; yet the language in which they are told never varies. It never aims to be lofty, or affects simplicity. As a history, can any production of the profane writers of after times possess more clearness and precision; or any classic poetry, though consecrated by the admiration of ages, be more harmonious, beautiful or sublime? Familiar as all examples from the books before us must be, let us illustrate what we have said, by referring to the song of Moses at the end of *Deuteronomy*: "Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak; and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth. My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass: because I will publish the name of the Lord: ascribe ye greatness unto our God. He is the rock; His work is perfect." After this introduction, he addressed himself to the gathered Israelites, exhorting to remember the days of old: "For the Lord's portion is his people. Jacob is the lot of his inheritance. He found him in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness; he led him about, he instructed him, he kept him as the apple of his eye. As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, so the Lord did lead him. He made him ride on the high places of the earth, that he might eat the increase of the fields." Then hear the denunciations of wrath against their disobedience: "I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation, for a fire is kindled in mine anger and shall burn into the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains. I will heap mischief upon them; I will spend mine arrows upon them. The sword *without* and terror *within*, shall destroy both the young man and the virgin, the suckling also, with the man of gray hairs." And where can there be found words of more thrilling import than those in Deut., 28 chap.: "And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee, and thou shalt fear day and night. In the morning thou shalt say, would God it were even! and at even thou

shalt say, would God it were morning! for the fear of thy heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see." It is this combined advantage of precision and energy, in common with all the Hebrew Scriptures, which forms one of their distinguishing peculiarities. Sir William Jones, speaking of them, says that they bear no resemblance in form or style to any that can be produced from the stories of Grecian, Indian, Persian, or even Arabic literature. But to those to whom these treasures are displayed only in a translation, there can be but an imperfect idea of their superiority in the original. Who can doubt this, that has read any modern version of a classic poet, for instance, with whose language he is critically acquainted? Evanescent beauties of idiom occur: expressions that cannot be translated, like those plants that can only flourish in their native atmosphere; and thoughts like birds, which take wing in moving them from one cage to another.

I can well conceive the effect of Moses' writings upon those who were initiated into the sublime mysteries of his language; who could apply its etymologies, and appreciate the reference of its imagery to the diversified objects of nature with which they were surrounded, and which we are informed were peculiar to their country. All these are lost upon us. But what stronger proof can there be of their effects upon those to whom they were more immediately addressed, than the continual allusions made to him by all the prophets, and the adoption of his imagery into their own writings, particularly those of them that were decidedly poetical. In addition to these instances, and without referring to the innumerable imitations of the poetry of the bible, which every modern language furnishes, (for Lord Byron says that its spirit is transferred over all modern poetry,) I would merely mention the *Paradise Lost*, whose twelve books are founded on the first four chapters of Genesis; and also Gesner's *Death of Abel*, beginning where Milton ends, and containing five books to illustrate that simple incident. And how can we who know poetry as an *art*, and are versed in its hacknied rules, "*usque ad nauseam*," have any idea of what it was amongst those with whom it was an inspiration, and who, as Goldsmith says, had the first rifling of all the images of nature. We might by study be-

come acquainted even critically with the Hebrew language, but unless we could carry back our minds to the period when it first became the great depository of divine truth, and the great instrument of intellectual display, we could have no adequate idea of its treasures. "He," says Bishop Lowth, "who would conceive and feel the peculiar elegances of Hebrew poetry, must imagine himself exactly situated as the persons for whom it was written, or even as the writers themselves."

By pious and learned enquirers, the Hebrew is pronounced to have been the original language—that in which God first spake to Adam—that in which the conception of the Eternal Mind, as to the creation of the universe, was first expressed—whose first utterance was when God said "let there be light:" that it survived the confusion of tongues in that family from which Abraham descended, and that it was preserved by him and his descendants, in their separate sojournings, even down to the days of Moses. From which, it follows that the Pentateuch, as well as the other books of the Old Testament, are written in the primeval languages, as though heaven had selected a form of speech best adapted to its sacred purposes; and as it had chosen a people to be the instrument of its ways, it had also set apart a language to be the guardian and exponent of its word.

Is there no argument to be found in favor of its divine origin, that the first known writings embodied in it have descended to us through all the chances and changes of time, having with them the warrant for their entire preservation even to a word—that although in a translation, and after a period so remote, it accommodates itself to the diversified tastes of every age and condition of society—that the poetry to which it lends its charm, is now the delight of manhood and of youth; and the history it records, conspicuous above all others for precision and perspicuity; and lastly, that the writings contained in it, have survived those of all cotemporary languages?

And here let us venture a remark that has often occurred to us, which is, that the Hebrew has long since ceased to be a living tongue, and is now only known as the consecrated depository of the great truths committed to it; as though it had been ordained that after its prophetic com-

mission had been fully accomplished, it should cease to be debased by the ordinary uses of language. And it may, in connection with this view, be observed, that although the parables of the Saviour of mankind, as well as all his moral teachings, were delivered in Hebrew, yet they are recorded in another language.

The Hebrew having become obsolete, there arose a necessity for translations of the Bible, so that it might be domesticated and familiarized with every living tongue, and circulated co-extensively with the spiritual wants of the whole human household; and it would really seem that those translations were, in many instances, influenced by the breathings of the same spirit that had animated the original record. This is remarkably true of the English version of 1615. Preserving, uncorrupted, every doctrine of religion, and "in its general construction faithful to the original, it has been also pronounced, with few exceptions, a standard of pure English, and chaste style, and, as the language is now settled, will probably remain to the latest ages. We may add that Luther's translation of the Bible is now considered a German classic.

But other views invite our attention. The Pentateuch contains the earliest revelation of the oracles of God, and is therefore interesting, as furnishing the divine original of all those which afterwards wielded so powerful a control over the destinies of the heathen world. All oracular influences were believed to proceed from supernatural sources. Whence, they became the most powerful engines that could be wielded over superstition and credulity. And as poetry was itself supposed to be an inspiration, "numinis aura potens," it was consecrated to the services of the shrine. Poetry was the language of its responses; and Apollo, who was the "*Author Carminis*," was also venerated as the "Vaticiniorum præses."

But how different the dark and incoherent language, uttered by his phrenzied priestess, from the word of God, revealed through his prophet! How insignificant, with all its advantages of gloom and grandeur and of the adornments of its votaries, was the cavern of Delphi, to the simple manifestation of the Divine presence made to Moses, whilst tending the flocks of Jethro in the desert! And how valueless the vaticination of the whole Pagan world, to the

prophetic reiteration of the promise which had been made to Abraham, that then issued from the burning bush! There was no ambiguity in the announcement of the name of Jehovah, as the only object of worship and adoration. Whatever circumstance of awe and mystery may have accompanied the delivery of the law, there was nothing doubtful in its interpretation, as a rule of conduct towards God and our neighbor. However dark and incomprehensible the prophecy of Moses, that "the Lord would raise up a prophet like unto himself, unto whom they should listen," its fulfilment, 1400 years afterwards, showed the divine source from which it had emanated. And the expectation, which is said to have prevailed all over the civilized world at that era, of the coming of a great personage or potentate, must have proceeded from that and no other. How could the Sybils, whose prophetic books were said to have foreshadowed it, "*search out God*," in the language of the Prophetess Judith, "and know his mind and comprehend his purpose." Since writing this paragraph, I have met with the following coincident remark:

"It has been a favorite theory of learned men, that Virgil had access to the Sibylline prophecies, which foretold the birth of a Saviour. How came the Sybils any more than the Pythonesses of Delphos, to be ranked on a sudden with the really inspired Prophets? or is it credible that they should have had the curiosity or the power to inspect the Jewish Scriptures."

The more probable idea is, that the expectation of such a prophet was derived from some Chaldee version of the Bible, or from that knowledge of the book of Moses which must have preceded the Septuagint, and which led to the translation of it three hundred years before the Christian era. In confirmation of this view, let me quote an authority from Dr. Anderson, in his history of philosophy, p. 88: that it is probable "that the Mosaic Scriptures and other prophetic writings, under the Jewish dispensation, could not be unknown to the priests of Egypt, Chaldea, and other adjacent countries."

The only evidence of the oracles ever having, as has been supposed, proceeded from a separate revelation, is the circumstance of their having ceased at the birth of the Saviour, the great centre of all prophecy. But this is suffi-

ciently rebutted by the fact, that long before that event they had ceased to be respected. Cicero spoke of them as contemptible impostures. Lucan, who lived afterwards, lamented their discontinuance as the greatest gift of the gods; and Juvenal, perhaps in the spirit of satire, said the "*caligo futuri*," consequent on their ceasing, was a great evil. In a word, many enquiring and ingenious writers, have denounced the heathen oracles as mere human contrivances. But who but the infidel and the sceptic, could question those which are recorded in the Book of Life.

Dr. Caunter, in his learned work on the Poetry of the Pentateuch, seems fully impressed with the prophetic character of his subject. For, after enlarging on the poetical benedictions of Isaac upon Jacob, and of Jacob upon his sons, in which the fortunes of them and their generations were traced, as upon a map, he devotes eighteen chapters to the Prophecies of Balaam, and thirteen to the prophetic ode of Moses, (32 Deut.,) before referred to.

In the circumstances attending the delivery of the word to Moses and the Israelites, we find a marked distinction, when it was addressed to the multitude, and when to him personally.

In the first case, being designed to convey a deep and religious impression of the Divine agency, as their only reliance, it was always accompanied with awful and imposing solemnity. In the desert, the sacred oracle was delivered amidst thunder and lightnings, and issued from clouds and thick darkness, in the voice of a trumpet, "so exceeding loud, that all the people trembled." Its presence was also manifested to them in the darkness of night by a pillar of fire; and again "the sight of the glory of the Lord was like a devouring fire on the top of the mountain in the eyes of the children of Israel." But when the word was addressed to Moses alone, it was for the most part unaccompanied with any exhibition of supernatural power. It was simply a voice, "*The Lord said unto Moses*," and "*the Lord spake unto Moses*," excepting when he besought the Lord to shew him his glory, which he did on the summit of Sinai, when he descended in a cloud, and passed before him, proclaiming "the name of the Lord, the Lord God." And so when the Lord first addressed Abraham in Haran, it was simply, "*The Lord said to Abraham*."

There cannot be conceived any thing more sublime than that exemplification of this idea in the 14th Edodus, when the Israelites, pursued by the chariots and horses of Pharaoh on the one hand, and hemmed in on the other by the sea — and seeing no hope of escape, “cried unto the Lord.” *“And the Lord said unto Moses,”* speak to the children of Israel, that they go forward. Where was oracle ever delivered with more imposing grandeur, and at the same time with greater simplicity, considering the magnitude of the miracle that was soon to follow? That mind is not to be envied which does not recognize in this plain and unadorned statement, the finest elements of moral sublimity.

In this brief and very imperfect comparison between the different characteristics of sacred and heathen oracles, I have been naturally led to consider the contrast which Hebrew and Heathen poetry exhibit in their conception of Divinity; how pure, fervid and elevated the one; how incapable the other of extending its highest flights beyond the attractive influence of human praise.

The Divinity that inspires the one is a self-existent, incorporeal being of infinite perfection. That which animates the other, is a fabulous compound of virtues and frailties, as displayed in their whole mythology, forbidding those exalted and devotional sentiments which are the very soul of Hebrew poetry.

In all the legends of the Heathen, from the days of Hesiod and Homer, we find the father of gods and men exhibiting all the frailties and vices of his mortal nature. The theogony of Hesiod is little more than a poetical commentary on his amours, representing him as the genial sire of a whole race of gods and demigods. Even when described, as he is by Homer, in all the majesty of heaven, bending his sable brows, and shaking his ambrosial curls; or when by Ovid, as presiding in state with his ivory sceptre over the Olympic parliament, and moving the earth and the sea and the stars with a single nod, the impression left on the mind is only that of admiration of the genius of the poet, without the least moral emotion. Indeed, were I required to draw the line of distinction between sacred and heathen poetry in the fewest words, I would say that the one addresses itself to the heart, the altar from which the only pure offering can be made to heaven; the other, to the imagination, the prolific

parent of idle and evil thoughts. We will, therefore, pass over the long array of epithets which classic poets have invented to magnify the name and attributes of Jove. For if they had heaped them as high as their own Pelion, how would they vanish before the simple words which represent the God of Abraham, as "merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth," as the "shield of help," and the "rock of refuge." If the richest treasures of classic genius were explored, where could be found any thing to compare with that exquisite little ode the 93d Psalm, thus beautifully rendered into Latin verse from the original, by the celebrated Arthur Johnson:

Regnat ubique Deus: cui majestate verenda
 Frons nitet, invicto robore dextra viget:
 Illius imperio, stabit secunda ruinæ
 Terra, vagas cœlum volvet et usque faces.
 Quo sidet hic, solium nescit primordia sæcli;
 Nullaque siderei Regis origo fuit.
 Flumina quantumvis conspirent murmure vasto,
 Et tumidum fluctus tollat in astra fretum:
 Ille tamen, fluviis pelago potentior ipso,
 Mulcet, et indomitas numine frænât aquas.
 Illius æternum durant oracula; sacre
 Et Solymæ pietas hospita semper erit.

The poetry of the heathen may indeed be styled their scriptures, for it recorded more of the doings of the inhabitants of Olympus, both in heaven and upon earth, than is to be found in any other of their writers. Philosophers, who enquire after truth, were considered in the light of Atheists, seeking to subvert the foundations of popular belief.

And if that poetry, characterized, as some of it is, by the noblest efforts of human intellect, establishing eras in the history of literature, conferring immortality on its authors, and delighting and instructing us by its variety, its richness, and its power, can bear no comparison with the Bible; it is that it recognizes no connection between religion and morals. Its ethics are false; its divinities fabulous. Did shepherds of Arcadia ever converse with God as Abraham did in Mamre and Haran, and Canaan? Could Arethusa or Castalia, or Blandusia, or Aganippe, or indeed any fountain celebrated in classic song, be compared to that which flowed from the rock of Horeb, furnishing to after times the beau-

tiful similitude of the rock of ages, and the fountain of living waters? Did ever bird consecrated to Heathen Divinity, from the eagle of Jove to the owl of Minerva, equal in interest the little dove that brought tidings to the ark of the abating of the waters, bringing in her bill the olive leaf as an emblem of reconciliation, and so beautifully prefiguring that which afterwards descended from heaven on the Prince of Peace, as the herald of grace and love? Can Olympus, or Ida, or Parnassus, or Hymettus, or Helicon, or any mountain which poetry has immortalized, equal in sublimity those to which the Exodus of the people of Israel gave so romantic and sacred an interest.

In what Idyl or Eclogue can be found narratives so true to nature, and so graphically illustrating the simplicity of pastoral and patriarchal life, as those related in Genesis?

Indeed, they have all the charm of episodes in a regular poem, with this difference, that they are inseparably interwoven with their subject. They are not only the instruments of the most elevated moral instruction, each beautifully enforcing some duty of life, but they are connected by an unbroken chain of interest, not only extending to us and our day, but which must necessarily reach to the end of time. Whenever I read them, they seem to be the breathings of divine love, presented in a tangible form to warm and to win the heart.

We have spoken of the language of the Pentateuch, as never falling below the thought, however elevated, or being too lofty for the simplest, or too plain for the most beautiful image. It has been represented not only as simple and energetic, but as highly poetical, and this we acknowledge; but in endeavoring to analyze that impression and to give a reason for it, we find ourselves at a loss. It is not metrical, neither does it vary in those parts which are decidedly *prosaic* from those which are decidedly *poetical*. Now, measure, we know, is the natural garb of poetry. Its fascinating effect upon the ear, gives it the easiest access to those faculties of the mind to which poetry chiefly addresses itself. Does it follow that the thought must depend, for its effect, upon a metrical garb? If so, what is it that constitutes the exception in favor of the language of the Pentateuch. (We refer here to our prose translation.)

One writer says that condensation elevates to the positive

dignity of poetry. By another, we are told that measure is a constituent quality of poetry. There are several passages in the Pentateuch, which are said by critics to be metrical, from what is called their parallelism, which I would define to be such a division of their sentences, as to make one a response or echo to the other. These are called poetry. But they do not appear more poetical than those which are expressed in ordinary language.

From the specimens of parallelism furnished by writers, we are inclined to think that that "*duplication* of phraseology," as it is called, was an accidental arrangement of words, discovered by the acuteness of critical observers, and arising from the condensed and sententious character of the Hebrew. Where the sentiment is elevated and poetical, the style of expression must be warm and figurative; and this, in a language remarkable for its conciseness, may have conveyed the idea of metrical arrangement. Both Buchanan's and Arthur Johnson's version of the Psalms, which are direct from the original, are written with strict adherence to the rules of Latin verse. But are they more poetical on that account, than our English prose translation? Is the spirit of the original better preserved in the one than the other? In conclusion, I am (however respectful to the opinions of learned critics,) disposed to think, that in regard to Hebrew poetry it is the thought that makes the expression harmonious; and that it is the conciseness and energy of that expression which gives it the charms of metre.

"The existence of such poetry as is to be found in the Pentateuch, five hundred and fifty years before the age of Homer, and of such history as is contained in the same collection, one hundred years before Herodotus, is itself one of the highest proofs of the divinity of the Scriptures. In all other countries, the style of poetry has preceded by many a century the style of prose; but here we behold both of them, written at the same time and in the same work, with a skill and beauty never rivalled, except in other parts of the holy volume."*

* Grimke.

ARTICLE VII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Napoleon and his Marshals.* By J. T. HEADLEY, in 2 vols., 3d. edition. New York: Baker & Scribner, 1846.

In the early days of the Edinburgh Review, there may have been too much severity in criticism; but no such charge can rest on the modern school. The Spatula is much more freely used than the Scarifier; and a good deal of corruption salvaged over, instead of being removed. In this age of indiscriminate praise, no book has received a larger share than the one at the head of this article.

It is true, Mr. Headley describes a fierce charge or bloody battle with great spirit and animation; and laid, as his scenes are, amid those intensely exciting days, whose every incident attracts us, he obtains at first the rapt and delighted attention. But the very brilliancy of his descriptions palls, and the mind is wearied, and its vision mystified, by the uninterrupted glare of his glittering language.

We cannot very well see the necessity of a work of this kind at this time. It adds nothing to history, and does not condense it in any useful form, either for reference or information. It teaches no lesson of practical importance, and the defect we have noticed takes largely from its interest, even as a work of mere amusement. As a defence of Napoleon, it says, and can say, nothing new. The question has been thoroughly discussed, and posterity will have, without its aid, the amplest stores, both of evidence and argument, on which to make up its verdict. We venture to predict, that will not lean either to the side of his enemies, nor yet to that of his indiscriminate advocates—in which latter class we rank Mr. Headley. His arguments are based very much upon mere assumption, and his inductions often fail for want of a basis. We do not hesitate to agree with him,

that from English historians the Mighty Conqueror has met but little favor, and nearly as little justice; but we cannot subscribe to the doctrine he boldly advances, that on the Britons rests all the blood of his cruel wars. His whole argument here, is based on the fact that Malta was not surrendered according to the treaty. Without saying any thing on the question of the right of a nation to decline to fulfil a treaty, which she knows her enemy only signed to violate; or, of the evidence England produces to sustain this charge; we will merely allude to the fact, that the real principle of contention, and the cause of all these wars, is found further back.

It is true that the French Republic, not content with her own freedom, avowed, and acted on a quixotic design, to aid all mankind in the same purpose; and never failed to incite to action and change the surrounding nations. Out of this grew her first wars with the despotic thrones; and that fixed determination to restore the old order of things, if possible, which produced the long series of campaigns that deluged Europe in blood. We are strongly disposed to think, notwithstanding this, that England would have been content to see the empire ruled by a man so essentially aristocratic in all his aspirations, had it not been for the great mistake of his life, the attempt to make France a commercial power, through the restrictions of the continental system. He struck at England's life blood, and the combat was no longer a fight about abstractions, but a struggle for existence.

As to Napoleon's superior magnanimity and good faith, we are constrained to think that it is imaginary. Such things have always been rare in European diplomacy and national intercourse. It was particularly so in Napoleon's time; there was not a particle on either side. This is the solution of the false views they have always taken of our national conduct on the other side of the Atlantic, and the source of all the doubts and insinuations thrown upon our present struggle with Mexico.

Napoleon was in fact, as Headley himself admits, without a moral nature, and though as much sinned against as sinning, we can never regard him in any other light than a scourge, sent to

do the will of God, as Balaam did, without a single desire to fulfil it. Mr. Headley would make him the apostle of freedom and the friend of man. Posterity will, we think, give him credit for much that is now doubted or denied, but will hardly regret that his fall at Waterloo ended a strife, as vain as would have been its results, if successful.

We object, too, to a good deal of Mr. Headley's philosophy; as for instance: "Your impetuous beings have always had the grandest plans and executed them." He thinks the world has always been mistaken on the subject of impulse. This is a narrow and one sided view of the characters he was contemplating. They were never impulsive, but vehement. The apparent sudden promptings of the moment, were but the quicker action of logical induction. There never was a man less impulsive than Napoleon, nor one who to the common mind seemed oftener to act upon its principles. He also thinks that the rapid rise of the heroes of that day, was a happy comment on republican institutions; forgetting that in the remarkable convulsions of the time, is found the true solution, and that all history contradicts his assertion. But for the Mexican war, Gen. Taylor would have died a respectable old brevet brigadier; and without the storm of the last century, Wellington would have been a silent Peer. No country presents more instances of sudden and unexpected elevations from the lowest ranks than despotic Turkey; and Mr. Headley had as well ascribe to our institutions the prevalence of intemperance, the rise of Mormonism, or the introduction and success of any other folly or extravagance of the age. We love and reverence our institutions, and for that very reason we dislike this attempt to bolster them up with cant and ad captandum argument. They have enough to glory in, without seeking to fill their measure from such doubtful, if not false, scales. The fact is, in ordinary times, free governments afford very little encouragement to individual talent and enterprise. It is one of their imperfections, over which we mourn, but will not mend by denying.

In religion, we suspect Mr. Headley will be no more acceptable to our readers than in philosophy. What his opinions on

the subject are, can be tolerably gathered from his observations on Murat's declaration, "that on Mount Tabor, in the hottest of the fight, he thought of Christ's transfiguration on that spot, nearly two thousand years before." "This single fact," says Mr. H., "throws a flood of light on Murat's character, and shows what visions of glory often rose before him in battle," &c.

We know nothing of Mr. Headley, except that we have heard casually that he was a minister, of what denomination we are not informed. But we drew the conclusion from our perusal of this work, and a glance at Washington and his Generals, that he is, if not a Socinian, but little better. In this day, it is important to know a writer's religious views; for they tincture all departments of literature, and the most improbable vehicles are used to convey opinions that might not otherwise have a hearing.

To conclude, we object to the onesidedness of the book, and the injustice done to Marmount, Grouchy, and other Marshals, to the true questions at issue, and even to the equally one-sided English. We object to a tone of false philosophy and shallow reasoning running through it; and most especially to a publication, whose only effect can be to add to the rabid desire for war and blood, which, under a smooth surface, runs with a deep and dangerous violence. Mr. Headley is not free from the charge of carelessness in composition. The "said he's" and "said Napoleon's," &c., come too often; and we never will consent, Noah Webster to the contrary, notwithstanding, to admit into good literary society such vulgarisms as "the whole structure was *tipped over*." There is but one meaning attached to that word in good English, and that meaning has no affinity to overturned or upset. Unless we set our faces firmly against such innovations, our language must soon become a miserable mixture of all the corruptions of the numberless languages, which unlimited immigration brings into this country.

2. *The Religious Instruction of the Colored Population. A Sermon preached by the REV. JOHN B. ADGER, in the Second Presbyterian Church: Charleston, S. C., May 9th. 1847. Published by Request, pp. 19.*

The pamphlet before us, bearing this title, contains in addition to the Sermon, an Appendix, consisting I. Of a set of Resolutions upon the same subject, introduced by the Hon. F. H. Elmore, at a large and respectable meeting of the citizens of Charleston, held at the Second Presbyterian Church, on the same day on which the sermon was preached. II. Of an extract from the published Minutes of the Presbytery of Charleston, containing the Report of the Special Committee, to whom the question was referred in regard to the propriety of establishing a church for the colored population in that city; and III. Of an extract from the Richmond Times and Compiler, containing the action of the late General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in this country, upon the general subject of the religious instruction of our slaves. Mr. Adger, it will be remembered, was, for twelve years, a missionary to the Armenians, and we utter our deliberate convictions when we say, that if all missionaries were *such men*, their services would be cheaply purchased at *any sacrifice*. None can know him without loving him, and loving him for his Master's sake. He has determined, and we believe by the motions of the Holy Spirit, to abandon the field of his former labors, in order to devote himself to the religious instruction of our colored population. His reasons for the change are briefly stated in the following extract from the sermon before us:

"My Christian Brethren! I appear before you this morning as one of yourselves, asking your fraternal counsel and assistance. More than twelve years ago you sent me forth as a missionary to the Armenians. I thank God for much happiness and for some success in that interesting field. But, brethren, my mind had previously been strongly drawn to another missionary field, lying nearer at home, and into that field nothing then prevented me from entering but the want of an "open door." Providence has brought me back, and the claims of this field have

pressed again—nay, they have, during the whole twelve years of my absence, been pressing strongly upon my mind.

Various considerations have presented themselves in favor of a transfer of my relations from that foreign to this domestic missionary work. One is, that the impaired condition of my eyes ~~is~~ unfits me for further labors, as a translator, in that parched ~~climate~~, and under that brilliant sky. Another is, that when I went forth, it was with the sympathy and support of the Presbyterian Church, and of the Southern churches in particular; but, this sympathy and support, naturally of great value to me, has long been withdrawn, and I have felt myself cut off and isolated. Strong and agitating influences, meanwhile, have been at work, drawing me centrewards, and leading me to feel that it is time for me to cast in my lot with my own people.

But, the strongest consideration has been the natural obligation which I feel, and have always felt, to do something for these destitute people, coupled with the fact that I consider the door of access to be now set open before me. It is with reference to this point, my Christian brethren, I come to ask, this day, your counsel. Has the time come when I may succeed in the attempt to gather these wanderers into a Christian fold? If, with the aid of my own private friends, I am able and willing to give my personal services without charge, will this community provide a suitable building for this purpose? And, in particular, will you, as a church—as the church of my childhood, the church in which I was baptized, the church in which I was educated, in which I was ordained—will you give me a practical, generous and liberal testimony that you do believe the enterprise important, and that you do consider me called to undertake it?" p. 5.

The points discussed in the sermon are, I. The enquiry who are our poor. II. The fact that the Gospel is not adequately preached to them; and III. The obligation and expediency of making a fuller provision for their spiritual wants.

The enquiry—who are our poor—is beautifully and happily answered in the following terms:

“The poor of this city are easily distinguishable. They are

a class separated from ourselves by their color, their position in society, their relation to our families, their national origin, and their moral, intellectual and physical condition. Nowhere are the poor more distinctly marked out than our poor; and yet, strange to say, nowhere are the poor so closely and intimately connected with the higher classes as are our poor with us. *They belong to us.* We, also, *belong* to them. They are divided out among us and mingled up with us, and we with them, in a thousand ways. They live with us—eating from the same store-houses, drinking from the same fountains, dwelling in the same enclosures, forming parts of the same families. Our mothers confide us, when infants, to their arms, and sometimes to the very milk of their breasts. Their children are, to some extent, unavoidably, the playmates of our childhood—grow up with us under the same roof—sometimes pass through all the changes of life with us, and, then, either they stand weeping by our bedside, or else we drop a tributary tear by their's, when death comes to close the long connection and to separate the good master and his good servant.

Such, my friends, are those whom we consider the poor of this city. There they are—behold them! See them all around you, in all these streets, in all these dwellings—a race distinct from us, yet closely united to us; brought, in God's mysterious Providence, from a foreign land, and placed under our care and made members of our households. They fill the humblest places of our state of society; they serve us; they give us their strength; yet, they are not more truly ours than we are truly theirs. They are *our poor*—our poor brethren; children of our God and Father; dear to our Saviour; to the like of whom He preached; for the like of whom He died; and to the least of whom every act of Christian compassion and kindness which we shew, He will consider as shewn also to himself." p. 6.

That the Gospel is not adequately preached to "our poor," is conclusively proved by an appeal to facts. Mr. Adger does not assert that they are entirely neglected; that no provision is made for them at all. He simply contends that existing arrangements are insufficient for the purpose contemplated. The inadequacy

of the present provision, consists chiefly in two things: 1, a want of church accommodation; 2, a want of suitable instruction — instruction adapted to the condition and capacity of the negro. With respect to both of these points, his positions we believe to be impregnable. His own ideas of what an adequate provision for the spiritual necessities of our poor is, may be gathered from the following passage, in which, it is needless to say, we heartily concur:

“ Let me tell you what is necessary, in order that we may be able to say that to our poor the Gospel is preached. Give them suitable church room and a suitable ministry devoted entirely to their good. Let them be induced, by such allurements as these, to crowd the place of worship; yet, be careful how they are suffered to crowd into the spiritual church. Invite them all to hear the Gospel, but receive them only after careful and thorough examination, into the membership. Let those who are admitted be built up in the faith, not only by suitable preaching, but by the laborious and persevering catechetical teaching of them in private. Indoctrinate thoroughly their class leaders, that they may communicate sound doctrine to the others. Pay great attention to the youth; and, with reference to the whole congregation, aim not at *exciting* them, but at *instructing* them. Thoroughly imbue their minds with the principles and precepts of the Bible, and store them with the facts and narratives of its history. At the same time, watch over them, as far as possible, both directly and by means of their leaders, as a faithful shepherd watches over his sheep. Let the discipline of the church be firmly and faithfully administered upon them. This is what we need. Such a course as this, quietly and perseveringly pursued for ten years, would shew the most delightful results. Different, alas! very different, is the present state and character of our efforts to do them good.” p. 9–10.

The obligation and expediency of preaching the Gospel to “our poor,” are enforced by the following considerations: 1. “God has committed the Gospel to us, as Christians, for the very purpose of our seeing that it is preached to the poor.” 2. “The grand distinction of the Gospel is, that it is designed especially

for the poor." 3. "The inestimable value of the poor as immortal beings." 4. "The faithful preaching of the Gospel to these poor, will be followed by great advantages to our own children;" and 5. "It is our bounden duty" to give them the Gospel. These arguments, in the order in which they have been mentioned, are briefly and pertinently pressed. The first, however, we feel bound in candor to say, is urged with an extravagance of statement which detracts something from its force. It is *not* true "that God has committed the Gospel to us, as Christians, for the very purpose of our seeing that it is preached to the poor." This is a purpose, but not, *the* purpose to be answered by the commission. It is magnifying a single department of duty beyond all scriptural bounds, to assert that our business in this world, our very object in living, and God's purpose in keeping us alive is that we may promote this end. We are certainly as much concerned with our own spiritual improvement as with the benefit of others. And the Gospel is as much committed to us to promote our personal growth in grace, as to be dispensed, by our stewardship, for the salvation of the world. We have other duties beside those connected with the wider diffusion of Christianity—other ends are to be promoted by our lives—other ends effected by our property, beside that of preaching the Gospel to every creature; and it is too much to affirm that the preservation of our being here, and the continued possession of our estates, are ordered, in the Providence of God, solely with a reference to benevolent effort. There is a work *within* as well as *without*; and there is communion *with* God as well as labor *for* God. These truths Mr. Adger would be among the last to deny; and yet he has inadvertently indulged in a train of remark, which has become too common and fashionable among those who are intent upon stirring up the church to greater zeal for the conversion of the world, and which loses its effect, because it is not in unison with Christian experience, nor the plain language of the Word of God. Nothing is ever gained by distorting the proportions of divine truth. With this single censure—and we beg it to be understood that we impute to Mr. Adger nothing more serious than unguarded statement—we commend the sermon to

the prayerful attention of our readers. The subject it discusses is enough to give it a welcome into every family; and the spirit which it breathes throughout is enough to secure, if not for it, at least for its author, the cordial affection of all who are led by the Holy Ghost.

Among Christian people there can be but one opinion as to the *duty* of providing for the religious instruction of the slave. The Gospel is God's message of salvation to the *bond* as well as the *free*. It is not, therefore, an open question, to be discussed upon principles of State policy or secular prudence, whether our colored people shall be taught the mysteries of Christ. This matter is settled by the plain command of God. But how shall they be taught? Most evidently by the living teacher. The ministry is the great ordinance of God for calling sinners to repentance. These points being conceded, two questions of great importance arise—how shall the preachers of the Gospel have access to this class of our population; and what relation shall preachers, permitted to instruct them, sustain to them?

1. As to the first question, the same method of imparting religious instruction, must be adopted, in regard to them, which prevails throughout Christendom, the method of collecting them together, and dispensing to *congregations* the teachings of the desk. To say nothing of the fact that *public worship* is an unquestionable duty, God having enjoined it upon men not to forsake the assembling of themselves together, the employments of the slave renders access hopeless to him, except in those periods of rest and leisure, when masses can be reached at once. Private instruction, except by masters and their families, must be rare and meagre. If, then, the slaves are to be taught at all, and permitted to fulfil the whole circle of Christian duty, they *must* be collected into *congregations*. Now, there are but two conceivable ways in which this can be done. They must either have separate Assemblies of their own, or they must worship in company with their masters. There are two objections which seem to us to be absolutely fatal to the latter plan. The first is, the enormous size of the buildings which it would be necessary to construct, in order to accommodate masters and servants together.

These buildings would, of necessity, be so disproportioned to the physical capacities of the preacher, that unless his lungs were of brass and his throat of iron, he would be incapable of discharging his public duties with comfort or safety to himself, or edification to his hearers. We know of no church edifice in the State, in which it is possible that masters and servants should be, at the same time, accommodated with seats; and hence it is a general practice to preach first to the masters and to as many of their slaves as can be admitted into the house: and then to the slaves, occupying the seats of their masters, and as many of the masters as choose to be present. In other words, the plan of *separate congregations* has been forced upon the ministry by the obvious impracticability of any other arrangement.

The second objection is, that the edification of both masters and servants, would be hindered by restricting them to precisely the same instructions. The Gospel, it is true, is distinguished by simplicity, but it is the simplicity of a great system. It has its elements, level to the capacities of a child, but at the same time, it contains mysteries which tax the understanding of an angel. The solar system is simple, but few can comprehend the celestial mechanics of La Place. There are certainly degrees of Christian knowledge—and the primary truths of Christianity, the facts of its history, the summary of its doctrines are, for the most part, impressed upon the minds of those who constitute our white congregations, at an early age; so that they are prepared to receive instruction from a higher form than the slave, who has been favored with no such early advantages. In addition to this, the truths of Christianity may be commended to their attention by illustrations borrowed from the various walks of science and of letters, which, however powerful and attractive to them, would be lost upon the ignorance of the colored hearer. There is meat in due season to be furnished to all classes of men, and it would certainly contribute to their edification, that those who are to be taught the elements of Christianity, should be separated from those who are ascending to its higher mysteries. The profiting of both masters and servants would more conspicuously appear,

if both received habitually and constantly the kind of instruction adapted to their respective attainments.

From considerations like these, we have been driven to the conclusion, that the PLAN OF SEPARATE CONGREGATIONS, is the only plan which promises any adequate or efficient provision for the religious instruction of our slaves. They *must not* forsake the assembling of themselves together; they *must* attend upon the ministry of the Gospel. But the duty of public worship cannot be discharged by them, nor the advantages of public instruction received, as long as they are doomed to scanty and contracted sections of our church edifices, and compelled to listen to ministrations which presuppose, for the most part, a preliminary knowledge which they do not and cannot possess. Experience, in fact, has already settled the question of the expediency of *separate* congregations. In all parts of the State, it is the custom of the Ministry to collect the negroes together, and to preach especially to them. It signifies nothing that these congregations are assembled in the same *building* in which the masters are accustomed to worship—the question is not in regard to *place* but *persons*—not where the Assembly is held, but who compose it. This system has been carried on for years, and it has wrought no mischief yet. And we cannot perceive how a change of building, the congregation itself being unchanged, can work any change in the result. If, for example, Mr. Adger had announced that he would employ the afternoon of every Sunday, in giving religious instruction to the colored people, assembled in the edifice of the Second Presbyterian Church, or if Dr. Smyth, the pastor of the church, had made the same announcement, we apprehend that no dissatisfaction would have been felt or expressed. Instead of this arrangement, Mr. Adger gives out that he will regularly preach to them in another building yet to be erected, and solicits funds to prepare a place for his colored flock. Now, where is the difference in principle? If the objection is to the *separate congregation*, in itself considered, then every man who preaches to a congregation of negroes, no matter where or when, is exposed to censure. Almost every minister in South

Carolina is an offender, and, by the grace of God, will be more a grievous offender still.

We wish it to be understood, that when we speak of *separate* congregations, we do not mean *exclusive* congregations, but merely congregations designed to consist principally of negroes, while they are open to all who may choose to attend. To separate congregations of this sort we see no valid objection, and there is evidently much to recommend them.

2. The next question is, how shall these congregations be served? Shall the slaves be under the same pastoral supervision with their masters, receiving instruction from the same preacher at a different hour, and constituting a part of his general charge? This plan is common in the country; it has been adopted, however, not because it was felt to be the best, but because, through the scarcity of ministers, the church has been shut up to it. The choice has generally been between this method and none.

But it is evident, from the well known principle of the division of labor, that if the blacks and whites could each have ministers exclusively devoted to themselves, both would be better served, and more would be accomplished. This is too plain a point to require argument. The same Gospel must be differently dispensed, in order to have its full measure of success upon men so diverse in capacities and attainments as the two races among us. And what objection can there be to separate preachers more than to separate congregations? Is it not an advantage that there should be some one man, known to the community—known to the masters—who is responsible to the country as well as to his God, for the species of instruction he imparts? Is it likely that the seeds of disaffection and rebellion will be sown, when the preacher knows that for every murmur of discontent, and for every act of insubordination, a terrible retribution will be visited on him? The very perils of his position will make him doubly cautious as to the subjects and manner of his teaching. It seems to us *safer*—not only better for the slave, but *safer* for the master, to adopt the plan proposed by Mr. Adger, than to pursue the old method, which, with more labor and less responsibility, inadequately serves both bond and free. To give to both their

own preachers is the best way to furnish both with their meat in due season.

There is another point of view, in which the expediency of giving them preachers peculiarly devoted to themselves may be strikingly exhibited. If *we* do not furnish them with men qualified to teach them, they will provide themselves with others, who will pander to their tastes and develop the religious element of their nature in forms, it may be, incompatible with their own improvement or the interests of their masters. No human laws and no human vigilance can prevent them from assembling for the purpose of worship. Man is essentially a religious creature, and religion is essentially a social quality. As in the days of the empire, neither imperial laws nor imperial cruelty could put an effectual interdict upon the occasional and solemn convocations of the primitive Christians—so it will be with the negroes among us. They *must* gratify the religious yearnings of their souls—and to attempt to restrain them in the exercise of what they feel to be a high, holy and imperative duty, will appear to them as tyranny from policy, which will fully justify rebellion from principle. Gratuitous abridgments of the liberty of worship arm the strongest feelings of their nature against the authority of their master. Our own security is best consulted, not by violent resistance to any original impulse of the heart—not by attempting to extirpate or destroy it—but by giving it a wise direction and turning it into safe and salutary channels. Separate congregations, therefore, they *will* have. If our laws and the public sentiment of the community tolerate them, they will be open, public, responsible. If our laws prohibit them, they will be secret, fanatical, dangerous. Teachers they *will* have—if *we* supply them, their teachers will be teachers indeed, instructing them in the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, and conducting them in the paths of holiness, obedience and peace. If they are compelled surreptitiously to supply themselves, they will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts, who will give them fanaticism for piety, excitement for devotion, and enthusiasm for faith. Is it not safer to gratify the religious impulses of their nature by an adequate provision on our part,

which will at once promote their improvement, and league their purest and noblest affections on the side of their masters? To give them the means of worshipping God—to give them preachers, who shall manifest an earnest and anxious solicitude for the salvation of their souls—to give them houses in which they can meet for prayer, praise and the word of exhortation—to display the same care for their eternal and spiritual interests which we are accustomed to cherish for their health, food and raiment, would be an exhibition of Christian sympathy on our part, which could not fail to reach the hearts of a race proverbially grateful, and sweeten the intercourse betwixt the master and his slave.

The danger is not in sound, judicious, scriptural instruction imparted by men who are commissioned by the church and known to the community—not in the Assemblies which these men must hold in order that they may reach, with the words of truth, minds which could never be brought under private tuition—the danger is not in the open, public, responsible meetings contemplated in the scheme of Mr. Adger, but in those secret conclaves, which no eye penetrates but the eye of heaven—and those incendiary addresses, which, under the sacred name of religion, fanatics among themselves may be tempted to pour forth. We save the slave from the liability to abuses of this sort by the plan which Mr. Adger proposes to institute. We save him from secret convocations which the white man cannot witness—we save him from appeals which madden rather than instruct—from a religion which puffs up but does not edify.

We presume that the true secret of the opposition which has been felt and expressed to the scheme of Mr. Adger, which is also the scheme of the Presbytery of Charleston, is to be found in the apprehension that these separate congregations are to be placed, in some sort, under the control of the negroes—so that they shall become nurseries of self-government, in which the seeds of disloyalty and independence will be gradually sown to the ruin of the slave and the jeopardy of the master. We wish to correct this mistake. So far as the Presbyterian Church is concerned, and particularly the Presbytery of Charleston, we can confidently assert that it is no part of the plan to entrust the

government of the congregations, either in whole or in part, to the colored people themselves. They are to be constituted, if constituted into churches at all, into missionary churches. The very object of this arrangement, is to hold their minister fully and personally responsible for the conduct of his charge. Under our discipline, a slave can neither be a preacher nor an elder; and we have no other officers who can take part in the government of a church. It is therefore impossible, in the very nature of the case impossible, that any other churches, consisting of slave members, can be organized among us but *missionary churches*. Now, in a missionary church, the minister supplies the place of pastor and elders. He is not *chosen* by the people, but *sent* by the Presbytery; he cannot be dismissed by the people, but is responsible to the Presbytery. Our scheme, therefore, is exactly adapted to the condition of this people—it places their spiritual interests under the supervision of a white man, who is himself responsible to other men, representing a large portion of the State. How can there be danger in such an arrangement?

But it has been intimated that these missionary churches may ultimately reach a point of maturity, at which they shall be competent to elect their own rulers and manage their own affairs; and when they shall have reached this point, they are to be no longer under the control of an evangelist. It is true, that when a church becomes competent to govern itself, it has the right to do so. But here lies the difficulty. Upon the Presbyterian plan, the only way in which it can exercise the rights of self-government consists in the selection of its officers; it can be organized into a particular church, only by being placed under the supervision of a bench of elders chosen from itself. Now, a slave *cannot* be an elder; and as long therefore as our colored people continue to be slaves, so long it is utterly impossible that they *ever can reach* the maturity which shall place their government in their own hands. The rule of the primitive church is our own rule, and the rule of common sense—that no man can be a bishop, under which title are included both ministers and elders, unless he be a free man. Hence, it is certain that the Presbyterian Church at the South will never tolerate negro

preachers, negro exhorters, negro elders, or negro instructors of any sort. Her Presbyteries will lay hands on none but educated men; and she will never invite into her courts nor invest with authority those who are under the yoke.

It must be confessed that the language employed in the Report of the Committee of the Presbytery of Charleston, naturally implies that a church consisting of colored members merely, after a length of time, may attain a sufficient maturity to be organized into self-government. A word of explanation may, therefore, be necessary to set this language in its proper light. It is evident from the whole tenor of the Report, that the object of the Committee was to submit a plan to the Presbytery, which would effectually guard against the evil of entrusting the slaves with spiritual power. To say nothing of the fact, that the exercise of such power upon their part would be inconsistent with Presbyterian principles, the Committee felt that it would be dangerous to the interests of the State. The subject had been brought before the Presbytery by the action of the Second Presbyterian Church of Charleston, embraced in resolutions which evidently fluctuated between two schemes, the second and third mentioned in the Report of the Committee. The writer of the Report had long entertained the opinion, that according to the Presbyterian system, an evangelist embodied in himself the powers of a Presbytery. He felt that if his brethren should concur with him in this opinion, the difficulty would be at an end, and separate congregations of colored people might be formed which could enjoy, with safety to the State, the ministry, ordinances and discipline of the church, without a departure from the Presbyterian platform. As a general rule, the office of an evangelist in a particular place is temporary—he labors until churches can be organized and Presbyteries formed, and then the government of these churches passes into the hands of their respective Presbyteries. The idea prominently before the mind of the writer of the Report was, that an evangelist might sustain to congregations of colored people the relations of a Parochial Presbytery; and this was expressed under the limitation which generally obtains, without its being intended to suggest that in

the present instance it could be a temporary contingency. Apprehensive that the theory of *permanent* evangelists to a particular community, which was rather novel, might be rejected, he distinctly asserts, "that from the state of society among us, it would probably require a length of time" for the churches contemplated in the report "to reach the maturity supposed." The design of this phraseology was to imply, rather than directly to state, what every member would at once feel to be true, that slavery was inconsistent with the full organization of Christian churches; that, in fact, upon no hypothesis but that which was affirmed in regard to evangelists, could churches consisting exclusively of slaves be constituted at all. That hypothesis being granted, the problem was solved.

From a careful review of this whole subject, it seems to us clear that no *adequate* provision can be made for the religious instruction of the colored people, which does not contemplate separate congregations and separate preachers. The pastors of the white churches can reach but a small number of the blacks. Are our large plantations to be left without the Gospel? Shall none be permitted to go into the streets, lanes and alleys of our cities, and rescue the descendants of Ham from theft, drunkenness and debauchery here, and the damnation of hell hereafter? Every motive of humanity, justice, prudence and religion urges upon us to imbue our servants with the principles of Christianity. We have nothing to fear, and every thing to hope for from the Gospel; and we sincerely trust that Mr. Adger may receive all the encouragement which his noble enterprise deserves from the descendants of those, who abandoned home and country for the sake of that very religion which he is anxious to proclaim in the city of their children to their children's nurses.

3. "*The Conquest of Peru.*" By WILLIAM H. PRESCOTT.

The brilliant reputation already earned by this elegant writer, in the production of his former works, "*The History of the*

Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella," and "The Conquest of Mexico," is fully sustained in this late one, recently issued from the press of Messrs. Harper & Brother of New York. It is the singular triumph of Mr. Prescott to have produced three separate, independent histories of rare and equal merit, all of them vieing in their impartiality, accuracy and elegance of diction, with the most successful works of a similar character, in any language.

We are accustomed to hear the historical novel recommended to those who seek for pleasant readings in the thorny fields of literature and learning. With a much clearer conscience can we recommend for this purpose true histories like these, which, while they inform the more sober faculties of the mind in actual events and in the progress of the world towards the consummation of all human things, at the same time delight the more lively ones with all the excitements of novelty, and wonder, and admiration—which, amid the truthfulness of real action, permit the pleasing play of the imagination among the strange and romantic and seemingly fabulous circumstances of motive, achievement and result, with which it is attended. The exaggerations of fictitious writings scarcely afford any thing more strange, surprising, or interesting, than we here find recorded of the actual condition of some of the nations occupying the Western Continent at the time of its discovery, and of their conquest and subjugation, numerous, warlike, brave and, in some respects, civilized as they were, by a mere handful of Spanish knights and adventurers, attracted by gold and the love of adventure, elevated by personal and national ambition, and sustained by a deep religious faith, blind and ignorant indeed, but so confiding and zealous as to shame the hesitation and inactivity of more enlightened Christians of the present day.

The "Conquest of Peru" opens with an introductory view of the civilization of the country before the conquest, its religion, political institutions, public works, its social and domestic economy; to us, the most interesting portion of the work, as the striking evidence which these give of a very considerable degree of art and advancement inflames our curiosity, and excites our

inquiry upon all the points connected with the remote history of the New World, its peopling, the sources of its knowledge, its progress in arts and civilization. The narrative of the discovery of the country by the Spaniards, of their successive expeditions against the natives, of their hardships, fortitude, courage, rapacity, cruelties, and ultimate success; of their own dissensions and civil wars; of the establishment of the Spanish dominion, and the settlement of the country, is conducted with great clearness and impartiality, and its interest is well sustained by much stirring and romantic adventure and action. The style is felicitously easy, graceful and elegant, without the least appearance of effort or unnatural straining for effect; and we look upon this work, along with the others of the same author, as the most successful and honorable efforts of American literature.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER III.

DECEMBER, 1847.

ARTICLE I.

THE DIVINE APPOINTMENT AND OBLIGATION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.*

1. *The Rights of War and Peace, including the Law of Nature and of Nations.* By HUGO GROTIUS. 3 vols. 8vo.
2. *The Relations of Christianity to War.* By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D. Charleston. 1847.
3. *The Punishment of Death for the Crime of Murder, Rational, Scriptural and Salutary.* By WALTER SCOTT, President and Theological Tutor in Airedale College. Bradford: Yorkshire.
4. *Capital Punishment, the Importance of its Abolition: A Prize Essay.* By the Rev. JAMES BEGGS, Late Missionary to India. London. 1839.
5. *An Essay on the Ground and Reason of Punishment, with special reference to the Penalty of Death.* By TAYLOR LEWIS, Esq. And a Defence of Capital Punishment. By Rev. GEORGE B. CHEEVER, D. D. With an Appendix, containing a Review of Burleigh on the Death Penalty. New York: Wiley & Putnam. 1846: pp. 365.

* With its bearing on the recent execution of colored persons, and their religious instruction.

6. *The Increase of Crimes against Life.* NEW ENGLANDER. July, 1844.
7. *The Right of Civil Government over Life.* IN *IBID.* October, 1845.
8. *Shall Punishment be Abolished?* IN *IBID.* Oct. 1846.
9. *Capital Punishment. Biblical Repository.* July, 1837.
By S. S. SCHMUCKER, D. D.
10. *Capital Punishment. Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review.* April, 1842. And in the second Series of *Reviews from that work.*
11. *Capital Punishment.* By DANIEL R. GOODWIN. In *The Bibliotheca Sacra, for May, 1847.*

It is our object, in the ensuing article, to present to our readers the subject of capital punishment. This we believe to be timely and important; and as it has been pressed upon us by the recent cases of the execution of colored persons, for the crime of poisoning two innocent and unoffending individuals, against whom they did not even pretend to have ground for retaliation or revenge,* we will draw from their case illustrations of our argument.

We have placed at the head of our article a number of works in which this subject will be found discussed, chiefly for the purpose of directing our readers to sources of information on both sides of the question, and of giving them palpable evidence of the interest the subject is exciting, and of the great necessity of "stirring up the minds" of those who are already "established in the truth."

In the extensive and learned work of the celebrated Grotius will be found a treasury, in which all the principles lying at the foundation of human society, and which determine authority and rights, in a state both of peace and

* From our own knowledge and their confessions, we know that in this case the treatment of the parties, by their owners, had been gentle and humane, and that their crime is traceable to distinct causes, foreign to such a source.

war, are discussed on the grounds of natural and revealed truth.*

In the Discourse by the Rev. Thomas Smyth, will be found a synopsis of the arguments in support of the right of society, both to inflict capital punishment and to prosecute a just war.

Mr. Scott's treatise, contains a very satisfactory statement of the scriptural argument in support of the divine appointment and permanent obligation of capital punishment.

Mr. Beggs' Essay is a very condensed view of what can be said in opposition to the law of death; and exhibits, in a remarkable degree, the difficulty of preventing genuine piety and true philanthropy from degenerating into a morbid and sickly sympathy for *distress*, even while it is the result of the most heinous and desperate guilt; and how easily the mind, in such circumstances, can delude itself, with the most inconclusive reasoning.

In the full and comprehensive work by Taylor Lewis will be found a survey of the whole argument, and of all the objections as urged by the latest advocates for the abolition of capital punishment. Of Dr. Cheever's labors on this subject the public have formed a very high opinion, and have derived from them important benefit, in staying that flood of wild speculation which threatens to overturn, in the State of New York, every landmark of security.

In the article in the *New Englander*, for July, 1844, the increase of crimes against life, which is, it is said, awfully notorious in the Northern States, is traced to the constantly diminishing value that is set upon human life; the mixture, in our population, of individuals of different races and nations; the loss of property and disappointed ambition; the absurd and barbarous custom of carrying deadly weapons; the diminished dread of a trial; the constantly increasing difficulty of procuring convictions on indictment for murder; the increasing uncertainty (owing to the unpardonable abuse of their prerogative by Governors,) whether, in case of conviction, the penalty of the law will be rigidly enforced; and the influence of the unprincipled por-

* On this subject, see particularly Book I, and Book II: ch. xx, on Punishments.

tion of the press. "What then, (it is asked,) can be done? We answer, we have the same remedy that we possess for all other evils, moral, civil, political or religious. We shall never expel tyranny by the sword, nor heresy by the flames. We shall never eradicate vice by law, nor protect life or property by an armed force. Such remedies partake not of the spirit of our institutions. We must aim our efforts at the minds and hearts of freemen. Our safety depends on constant and persevering efforts to enlighten the one and to purify the other."

The article in the same Review, on the right of civil government over human life, is a short but conclusive one. It thus concludes:

"We have taken this cursory view of certain conditions under which it is right for the 'powers that be' to destroy human life, for the sake of establishing this right as a general principle. We claim it to be a plain corollary from the divine institution of human government, that life may be justly taken in vindication and support of the laws; for nothing is more certain than the dependence of civil government on this right, for its existence and power to answer the ends of its existence. And we feel authorized to charge all deniers of the right of capital punishment, of the forcible suppression of domestic insurrection, and of war with foreign powers, with a logical denial of the right of civil government itself. Their position leads, by irresistible inference, to the grossest errors of the non-resistants. Starting with the doctrine that life is inviolable, and that the intentional destruction of life is always murder, to what other conclusion can they come, than that civil government is a usurpation, and that God intended man should be controlled by moral influence alone, in this world? If the enemies of society are not liable to the loss of life, for their crimes and criminal attempts, no restraint can be exercised over them, and no penalty, however mild, can be inflicted. They will not suffer themselves to be seized and imprisoned by the nerveless arm that dare not strike; and there will in fact, and from necessity, be no such thing as government, which, by supposition, God has ordained."

The last article, from the same Review, of 1846, we regard as a very lucid, able, and conclusive refutation of the objections made to this law of death, and commend its pe-

rusal to any who may feel a desire to pursue the investigation.

Dr. Schmucker discusses, in his own didactic manner, the various questions to which the subject gives rise, both on the grounds of natural right and scriptural authority.

Of the elaborate article in the *Biblical Repertory* and *Princeton Review*, in reply to the reports presented in favor of the abolition of capital punishment, to the Legislatures of Massachusetts and New York, we cannot speak too highly, nor commend it too warmly; and by the republication of two volumes of separate essays from this able *Review*, it is placed within the easy access of all our readers.

The article in the *Biblical Repertory* and *Princeton Review* will be found especially satisfactory and valuable, as containing a full view of the argument, from history and experience.

In the extended and elaborate article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* will be found a full philological investigation of all the scriptural passages involved in the controversy, particularly as it regards the sixth commandment, which, it seems, is regarded by the abolitionists as a stronghold. The subject is to be continued.

We will now proceed, in as condensed and practical a manner as possible, to give a summary of our own views on this vitally important question. There is, at present, a great outcry on this subject extending itself over the world, and promulgated, with vehement emphasis, throughout our own country. Capital punishment, even for the wilful destruction of human life—to which and to very few other crimes, it ought, we think, to be limited—is spoken of in terms of unmeasured reprobation; represented as a lingering remnant of a barbarous age; or the custom of savage feudalism, and unworthy of a civilized state. In the terms of a prevailing but morbid sensibility, it is coupled with the calculations of utilitarianism. It is contended that putting to death according to law is “an ill-judged evil-working expedient, and worthy of no higher designation than legalized murder.”

Now it must be admitted that the subject of capital punishment is often treated in this manner, from honest conviction and good motives, and from an apprehension that

the genius of Christianity is inimical to it, under any circumstances. But while this must be admitted of many holders of the above opinion, we fully concur with the London Record when it says, "We reiterate our opinion, that the present attempt to do away with the punishment of death where murder has been committed, proceeds from no other than the practical infidelity of the age. It is from foolish and corrupt man, affecting to know better and be more benevolent than 'the only wise God,' a God full of compassion and tender mercy, but 'who will in no wise clear the guilty.'" And that such is the true source of this opposition would appear from the obvious character of the avowed opponents of this law. "All those," says the New Englander, "whose impulses and habits put them in opposition to law, and who not unnaturally feel somewhat as if it were for their interest that the punishments of crime should be abolished, are agitated with the movement. The haunters of dramshops; the frequenters of brothels; those whose oaths shock you as you pass along the street—are generally in favor of the abolition of capital punishment. Those who profess to believe that there is no retribution for wickedness in the world to come, and that the murderer, dying with all a murderer's malice in his heart, dies only to enter into perfect bliss—cry out against the dreadfulness of the death penalty, and demand that the murderer shall have a kinder and less vindictive treatment. Philanthropic projectors of a reconstructed moral universe, who hold that society is all wrong, and that everything existing must be overturned to prepare the way for a new era of social equality—utter the same outcry. Those whose religion is mere sentimentalism—whose Christianity, as they call it, is little else than a low conception of the poetry of nature—and who conceive of God chiefly as a great artist that has made the world for its beauty—give in their adhesion."

The benevolent and philanthropic character of the age—according to the universal tendency of weak and imperfect reason—is carried out into absurd and extravagant theories, as if all the tares of human depravity could be at once and completely eradicated by the devices of man's wisdom and man's philanthropy; all temptation and trial be entirely done away; and an age of perfect holiness and therefore of perfect happiness, be restored and perpetuated. Now while

it is hard to resist a current apparently so pure and gentle in its flow, so benevolent in its design, and so beneficent in many of its *partial* and *present* results—yet truth compels all lovers of equity to stand fast against the Syren voice, even though it speak in the tone and assume the garb of “an angel of light.”

In the decision of every question of conscientious obligation and moral duty, “TO THE LAW AND THE TESTIMONY” must be our immediate and our final appeal; and every theory that is not accordant with these, and based upon them, must be rejected—however specious and refined—as having “no truth in it.” And this is the true and only criterion by which we can determine whether ANY plan of man’s devising, having for its *professed* object the promotion of man’s welfare—is pure gold, or only a glittering counterfeit—“the hay, the wood and the stubble;” and whether, therefore, under the cover of a present and apparent good, there will not be found, in all such schemes, the seeds of future and ultimate evil.

Now the opponents of capital punishment—while, of necessity, they attempt to shelter themselves behind a few isolated passages of scripture, severed from their context and misinterpreted in their true meaning—nevertheless aim as much as possible to divest the question of its scriptural character, and thus clear the way for reaching bold and plausible conclusions, and for enlisting public sympathy.

This question, however, so far as it is one of *obligation and right*, is purely theological. It is altogether a Bible question, and to be decided by the proper answer to the question, “Is there a law framed by divine authority and by which, in every case, it is made necessary that the crime of murder should be punished with death?” For our own part, we could give no sanction nor concurrence to the infliction of death—terminating as it does the period of man’s probation for eternity—except under the authority of divine requirement or sanction. And therefore we regard the propriety or impropriety of this punishment to be at once and forever decided by a knowledge of what God has required and ordained, and as we would not allow any reasons of mere expediency or self interest to *establish* the law of death, so we cannot admit loose and declamatory statements to have any weight *against* a law of God, un-

less there can be produced some decisive intimation in the Bible of the subsequent repeal of that law. Our direct and decisive reference, therefore, is made to God's law and to God's testimony.

But in doing this, let it not be supposed that we have any fear of bringing this question to the decision of sound reason and of long tried experience.

On the contrary we maintain that the infliction of death for the crime of wilfully taking away life, is in itself right; is sustained by every principle of justice; and is required by the moral sense and conscience of every unprejudiced mind. That such is the moral nature of this law of death, we might argue from the fact that God has unquestionably authorized and required the punishment of death by the Jewish law, and under the whole period of the Jewish economy. This fact no one ever has, or ever can possibly deny.* But if this fact is true, how can any one who believes that God is so necessarily and immutably holy, that He cannot either authorize or sanction what is wrong;—how, we say, can such a person question that the punishment of death must be in itself right, and accordant with the principles of justice, when it was instituted and required by God himself? Who, without blasphemy, can say that God, *under any circumstances* or *for any length of time*, could do evil to secure good? And who, therefore, without blasphemy, can affirm that the legal punishment of death, which God most assuredly instituted and required, can, in its own nature, be either unjust or cruel.

It is indeed said, that one of the ten commandments embodied in the Jewish Law, is a plain and positive requirement in no case, and in no circumstances, to kill. But to kill, in a legal sense—and in this sense only is it used in Decalogue or Law—is “to put an end to the vital functions, either in destroying or essentially injuring the organs necessary to life, by the sword, by poison, by disease or by suffocation—and to do this not by any legal authority, but under the influence of malice, covetousness and revenge.”

To inflict the punishment of death, however, for the crime of murder, of which the culprit has been legally convicted, by hands of justice, and in accordance with the

*See Exod. 21: 11—14; Num. 35: 17—21; Deut. 19: 11—15.

sentence of a proper legal tribunal, this is not to kill. Capital punishment and killing are as distinct as law and passion; conviction and revenge; calm solemnity and sudden and infuriated assault; the august authority of a state or community and the rash and hasty fury of a lawless criminal.

The same law, therefore, may very properly, and ought unquestionably, to prohibit killing and to enforce the legal infliction of death. God *has* done this, in the very law quoted, since—while in the decalogue He prohibits all taking of life by *individuals*, unless in the case of unavoidable self-defence—in that very code in which the decalogue is embodied, He has, in numerous places and for numerous crimes, required of the legal officers the infliction of death, as a legal punishment.

And hence, for any man to justify the abrogation of capital punishment, by pleading the language of the sixth commandment, is to make God contradict himself, and even to convict His own laws of a blood-thirsty and revengeful spirit. For us, let it be enough to say “let God be true, consistent and perfect, though every man should be found guilty of a dangerous treason against His wisdom and His mercy. The works of God’s hands are verity and judgment—all his commandments are sure. They stand fast forever, and are done in truth and uprightness.”* The question, therefore, to every one who believes in the holy and just character of God can never be—“is the punishment of death wrong in itself?”—but the only question is, “is the punishment of death still permitted or required by God.

But to proceed, let any man consider what the crime of murder is, and then ask himself, is it severe or cruel to punish with death the man who has either alone, or in company with others, taken away the life of a fellow-being? If a man cuts short the life of a fellow-being by poison, fire, or other means;—if he thus deprives his neighbor of all earthly good and happiness;—if he introduce misery and distress into the bosom of the bereaved family;—and if he *forces* his victim into eternity, whether prepared or unprepared;—if a man does all this knowingly and wilfully;—

* Ps. iii : 7, 8.

is it, we ask, improper or cruel that the arm of justice should seize upon him, and imprison him, and try him, and when proved to be guilty,—should put him to death?

But to show still further the *reasonableness* of this punishment, let us consider the design and object of punishment. One object of all law and of all punishment is to ensure the welfare and security of the living, and above all things else, to preserve them from violence and murder. But if a man can take away life without forfeiting his own life, there are so many temptations to prevent the discovery of other crimes by taking away the life of those who could betray and expose them, that no man's life would be safe. The only way to prevent men from committing murder, either for its own sake or in order to conceal other crimes, is to make them feel that **AS SURE AS THEY TAKE AWAY LIFE, THEIR OWN LIFE WILL BE TAKEN AWAY.**

Much, we know, is said about the dreadful nature of solitary imprisonment for life, as a substitute for death. If, however, as is alleged, solitary imprisonment for life is the most terrible and the most frightful of all punishments, and in this respect more terrific, as a warning, than death itself—then where is the honesty or the propriety of such reasoners in denouncing the punishment of death, because it is so awful and severe? And, on their own reasoning, who, we ask, is most righteously to be condemned as cruel and severe? Such reasons assuredly demonstrate one of two things—either the hypocrisy or the absurdity of their objections. But let men talk as they may on this subject, it will still, we think, remain undeniably and universally true, that a man will give up every thing and endure every thing rather than give up life, and that whatever may be the severity of the punishment of solitary confinement in its *actual* endurance, it has but little power in its *anticipation*, to hold back pride, passion, hatred, revenge, and the insatiate thirst for money, from perpetrating murder, when it is once compared with the awful conviction in the mind of those who are led to meditate murder that as sure as their murder is found out, (which God and conscience assure them it will,) they will themselves be put to death, and whether prepared or unprepared, be made to stand before the judgment seat of Christ. And of this truth we have certain proof in the fact that it was never known that a prisoner

labored, through his counsel, to transmute a conviction of manslaughter into a verdict for murder, that he might die rather than be imprisoned for life—or that a prisoner on the way to the penitentiary devised and desired a plan for his immediate execution. Death is—must be—and ever will be “the king of terrors” to a guilty and self-condemning conscience, and “is therefore the only adequate and *certain* preservation against the commission of murder, and for the security of society.

Besides murder may be and has often been committed by those who were already under sentence of solitary confinement for life. “And what shall be done in such a case? Imprisonment for life, according to the new theory, is to be the ultimate sanction of law—the highest punishment that human justice can inflict. There remains, therefore, no further possibility of punishment for those who are already under that sentence. In other words, you put a score or more of murderers into your prison, and by that act proclaim to them that there is nothing more for them to fear, and they may kill their keepers if they will; the law has already done its utmost upon them, and can not hurt them. Plainly, if you abolish capital punishment entirely, you cannot maintain government within the walls of your prison. The life of the warden, and the lives of the guard, are completely—so far as the law is concerned—in the power of the prisoners. Your law, then, for the abolition of capital punishment, must make an exception against such cases as these. The dreadful gallows must still project its dark shadow into the convict’s cell, to make him feel that law has still another and more awful sanction; or your abolition of the death penalty will go far either towards abolishing punishment altogether,” or towards driving society to some mode of self-vindication. “Abolish capital punishment altogether, and by that very act you establish either the primeval barbarous rule of blood-revenge by the next friend of the murdered, or a horrible Lynch court to take cognizance of crimes peculiarly atrocious. In other words, if the magistrate lays down the sword or bears it in vain—if the state, as such, abdicates its proper function of maintaining justice by penalties adequate to the protection of life, society itself, by an irresistible tendency, begins to be disorganized.”

But another end aimed at by punishment, is to impress upon the heart of the condemned culprit a proper sense of his criminality and guilt, and thus lead him to repentance. And what possible punishment, we ask, can awaken the hardened and seared conscience of a wilful murderer to a true sense of his awful guilt, but the punishment of death? When he knows that by the law of God and the law of man, he is not to live, and cannot be permitted to live, and that "ALL MURDERERS" who die impenitent "SHALL HAVE THEIR PART IN THE LAKE THAT BURNETH WITH FIRE AND BRIMSTONE"—and that within a short and unalterable period, he must be in eternity, and beyond the reach of mercy—then it is, if ever, that hard heart can or will feel penitent and in earnest about his salvation—and then it is, if ever, that the man appointed to die will listen to instruction, call upon God in earnestness and truth—and lay hold of eternal life.

Such, in a most striking manner, was the case with the two colored culprits who were recently executed in Charleston, for the crime of poisoning. Henry, who was shrewd and knowing, and to some extent informed, at once realized his condition, and felt and admitted the justice and necessity of the punishment. Jane was hard of hearing, and therefore, though naturally shrewd, *actually* very ignorant of all divine truth. Her mind was dark—oh how terribly dark!—on all subjects relating to God, to duty, and to eternal retributions. Her conscience was, therefore, seared, and her sense of crime feeble and imperfect. She was one of those sordid souls,

"Such as do murder for a meed—
Who but of fear know no control;
Because their conscience, sear and foul,
Feels not the import of their deed."

We found her, therefore, in her cell at first bitter in her outcries against the severity of her punishment, and looking into the grave and eternity, with sullen, blank, and absolute despair. But when her mind was led to an understanding of her guilty heart and life, and of the real enormity of her crime, and had been further led to see that it was God who had appointed death as the punishment for murder, she emphatically and repeatedly said, "I did think

my punishment was too hard, but now I think it is right." And as she saw that there was hope even for her, that the blood of Christ could cleanse even her sins, that *she* might be pardoned, justified, and saved, and that this was the heart's desire and prayer, even of her injured owners, by whose wish we had come to her—her soul became pacified, calmed, and we would humbly hope truly penitent. She met death, therefore, calmly, and as the executioner was tying up her arms behind her back, before she was led out to execution, she leaned her head upon our breast, as we stood beside her, and with deep and solemn tone, said "Yes, I know that it is God that is doing it, and I hope He will save my soul."

The penalty of death is, therefore, of all possible punishments, most adapted to lead the guilty culprit to real penitence, prayer, and earnest anxiety to be saved, and to prepare him for death and for that "judgment which is after death."

Another end of punishment is, to secure an equivalent to society—a reparation for the evil that has been done against it. But in the case of murder, nothing can be an equivalent, and no reparation can be adequate—except the taking of life for life. Punishment is the price or value which society sets upon the life of man, and when the life of man has been wilfully and wickedly taken away,—society could accept of nothing short of the life of the murderer—without reducing the value of the life of man, and lowering the sense of humanity, justice, obedience, in every heart. But while it is thus the design of punishment to secure the welfare and the safety of the living ;—to lead the culprit to a true sense of his crime, and to make reparation to society—**THE PRIMARY AND CHIEF END OF PUNISHMENT IS TO VINDICATE THE RIGHT.** The moral judgment of man tells him that it is just that a man should suffer according to the evil he has done ;—and that every crime should be followed by an evil equal in degree, similar in kind, and proportionate in severity. Conscience enforces the infliction of punishment, proportionate to the degree of the moral guilt of the crime, independent of any ulterior consideration, and solely with a view to the past guilt of the offender. It further demands such a punishment as will prevent, by the terror it excites, or the removal it secures, the repetition

of the offence, on the part either of the present criminal, or of others who may be tempted to the same offence; and the influence of punishment in the prevention of crime *generally*, by the terror of example, is of immeasurably more importance than its effect upon individual offenders.

Punishment, therefore, is not founded in revenge, or cruelty, or expediency; nor does it aim at the benefit of the offender, except so far as that may be made to consist with its true and higher ends; so that this, instead of being, as many suppose, the first, is in reality the last end of punishment. Punishment is the expression of the moral sense against crime. Its first and chief object is to excite such an estimate of crime as to make it at once loathsome, infamous, and dreadful. It would thus, by the pain and ignominy it inflicts, deter from the commission of crime, and by the "magnitude of the penalty, proclaim the magnitude of the interests which law protects and natural justice makes inviolable."

Neither individual nor general interest, therefore, confers the right to punish with death; nor is this right to be based upon necessity, direct or indirect; nor upon the supposed existence of a social contract. There is—as Mr. Rossi, in the most recent and able treatise on this subject, well says—a moral order in the world, binding upon all free and intelligent beings, which demands absolute justice. Upon this justice, then, punishment is founded, and punishment is retribution, inflicted by legitimate authority, for the violation of what is right and obligatory. And since wilful murder is the highest possible crime against society, this moral sense of mankind universally requires the infliction of the greatest punishment, which is that of death.

"The sentimental philosophers of the day, who would do away with the punishment of death, have committed not only gross blunders in reasoning, but they have been guilty, doubtless unintentionally, of the hardly less pardonable error of misrepresenting facts. It is asserted by them that the abolition of capital punishments, hitherto, has always been attended with a decrease in the crimes for which those punishments were inflicted. This is the very opposite of the truth. The following extract from a paper which appears in the Law Magazine, in England, will abundantly establish this point: 'On the 1st October, 1836, death

punishment was abolished, for—1st, attempts to murder, attended with no results dangerous to life; 2d, burglary; 3d, robbery; 4th, arson; and, in the year 1841, for rape. *In every one of these crimes there has been an increase since the removal of the punishment.* Taking the three years which preceded the change in 1837—namely, 1837, 1836, and 1835, and comparing the total number in this period with the last three years, namely, 1844, 1843, and 1842, we find that in attempts to murder, with and without injuries, and shooting, stabbing, &c., *the increase* has been 89 per cent.; in burglaries of both kinds, it has been 115 per cent.; in robberies of all kinds, it has been 124 per cent. In rapes we find a similar result: the law was changed in 1841, and on comparing the three years, 1837, 1836, and 1835, with those of 1844, 1843, and 1842, we find the increase of rapes in these last years has been no less than 102 per cent.’ If this be not satisfactory on the point that the abolition of death punishments has not hitherto had the effect of checking crime, it is difficult to say what amount of proof the abolitionists will then require. These figures clearly and incontestably prove that the punishment of death is more dreaded than any other punishment, and that, therefore, it is the most effectual of all punishments, in deterring the wickedly disposed from committing crimes. Here are proofs in support of its truth, drawn not from *a priori* reasoning, but from the irrefragable evidence of facts themselves.* And what is thus true of England is true also of other countries, and most emphatically of our own.

In the Conversations Lexicon, a recent work of undoubt-

* In the Pennsylvania Law Journal, for October, 1847, at p. 574, the following is the closing summary of an article extracted from the London Law Magazine, for August, 1847, on Capital Punishment: “The increase, therefore, of these very offences, (in respect to which capital punishment has been abrogated,) has been no less than 34.5 per cent., in fifteen years! Whilst the number of attempts to murder, rapes, burglaries, robberies, and arsons have increased since 1836, that is, during ten years, in the early part of which they ceased to be capitally punished, to the following enormous extent: attempts to murder, 64.52 per cent.; rapes, 114.74 per cent.; burglaries, 154.81 per cent.; forgeries, of both classes, 108.85 per cent.; arsons, 58.74! And yet we are told that crimes diminish in proportion as capital punishments are abolished! The assertion has no other foundation than its audacity. Murder, it will be observed, which is not exempted from capital punishment, has very slightly increased last year, and during the last five years has actually decreased.”

ed authority, and almost universal circulation in Europe, the same which is the basis of the Encyclopædia Americana, of Dr. Lieber, it is expressly asserted: "That even in those countries where the governments, from a mistaken feeling of humanity, abolished capital punishments, they were compelled again to introduce them; because, according to the prevailing views of men, death is regarded as the greatest evil, to avoid which men will willingly submit to the most laborious life, so long as there is any hope of escaping from it; and because, moreover, the punishment of death is the most terrible of all penalties."

We have thus shewn that the punishment of death, for wilful murder, is sustained by the almost universal sentiment and practice of mankind, and is founded upon the moral nature of man.

But still we repeat the declaration that the plain, indubitable, and all-sufficient authority for the punishment of death, is to be found in the requirement of God. Man, it is true, has not the right to take away his own life, and of course he cannot give that right to others, but God has a right to take that life which He gave, when it is used for purposes contrary to His will, and this right, we have seen, God has delegated to civil government.

Examine, then, the words given to the human race by the voice of God, immediately after that great catastrophe by which he exhibited his infinite hatred against sin: "Surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: FOR in the image of God made he man." (Gen. ch. 9: 5, 6.)

That this is a plain and imperative law cannot be gainsayed, and that it is still in force is, we think, as unquestionable.

"This law, as given to Moses, does, in its most obvious sense, command that the wilful murderer shall be put to death. The most critical inquiry into the meaning of its terms only serves to confirm this interpretation. It has been so understood by all men, in all ages, until these latter days. The universal belief of all Christian nations has been that God has pronounced this doom upon the mur-

derer; and the public conscience has everywhere, with mute awe, approved the dread award of human justice, made in fulfilment of this divine command." The supposition that *yisshaphek* should be rendered *will*, instead of *shall* be shed, appears highly improbable. The context indicates the imperative character of this verse. It is in the midst of a series of commands whose preceptive nature is undisputed; and the form of the word is exactly what it must be, to express a command in the third person. For it need not be remarked, that the Hebrews have no third person in the imperative mood, and that the third person of the future is always used in its stead. We are, therefore, constrained to regard this passage as a universal sanction for the capital punishment of murder, unless it has since been revoked." It is however alleged, that this command was temporary, and has passed away—first, because Cain was not punished with death—secondly, because similar laws, under the Jewish economy, have been abrogated; and, thirdly, because it has been done away by the milder spirit of the gospel and of Christ.

As it regards Cain, we would remark that both his own conscience and confession, and the reasoning of God with him, concur in shewing that the infliction of death was what Cain deserved and expected;—but, as God had not yet made known, by a distinct law, that murder should be punished with death, and as civil government was not formally established, he inflicted upon Cain a combination of other and terrible evils. If it is said that this law was not enforced during all the antediluvian age, we answer that this cannot be proved; and if it could, the universal wickedness which prevailed would be a sad proof of the necessity of such a law. The obscure passage, however, (Gen. 4: 23, 24,) in which Lamech's speech to his wives is introduced, can, we think, admit of no interpretation which will not involve the existence, or apprehension of the law of capital punishment, and the conscientious approval of it, as in itself right.

As it regards the Jewish law, it is true that under this law several other crimes, for special reasons, were punished with death as well as murder, and it is true, also, that as the Jewish law has been abolished with the Jewish state and economy, we are no longer required to punish with

death any crimes, but those for which it is elsewhere prescribed, or for which the reasons are not of present and universal application. The law proclaimed to Noah, however, was not given to the Jews, but was proclaimed some nine hundred years before their law was established. It was given through Noah, their progenitor and representative, to the whole world. It extended to all nations, and not merely to the Jews. It is unlimited by time, circumstances, country, or condition. The removal of the Jewish law, therefore, which was given nine hundred years after, and to the Jews only, could not in any way alter or remove it.* The law of Noah is, in its own nature, universal. It is based upon a reason which is common to all men and to all times, that is, that every man is made in God's image, and that to kill a man is to destroy an image of God, and therefore to attempt the injury and dishonor of God himself. And this law is also *enforced* by a reason which is equally universal, namely, that if the proper authorities in any community refuse to inflict this punishment, God will punish them by inflicting some other retributive punishment upon the community itself. Now, wherever we find, in the Old Testament, a precept or law of this kind, we may feel confident, that as the reason of the law continues, and the ground of it continues unchanged, the law or precept is, in its nature, moral, and not ceremonial, and is therefore of permanent and not of temporary duration. This conclusion is further confirmed by the fact that God has repeatedly and most peremptorily enforced this law of death, during the Old Testament economy, not only in this law, and in the Jewish law, but by the mouth of many of his holy prophets and inspired psalmists, so as to enforce it even in the devotional praises of the sanctuary. (See Judges, 9 : 24 ; Ps. 9 : 12 ; I Kings, 21 : 18 ; Ezek. 7 : 23, 24, and 22 : 2—4, and 24 : 7, 8 : Prov. 28 : 17 ; II Sam. 4 : 11 ; I Kings, 21. 5, &c.)

This law, then, given through Noah, remains binding, because it is not affected by the abrogation of the Jewish law, neither is it done away by anything in the Christian dispensation. The supposition that God is revealed, under the Christian dispensation, as at all less holy, less just, less

* See the Apostle's argument, in Galatians 3 : 17.

absolute in his laws, and less severe in exacting the most perfect obedience and the most complete enforcement of the penalty of disobedience than He is under the old, is a most ruinous and unfounded mistake. God, it is true, has more clearly and fully revealed his mercy and the plan of salvation in the gospel than he did under the law; but he was just as merciful and just as willing to save *then* as *now*; and he is just as terrible in his holiness, in his hatred of sin, and in his vengeance against sin *now*, under the gospel, as he was formerly, under the law. God is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." "He changeth not," and as with Him "there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning," so is it with his law, in its requirements and in its penalty—for "Heaven and earth may pass away, but one jot or tittle of what he has said shall never pass away." And as it regards the threatenings, the denunciations, and "the terrors of the Lord," with which men are persuaded to repent and obey the gospel, instead of being less severe, less awfully terrible and alarming than those of former dispensations, the truth is, they are unspeakably more so. They are, it is true, *more* generally connected with the soul than the body; with eternity, than with time; with hell than with earth; but, they are all the more fearful, because they are clothed with immortality—surrounded by the blackness of darkness forever—and hold the soul in the grasp of His vengeance who is "a consuming fire" to evil doers, and "who can cast both soul and body into hell forever." "If he who despised Moses's law died without mercy, under two or three witnesses, of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace? For we know Him that hath said, vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, the Lord shall judge his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." (See Heb. 10: 28, 29, 31.)

Upon the ungodly and the unrighteous, therefore, the gospel heaps punishment as much greater and more severe than did all former dispensations, as its knowledge, motives, and encouragements to obedience are greater. And while

it does substitute, as far and as fast as possible, persuasion for fear, and conscience for compulsion, it nevertheless presses these motives by "the terrors" of a coming judgment. And while it has led and will continue to lead to the mitigation of temporal punishment, as far as the moral elevation of the community will permit, it nevertheless leaves this law of death unrepealed and in all its force. For such a repeal, not a word can be quoted from Matthew to Revelation. While the punishment of death, when these books were written, was the law of every nation under heaven, there is not a word of condemnation uttered against it, either by Christ or his Apostles. This law of God is, therefore, unrepealed and still in force, and God still requires that every man who is guilty of wilfully taking away human life, shall be punished with death.

How could our Saviour more pointedly repeat and authenticate this ancient law of death, than he has done in His Sermon on the Mount? After (Math. 5: 17) assuring us that "He came not to destroy, but to fulfil the law or the prophets," he goes on to say, (v. 21,) "Ye have heard that it was said to them* of old time, thou shalt not kill, and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment," that is, of the penalty adjudged for such offence.† "But I say unto you" that not only are murderers obnoxious to such a penalty, but that even those offences of hatred and malice which the elders allow to pass by unreprieved, render their perpetrators, according to the intention of God's law, justly liable to the punishment of the "Judgment" and "the Council," or Sanhedrim—both of which courts then punished criminals with death.

Does not Christ allude to this universal sentiment, practice, and law of men, when he commanded Peter not to kill with the sword, or he should himself be put to death—as culprits commonly are in the East—by the use of the sword? Does not Christ explicitly recognize the same law, and the propriety, justice, and designed terror of this law, when he says—"Fear not them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do, but I will tell you whom ye shall fear, Fear Him who can cast both body

* See the marginal reading.

† See Gen. 9: 5, 6; Exod. 20: 13; and 21: 12—14, &c.

and soul into hell forever—yea, I say unto you, fear Him,” —“even according to whose fear, so is his wrath.” Does not Christ further implicitly enforce the righteousness of this law in his parable of the husbandmen, who killed the servants and the son of their master, (Math. 21: 36, &c.,) when he says, “When the Lord, therefore, of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? They say unto Him, he will miserably destroy those wicked men?” Did not Christ submit himself to the execution of this punishment by a human tribunal? Did Christ not impliedly allow that it was in accordance with a divine law the punishment of death was inflicted by Pilate, as a judge, and that but for this he could have had no power over Him? Did not Christ, when upon the cross, impliedly give his sanction to the opinions of the dying thief, when this culprit referred the condemnation of the other thief and of himself to God, and declared that their punishment was just? (Luke 23: 39, 40, 41.) Do not all the Evangelists everywhere admit the abstract correctness of this punishment, where it is Justly deserved? Does not the apostle Paul expressly teach that civil government is authorized by God, and that civil governors are entrusted by God with the power of life and death, (the sword being, in oriental countries, the means of inflicting death,)—and that they must therefore be a terror to evil doers, while evil doers ought to fear and dread their power? Does not our Saviour, therefore, forbid all personal and individual revenge, because he would leave vengeance in the hands of the civil tribunals? And does not the apostle Paul mean the same thing, when he represents God as taking vengeance through the officers of government, and when he, therefore, requires all private citizens to let *their wrath* give place to the wrath which God legally inflicts upon those who injure them? “Avenge not yourselves, but rather give place to wrath”—ὁδοῦτε τὸ πικρὸν τῆ ὀργῆς—wait, let God’s justice have an opportunity to assert itself; and the reason is offered—“For it is written, vengeance (punishment) is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord.” Did not Paul himself, in his public defence before the Roman governor, say, “For if I be an offender, or have committed anything *worthy of death*, I refuse not to die,” and did he not thus plainly admit the justice of the law, and punishment of

death? Does not the apostle Peter as plainly admit and teach the right of punishing murderers with death, when he says, (I Peter, 4: 15,) "But let none of you suffer as a murderer"? And does not the apostle John, in the very close of the New Testament, (Rev. 13: 10,) declare that "he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword"?

And while, therefore, the New Testament does most peremptorily condemn all retaliation and revenge, and all infliction of death by *individuals*—unless in a case of absolute and unavoidable self-defence—does it not leave this law of God unrepealed, and does it not recognize the duty on the part of the civil officers, of PUNISHING MURDER, IN ALL CASES, WITH DEATH? Unquestionably it does. It is impossible to conceive that amid the unsparing condemnation with which crime of every hue is anathematized and condemned in the New Testament, the legal infliction of death, *if criminal*, would have been passed by without rebuke; or that, while every law of Mosaic and temporary appointment is so completely abrogated, this law of capital punishment, if of a similar character, should be not only NOT repealed, but implicitly assumed and indirectly and directly enforced.

Being originally instituted by God—to whom "vengeance belongeth"—this law must be, in itself, just and proper; and civil government, which is "ordained of God," being invested by Him with this right, and required to exercise it, on pain of divine displeasure, the enforcement of this law, in every case of murder, is not only just and proper, but imperatively enforced, both by duty and necessity.

To all, therefore, who believe in the Bible, as the word of God, it must appear certain that the law of death for capital offences, is both proper and expedient. "Is God unrighteous, who taketh vengeance? Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" "Or can man be more merciful than his maker?" "God forbid." Nay, in this very law, behold both the "goodness and the severity of God"—towards them that perish, severity, but towards society, whose general interests are preserved and perpetuated, "goodness." Perfect goodness is the disposition to secure the highest good of all to whom it can extend, in the exer-

cise of all the power and resources at command. In God therefore, perfect goodness must comprehend all worlds, all time, and the interests of all intelligent beings; and demands, therefore, the preservation of law, order and obedience, as the very pillar and ground of all happiness. "Justice and judgment" must constitute "the very foundation of God's throne," and it is only while God is "holy, just and true," in executing wrath as well as in distributing recompence and reward—that "mercy and truth can meet each other." "A God all mercy is a God unjust." "Vengeance belongeth unto God," as necessarily and as surely as goodness and mercy; for "God is known by the judgments which he executeth." And if man "must be just before he can be generous," and is otherwise prodigal, dishonorable, and dishonest, can we, without blasphemy, attribute a character which would imply weakness, imperfection and incapacity, to God, who "is perfect?" The fire that purifies must consume and destroy the dross, and therefore, as "a consuming fire, God must destroy all the workers of iniquity," and "cannot pass by transgression."

The contest, therefore, on the subject of capital punishment is, as we have said,—between atheism and theism,—between infidelity and inspiration,—between the Bible and the books of men,—between the wisdom of God and the wisdom of man,—between the moral constitution of man and the utterances of a "vain philosophy falsely so called,"—in fine, between the interests of society, as these depend on the favor, protection, and blessing of God, and the phantom day-dream of a feverish and sickly philanthropy, which promises happiness to the annihilation of the moral sense, the prostitution of man's spiritual nature, and the extinction of every moral affection. And the obligation of capital punishment "has therefore, been set up and urged upon grounds which, if universally adopted and acted upon, would demoralize the universe." Capital punishment is only one of the divinely permitted institutions of society, against which wicked and weak and misguided men have set themselves, and "taken counsel together," "saying, let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." But "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision," and when all their cob-web theories shall have been spun and swept away by

the besom of destruction, "the counsel of the Lord shall stand sure," nor shall "one jot or tittle of it fail."

As our object, in this article, is a practical one, we will draw three inferences from the discussion, before we close: one which may be termed political; one which may be termed doctrinal; and one which may be denominated practical.

And, *first*, the bearing of this subject on the social and civil interests of men is very evident and very important.

If civil government is the ordinance of God, instituted for the temporal peace and prosperity of men; if God has founded it on principles analogous to His own moral government; if it is, therefore, apparent that a nation can only be exalted when it is established upon the principles of righteousness;—and if one of these principles which God has most expressly enunciated is that he who wilfully takes away man's life shall have his own life taken away by man;—and if, to secure the enforcement of this righteous penalty, God has put into the hands of the courts and officers of justice "*the sword*," (that is, the power and the means of inflicting death);—and if God requires that every citizen shall submit to this authority, and dread the execution of this awful penalty, seeing that they "bear not the sword in vain, but are ministers of God and revengers to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil"—if, we say all this is true—clearly and indisputably true—then does it as certainly follow that the moral welfare and prosperity of every community depend upon the certain, speedy, impartial, universal, and inexorable infliction of the punishment of death upon every murderer. And to allow therefore, any murderers to escape, because of color, sex, or station, or any murder to go unpunished, because it was committed under the excitement of ambition, politics, or revenge, or in the form of that most anarchical, savage, and demoralizing of all possible modes of murder, (and this just because it is so cool and purposed in its thirst for blood,)—we mean murder by duel—to pass by any such offenders, for any such offences, is, we say, to call down upon the community, in some form of terrible retribution, the sure vengeance of God, who can "turn a fruitful land into barrenness, for the wickedness of them that dwell therein," and who "will require the blood of every murdered man

at the hand of man—at the hands of every man's brother, for in the image of God made He man.”

“In the corrupted currents of this world,
Offence's gilded hand may shove by justice;
And oft 't is seen the wicked prize, itself
Buys out the law. BUT 'T IS NOT SO ABOVE :
THERE is no shuffling; THERE the action lies
In its true nature, and we ourselves compell'd
Ev'n to the teeth and forehead of our faults,
To give in evidence.”

And how many cases of heart-rending murder are permitted to come upon us, because of the unrighteous and God-defying levity of our juries, courts, and above all, of our Governors, who abuse the prerogative entrusted to them for the protection of the innocent, to the encouragement of the guilty—God alone can tell. Many passages of scripture, however, lead us to fear that they may be but the retributive punishment of that God whose law has been dishonored, whose authority has been disregarded, and whose image has been trampled upon with impunity.

“Oh, it is a dreadful thing to leave innocent blood unavenged. It cries aloud to God from the earth. It will haunt the dwelling place of guilty rulers. It will bring down swift curses on the offending land. It will not be appeased until law and justice have free course, and the nation acquits herself by the death of the murderer.” “Who-so sheddeth man's blood, by *man* shall *his* blood be shed.” “Thine eye shall not pity him, but thou shalt put away the guilt of innocent blood from Israel, that it may go well with thee.” The temple of liberty, the very altar of God must not shield him, from the just retribution. God requires the blood of the innocent at the hand of society; and though we may refuse to answer the demand, though we may leave the innocent unprotected, unavenged, yet WHEN HE MAKETH INQUISITION FOR BLOOD, HE WILL REMEMBER THEM!

Our second inference is a doctrinal one. In this law of all human societies we have a forcible and standing illustration of the universal law of God's moral government that “without shedding of blood there is”—that is, there can be—“no remission of sins,” and that every capital offence—as a sin which aims at the authority and power of

the Almighty Ruler—is, and must be visited with death. Physical death, that is, the destruction of the living frame, is the greatest of all penalties, and must therefore be visited upon murder, which is the greatest of all possible crimes against a fellow-man.

In like manner, ungodliness, unbelief, enmity, hatred, opposition, indifference and contempt of God, his authority and his law, these are the greatest of all possible crimes against God and against his universal dominion. "THE SOUL that sinneth," therefore, "IT also shall die," for "the wages of sin is death." And hence, that it may be possible for the *soul* to die—that is, to suffer spiritual and "everlasting destruction," in its separate and spiritual capacity—"there is a judgment after death," and a "second death" after the first death of the body.

Now of this final, fearful and everlasting death of every guilty and impenitent soul, "on which the wrath of God must abide forever,"—the death of the body is an awful type, emblem, and evidence. "Fear not, therefore,"—to repeat a passage already quoted — "them who kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do, but fear Him who can cast both body and soul into hell forever. Yea, I say unto you, fear Him." And of this typical nature of this punishment, our Saviour affords us an express declaration, in the parable of the husbandmen, to which also reference has been made—the propriety and certainty of a miserable death in this world, as the punishment of their murderous deeds, being made to shadow forth the equally certain and awful death to be visited upon the ungodly, in the world to come.

Death is God's curse, and the consequence of "sin, by which it came upon all men, because that all have sinned." And as the whole nature of man was involved in sin, so is it in the penalty, and hence as the "body returns to the dust" in corruption, dishonor and decay, so "the soul that sinneth, *it*" also "shall die," and be forever deprived of spiritual life, light, and glory. This is that "wrath" which will be revealed in "the day of wrath." This is that "righteous judgment of God"—that "tribulation and anguish," from which Christ came to save. In Christ's nature and Christ's work, therefore, we have the true exposition of God's character and of God's deep, abiding, and in-

finite abhorrence of sin. In the Godhead and Divinity of the Saviour we see the infinite guilt and heinousness of that "sin of the world," from which He came to "save;"—in the nature of Christ's sufferings and death we see the true character of the death due to sinners;—and in the inexorable justice with which the "uttermost farthing" was exacted from Christ we see the immutable nature of that "everlasting death" to which every sinner is exposed.

The penal infliction of death is thus shewn to be a type and evidence of God's universal law, and of His holy, just, and avenging character; and while it fills us with awe and dread of incurring its execution upon our bodies, it calls upon all, as with a voice of thunder, to flee from that wrath to come, of which it is an earnest and a monitor, and which will be inflicted upon "every soul that doeth evil."

The *third* and last inference we deduce is of a practical nature, which our readers will permit us to present.

Since, as has been shewn, the law of capital punishment is so plainly and incontrovertibly the law of God, let all the pleas which our weak sympathies would urge against the apparent severity of the punishment, give place to the decision and the judgment of Him who is too wise to err, too good to be unkind; too omniscient to be deceived; and too omnipotent in His resources to resort to any needless or avoidable severity. His "judgments we are sure are according to truth against them who commit such things." He cannot be actuated by revenge or malice, and does not "willingly afflict" or punish "the children of men." And hence we may be sure that any feelings which would shrink from the most perfect commendation of God's penal threatenings, are the result of our weak and selfish imperfection, and that any reasonings which would lead to the condemnation of such threatenings are founded upon our inability to realize the true nature, and bearing of sin and crime, and from the secret partiality and favor with which "our desperately wicked hearts" regard iniquity. The language of every truly upright and right-minded soul will be that of the inspired Psalmist—"Come and see the works of the Lord, how terrible are His doings to the children of men."—"Thou puttest away all the wicked of the earth, like dross; therefore I love thy testimonies. My flesh trembleth for fear of thee: and I am afraid of thy judgments." (Ps. 119: 119, 120.)

This is made manifest in the result of such feelings when they are cherished by a false or corrupt religion—a religion severe only so far as it bears on the interests of a hierarchy, but lenient and accommodating so far as the honor of God and the corrupt desires of man are concerned. Of this, proof might be drawn from the whole of papal Europe and the superstitious regions of the East. We will only, however, adduce the following illustration, from a recent tourist in Portugal, as given in the Protestant Quarterly Review :

“It is considered that the Portuguese, as a nation, are a full century behind most of the other European countries. I had not been long in Lisbon, when I felt, more than ever I had done before, the privilege of having been born and educated in a Protestant country.

“In my long morning rides to the aqueduct and the beautiful valley of Alcentra, I was in the habit of passing many of those mementos of assassination, so frequently met with in the streets and suburbs of Lisbon. I allude to the sign of a cross, made of wood, or carved in stone, which is usually placed on the side of a house, wall, or tree, whenever an immortal soul has been hurried into eternity by the hand of the assassin.

“It is impossible to pass a cross of this kind without a shudder, and a glance of inquiry in the mind as to *when* or *why* the deed was done. But the murderer is generally sheltered by the populace; it is rarely that he is brought to justice. ‘Poor fellow, let him go!’ is the usual cry, and the crowd make way for the assassin, bestowing their pity on him, instead of on the object of his revenge.

“I heard an anecdote of a married couple, who had lived together for some time very unhappily. The husband at last attempted to murder the wife; and she escaped to her own friends, who took up the cause, and the man was put in prison. It is customary for justice to yield to mercy, whenever the injured party intercedes for the aggressor. The husband’s relatives, therefore, came and implored the wife to exert her prerogative, and beg the life of her husband. She seemed resolved he should die, and it was long before she would listen to any proposal for releasing him. Her relations at last joined her husband’s, and made the same request; when, overpowered by their united entrea-

ties, she consented to implore his release. The next attempt made by their united families was to persuade the wife to return to her husband's house; and she at length yielded to their solicitations and his promises of future kindness, and a day was fixed for her return. The husband, attended by his relations, and the wife by hers, met at an appointed place. The sight of her husband revived affection in her bosom, and she rushed forward to his arms. 'Take that,' said he, in a tone of savage revenge, and she sank on the ground, whilst the dagger he had plunged into her breast gave the death blow. No attempt was made by any of the attendants to secure the murderer. 'Poor fellow, let him go!' was the only observation; whilst a way was opened to facilitate his flight.

"This want of moral feeling is not to be wondered at, where the Word of God is so hid, that the true light never shineth, and where 'men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil.'"

But let us come still nearer home, in this practical improvement. Let us look into our own hearts, and see what is there. "As it is written there is none righteous, no, not one: Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: Their feet are swift to shed blood: Destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known: There is no fear of God before their eyes." (Rom. 3: 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.)

Such is the telescopic view given by the word of God of every human heart. And when, therefore, you read of, or behold the murderer with horror and a sense of righteous vengeance—ask yourself "who maketh me to differ?" and let your answer be that of good Bishop Hooper, in such circumstances: "There goes John Hooper, but for the grace of God." Oh, how few, to use the words of the immortal Howard, in his work on Prisons, how few are sensible of the favor of Providence which distinguishes them from the sufferers. And as to criminality, it is possible that a man who has often shuddered at hearing the account of a murder, may, on a sudden temptation, commit that very crime. Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall, and commiserate those that are fallen.

Ah yes, grace divine, free and transforming, can alone chain the tiger of man's blood-thirsty revenge;—tame the fury of his lion pride;—

“For passions in the human frame
Oft put the lion's rage to shame;”

or restrain the sudden bolts of his lightning passions. And the recent case of a duke slaughtering an innocent and helpless wife, and the every day accounts of similar enormities, prove to awful demonstration that every man is a Hazael, who, in his cooler judgment, would resent and abhor crimes which, under the excitement of passion and the corruptions of a selfish, self-willed heart, he will be found ready to plan, to prosecute, and to perpetrate.

“For jealousy by dark intrigue
With sordid avarice in league,
Will practice with their bowl and knife,
Against their harmless victim's life.”

He only who is kept by God is kept from open and from deadly sin.

ARTICLE II.

Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jews, from the Church of Scotland, in 1839. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1845.

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, convened May, 1838, in the city of Edinburgh, had its attention called to the subject of missionary effort among the Jews, through sixteen different overtures from various Presbyteries and Synods. The result was the appointment by the Assembly of a very large Committee, *ad interim*, with various instructions: among others, to collect information respecting the Jews, the world over, and to inquire what openings could be found for the establishment of missions. This Committee wisely thought the most ready and efficient

mode of executing their trust was to send forth a deputation who should travel extensively, and ascertain, by actual contact, the true condition of this scattered race. The men chosen for this imposing embassy were Rev. Drs. Black and Keith, with Rev. Messrs. McCheyne and Bonar: to whom was added, also, Robert Woodrow, Esq., great grandson of the historian of that name; whose memorial on this subject, laid before the Presbytery of Glasgow, gave the first impulse to this remarkable revival of interest on behalf of the Jews, and was, in fact, the inception of the whole enterprize. Mr. Woodrow being prevented by ill health, the four first named gentlemen went forth to convey the salutations of the church of Christ to the wayward and wandering exiles of Judah. The work before us is the result of their travels, accomplished in 1839, through various countries in Europe and Asia, and embodies the information they were sent forth to glean.

It is small praise, but entirely just, to say we have read every line of this Narrative with the utmost avidity. The intense interest felt by every intelligent and thoughtful Christian, in this ancient people of the Covenant, is of course concentrated upon a book written expressly to illustrate their present condition and their future prospects. But, in addition to the interest which inheres in the subject, the volume itself is evidently written in the spirit which we may suppose to have possessed old Simeon and Anna the prophetess, while they "waited for the consolation of Israel." The familiar acquaintance displayed with the fulfilled predictions of the Old Testament, the facility with which these predictions are identified with the localities visited, the passionate sympathy constantly escaping, for the scattered remnant of Israel; the ardor and hopefulness with which their future history, as delineated in prophecy, is contemplated; and, above all, the fervent piety and personal devotion breathing throughout the work, refresh the reader on every page, and exhilarate him to the very close. Indeed it was not until we had put away the volume, that we became fully conscious of a feeling of disappointment, which had been vaguely gaining upon us as we drew towards the end. If there be blame in this, we are willing to share it with those to whom this book owes its parentage. We sat down to its perusal with expecta-

tions which our subsequent reading has convinced us were extravagant: for, however it may impeach our credit with the reader, candor compels the confession that no work has ever satisfied the inquiries suggested by the condition of this singular people. It is difficult to cull a satisfactory history from the undigested mass of Rabbinical tradition, stowed away in the voluminous work of Basnage. Legend and fact are so intermingled that the wearied attention gives way in the effort to balance the account between credulity and scepticism. The more entertaining, but more superficial work of Milman, gives only a bird's eye view of the race, during eighteen centuries. So far from being occupied with any philosophical views, the reader finds himself pressed to keep pace with the historian, in the bare march of the narrative. With magical rapidity, he is hurried from point to point: for a moment set down by the sea of Tiberias, to witness the growing spiritual power of the Patriarchate—then suddenly transported to Babylonia, he stands confounded before the glittering splendor of the Prince of the Captivity. With another motion of the wand, he speeds through Europe, wondering at the alternate exaltation and depression of this remarkable race. Yet in these, as well as in the less formal histories of the Jews, there is no satisfactory account of the great dispersion after the destruction of Jerusalem. We go back to the days of Adrian, and see Judea suddenly emptied of her inhabitants, and these shortly reappearing, in the fulfilment of God's published decree, in every nation and country upon the globe. But the wide chasm between the annihilation of their national estate and their reappearance on every spot of earth, as victims to the pride, cruelty, and avarice of their fellow-men, no history which we have seen, undertakes to supply. Perhaps it is one of the essential conditions of their painful destiny, bound upon them by the purpose of God, that a connected national history cannot be written. From the moment that Titus, and afterwards Adrian, shattered their political state, their history, as was fabled of the mysterious river of Africa, disappears under ground. After an interval it rises once more to the surface, and the Jews are found diffused in cohesive masses over the globe. Yet henceforth whatever is known of them has been disinterred from the histories of other nations, by whom they

have been overlaid. The elaborate work of Jost, doubly valuable, as the work of a German and a Jew, unfortunately for the writer, is locked up in the hieroglyph of an unknown language: and it is only of late that the promise of an enterprising American firm has lighted up the hope of reading it in our vernacular. It was, then, with no little eagerness, we laid hold of the volume placed at the head of this article, which was brought within reach by the Board of Publication. The familiar name of Dr. Keith, long associated with the fulfilled prophecy of which the Jew is the subject, secured a sufficient guarantee that the work would contain some traces of true Christian philosophy. We hoped to find here the long desired nexus between the ancient and the modern history of Judaism, if not historically developed, at least incidentally suggested. We expected confidently to find that truthful analysis of Jewish character which so close an inspection of this people in every variety of situation would enable the Deputation to afford. A full drawn and accurate portraiture of the race, combining their varying features into one national likeness, would have satisfied at least the second demand of our imperious curiosity. In these respects we have been disappointed. We have not even that close statistical information respecting this dispersed nation, which we had supposed it the great design of the book to impart. We have indeed enjoyed a charming pilgrimage, with very pious and choice companions, to the land of pilgrimages: we have derived much information concerning an interesting people, and a little biblical knowledge from the interpretations put upon some portions of the word of God. But, as a *vade mecum*—as a complete directory to the Jewish quarters of the globe, after making due allowance for their fragmentary existence—it is as unsatisfactory as the works of which it was expected to be the supplement.

We have no desire, however, to criticise a volume which has afforded, in the perusal, both profit and pleasure. Indeed it has been so long in the hands of those who will read this article, that such a critique would be supererogatory. It affords, however, a text from which we may pleasantly discourse concerning a people who, above all others, have been, except in times of eclipse, before the eye of history, ever since it was chosen, in the days of Abraham, to

bear upon its bosom the immortal Church of God. We propose, then, to enter upon an examination of the fixed character of the Jew, both intellectual and moral : and to penetrate, if we may, the causes which have stereotyped it in its present mould.

The most obvious trait of the Hebrew character is, to employ a term of natural science in a metaphysical sense, *its almost superhuman tenacity*. The test to which this trait has been submitted, all will grant, both for severity and continuance, to be sufficient. During eighteen centuries they have been "emptied from vessel to vessel," yet the race stands before us, without material loss, admixture, or change; according to the prophecy of Amos, "I will sift the house of Israel among all the nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve; yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth." Our first surprise is, when the mine exploded which Providence had laid beneath the Jewish commonwealth, and which threw it in a thousand fragments over the globe, that these, in their disjointed condition, did not at once homologate with the various nations among whom they fell. Their nationality seemed hopelessly destroyed: the collected mass, whom the annual feast had called together in the Holy City, presented to the Roman the one neck of the nation, on which his victorious heel was pressed. The vast numbers slain in siege and swept into slavery, too plainly showed the opened arteries through which the national life was bleeding out. The Temple, the very type of their religion, was burnt with unholy fire, and its smouldering ruins blackened the sacred height of which it had so long been the crown of glory. Yet while the nation is destroyed, the Jew is not. Each individual of this now scattered race is suddenly found to possess the essential characteristics of the organized whole: though disjointed and broken in hopes, each fragment preserves entire the national character. But the wonder ceases not here: indeed we have just opened a volume of wonders. More than a thousand years of dispersion have been accomplished, still the Jew preserves his identity. In all countries they live: lining the coasts of Africa and the shores of the Mediterranean; penetrating the heart of Asia; lying in the bosom of Europe, and stretching over the whole continent of America, yet everywhere unique and intense-

ly individual. They find no people to whom they will assimilate, no country which they will adopt. All lands afford them only a pilgrimage, for their hearts are away upon the bleak mountains of Judea, whose soil God seems to have cursed, as well as its inhabitants. Driven by the persecutions of men, they wander, like their own scapegoat, in a wilderness; but discover no political fortunes, for which they are willing to exchange their heritage of sorrow. Riven and shattered by an adverse Providence, their adamant may be ground to dust, yet is infusible by adversity, insoluble in prosperity; clothed with honors or racked with tortures, they are neither softened by the one, nor subdued by the other, into apostasy. Among Christians and among heretics—among the worshippers of fire and the followers of the Arabian impostor—the Israelite preserves his faith, for the most part, without abatement and without soil. In all regions and in all situations, he is the proudest monument of human constancy the world has ever seen. Patriotic, yet without country or charter, without king or commonwealth. Religious, yet without altar or victim, without temple or priest—a fraternity whose bonds, though secret, are yet indissoluble. Though wandering to either pole, the sun himself not more regularly turns at the tropics, than do the weary steps of the Jew, whom age is overtaking, to Zion, as his resting place. Even in death his soul blesses the land which denies him a grave.

Yet this inflexibility did not always form the most prominent characteristic of the Hebrews. In this regard, they differ not more from those nations who have been absorbed into others, than from *themselves* during their whole novitiate as an independent people. Indeed we venture to affirm, that no one trait more clearly attached to them, prior to the Babylonish Captivity, than extreme facility of temper and slavish assimilation to others. It could hardly have been otherwise, without a suspension of those moral causes which are known to operate with sublime yet silent uniformity. While they were outgrowing the narrow limits of a family, and expanding into those of a nation, the gloomy interval was spent in galling servitude. What else can be looked for but the "obedientia fracti animi," and when suddenly emancipated by the power of God, we expect, what we find, a wayward people and impatient of re-

straint. The first lesson to be learned was that of self-control, which is the basis of all true independence. The want of this provoked their frequent murmurs in the wilderness, and caused the extermination of that generation, as unfit materials of which to form a free people. Their idolatrous worship of the calf, at the foot of Horeb, was only after the manner of Egypt: and their restive insubordination under the Judges, was explained by themselves: "Now make us a king to judge us, *like all the nations.*" They cohered and preserved their unity during this whole period and throughout the reigns of the first kings, not by any inherent energy of national character, but by the pressure of those wars which the conquest and possession of Canaan imposed. It is even doubtful if the profound peace of Solomon's reign would not have too severely tested the confederation of the tribes, had not some great national work, as the building of the temple, cemented them in purpose and labor—upon the same principle that the immense pyramids of Egypt, and the hanging gardens of Babylon, probably worked off the dangerous and untamed energy of those who could not be managed, unless they were diverted. We know that as soon as occasion served they manifested, to say the least, a want of nationality, (for in what can a people ever be national, if not in its religion,) in borrowing the idolatries around them. Then came the seventy years' captivity in Assyria, which was, in truth, the closing act of a long course of discipline, by which God was preparing the national character of the Hebrews, giving that compactness and inflexibility which adapted them for the destiny they have since fulfilled. They came forth from Babylon that perfect crystal, which, however rudely tossed over the world, has never lost its colour or its form.

How then was this extraordinary tenacity superinduced? For, however we may recognize in their case the operations of a supernatural Providence, yet, doubtless, they are, as much as others, the subjects of ordinary investigation, tracing out the influences by which they have been moulded. To this inquiry it is obvious to reply, that their first school was that of affliction, and their first lesson was that of endurance. During the first two centuries of their sojourn in Egypt, they were but tolerated *as aliens*, while during the latter two, they groaned under intolerable bon-

dage, *as slaves*. Even their investiture with empire and freedom was performed with ceremonies of war and blood. A gloomy eclipse of nearly one century of banishment darkened the day of their highest prosperity; and the wars of the Maccabees fill up the melancholy chasm in their history which lies between the two Testaments. Remarkably were they disciplined for their destiny—taught endurance which should exhaust the constancy of tyrants, and patience unfathomed even by the inventions of cruelty. A nation which had been nourished in prosperous independence could not have survived the catastrophe which Titus inflicted upon Judea. They would have immolated themselves upon the advancing spears of the enemy, or yielding to their fate, would have been absorbed by the conquerors. But these were trained to *endure*: the result is, they live yet, though, for eighteen centuries, broken upon the wheel.

It is worthy of note, also, how God anticipated the danger of fusion and commixture, at the two most critical periods of their history—the Captivity in Babylon, and the expulsion of the race from their own soil, by a Roman edict. In the first case, besides that the period was too short to obliterate the characteristics of any people, the nation was removed in mass, and thus preserved its integrity. In the second case, their first expatriation by Nebuchadnezzar, while it answered the high ends of discipline and correction for past sins, prepared the way for the future dispersion, under the Romans. For when the nation was restored, by the favorable decree of Cyrus, a large portion being comfortably settled, preferred their new homes to another removal. These will account for those Jewish colonies, scattered, in the times of the Apostles, throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Pamphylia—among Parthians, Medes and Elamites, Cretes, and Arabians. Just so long as the Jewish commonwealth subsisted, these colonies drew life and nutriment from the parent land, and by means of constant intercourse with it, were preserved from absorption. When this was destroyed, each of these was a nucleus, around which the flying members of the old theocracy were gathered. Like magnetic points, they attracted the scattered particles of the original state; became nursing mothers in their turn, and supplied the national feeling to those who, as individuals, must have been speedily absorb-

ed. We are far from denying the special agency of God, in preserving from utter extinction those who had yet a destiny to fulfil; but in no other way can we explain the instrumental preservation of the Jewish nation, when its organism was destroyed, and it was destitute even of "a local habitation and a name."

Another cause which contributed to engender this tenacity of character, was their singular seclusion from other nations, for successive generations. Even the families from which, as from a seed, they sprung, were, in the providence of God, sifted from the tribes in which they dwelt. In Egypt they lived apart in the land of Goshen,—as slaves, they were, of course, a degraded caste; and throughout the whole period of their independence, they were, by commandment, an exclusive race. Addicted to the culture of the soil, they lived in almost patriarchal simplicity. Commerce with foreign nations they had none—their whole traffic being internal, between the tribes. In this seclusion these points of contact which foreign intercourse begets, were worn away. Having few affinities with others, and these becoming daily less, it became finally difficult to intermingle. In the lapse of time, and under the influence of habit, the Hebrew became a petrification: the features were living, yet they were features of stone. In addition to this, the Mosaic institutions, while they hedged them in from correspondence abroad, drove them into the closest association at home. Three annual feasts, for example, rallied the whole population around the great altar at Jerusalem; which feasts, though doubtless appointed for higher, because spiritual ends—yet, subordinately, exerted the same political influence in cementing the nation, as the celebrated games and mysteries of Greece. The people became homogeneous, not merely by the exclusion of foreign elements, but also by this felicitous community of thought and feeling, sentiment and worship. The inhabitants of Palestine, no longer individuated, were driven into each other, the atoms agglomerated into the mass: and the character thus formed became, under the compression of fifteen centuries, sufficiently compact to resist the violence of as many centuries of dispersion.

But these two causes, operative as they may be, dwindle into nothing before another, which we can only trust our-

selves to suggest. Should we cross its border, and venture to expand the widening theme, our discursive pen would not soon travel back to the present record. We allude to the direct influence of their religious belief. It is no dogma of divinity, but the candid testimony of true philosophy, that the religious element underlies the whole constitution of man. Our relations to God are strictly original—preceding every other, both in the order of time and of thought. Hence, in the enlarged etymological sense of the word, we are *religious beings*: and whatever commands us here, commands us wholly. What people ever became great and noble, which was destitute of a strong religious feeling, even though it were corrupt? How happens it that this apostate world of ours, clinging ever to a false faith, has never tasted the joys of lasting and universal peace? And whence comes it, that only in the path which true religion has trodden, are strewn the blessings of a true civilization? Let the reader ponder well these questions; for they wrap up the great problem of human liberty and human happiness, the practical solution of which will work out this earth's millenium.

The proud distinction of the Jewish people is, that for fifteen hundred years they were chosen to be the depository of God's revealed truth. The Ark of the Covenant, locked up in its sacred secrecy the true knowledge of God, and the only true hope of man's redemption. While idolatry, in its varied forms, enfolded the earth, striving to pervert what it could not obliterate, the idea of God, to the Israelite was disclosed the true secret concerning Him, that he is a Spirit. The independence and all-sufficiency of this august Being, the holiness of his nature, and the inflexible purity of his law, were prime articles of the Jewish faith. But that which formed its very soul, and placed it immeasurably above all the "elegant mythology" of paganism, was the doctrine of atonement and sacrifice. That God could be "a just God and a Saviour:" that a Divine Redeemer could take away sin, by the sacrifice of himself; that the human soul could be cleansed from its defilement, by the baptism of the Holy Ghost; all, in short, that goes to make up a scheme of salvation, and to inscribe hope upon the immortality of a sinner, breaking the long entail of woe with which God's curse had burdened it—these were

the doctrines which made the Jew's a living faith, and distinguished it from the superstitions of a world lying in its wickedness. These Divine thoughts, undiscoverable by the closest analysis of nature, or by the widest induction of reason, were let down into the Jewish mind by exceedingly transparent signs and types, which, through their elegant drapery, disclosed the truth they half concealed. That whole economy was the splendid symbol of a spiritual faith, illustrating to the imagination and the reason, to the understanding and the heart, the glorious mysteries of Divine grace, and its gorgeous ritual was but the shrine of a spiritual worship. It is indeed true, that as a spiritual system, it controlled the lives and affections of few out of the great mass. There was the same distinction, unquestionably, in the ancient, as in the modern church, between the true and the nominal worshipper. Not all Israel, but the election only, recognized in the numerous sacrifices of the Levitical law, "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," the rest were blinded, and bowed before the form. But the few—the spirit-taught election—the Israel of Israel—these broke the shell of outward forms, and fed upon the spiritual truth lying hid under the cover of types and symbols. Yet there was a mysterious connection between these truths and their national existence, which wrought them, not as spiritual realities, whose Divine power was felt, but as political and national ideas, into the very spine of Jewish character. It was plain that the nation was only an envelope for the church; the mere shell or rind thrown around it for temporary protection, afterward to be thrown off by its development. It was to keep alive in the world the knowledge of God, the unity and spirituality of his essence, and to lay out before men a plan of redemption, that God gave to this people a corporate existence. It was for this, he formed that covenant with Abraham, which they ever claimed as their national charter; it was for this, they possessed the land from which the Canaanites were ejected—and this was the clue to that whole supernatural providence which formed a part of their history. All the glory of the Theocracy centred upon these truths; which, of necessity, became interwoven with all their recollections of the past, associations of the present, and anticipations of the future. The entire texture of their thoughts and feelings

was woven from these threads. Their religious belief was not something distinct from, and yet attached to them. It was a part of their individuality, and constituted the fabric, warp and woof, of their nationality. It is easy to see the result of all this: it made the Jew, wherever he might go, *a dissenter*. During the subsistence of the Theocracy, he could not conform to any existing superstition, without being chargeable with the "*crimen læsæ magistatis*:" and after the subversion of their empire, to disown Judaism was more than to change one faith for another: it was to divest himself of all character, and tear to shreds the whole principles, associations, and emotions of his life.

The rise of Rabbinism, and the uncontrolled ascendancy it has for ages maintained over the Jewish intellect, signalily illustrate the strength of the religious element, as it enters into a nation's character, and the facility with which it will create for itself an organization, for the diffusion and perpetuation of its influence. We refer to it, also, as an illustration of the striking providence of God over this people, and of the methods he has adopted to preserve them through a dispersion of near two thousand years. It is the strangest of all the wonders connected with their marvelous history, that a system of worship so strictly local, so tied to one place and form, should yet be maintained by them, scattered as they are over the globe. If ever there was a system destitute of elasticity, this would seem to be it. Jerusalem was more the spiritual than the political metropolis of Judea: to the temple the nation must repair and celebrate the mysteries of their religion within its sacred precincts. Yet observe how God accommodated even this inflexible system, bending it to the severe fortunes of its followers. At the Captivity in Babylon the magnificent temple of Solomon was destroyed: true, a second was built; but far inferior in splendor, and devoid of those precious associations which clustered around the former, which was the proud monument of their golden age. The sacerdotal tribe of Levi, too, was blotted out; for they were among the tribes of whom history gives no account, beyond their removal from Palestine by Shalmanezar. These returned, indeed, in sufficient numbers to supply the different courses of the temple service, until the end of that dispensation: yet, as an independent and brilliant order, living in their

own cities, the interpreters of the law throughout the land, and ramifying the temple influence to its very extremities, they were no longer found. More than this: the planting of synagogues over the whole territory of Judea opened, besides the temple, a new supply of religious feeling, and new rallying points of religious sympathy. A new class of doctors or teachers sprang up around these, supplanting the old Levitical order, as instructors of the people. Even in the time of our Saviour this new order of things was well developed. The Pharisee already existed, the archetype of the Jew of all after time; and the scribes and doctors of the law, the true founders of the Rabbinical dominion. Here then was a system quietly gaining upon the old established order, ever since the restoration from Babylon; and one precisely adapted to the exigencies of the great dispersion. Had the temple been the only centre of religious worship to Israel, and the Levitical priests, confined to the temple, the only feeders of the public religious feeling, Judaism must have been swept away in the same flood which overwhelmed Jerusalem and the temple. But when these were destroyed, the synagogue quietly reared its head wherever ten Jews could be found, equally the church of the adult and the school of the child. The Rabbi, less restricted than the Levite, could survive where the other was overthrown. Accordingly we find, as soon as the nation could recover from the stunning blow which shattered their state, their religious feeling creating for itself a spiritual head in the Patriarchate of Tiberias; and the Eastern Jews opening a new centre of unity, chiefly religious, at Babylon.

It is, too, a significant fact, that this spiritual monarchy subsisted just long enough to adjust and to perfect the influence of Rabbinism. The two Talmuds digested at Tiberias and at Babylon became the ecclesiastical canons by which the people lived and were regulated—and these, from the multiplicity and obscurity of their points, called for the constant exposition of the living teacher. Indeed, it was the religious belief of the Jews that offered the first rallying point to the nation, when deprived of its independence; which being soon digested into a system, touched upon every point of human life, from the cradle to the grave; and, like a fine net-work thrown around the most widely scattered of the race, made them one and insepara-

ble. It is easy to infer from the whole, what influence it exerted upon Jewish character, in giving to it the remarkable tenacity we discover.

The second trait which commands our notice, is nearly allied to that already discussed, and may partly be accounted for upon the same principles. It is that *singular elasticity of constitution* which enables the Jew, upon the removal of any superincumbent pressure, at once to spring back to his original position. Instances of this will crowd upon the reader's memory. It is estimated that no fewer than a million and a half of the inhabitants of Judea were swept away in the wars of Vespasian and Titus; a blow, one would think, sufficient to annihilate a country, not larger in extent than perhaps the State of South Carolina. At any rate, we are unprepared for the next record which history makes—that in little more than half a century, this miserable land was able to offer up five hundred and eighty thousand men, slain in battle and siege by the power of Rome a second time drawn forth. Yet, notwithstanding the exhaustion of two such exterminating conflicts, and while we are pitying the land thus twice trodden down by the iron heel of war, we see, in less than sixty years, this race rising above all, and living as an organized community, amenable to their patriarch.

This, occurring at the beginning of what may be called their modern history, is only the earnest of what they afterwards achieved. For example, expelled three times from the soil of France, (or, shall we say seven times, according to the showing of others,) in each case they leave their possessions to the spoiler, and ask for the interval of only one generation, when they are able, with a full price, to bargain for their deserted homesteads: if it be not a contradiction, to speak of *the homes* of those whose universal plaint has been

“The wild dove hath her nest—the fox his cave:
Mankind their country—Israel but the grave.”

Yet this is but a single leaf from their history, fruitful throughout in equally mournful illustrations of their buoyancy and fecundity. But it is needless to go into detail. Give them the hard conditions it has been their destiny to fulfil: give them time, but no place, to weave out the web

of life. Give them the centuries of pillage and extortion, of confiscation and banishment, the centuries of homeless wandering from land to land, which have passed over them, ever since, like the dove of Noah, they were thrust out upon the storm—and you come back, at last, upon a people who have outlived all who oppressed them—who rise, still, above the tread of these unfeeling centuries—to a people who have never known despair—elastic beyond the power of man to depress.

Are there now any causes in existence, to which this can be referred? We will not enter into the question of races, though that a difference does exist we fully believe. There is no call for speculations of this kind, as there are moral causes fully adequate to the demands of the case before us. The first we suggest is their splendid recollections of the past. It must be remembered that this nation took its rise in the purpose of God to plant his Church upon the earth. In a sense very peculiar, therefore, they claimed to be the Children of the Most High; their charter of privileges and rights was his own free covenant; their shield and defence was his supernatural protection; for them stupendous miracles were wrought; to them, through long generations, prophets were sent, inspired of God, to keep up his high communication with them; and they had, immediately from the lips of Jehovah, the most splendid dispensation of typical truth and ritual worship, that ever displayed its pomp to mortal eyes. Beyond all controversy, no other nation ever had so sublime an origin; and the recollections of the proudest are abashed, before those which the meanest member of the old Theocracy can at once command. Now, these very magnificent recollections have lent a peculiar inspiration to the Jew of every age. To yield to despondency, is to renounce, forever, his inheritance in the glory of his fathers—to be recreant at once to his country, to his ancestry, and to his God. In all their dispersion, they regard themselves as still under the broad protection of that covenant which shielded Abraham and David, Moses and Solomon. Is not God able to do for them as he did for those? Is his arm wearied by the miracles already wrought? But whether he deliver or no, the deeds of their fathers, the glory of that old Kingdom which owned the High God as its sovereign, and the whole line of light

which marks the course of their nation over the dark and turbid past—these are too dear to the Jew to be easily disowned; and they inspire him with all that heroism of patience which has been remarked. They imagine God their Father in the same high sense he was of old; but being angry with their many derelictions, he chastises them with stroke upon stroke—at last, they hope the purgatory will cease, and suffering give way to the most ample rewards. In some, this national vanity has risen to a still higher pitch, who fancy themselves the scapegoat of the world, bearing vicariously the punishment which is due to all mankind: “the running sore, giving vent to the peccant humors of the body,” the issue being the means of life. A melancholy smile is, for a moment, provoked, by this fanaticism of conceit; yet is soon chased away, by the unrelieved sadness which we feel in contemplating the sorrows which have engendered it. There is indeed a pathos in this attitude of the Hebrews, submitting with patience to the most cruel wrongs from man, regarding it as the cup which the Lord has mingled in the day of his anger, that always melts us down into deep-toned and tender sympathy. It is not strange, in this view, that the sufferings of ages has had the effect of welding this nation into a close, and, as they feel, a holy brotherhood. No tie binds man more closely to his fellow than fraternity in sorrow.

But if the past, with its venerable associations, exerts so energetic an influence, what shall we say of the future, with its brilliant anticipations? This is probably the principal cause of the elastic character of the Jew. Their government was Theocratic, judges and kings being alike the mere vicegerents of God, the visible representatives of his jurisdiction. This long succession of the princes of Judah they expected to terminate in the person of the Messiah, who should sit forever upon the throne of David. In his reign they hoped to enjoy universal dominion: all lands should pay them tribute, and a splendor little less than divine, should forever encompass them. Alas! for their blindness! the Christian may easily weep over this mixture of truth and falsehood, which they cherished. How utterly have they misunderstood the nature of Messiah's Kingdom! How have they confounded the two comings of the Son of Man—dropping out of view the first, and

misapprehending the second! How grievously have they failed in the interpretation of their own symbolic institutions, which point, without the variation of the needle, to Jesus of Nazareth! How blind, not to see that all the lines of ancient prophecy converge only upon the Man of Calvary! not to see that the dispensation of Moses shines only with a borrowed splendor—being only the morning beam of the dispensation of Christ! Such, however, is the case. They still wait for the first appearance of the Messiah, who will never come, except upon his second and final mission. This predominance of hopefulness, founded in delusion as it is, is the spring of all their energy, and makes them buoyant as the air.

But we pass on to consider, with more haste, the most painful feature in the national likeness of the Hebrews: *their incorrigible worldly-mindedness, and consecration to the service of Mammon.* Yet there is a recklessness often exhibited, by those who prefer this charge, which we would censure. The Jew is considered the mere synonyme of avarice and usury: the mention of his name calls up the image of a man, all whose better impulses have been swallowed up in the inordinate lust of gain. And this Shylock, in whose withered soul is found no spot of verdure, is set forth as the universal type of his race. But the fact that the Jew has been, by profession, a money broker, often exacting a rate of interest which neither reason nor conscience can justify, has been cast up to their reproach, by those who have not paused to consider how far the rest of the world has been accessory to this guilt. That in many instances, too, this extortion has been united with a genuine misanthropy, and has been turned to the account of private and national revenge, may also be readily admitted, without attributing extraordinary malignity to the character in which these distorted features are found. If, indeed, the Jew bows, with more than ordinary devotion, at the shrine of a golden god, it is for the observer to study the causes which have made him so blind a worshipper. Without going far into the discussion, there are two, which we would indicate: the first is that activity of mind and energy of purpose, from which the reader has just withdrawn his attention: the second is untiring persecution, which has made them the victims of traffic, and given to money

a factitious value, as the means of purchasing an occasional respite.

If it be true that this people look forward to a triumph, the splendor of which shall be the exact counterpart of their present humiliation; and if they feel all their energies summoned to keep themselves from extinction, until this time of triumph shall roll on, it is easy to account for the unquiet activity of their disposition. But in what direction shall this active energy expend itself? If they had possessed a soil of their own, they might soon have adjusted themselves to the duties which have filled up the energy of other races; they might have built cities, and founded empires; made war, and wasted their strength in conquering their foes: in a word, they might have done precisely what all the world beside has done, for six thousand years. But these employments were denied them. They might have devoted themselves to letters, as not a few of them did in Spain before their expulsion with the Moor. But study requires quiet and the stimulus afforded by honor and profit. What rest had any, in those days of feudal strife and Baronial warfare, save the lazy monks, shut up in their cloisters, throughout papal Europe? Who, but idle ecclesiastics could be devoted to literature, in those ages of Gothic invasion, Saracenic inundations, and Religious Crusades? And, above all, what rest had these wandering Jews, who scarcely rested their weary feet upon one soil, before they were driven, with violence, to another; who have always lived, even where most stationary, like their forefathers at the Passover, with girded loins and sandalled feet, staff in hand, eating the bitter herbs of rebuke and scorn? They might have become Pietists, and given to the world the sublime spectacle of a people whose energies were expended in the maintenance of spiritual religion. But for this, they were incompetent. It was not for those to be the expounders of Godliness, who had put to death the "Holy and Just One;" who had miserably dashed out the light from their own souls, with the blood of Him who was both the light and the life. It was not for those who picked up the rind of ceremonial observances, after the core was extracted—who bowed before forms, with superstitious reverence—to expound henceforth the spiritual to man. What could they do? They could not

die ; for the wide horizon shut within their view a brilliant, though distant future. They could not sleep away the dreary interval ; for even had the nations permitted it, this would have rusted them out, and unfitted them for their destiny. Perhaps, without reasoning upon it, they did just what Providence ordained, and circumstances enforced. The world was convulsed with wars and revolutions, and the military profession has ever been unfriendly to the mercantile. Yet, after all, the world cannot subsist without trade, and these were the people for it, during the world's dark ages. Without local ties, free to move every where, they became carriers for all the world, and bankers, and merchants — they supplied the warrior with his doublet and armor, and filled his purse, at an advance. Soon they found pleasure, in finding' scope for their activity, while the wealth accumulated proved a new source of enjoyment.

This brings us to the second cause mentioned above, the effect of unceasing persecution. If the disjointed condition of society, and the isolated position of the Jew, had not marked him out as the universal merchant of the past, the persecutions to which he has been subject must have driven him to seek his bread by traffic. Their wealth has usually been wrested from them as soon as acquired, and even the partial toleration occasionally enjoyed has been allowed them only to fill themselves, to be again squeezed. To vest it in any visible form, was only to hang out a sign to the harpies of plunder. What more natural than to seek employments, in which they could secrete their gains : hence the Jew became a professional money broker. To reveal his wealth, by loan, was to run the peril of confiscation : what but a large percentage would endemnify him for the risk incurred ? Hence the exaction of exorbitant interest. We do not absolve them from guilt. They were, equally with others, under the obligation of that law which commands us to love our neighbor as ourselves, and of that higher law which forbids us to love this present evil world. We do not acquit them ; but we fasten the charge of guilt upon those who have been accessory to their degradation. We affirm that all mankind have entered into a practical conspiracy against the Jew, to make him covetous, and a usurer. Let us beware how we throw the stone of rebuke at those whom we have conspired to debauch. If these

are low and sordid, let it be asked who they are that have thrown them into the ditch.

The last moral trait, which we will now consider, is *their comparative freedom from the gross vices of other races*. This may be best presented in the language of one of themselves, who thus writes: "as a people they eminently fulfil the duties of domestic life, are good citizens and obedient to the laws of every country in which their lot is cast. How many Jewish drunkards and beggars are seen in your streets: and ask your judges and your jailers how many convicts and criminals of Israel's faith occupy the dock or the prison?" This is a remarkable challenge, and facts eminently sustain it. Happy would it be for them, if we could ascribe it to the influence of a spiritual faith, or consider it the fruit of inward holiness. But alas, there is no holiness apart from faith in Him whom they have crucified and whom they continue to reject. This morality we consider the natural result of natural causes. It is owing, in part, to the circumstance of their being a small people, few in proportion to the rest of mankind, insulated and singularly discriminated by many outward marks from those among whom they dwell. The consequence is that whatever of moral sentiment exists in the whole body is brought to bear upon each individual. Fenced in by a class feeling, virtue is propagated among them by the mere force of this "*Esprit du corps*." If various vices abound among large bodies of men, it does not necessarily infer the want of virtue in the mass, but only that individuals are so swallowed up and lost in the mass that they are not reached by the existing virtue. We are strongly impressed with the conviction, that much of the boasted morality of the Jews, as well as of Unitarians, who by the way are near of kin, is due to the mere force of a class feeling and does not spring from any fountain of virtue within—and this is confirmed by the testimony of the deputation sent out by the Scotch church, that the Jews in Palestine, where they are less pressed upon by a surrounding and foreign society, are lower in morals than the Jews in Europe.

It may be caused, in part, too, by the instinctive feeling that all gross vices wear out their victims—and they are held in check by the all-controlling sentiment of the Jew,

that he lives *in* the present but *for* the future. The history of all vice, shows its exhausting nature: but in large communities of men, the waste is continually supplied, so that while the individuals die, the class remains: yet the exceeding disproportion of the vicious to the good prevents us from discovering the recruiting process as it is going forward. But in so select and circumscribed a community as the Jewish, this waste would speedily exhaust the whole: so that the instinct of national self-preservation, which is their strongest peculiarity, unreasoned perhaps, checks in them the natural tendency to gross outward vices by which other classes are debased.

But, principally, we would explain it by the predominance of covetousness, the master passion of the Jew, which like the lean kine of Pharaoh's dream has eaten up the others. Where one passion gains such ascendancy in the human heart, it usually, with tyrant jealousy, puts the rest to death—and perhaps it is psychologically true, as well as true in the sense originally intended, that “no man can serve two masters.” The love of gold, we know, has wretchedly rusted into the soul of the Jew, and may have eaten out many of the bad as well as good qualities of his nature. However, for the mere fact of outward virtue, in so far forth as it exists, let due credit be awarded—leaving it to the judgment of the great day to decide how far it is approved by Heaven.

Beguiled by the subject, we have lingered so long upon these moral traits as almost to cut ourselves off from the other section of their character, *the intellectual*. A few moments delay, however, will suffice to present together the two prominent traits of the Hebrew mind: its activity and its shallowness. Acute but superficial—these terms sum up the whole. It would be well, if we had space, to investigate the extravagant pretensions which have been put forth by Jewish partizans. It has been affirmed, for example, that no important movement takes place in Europe in which the Jew is not at the bottom. If this were true only of the diplomacy of European Courts, it may perhaps be entirely due to the money power, which in these days of comparative toleration they may wield—and to the singular concert with which in all their dispersion as a people, they have ever moved—so far as these pretensions have

been urged in connexion with letters and the arts, their labors have been precisely in those departments of art and science which do not demand a profound intellect, but merely a fine taste and an active understanding. Though at this moment in Germany, and centuries ago in Spain, many Jews have become Professors in Universities and have given themselves to learned pursuits, we have yet to discover the first substantive addition they have made to true and profound learning: and what is well worth remarking, the individual Jews who have distinguished themselves as men of knowledge or genius, are precisely the men who have emancipated themselves from the trammels of Judaism. A reference to Spinozo and Mendelsohn in the past, as well as to Neander in the present, will illustrate and confirm this statement. Indeed we are sure that a full examination of these high pretensions will show them to have always been in letters, as in trade, mere carriers. They can acquire and exchange the products of mind as well as of matter and realize a profit upon both. A just decision will assign them the subordinate position of commercialists only in the world of letters. They coin nothing; they may vamp up and dress into new shape some existing truth, but there is not depth of intellect sufficient to think out "ab ovo" what men "will not willingly let die." It is impossible that a Locke, a Newton, a Bacon, a Milton, or a Shakspeare could ever have been a Jew—or rather it is impossible that a Jew should ever be any one of these.

Yet, in affirming this, we cast no slight upon Jewish mind, as it inherently is; but only disparage it as it has been made to be by causes not difficult to trace. No man or class of men can trifle with truth without being visited with fearful retribution. Truth is the aliment which God has provided for the nourishment of the soul: whoever poisons that, sows wasting and woe upon this. If we sin against the laws of our physical being, we are sure to inherit an enfeebled and tortured frame. Equally must we suffer, and even more severely, if we sin against the laws which regulate our spiritual nature. If we stifle conscience, it becomes "seared as with a hot iron;" if we cherish guilty passions, we are consumed by them; if we quench those that are pure, the doom is a reprobate heart; if the understanding be employed in resisting truth, we are sealed

up to imbecility of intellect. This last is the sin which for nearly two thousand years the Jews have committed. They have gazed upon the light which emanated from the Shechinah of their own Tabernacle, which shines around the cross of Him they crucified, which is emitted from the whole line of christianity as it has tracked over the past; and the truth which should have illuminated them even to transparency has but struck them blind. The Scotch deputation, to whom reference has been made before, delivers a singular testimony upon this point; "one advantage of Talmudical knowledge is that it enables the person to argue by Talmudical logic, which is much shorter and more striking than scientific logic. Jews cannot follow a long argument. They do not feel the power of the syllogism: and on this account 'Leslie's short method' does not suit them." It is needless to comment upon this. The syllogism is not a particular species of reasoning, but it is reasoning itself with all the steps fully drawn out and artistically arranged. Not to understand the syllogism then, argues imbecility of reason. Precisely what we affirm, that long resistance of truth has so enfeebled the power of reason, that a profound race cannot be looked for here. Should this sentiment be deemed strange, that resistance of truth debauches the understanding, let it be enforced by a parallel case. Socinians, the world over, show an intellect that in each generation slips down the scale. Although it has been termed the heresy of the learned, there is not a heresy whose learning is more paltry. Pathos and Poetry, however masculine when they borrow it, soon degenerates into mawkish sentimentalism. Philosophy falls back from its native elegance into slipshod twaddle—and learning, no longer the stout texture woven from the truth, becomes a mere quilt-patching of other men's cast-off thoughts, the sowing of purple patches upon garments of serge. The real champions of this system have always been wretched apostates from the truth, who have at least this advantage, that their minds were trained in a better school. We take it upon us to say that this wretched negation, if it were not occasionally recruited by the vigor which apostates lend, if left to be propagated from its own kind, would soon die away from sheer imbecility.

The influence of Rabbinical studies, so long continued,

has been extensively injurious to Hebrew mind. The same process which has sharpened the ingenuity has emasculated the understanding. Consider how many ages have been employed by them, not in following truth into her most sacred adyta and being initiated in her profoundest mysteries, but in blinking the slender light which shone upon them and outfacing the evidence of the only truth in which they were interested, and it will not surprize us to find Jewish mind perversely sophistical. The dialectics of the Talmudists produced a race of sophists precisely similar to those whom the dialectics of the schoolmen produced in the Romish Church. The mind may, indeed, be very acute, but it must first be narrowed to a point, before it can be brought gravely to discuss how many angels can dance upon the point of a needle. In like manner, Jewish mind may be sharpened to a singular acuteness, but must be baled out and shallowed to emptiness by investigations which have no other object than to hang the greatest number of puerilities upon the horn of a Yodh.

This analysis of the character of the Jews has been made with the practical design of interesting the reader, and of inspiring a deep and prayerful regard for them. Avoiding on the one hand the unkind anathemas which for ages have been fulminated against them, and on the other hand that adulation of them which offends both against taste and truth, we have endeavoured without passion and without prejudice to render a true verdict. Let the reader, before closing these pages, consider the claims which this afflicted people have upon his most Christian regards. Small as the proportion is between them and the rest of the world, it is impossible that a thoughtful man can view them with any other than the highest interest. By just so much as the Bible is valued, will those be cared for to whom "the oracles of God" were first committed—and who in the singular providence of God have transmitted them with the most sacred fidelity, while yet they reject their testimony. By just so much as the church is esteemed with her precious ordinances, will that people ever draw upon our sympathy who were first embraced within her pale. Let it be impressed upon us, that in Judea first was the lamp of life hung out, which now flings its blessed rays athwart this dark and apostate world: that Moses and

all the Prophets, that all the holy Apostles, and even the son of David himself, were all of them blood and bone of this proscribed race.

But we are debtors to the Jew for another reason; we owe a large arrearage of Christian love, love commanded by our own religion, and which the past neglect of the Church has turned over upon us with an accumulated interest. True it is, they crucified the Son of Glory: but it is not our prerogative to draw the sword of vengeance. With dreadful impiety they imprecated Christ's blood upon their own and their childrens' heads, and bitterly has the curse fallen. Yet, Christian, let the dying words of the Crucified One, 'Father forgive them,' teach you to weep over the folly which God has so signally avenged. Alas, that for eighteen centuries, Christians who ascribe all their salvation to distinguishing grace, should stand as angry Cherubim with double flaming swords to drive away these of the Ancient Covenant, and bar their access to the tree of life. The Christian Church must atone for a long committed and grievous fault. Her deep sympathy, fervent prayers and painful labors, must attest the sincerity of her repentance for this sin against charity and God.

But more than all, the Church cannot be fully extended until these outcasts shall be embraced with the fold. Take what view we may please of the manner and time of this ingathering, "all Israel shall be saved," and with them "the fulness of the Gentiles." Now we may gather only the scattered elect out of every kingdom and tongue and people and nation: but *then* shall Christ receive the fulfilment of the Father's great promise, "I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."

Whoever then feels a lively sympathy with Christ in his present humiliation and prays to see Him Lord of the whole earth, must be ill instructed if he does not feel a corresponding anxiety for the salvation of the House of Israel. It is not improbable that God is now reserving this people for a distinguished service in the work of evangelizing the world. Their complete diffusion over the globe—their comparative isolation among men—the extraordinary enthusiasm and energy of their character, destined to be greater when it shall be toned by the truth—their very con-

version to Christianity after so many ages of unbelief—all adapt them for extraordinary labor in the Missionary service. Perhaps the future history of the Church will reveal many a son of Abraham with Abraham's faith, doing the work of Paul, "preaching the faith which once he destroyed." And the conversion of the Jews, accomplished in fulfilment of a hundred predictions, will probably be the grand fact argument by which the truth of Christianity, in the latter days, will be attested.

There is, likewise, much in the present aspect of this race to encourage the loftiest aspirations of the Christian heart as it yearns over them. The growing intercourse between Jews and Christians—the softening down of prejudice on either side—the relaxation of the fatal grasp of Rabbiniism upon Jewish mind—the desire of general knowledge spreading among them—the missions undertaken specially for their Christianization—and the numbers of proselytes already made, all foreshadow the great event which is to freshen the stream of evidence flowing from fulfilled prophecy. When it shall please God to "pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and of supplications; when they shall look on Him whom they have pierced and mourn; then will that heavy cloud of wrath, which has hung for a thousand years like the black pall of death over this guilty race, be rolled away—then shall Jew and Gentile sit down together in the sun-light of their Heavenly Father's smile—then shall God, even "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," and what is more precious, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," cause his face to shine and we shall be blessed. For this let the Church feel and pray, that as "the blessing of Abraham" has already in part "come upon the Gentiles through Jesus Christ," so it may speedily react upon those who are his natural seed: that these may learn, what for two thousand years they have forgotten, that only as they "are Christ's" can they be "Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." The highest glory of the Church on earth will be when in practice, as in theory, there "shall be neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision; but when "all shall be one in Christ Jesus."

ARTICLE III.

THE LATE DR. CHALMERS, AND THE LESSONS OF HIS
LIFE, FROM PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS.

Third Report from the Select Committee on Sites for Churches, (Scotland,) together with Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 5th July, 1847. Fol. pp. 201. Including the Evidence of DR. CHALMERS, p. 121—144.

Startling is the cry which the wailing blast bears along: "Watchman, what of the night?" And portentous must be our response, as we announce that one star after another has disappeared from the moral firmament, while thick darkness shrouds the midnight sky. Fuller, and Hall, Watson, and Waugh, Foster, and Gurney, Welsh, and Abercrombie, Brown, and McCheyne, and others also—stars which burned brightly, and shed around them a transforming radiance—have, one by one, flickered and faded, and become extinct, like those constellations which have from time to time disappeared from the heavens. And now we hear that Chalmers—"the divine Chalmers—Chalmers, the object of Scotland's love—Chalmers, the benefactor of all nations, through all time"—that star of the first magnitude—that centre of such powerful attractions, by which so many planetary orbs were kept in motion, and by whose diffusive light so many were illumined—has also sunk in darkness; and that the kindred spirit of the renowned Wardlaw is waxing dim, and giving token of an approaching extinction. "The greater lights" have thus, one by one, vanished, and we are left to those "lesser lights," which still skirt the horizon, or beam upon us from on high.

Thus genius fades away,
Power, talent, influence thus decay,
And leave us dark, and in dismay.

Shall we then fold our arms and go asleep? Shall we sit down and take our ease? Shall we excuse our stum-

•Dr. Campbell.

bling because there is no light? "Shall the righteous perish and no man lay it to heart; and merciful men be taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come? He shall enter into peace; they shall rest in their beds, each one walking in uprightness." No! rather let us cry unto God in our trouble; rather let us take unto ourselves his own words of earnest and encouraging prayer. "Help Lord, for the godly man ceaseth, for the faithful fail among the children of men." Thus let us plead with God, that he may stir up the gifts and graces of his servants still preserved to us; that he may enlighten them abundantly with all heavenly wisdom, and cause them to give light to those that are sitting in darkness; and that by his creating energy, he may bring forth other lights to "rule" and irradiate our night season. Let us, too, remember, that God, who is to be "blessed" for having "given" these heaven-enlightened minds, is also to be blessed in their removal. God's glory is to be proclaimed by a grateful remembrance of these gifts of his hand, and an admiring contemplation of the wisdom, power, and grace illustrated in their character and lives.

Dr. Chalmers was in every way a remarkable man, and will be found, like the sun, to have been greater in his setting, than in his noon-day splendor; and to have excited a greater and wider influence by his posthumous, than even by his living influence. He was one of those stars which are visible in both hemispheres, and who set in one, only to rise upon the other with continued or increasing lustre.

A watchman on his lofty tower,
His thrilling trump still warned the church,
When fraud or danger was at hand.
By him, as by a beacon light,
Her pilots still kept course aright;
As some proud column, he alone
Had strength to prop her tottering cause.
Now is the stately column broke,
The beacon light is quenched in smoke,
The trumpet's silver sound is still,
And heard no more o'er dale or hill.

Oh, think how to his latest day,
When death, *just hovering*, claimed his prey,
With Palinure's unaltered mood,
Firm at his laboring post he stood;
Each call for needful rest repelled,

With dying hand the rudder held,
Till in his fall, with fateful sway,
The steerage of the church gave way.

The public events of Dr. Chalmers' life are few and easily told. Born at Anstruther, in Fife, March 17th, 1780, he was educated at the University of St. Andrews. At this period he was devoted, with intense ardour, to the cultivation and practical pursuit of the physical and mathematical sciences, including Botany, Conchology, and Chemistry, &c.,* for which, and especially for the latter, "as the queen of the sciences," he ever retained a fond partiality.

His first ministry was at Cavers, where—according to the judicious custom of the Scottish church—he labored as a helper to the aged minister of that parish. Here, like his senior, Chalmers poured forth the streams of earthly wisdom; but as neither of them knew more of the Gospel than as a system of refined morality, the stream, of necessity, could not rise higher than the fountain, and partake of no more renovating qualities. In 1803, he was removed to the country parish of Kilmany, in Fifeshire, where he continued to think, to feel, and to preach, as he had done at Cavers; and devoted himself to his favorite pursuits—"wandering all day long, hammer in hand, and botanical box on his shoulders, chipping the rocks, and ransacking the glens, and cultivating a kindly acquaintance with the outlandish peasantry."

From Kilmany Dr. Chalmers was translated to the Tron Church, in Glasgow, in 1815;—from thence to the Chair of Moral Philosophy, in the University of St. Andrews;—and from thence to the Professorship of Theology, in the College of Edinburgh, "the top of the pyramid—the highest post which Presbyterian Scotland knew—and, like Newton to the Mathematical Chair in Cambridge, his preëminent fitness bore Chalmers into the Edinburgh Chair of Divinity." It was from this central focus, he sent forth his blazing thoughts to kindle up beacon fires on every hill and on every hearth in Scotland. From this high station, which he continued to adorn, with increasing honor, Dr. Chalmers voluntarily retired, when he abandoned the establishment

*After his settlement at Kilmany, he gave lectures on Chemistry, at St. Andrews.

of Scotland, and led the van of that glorious army of evangelical ministers, who have since constituted the Free Church of Scotland. As the acknowledged head, leader, and champion of that church, he shone more and more, until "he was taken up out of their sight."

It is not our purpose to enter into a more extended biographical notice of Dr. Chalmers; or into a philosophical analysis of his character and talents. This will be done more satisfactorily by others. It will be our object to present some general considerations, suggested by his character and life, and our own partial acquaintance with him, which may afford us, at this distance from the scene of his labors, instruction and profit.

And, in Dr. Chalmers, may we not behold the infinite resources of Divine wisdom and power, in the formation of human minds and hearts.

In the works of nature, variety is a prominent characteristic, and one chief source of pleasure and of admiration. Not only are the species of rocks and earths, fossils and minerals, plants and trees, insects and animals, birds and fishes,—numerous and diversified; but every specimen of every species, is distinct and individual. So is it with the human race. The features and limbs, the voice, the manners, and the disposition of every individual, are unlike. So that, while the prominent features of man are few, no two men are exactly similar. This wonderful variety is manifested in the mental constitution of different men. With faculties few in their number, and substantially alike in all men, we find, in all, the same individual distinctions, and the same "uniform variety."

Dr. Chalmers was not only an illustration of this characteristic peculiarity of mind,—he was an eminent exemplification of the infinite resources of Divine power and wisdom. He was a genius—a genius of a high order. But there have been many men equally great, and no doubt superior, as it regards any one endowment. He was remarkable in possessing, in an equally powerful development, faculties which have been hitherto deemed antagonistic. The head and the heart have seldom been proportionably endowed. Judgment and fancy; reason and imagination; abstraction and feeling; analysis and illustration; science and poetry; the severity of demonstration, and the

nice discrimination of probabilities; subtle distinctions made plain by profuse and simple illustrations; vehemence of zeal and generosity of feeling; lofty ambition, and unimpeachable candour; invincible love of truth, and the most perfect charity for error; greatness and goodness; sublimity and simplicity; angelic reach of thought, and child-like humility; visions and fancies beyond the reach of other men, and a spirit exuberant with companionable emotions; love of family, brotherhood, and denominational distinctions, and the most illimitable benevolence and complacent delight in good men of all denominations; a tenacious grasp of all the elements of Calvinistic theology, and a heartfelt embrace of all who held to the practical and fundamental verities of the evangelical system; a capacity to rise to regions of the loftiest speculation, and an activity that was ever ready to exert itself in the execution of its schemes and the practice of its benevolent designs; fitness to become a venerated leader and a hearty co-worker; to guide and to follow; to be every thing, and to be nothing; to speak, and to be silent; to feel at home with intellectual giants, and with prattling children and fireside chat;—these are qualities which past experience has regarded as incompatible and inharmonious, but which were all found combined in apparently easy and most happy adjustment, in the wonderful mental and moral constitution of Dr. Chalmers. He was great scientifically, great morally, great practically, great socially—

With genius high and lore profound,
And wit that loved to play, not wound;
And all the reasoning powers divine,
To penetrate, resolve, combine,
And feelings keen, and fancy's glow,—
All sleep with him who sleeps below:
Genius, and taste, and talent gone,
Forever tombed beneath the stone.*

*Speaking of Pascal M. Villemain in his *Eloge* says, "Thus the advance of human knowledge produced a divorce between science and literature; and the enlargement of our understanding led to a separation in its pursuits; as an empire growing too extensive falls necessarily into independent provinces.

If we look at the individuals who have, at any time, endeavored to challenge an exemption from this common law of human weakness and limitation, we find our observation more confirmed. Where they have succeeded in achieving some exceptions, they have never brought them to

Dr. Chalmers impressed alike his readers, his hearers, his visitors, his companions, and his intimate friends, with a sense of his vast superiority. He inspired them all with a conviction at once of his greatness and of his goodness; and he sent every one away with ardent love and affection for his kindness, urbanity and condescension, and with admiration and awe for his preëminent genius. There was, too, in him, a wonderful adaptation of the outward and the inward—the body and the mind. The power and the purpose were of equal strength; and hence, more than almost any other man, he lived to see accomplished nearly all he had designed, to build all he had planned, and to complete all he had undertaken.

This remarkable comprehensiveness of Dr. Chalmers, may be illustrated in his character as a preacher, as a writer, and a practitioner.

Let us view him as a preacher. When fully entered upon the subject he had chosen, his genius kindled with the thoughts, until he swept along like the impetuous torrent, bearing every thing before it, and scattering its foam in all directions. The spray (at least in his earlier years,) *literally* issued from his mouth, too full of words, and too big with vehement utterance, to allow the natural functions of the throat to be fully sustained. Like the breathless war-horse—fired with his rider's ardour, and dashing forward in pursuit of the retreating foe, as the trumpet sounds the loud notes of victory, his sides covered with foam, and his nostrils breathing forth fiery vapour,—so did this mighty champion of the cross rush upon his subject, and bear down his hearers with irresistible power; while, at the end of every paragraph, he stood breathless and exhausted, wiped from his brow the heavy sweat, adjusted his gown, changed the hand which he always kept upon his paper, while the other was clenched and elevated, and then, with an inflated chest, a fresh inspiration of zeal and burning haste, bending forward over the pulpit, he plied his freed arm like some Cyclopean Vulcan, blew up the fire of his consuming thoughts into a torrid blaze, and then, seizing upon upon the one idea which he wished to mould and fashion

bear upon the same points. Perfection in the one object has ever been gained at the expense of another, and the same mind has alternately exhibited mediocrity and greatness.

to his taste, he placed it upon his anvil, and while his hearers stood amazed at the Herculean strokes with which he battered it into shape, and the wondrous skill with which these accomplished the intended effect, they perceived the complete idea assuming shape and form before them, until it became radiant with sunbeams, and glistening with reflected light.

His eloquence a stream of living thought,
Gushing from out the fountain of the heart—
Now among green pastures, making minstrelsy,
Sweet to the ear of cottage patriarch—
Now fearless, rushing from the dizzy brink,
Like mountain cataract, with thundering voice,
Bearing the breathless hearers midst the foam;
Then lulling into calm, midst rainbow hues,
As gently flowed from his persuasive tongue,
The promises of pleasantness and peace.

He was indeed a giant in force and power, physically as well as mentally. He stormed the citadel of the most impregnable and prejudiced heart, and forced a lodgment for the most unwelcome thoughts. He took his hearers captive, and led them at his will. The power of free thought, of voluntary intellection, and of inferential reasoning, seemed, for the time being, to be lost, as the wrapt listener sat in silent awe, fastened by the spell of the great enchanter. He was, indeed, a magician, and wondrous were his feats. When he propounded some startling utterance, which it was his object to illustrate, although it seemed at first dark as Erebus, as his genius lighted up the illustration, it seemed as if you were gazing at some pyrotechnic exhibition, which, as the fire extended, revealed more and more of the hidden design, until the letters, form, and figure came forth in characters of flame.*

*Our description may appear exaggerated, to those who have not heard him. But it will be found confirmed in the representation of the writer in *Frazer's Magazine*, who was evidently a familiar: "We seem to see and hear him still, bending forward, with his left hand on his manuscript, and his right clenched and elevated in energetic action, while the wildest expression of the eye mingles strangely with the solemn and almost austere determination of that large, firm upper lip, and broad knotty forehead; and what lies written before him is enunciated in a voice husky, indeed, and tuneless, but very distinct, and in the highest degree earnest and vehement, so as to make you almost feel the words literally smiting your ear, and fixing themselves in your flesh as if with fangs. There was something in Chalmers' more impassioned delivery that always remind-

As a speaker, Dr. Chalmers was anything but graceful, and as a composer he was anything but chaste and finished, according to the rules of rhetoric and style. In any ordinary man, his manner would be grotesque, as of some rude ploughman in the character of a senatorial orator; and in any ordinary man, his style would be condemned and scouted as bombastic and uncouth. But he was all his own. There were none like him—none to be compared with him. His physical and mental powers were mutually adapted to each other—the sword was fitted to the sheath, and both fitted to the giant hand of this spiritual Guy of Warwick. In his style and thoughts, other men seemed like David in Goliath's armour.

We first heard Dr. Chalmers when he came some 18 or 20 years ago, to open the new and elegant Presbyterian Church, in Fisherwick place, Belfast, Ireland. The audience were admitted by tickets. That Sabbath was a proud day for Belfast. The streets leading to the Church, from his temporary residence, were lined with spectators eager to

ed us of the whizzing of steel upon a rapidly revolving grindstone, with the sparks of fire flying off in showers. At all times there was a breadth and depth of cordiality in his utterance, which sent it to the hearts of his hearers at once. The gusto that he put into it was immense. The sound is still in our ear, of the hurricane of denunciatory fervor with which, extending his arms aloft, and with his eyes shooting their fiercest gleams, he spoke that day, of the Lord sweeping the earth with the besom of destruction. We remember little besides of the sermon, except that the text was—'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation.' Probably the words, as was his custom, were again and again repeated, in the progress of the discourse. We recollect too how, when soon after he had commenced, a slight disturbance arose among some portion of the closely-packed and struggling people, he repressed it at once by a '*Hush!*' uttered quickly as he went on, and without raising his eye from the manuscript lying before him, in which his whole soul seemed to be absorbed—its commanding solemnity, nevertheless, nothing could surpass. And it seems as if we had listened to him but yesterday, as, after the sermon, while he panted with exhaustion, he read these verses from the noble old Scotch metrical version of the Psalms:—

'The floods, O Lord, have lifted,
They lifted up their voice;
The floods have lifted up their waves;
And made a mighty noise.

'But yet the Lord that is on high,
Is more of might by far
Than noise of many waters is,
'Or great sea billows are.'

see—though they could not hear—the greatest living preacher. We were seated among the dense throng in the gallery near the pulpit. At the proper hour the speaker entered the Church, amid the suppressed whispers and eager looks of the vast multitude. He was medium in height; thick in proportion; with large head, broad features, wrinkled brow, grey eyes, large and half closed eyelids, thin, scattered and white hair, and wore the Genevan gown and bands. His utterance was thick and not very distinct—his tongue seeming to be of undue size, and this with his broad Scottish accent, and the simplicity of his words, gave to his reading of the Psalm and the Scriptures, and to the prayers, no promise of his coming eloquence. We were prepared in College fashion (which was then our *norma vivendi*) with our note book and pencil to make ourselves master of the sermon, and we did commence with his commencement. But before he had proceeded far, we found ourselves spell-bound—the pencil dropt from our hands—and the note book from its hold—our eyes were rivetted upon the speaker—our feelings were roused with his into a tumult of emotion—and we found ourselves as when we have stood upon the margin of Niagara's boiling rapids, impelled as by an irresistible power to throw ourselves headlong—so mastered were we by the magic of his eloquence. During the delivery of a paragraph the congregation seemed not even to breathe, and when finished there was a universal murmur as every hearer prepared himself for another effort of attention. The late Dr. Young, Professor of Moral Philosophy, and who was remarkable for his strict decorum and his attention to rule and etiquette, was among the hearers, and at the end of each paragraph he turned round to a friend behind him, and with irresistible ardour exclaimed, "did you ever hear the like of that." As we left the Church we felt exhausted and depressed as when "the voice of one that playeth well upon an instrument" is hushed, and we wandered home in silence and in sadness.

We have heard an anecdote of a celebrated Scottish divine who had not heard Dr. Chalmers. Learning that he was to preach a public discourse some miles distant on a Sabbath evening, he repaired there after his own labours and pressed his way into the crowded church. When he saw the preacher enter and ascend the pulpit, and heard

him as he proceeded with the service,—judging from what we have mentioned and particularly from the heavy, glazed eye, only brilliant when lighted up by the fire of his genius—he felt assuredly disappointed, and being confident that he was some substitute, would have been glad to have escaped. But when the preacher made some progress in his discourse all doubts vanished, and he felt that it was indeed the man. When Dr. Chalmers closed, as he thought, with unwonted brevity, (although the discourse had occupied above an hour,) he found himself unable to erect his frame, and then discovered, for the first time, that he had been unconsciously leaning forward upon the opposite seat on his *elbow*, while a brawny Scotchman had been resting his elbow in the hollow of his back.

Such was the eloquence which forced even from Francis Jeffrey, after hearing one of his speeches in the General Assembly, the enthusiastic declaration that he would walk twenty miles any day for such another feast of eloquence “His mind” says Mr. Turnbull, “was on fire with his subject, and transferred itself all glowing to the minds of his hearers. For the time being, all were fused into one great whole, by the resistless might of his burning eloquence. In this respect Chalmers has been thought to approach, nearer than any other man of modern times, the style and tone of Demosthenes. His manner had a torrent vehemence, a sea-like swell and sweep, a bannered tramp as of armies rushing to deadly conflict. He thundered out his gigantic periods, as if winged with volleyed lightning. The hearers were astonished, awed, carried away, lifted up as on the wings of the wind, and borne whithersoever the master listeth.”

The last time we heard Dr. Chalmers was in Edinburgh, in July, 1846, when we learned that he was to hold forth to his new Missionary congregation at the West Port. This is the name of one of the most destitute and outcast parts of Edinburgh, where a considerable portion of the 50,000 inhabitants, who are said never to attend public worship, reside. Here Dr. Chalmers made the last application of his “territorial principle.” He limited himself to this single district which he split up into sub-districts, having each a Christian agent attached to it, so that not a lane or family might be left without frequent and habitual visita-

tion. By this "busy internal Missionary process" he had succeeded in collecting into a day school about 300 children under male and female teachers,—in forming a Sabbath congregation with nearly 100 members having the usual apparatus of Sabbath Schools and prayer meetings. And for the erection of an elegant building, including church and school rooms, he had succeeded in procuring ample subscriptions. In the meantime, however, he occupied a part of the very building in which the infamous murderer Burke had carried on his infernal operations. It was with great difficulty we found our way through narrow and most filthy passages to an upper room, with low ceilings and dingy walls, filled with a most attentive auditory gathered from the humblest classes of society. Never did the preacher seem more wonderful than as he stood before that assembly, and with all his powerful eloquence dealt out to them, in such a form of statement and illustration as made them perfectly intelligible and deeply interesting, the great fundamental truths of the Gospel. And never was the mighty efficacy of his genius and piety more clearly manifested than in the silent, subdued, earnest and intelligent appearance of his delighted congregation. The minister whom he had associated with him in this labour of love was present, and united with Dr. Chalmers in insisting upon one of the two divines from these Southern States, who were present, occupying the pulpit in the evening, which was readily done by the Rev. Dr. Scott of New Orleans.

As a WRITER Dr. Chalmers was equally remarkable. He is like no other writer. His style, his manner, his words, his plan are his own. He had unquestionably many defects, and cannot be selected as a model. His ideas absorb and fill his soul, and the only end aimed at in his language is the communication of these ideas to other minds in a manner so clear and so effective, as not only to secure their lodgment, but to impart to them an assimilating and creating power. This, to our minds, is the chief characteristic of Chalmers as a writer. Whatever may be his views, he is sure to make them plain and impressive to his reader, who is like a besieged castle surrounded by enemies and incessantly battered with the missiles of the assailants. The reader of Dr. Chalmers cannot escape from his fire—

he must front his onset until compelled to yield a glad and willing surrender to his overpowering argument and his irresistible illustrations. If one attack fails to unman or subsue, another is forthwith made from some new and unlooked for quarter. If one demonstration is insufficient to produce conviction, another follows it. And if the wind and tempest of his long sounding arguments, do not uncover the prejudiced and cloaked reader, the sunshine of his radiant illustrations will gradually melt him down. To most readers there is in the style of Dr. Chalmers, especially in his more energetic passages, a redundancy of words, of illustrations, and of argument, but all receive the full, clear, and perfect comprehension of some new, or forgotten, or misjudged truth. Other writers of genius seem like pearl-divers, as in the depth of ocean-thought they obscurely and with panting breath seek their gems and present them still covered with hard and slimy incrustations. Chalmers, however, gives the gem itself, separated and polished, and appropriately set in some suitable adornment. Other writers of genius appear like cloud-capt mountains wrapt in fog, and sublime in their dim and half discerned obscurity; but Chalmers claims our admiration and our awe by the simple majesty of his Alpine heights. The strength of genius is best displayed in its *suggestive* power over other minds; and for ourselves, we must confess that no other writer—prose or poetical—has had the same power as Chalmers to stir up the waters of our soul and cause them to flow out in full and easy streams. From no other writer have we risen so disencumbered of the style and manner of his thoughts;—so prepared according to our ability to enter upon a work of intellectual effort. The want of such a stimulant to awaken the sensibilities of a dormant or fatigued spirit every one must have felt, and to those who have not made the experiment, we would recommend a preparatory reading, (and if aloud, the better,) of some pregnant and glowing page of Dr. Chalmers' works.

Nor is Dr. Chalmers less wonderful when regarded as a PRACTITIONER. He was not only a great commander, but also a great warrior. He was not only a Statesman, but also a most energetic functionary. He was not only a noble Captain, but himself able on occasion, to take the helm or stand by the ropes, or even mount the topmast heights

amid the fiercest sweep of the hurricane. The moral influence of Dr. Chalmers can never be measured by the scan of human observation. To appreciate it we should first have a clear perception of the condition of the church establishment in Scotland when he entered it and when he left it;—the tone and spirit he imparted to the pulpit in every part of the United Kingdom; and the onward swell of a pure, a simple, a living, and a warm hearted ministry to which he gave the impulse;—the shame, compunction, and repentance enkindled by his appeals in the hearts of many a worldly patron;—the gradual increase of an evangelical minority which he found small, faint, and buffeted, until it became the overwhelming majority in every Presbytery and Synod, and in the General Assembly itself;—the zeal for home and foreign Missionary labour he set agoing and fanned into an undying and ever brightening flame;—the two hundred additional Churches for the poor and neglected, which, by dint of personal journeys and laborious toil, preaching and begging, he himself erected;—the glorious struggle maintained under his guidance by the unprotected church against principalities and powers in high places, and against a hireling minority within the church itself;—and the still more glorious triumph of a free and disfranchised church, when in the face of all apparent inconsistency and of all earthly endurance, combining in his person the separate characters of Moses and of Joshua, he led forth 500 Ministers with their elders and people from an Egyptian bondage and planted them in their

* See an article in the London Evangelical Magazine on "The Chalmersian Era in Theology." "It is unquestionable that in the end he gave to a large portion of the rising talent of his native country a Theological direction." *Fraser's Magazine*. His entrance among the cold formalism of moderate Theology in the university of St. Andrews when appointed professor, is thus described by the same writer. The right of appointment was with the remaining professors of the United College, eight in number; and their election of Chalmers was certainly the most dashing and eccentric movement that had been ventured upon by the Senatus Academicus since it has had an existence. We believe that people, when they heard of it, were generally inclined to conjecture that the thing must have been gone into when the learned body were hardly in their sober senses; but too much learning, perhaps, must have driven them suddenly all mad. It was as if a fleet of merchantmen, with highly combustible cargoes, seeing a fire-ship drifting about, instead of keeping as far out of its way as they could, had deliberately set about towing it into the midst of them.

own free and fruitful Canaan.* And when we shall have traced out all the way by which that church has been led from step to step in its onward march until we now see it with its 725 churches either built or in progress,† its hundred of manses and school-houses and teachers; its splendid College buildings, apparatus and Library; its sustentation fund supplying a moderate income and support to every pastor;‡ its extensive missions; its churches which, in the midst of every other burden, failed *not one of them* during the past year to contribute to the missionary enterprises;—when we have fully appreciated these moral miracles which he achieved—then may we estimate the Herculean powers by which all this was achieved and by which unity, energy, and vitality were communicated to every partner in the mighty undertaking. So that, guided by his wisdom and impelled by his energy, they have “performed both moral and monetary wonders to which modern history supplies no parallel.”

Such was Dr. Chalmers. His breadth of mind was commensurate to his breadth of shoulders and his unequalled breadth of forehead. He was, in the original and literal sense of the word, **MAGNANIMOUS**. **GREATNESS OF SOUL** was perhaps more truly than any other trait the distinguishing characteristic of this prince of divines.

Of this characteristic we cannot forbear alluding to one or two exemplifications, and the first is his universal charity and good will. “He was the most loveable of all living men,” because he was the most loving. He was what Carlyle calls “a true man”—“a man of great soul as well as of great mind.” “Wondrous goodness has therefore been termed the prime feature of his picture,” and it was in “his mighty heart he most surpassed all his fellows.” Good will to man was the inscription on his serene and benignant

* “Wherever Dr. Chalmers is, there,” said Sir George Sinclair, “is the Church of Scotland.”

† See Minutes of Evidence before Parliament, p. 136.

‡ The Sustentation Fund was established and presided over at first by Dr. Chalmers, with what success every one knows. And we have no doubt but that, through the divine blessing, it will fully realize his expectations, and be the means of maintaining and spreading a preached gospel in the land. The Sustentation Fund is one of Dr. Chalmers' great legacies to his country, and it behoves us, as we would fulfil our duty as a Church and do honour to his memory, vigorously to support and cherish it.—See *Monthly Statement for July, 1847.*

countenance. "Like him who best knew what was in man, but was so bent on making him better, that the kindness of his errand counteracted the keenness of his intuition, and filled his mouth with gracious words—there was so much inherent warmth in his temperament, and so much of heaven imparted kindness in his Christianity, that love to man was his vital air, and good offices to man his daily bread." "With magnetic alertness all that was Christian in himself darted forth to all that was Christian in another." He had reduced the gospel to its system, and that system to its elements, and where he could find these he was at once prepared to recognize the valid title to the Christian character and to the Christian's love. He had accurately distinguished the fundamentals of Theology as a **SYSTEM OF GRACE** and as an everlasting covenant, and the fundamentals of that scheme as **A PLAN OF PRACTICAL AND PERSONAL SALVATION**. He had "walked about Zion, and marked well those bulwarks" which guard the outposts of organized Christianity, and the principles which constitute true church-manship, as well as those which enter into the essence of a living, active, and devoted piety. Without limiting, or in any degree curtailing, the platform of sound and orthodox Calvinism, he had extended to its utmost limits the platform of Christian evangelism and of Christian brotherhood. Tenacious of all truth, he was equally tenacious of all peace. The champion of controverted and condemned dogmas, he was also the mightiest defender of evangelical union, intercommunion and coöperation. Love to Christians of every evangelical denomination was with him as much a passion as a principle. It was the easy, natural, and invariable outgoing of his soul. It was developed in kind actions as well as in kind words. What in other Christians is the dictate of conviction and the result of a deep sense of obligation, was in him the instinct of his spiritual nature; what others feel that they *ought to do* and must do in consistency with the principles they confess, he cherished from the intuitive impulse of a Catholic spirit. And he has left behind him living monuments of this true philanthropic spirit, in the enlarged liberality of the free church of Scotland; in the North British Review *quorum magna pars fuit* and which is based upon the platform of evangelic Christian literature; and in the very last paper

he drew up containing a plan for national education, which might harmonize all religious parties.

But to our minds a more striking exemplification of Dr. Chalmers' breadth of soul and comprehensiveness of spirit is given in his noble vindication of this country, and especially of its Southern States, against the furious fanaticism of popular and ecclesiastical abolition outcry. In its investigation of truth, the human mind is easily warped by self-interest and prejudice, and by a superficial, partial exhibition of the real facts in the case. This is, in an especial manner, true where the subject of investigation is one remote from the immediate interest of the inquirer; still more where it is associated with a people towards whom there may exist feelings of national jealousy;—and still more when one view of the subject has, for these and other reasons, become the watchword of popular excitement. Now just such to a British mind is the subject of American Slavery. It is enveloped in the mists of ignorant prejudice and national pride. It is confounded with British Colonial Slavery, from which, however, in all its *essential* relations, it is entirely and manifestly different. Its real character is unknown. No distinction is made between the civil condition of slavery in itself considered, and every existing law, custom and habit which may have grown up under it, and every case of cruelty and hardship which may occur in connection with it. To have a legal right to the life-services of men, who are of course to be used and employed as men,—is confounded with an absolute right claimed and enforced, to the body, soul, and spirit of every slave, to have and to use them for the mere convenience and interest of the owner. And the guilt which ought *properly* to attach to an unchristian abuse of this right of service is most wrongfully and sinfully attributed to the legal claim and to the social condition by which such service is held.

The difficulties therefore in the way of a British mind in forming a correct judgment on the subject of American Slavery are *almost insurmountable*. And hence we find that the most pure and lofty spirits are found incapable of resisting the pressure of opinion, and are willing to sustain their influence at home by joining in the outcry against their brethren abroad. In their position nothing is easier than with the help of false maxims and one-sided represen-

tations, and a reference to their own civil polity, to frame an argument against their American brethren apparently irresistible, and thus to give conscience the opportunity of throwing its sacred influence around the otherwise unpardonable and rude severity of their hard and ungodly speeches; and to be able to make allowances for this state of things, and to regard with charity the opinions entertained and expressed, concerning Christian men and Christian churches by the generality even of British Christians, one must have been himself immersed in the same mist of prejudice.

It was, however, through all this fog and smoke the lofty mind of Chalmers was enabled to send its penetrating glance, and to form, to a great extent, a correct Christian and philosophical estimate of this grave question.

With all his economic objections to slavery, as a system of state policy, and social life; with his deep convictions that it exposed its subjects to greater evils than other systems; and with his most sanguine expectations of its ultimate annihilation;—while, we say—as was to be expected from *his* position—Dr. Chalmers cherished these views—he, nevertheless, saw clearly the fundamental errors on which abolitionism is based. That slavery, *in itself considered, is a necessary and heinous sin*—that it ought, therefore, to exclude those who live under its system, and sustain the relation of master, from the communion of other churches, and from all claim to the character of Christians and Christian churches themselves; and that this system, being essentially sinful, ought *at once, and at all hazards*, to be done away; these positions, which are the axiomatic data of the abolitionists,—were the subjects of most unqualified condemnation by Dr. Chalmers. With the holders of them—as he energetically assured us—he had no sympathy, and in their proceedings he had no confidence. Their principles he regarded as fanatical and visionary, and their conduct as foolish, suicidal, and disastrous. Sin was contracted, in his opinion, not by holding the civil relation of a slave-holder, but by abusing that relation to the commission of sin, or the omission of duty. And “the business of Christianity,” he regarded as having to do, not with civil or political institutions, (as slavery unquestionably is,) but with persons and with ecclesiastical in-

stitutions, and that the object of these last is to operate directly and proximately with the most wholesome effect upon the consciences and character of persons. At our own request, he put these sentiments in writing, and sent them to us, to be made use of as we desired, in the following letter, which we give entire :

“EDIN, 25th Sept., 1844.

“MY DEAR SIR—I do not need to assure you how little I sympathize with those who—because slavery happens to prevail in the Southern States of America—would unchristianize that whole region ; and who even carry their extravagance so far as to affirm that, so long as it subsists, no fellowship or interchange of good offices should take place with its churches, or its ministers.

“As a friend to the universal virtue and liberty of mankind, I rejoice in the prospect of those days when slavery shall be banished from the face of the earth ; but most assuredly the wholesale style of excommunication, contended for by some, is not the way to hasten forward this blissful consummation.

“Few things would afford me greater satisfaction than to hear of a commencement in your country, of that process, by which the labor of freemen might be substituted for that of slaves. As I mentioned to you, I was exceedingly struck, so far back as twenty-five years ago, by the description of such a process in Humbolt’s Travels through Spanish South America. This was long anterior to the abolition of slavery in the British Colonies ; and such was the confidence I then felt in its efficacy, that I ventured to draw out a sketch of the Spanish plan which, if adopted at the time, might have ensured a far safer and even earlier emancipation than took place afterwards. You will find my account of it in the twelfth volume of my works, from page 395 and onwards.

“I have not been able to engage in any sort of public business since I had the pleasure of meeting with you, but I observe that in our Assembly’s Commission, a few weeks back, the subject of American slavery was entertained. I do hope that the Resolutions which they have adopted will prove satisfactory.

“I feel it a great acquisition that I have made your acquaintance. We owe you much, and I trust the ministers

of the Free Church of Scotland will ever entertain a grateful sense of your able and disinterested services.

“Do believe me, my dear sir,

“Yours most respectfully and truly,

“**THOMAS CHALMERS.**

“To Rev. ———.

“N. B.—I shall be happy at all times to hear from you.”

The publication of this letter led to a demand made upon Dr. Chalmers by the Anti-Slavery Society of Edinburgh, for a disclaimer of the letter or a fuller expression of opinion. This he gave in a letter on American slave-holding, of which a copy lies before us issued by the Belfast Anti-Slavery Committee, with their violept comments upon it. From this correspondence also arose that fierce onset made upon the Free Church by the combined abolition fanaticism of Scotland; and against which Dr. Cunningham has so nobly presented the irresistible shield of christian truth and charity.

In this letter Dr. Chalmers, repeating the sentiments already quoted, says, “Our understanding of Christianity is, that it deals not with civil or political institutions, but that it deals with persons and with ecclesiastical institutions, and that the object of these last is to operate directly and proximately with the most wholesome effect on the consciences and the character of persons. In conformity with this view, a purely and rightly administered church will exclude from the ordinances **NOT ANY MAN, AS A SLAVE-HOLDER**, but every man, whether slave-holder or not, as licentious, as intemperate, as dishonest. Slavery, like war, is a great evil—but as it does not follow that a slave-holder cannot be a Christian, neither does it follow that there may not be a Christian slave-holder.” * * * “It holds experimentally true that within its limits” * * * “**THE MOST EXALTED SPECIMENS OF PIETY AND WORTH ARE TO BE FOUND.**” * * * “Neither war nor slavery is incompatible with the personal Christianity of those who have actually and personally to do with them. Distinction ought to be made between the character of a system and the character of the persons whom circumstances have implicated therewith. We hope that our free Church will never deviate to the right or the left from the path of un-

doubted principles. But we hope on the other hand that she will not be frightened from her propriety, or forced by clamor of any sort to outrun her own conviction, so as to adopt, at the bidding of other parties, A NEW AND FACTITIOUS PRINCIPLE of administration, for which she can see no authority in scripture and of which she can gather no trace in the history or practice of the churches in Apostolic times. But I must repeat my conviction, that slavery will be not at all shaken,—IT WILL BE STRENGTHENED AND STAND ITS GROUND, if assailed through the medium of that most questionable and ambiguous principle which the abolitionists are now laboring to force upon our acceptance, even that slave-holding is in itself a ground of exclusion from the Christian sacraments. Not only is there A WRONG PRINCIPLE involved in the demands which these abolitionists now make on the Free Church of Scotland, it is HURTFUL IN EFFECT. Should we concede to their demands, then, speaking in the terms of our opinion, we incur the discredit (and in proportion to that discredit we damage our usefulness as a church,) of having given in,—and at the bidding of another party—to A FACTITIOUS AND NEW PRINCIPLE, WHICH NOT ONLY WANTS, BUT WHICH CONTRAVENES THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE AND OF APOSTOLIC EXAMPLE, AND INDEED HAS ONLY BEEN HEARD OF IN CHRISTENDOM WITHIN THESE FEW YEARS, AS IF GOTTEN UP FOR AN OCCASION, INSTEAD OF BEING DRAWN FROM THE REPOSITORIES OF THAT TRUTH WHICH IS IMMUTABLE AND ETERNAL—EVEN THE PRINCIPLE THAT NO SLAVE-HOLDER SHOULD BE ADMITTED TO A PARTICIPATION IN THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS.”

And in concluding this letter, Dr. Chalmers says,*—“We admire the practical wisdom of the American Board in the deliverance which they have come to and in which they state, ‘that the Board was established and incorporated for the express purpose of propagating the gospel in heathen lands, by supporting missionaries and diffusing the knowledge of the scriptures;—that the Board had confined themselves to this one great object;—and that a regard to our sacred trust requires us to pursue this object with undiminished zeal, and not to turn aside from it or mix any oth-

* See similar language in his pamphlet on the *Evangelical Alliance*.

er concerns with it. And we still think that the Lord of missions and the Saviour of the world will approve of this deliberate purpose of ours and this course of action, and would frown upon us if we depart from it.'"

Such were the views of Dr. Chalmers on this most delicate and difficult question; and greatly do we rejoice that the man who was regarded by the united voice of the Free Church as most competent to fill the Chair of Dr. Chalmers and to wield its mighty influence, has adopted both the principles and the spirit of his great predecessor on this subject, and that with his mantle of honor, Dr. Cunningham has received from above many of his gifts and graces. We rejoice that there is a CUNNINGHAM ready to stand in the place and maintain the principles of the illustrious Chalmers, and to confront *eloquence*, ribaldry, and popularity, in sustaining *right* against *might*, mercy against acrimony, truth against misrepresentation, and the cause of the stranger and defenceless against their slanderous and unjust judges. Sure we are that in the plaudits of an approving conscience, the admiration of the candid and impartial, and the love and gratitude of the whole American Zion, he will be amply remunerated for the loss of that flattery which might have echoed round him, as it does round others, had he sacrificed to the interests of party what he owed to the interests of mankind and to the glory of God.

But we proceed to remark, that in Dr. Chalmers we have AN ILLUSTRIOUS EXEMPLIFICATION OF THE SOVEREIGNTY AND TRANSFORMING EFFICACY OF DIVINE GRACE, and a triumphant demonstration of the truth that the Gospel is the power of God.

Just think of a planetary orb rushing forward in its course at the rate of thousands of miles per second, and at the same time while propelled by the irresistible law of motion, held fast in its course by the equal powers of centrifugal and centripetal attraction—suppose, we say, this immense body all at once, and without any convulsive movement, turned round in its orbit, and wheeling with even accelerated speed in a directly opposite direction. When you have conceived this, then you will be prepared to appreciate the nature and extent of that change which took place in Dr. Chalmers when by the grace of God, silently but irresistibly working in his heart, he was brought

to a pause in the race of ambition and self-indulgent speculation, and led to consecrate to the service and glory of that divine Redeemer of whom he had previously such lifeless and inadequate conceptions, his body, soul, and spirit as a living, a reasonable, and a most willing sacrifice.

His path was as a comet in the heavens;
 He through the fields of science swept along,
 His orbit all his own, till far beyond
 The gaze of common men, led by the power
 Of Heaven's attractiveness, his smitten heart—
 Smitten with dying love—received new stores
 Of truth and joy, and holiness and peace.

We cannot realize the change in Dr. Chalmers, better than by perusing the following extract from his first publication,—long since out of print—in which he repelled the opinion of Professor Playfair, that clergymen had not time to become adepts in science.* It is plain from the whole tone and bearing of this first pamphlet that when it was written and published Chalmers had no notion that any distinction he might attain to in the world would ever be derived from, or connected with his clerical character. He insists, almost in so many words, upon his profession being considered as a mere accident, or at any rate as a circumstance of no more importance than the colour of his coat. "Clergymen," he goes on to contend, "are not accountable for being clergymen: the choice of their profession often depends on the most accidental circumstances, a whim of infancy or the most capricious destination of parents." He therefore speaks of his being a clergyman as a misfortune, indignantly deprecating and protesting against the cruelty of people looking down upon him for what he cannot help. His estimate of the work and duty of the ministry at that period will be evident from the following quotation:

"The author of this pamphlet,'—Chalmers here writes with the honesty and intrepidity which were part of his being,—'the author of this pamphlet can assert from what to

*For this information see Fraser's Magazine. The same facts are attributed to the Rev. J. McKenzie, in the Visitor or Monthly Instructor, published by the London Tract Society, for October, 1847, p. 364-5. Mr. McKenzie says that on the above occasion Dr. Chalmers was himself the candidate for the Chair of Mathematics in the University of Edinburgh, and that it was in reference to him Playfair made his representations to the Lord Provost of Edinburgh.

him is the highest of all authority, the authority of his own experience, that, after the satisfactory discharge of his parish duties, a minister may enjoy five days in the week of uninterrupted leisure, for the prosecution of any science in which his taste may dispose him to engage. In as far, then, as the command of time is concerned, it will be difficult to find a situation in the country more favorable to the free and uninterrupted exercises of the understanding. Mr. Playfair may smile contempt when I say that a clergyman is more favorably situated for the successful prosecution of the mathematics than a mathematical professor. For one half of the year the professor has three different classes to attend to, and we apprehend that the fatigues and the preparations of teaching will be found to leave little time and less energy for those higher exercises of his mind which are to add to the stock of his information, and to raise him above the level of his present acquirements. A minister has five days in the week for his own free and independent exertions.'

"And then he expatiates for a couple of pages more upon the 'almost no consumption of intellectual effort' which there is in the peculiar employments of a parish minister."

Subsequently to this period Dr. Chalmers was so far smitten with the warlike spirit that prevailed as to enrol in a volunteer corps, and a very curious anecdote is told of the astonishment created on one occasion, by his rapid transition from his clerical to his military character, on a Sabbath day.

Such was Chalmers in his spiritual character at the age of twenty-five, and as the minister of Kilmany.

Twenty years after this, when at the height of his influence as an evangelical leader, he was twitted in the General Assembly with a reference to his former views and habits. "It was," says Mr. Mackenzie, "in a debate on the question of pluralities, or unions of a pastoral charge with an academical chair, in the General Assembly of May, 1825, in which Dr. Chalmers warmly espoused the negative side, that a clergyman of the opposite party, in order to convict him of inconsistency, charged him with the authorship of this pamphlet, and quoted the above, along with other sentences from it. Every eye in the crowded house and overflowing gallery was fixed upon Dr. Chalmers, who

sat unmoved till his assailant had concluded his harangue. As soon as he had ended, he arose and for a few moments the silence or intense expectation suspended the gazing audience. In his reply, which was instant and overwhelming, Dr. Chalmers acknowledged that it was his own production; and after explaining the circumstances which had called it forth, he said in reference to the sentiment therein expressed, "Alas! sir, so I thought in my ignorance and pride. I have now no reserve in declaring that the sentiment was wrong, and that in giving utterance to it I penned what was most outrageously wrong. Strangely blinded that I was! What, sir, is the object of mathematical science? Magnitude, and the proportions of magnitude. But, then, sir, I had forgotten two magnitudes. I thought not of the littleness of time, I recklessly thought not of the greatness of eternity!"

"It was," says the writer in *Fraser's Magazine*, "humbly yet proudly spoken, for the speaker felt, while the words fell from his lips, that he was acquitting himself nobly, and lifting himself to an immeasurable height, even while thus assuming the tone and attitude of sorrow and self-condemnation, above his humiliated assailant. We never witnessed any effect of eloquence like that produced by those few solemn sentences, thus firmly and dignifiedly pronounced, in circumstances that would have covered most men with abashment and confusion. They were followed by an universal storm of applause, in the midst of which the ashamed and mortified blunderer, whose vulgar abuse had been so manfully encountered and so splendidly repelled, endeavored in vain to make himself heard, even in apology for his luckless onset. His voice, repeatedly raised, was as often drowned in an outcry of aversion and disgust."

Surely therefore when we "look on this picture and on that,"—when we contemplate Dr. Chalmers as he was and as he became—we are not extravagant in saying that it is only in the Apostle Paul we find a case perfectly analogous. Both in their unconverted state were exemplary in their personal morality—in their attention to all the outward services of religion—and in their laborious and zealous discharge of the duties of the ministry, so far as it bears upon the moralities of life—and both were, by an act of free, sovereign, and omnipotent grace, led to the spir-

itual comprehension of saving truth and to the adoring worship of "the Lord their Righteousness."*

The circumstances connected with his conversion are thus given by Mr. Mackenzie: "About the year 1809 he was engaged in writing the article 'Christianity,' for Brewster's 'Edinburgh Encyclopædia,' and it was in the course of his studies connected with that work, his perusal of the lives of the primitive Christians, but more especially of Wilberforce's 'Practical View,' that he began to perceive that the religion of Christ was something very different from what he had hitherto imagined. When in this transition state, he fell into a severe illness which, under God, was the means, along with the counsels of a pious dissenting minister who visited him on his sick-bed, of consummating the blessed change; and great was the surprise and joy of many, when on re-appearing in his pulpit, he boldly avowed his previous ignorance, and preached the doctrine he had once despised."

When thus experimentally acquainted with this "great salvation" it became to him, what it did to the Apostle Paul, his theme, his triumph, and his joy. His previous glory he counted but shame, his attainments dross, and his knowledge vanity. He now knew "nothing among men but Jesus Christ and him crucified." He "gloried only in the cross," and "this one thing he did"—"he lived not unto himself but unto Him who died for him," and who had "called him by his grace."

The transformation thus effected was as conspicuous to others, as it was clear and undoubted to himself. He became a new creature, and both in his doctrine, conversation, and conduct gave manifest proof to all around him that he testified to the things which he had both seen and felt. His own reference to this change is one of the most striking passages of his works, eminently illustrative of his bold and fearless spirit, and a noble testimony to the efficacy of the gospel as the only efficient moral regenerator of society. This will be found in his "Farewell Address to

*This analogy has, I since find, presented itself to the Rev. Mr. Lathian, of St. Andrews, in his sketch of Dr. Chalmers' life. See the Christian Witness, London, August, 1847. "There was," says he, and he speaks from much personal knowledge, "a striking similarity between the characters of the Apostle Paul and the late Dr. Chalmers."

the inhabitants of Kilmany," which contains a beautiful summary of his future pulpit ministrations. "And here, says he, I cannot but record the effect of an actual though undesigned experiment, which I prosecuted upwards of twelve years amongst you. For the greater part of that time I could expatiate on the meanness of dishonesty, on the villany of falsehood, on the despicable arts of calumny—in a word, on all those deformities of character, which awaken the natural indignation of the human heart against the pests and disturbers of society. Now could I, upon the strength of these warm expostulations, have got the thief to give up his stealing, and the evil speaker his censoriousness, and the liar his deviations from truth, I should have felt all the repose of one who had gotten his ultimate object.

"It never occurred to me that all this might have been done, and yet every soul of every hearer have remained in full alienation from God; and that even could I have established in the bosom of one who stole such a principle of abhorrence at the meanness of dishonesty that he was prevailed upon to steal no more, he might still have retained a heart as completely unturned to God, and as totally unpossessed of a principle of love to Him as before. In a word, though I might have made him a more upright and honorable man, I might have left him as destitute of the essence of religious principle as ever. But the interesting fact is that during the whole of that period in which I made no attempt against the natural enmity of the mind to God, while I was inattentive to the way in which this enmity is dissolved, even by the free offer on the one hand, and the believing acceptance on the other, of the gospel salvation; while Christ, through whose blood the sinner, who by nature stands afar off, is brought near to the Heavenly Lawgiver whom he has offended, was scarcely ever spoken of, or spoken of in such a way as stripped him of all the importance of his character and offices, even at this time I certainly did press the reformations of honour, and truth, and integrity, among my people; but I never even heard of any such reformations being effected amongst them. If there was anything at all brought about in this way, it was more than I ever got any account of. I am not sensible that all the vehemence with which I urged the virtues and the proprieties of social life had the weight of a feather on the

habits of my parishioners. And it was not till I got impressed with the utter alienation of the heart in its desires and affections from God, it was not till reconciliation to Him became the distinct and the prominent object of my ministerial exertions; it was not till I took the scriptural way of laying the method of reconciliation before them; it was not till the free offer of forgiveness through the blood of Christ was urged upon their acceptance, and the Holy Spirit given through the channel of Christ's mediatorship to all who ask him, was set before them as the unceasing object of their dependence and their prayers; it was not, in one word, till the contemplations of my people were turned to those great and essential elements in the business of a soul providing for its interest with God, and the concerns of its eternity, that I ever heard of any of those subordinate reformations which I aforesaid made the earnest and the zealous, but I am afraid, at the same time, ultimate object of my early ministrations."

"You," he adds, "have at least taught me that to preach Christ is the only effective way of preaching morality in all its branches, and out of your humble cottages have I gathered a lesson which I pray God I may be enabled to carry into a wider theatre, and to bring with all the powers of its subduing efficacy upon the vices of a more crowded population."* In Dr. Chalmers, then, we see the wonder-working influence of that divine grace which can "subdue all things unto itself," make even the most towering and lofty intellects to "become as little children" and to "bring all their gifts" to the humble shrine of the despised and rejected Saviour. And in him we see also that the hearts which are thus given to God to be transformed "by the renewing of the Holy Ghost" he gives back again to their possessors enlarged, elevated and ennobled.

* See also his *Essay on the Efficacy of Missions in Wks.* vol. 12, p. 251. In the preface to that volume published within a few years, he says, speaking of the moral elevation of the people, "For it is unnecessary to state it as our conviction, that, to carry this cheering anticipation into effect, the education, as comprehensive of what is taught both in churches and in schools, must necessarily be a Christian education. The present unholy attempts to dissever the scholarship from the religion of our people, if not counteracted by the friends of Christianity, will land only in the derangement of all our existing social relations, and utter discomfort of the people themselves."

Upon the hill of Zion strong he stood,
 And like the eagle conscious of his strength,
 Soared into realms unknown, and soaring, breathed
 A heavenly atmosphere, where his keen eye
 Beheld a purer light than ere was seen
 By proud astronomer, in plenitude
 Of power, with ready aid of skilful lens,
 Or help of new constructed telescope.
 On earth a citizen of heaven, he looked
 Down from the battlements of lofty thought
 Upon imprisoned minds encamped below ;
 Nor looked he heedlessly. Ah, no !— he felt
 The weight of other souls upon his own.
 Dark lanes and wretched dwellings of the poor
 'Scaped not his keen and territorial search.
 To those who came he gave, and unto them
 Who would not come he went, e'en like to Him
 Whose words the common people gladly heard.
 He shone, a light amidst terrestrial gloom,
 Bright and more bright, unto the perfect day.

Time will only permit us further to contemplate in Dr. Chalmers THE SUPERIORITY OF MORAL, OVER INTELLECTUAL, POLITICAL, OR MILITARY GREATNESS, and to learn

That not in *mental* but in *moral* worth
 God excellence placed, and only to the good,
 To virtue, granted happiness alone.

It was the saying of the sage and "*naturally*" wise Cicero, that, "the heart is the source of moral greatness," and that, "no man was ever great without a certain divine influence."* The efficient cause of true greatness, he places in the divinely implanted principle by which men are elevated above the world, and its mean, selfish, and dishonourable motives, and enabled to resist temptation, encounter and overcome difficulties, and perform actions for the good of others not only of great magnitude but of extreme difficulty.† How bright the anticipation of that perfect gospel which teaches that truth is in order to goodness ;—that goodness is greatness ;—that resemblance to the moral image and character of God is the foundation of goodness ;—and that "peace on earth and good will to men" are the fruits and evidences of goodness. Compared with this *moral* greatness what is "all Greek, all Roman fame," and

* Nemo vir magnus sine aliqui divino unquam fuit.

† De officiis lib. 1, cap. 20.

how peerlessly do its ancient representatives, Plato and Socrates, outshine the glittering show, and all the pomp and circumstance of an Alexander, a Hannibal, or even the fame of an Aristotle? And when the vain pageantry of earth shall vanish before the splendour of eternal day, how will the torch-light of all human fame be lost amid the unfading and ever brightening glory of true moral greatness.

And if, as Cicero also teaches, the highest and perfect glory of a man consists of these three things; "when the multitude love him, when they have confidence in him, and when they deem him worthy of special honour and admiration,"* how far, even in this life, does true moral greatness draw after it the heart-homage, love and admiration of every right minded man, beyond either intellectual or military greatness. Well may the tribute paid to the great Athenian sage and Father of Philosophy, be ascribed to Chalmers.

"He in every street
Dealt priceless treasure. Goodness his delight,
Wisdom his wealth, and glory his reward,
Deep through the human heart, with playful art
His simple doctrine stole, as into truth
And serious deeds he smiled the laughing race
Taught moral happy life, whate'er can bless,
Or grace mankind; and WHAT HE TAUGHT HE WAS."

"No man, in our day, was ever followed by such crowds of admirers, or was exposed to a more severe ordeal of adulation; all ranks and denominations vied with each other in doing homage to his genius, and the highest nobles of the land paid court, both in public and in private, to the humble presbyter of the Scottish church." We see him invited to London by members of the established church as the champion of their endangered church against the leveling principles of a reckless and unbelieving parliament, and listened to for days by the highest dignitaries and nobles of the realm. We see him chosen by that same church as one of the honoured few to whom were given the emolument and the fame of the Earl of Bridgewater's treatise. We see him enrolled as an honorary member of the Royal

* Summa igitur et perfecta gloria constat ex tribus his:—Si diligit multitudo—si fidem habet—si cum admiratione quadam honore dignos putat.—*De officiis, lib. 11, cap. 9.*

Institute of France—and his character and opinions deferred to by the mighty minds of all countries, as one of “the purest, greatest and most self-sacrificing patriots of the 19th century.”

Dr. Chalmers has “rested from his labours, but his works follow him.” They abide forever. In his writings—which have become the classic eloquence of every religious denomination in every land; in his posthumous works, which have commanded a greater price than those of any other author, in ancient or modern times, and which constitute a rich legacy to his family and to the world;—in the stupendous monument of a Free Church destined, we trust, to be the model church of Europe, and of which he was the architect, and to no small extent the builder;—in the spontaneous outburst of national respect which was exhibited in a funeral procession embracing one hundred thousand persons,* of whom, besides the members of the Free Church Assembly, then in session, from eight to nine hundred were ministers and elders of the Establishment, whose

*“The estimates taken of the numbers joining in the funeral procession must fall very short of the truth—the line having been very much compressed whilst at Morningside. The *Witness* says there could not be fewer than 100,000. It is difficult to state the number of persons in the procession, especially as considerable numbers fell into it by the way, and a large body were drawn up on the road leading up to the cemetery. We understand that there were from 800 to 900 ministers and elders in St. George’s Free Church alone, in addition to the members of the Assembly. It would be still more difficult to compute the number of spectators who, without formally joining in the procession, were there, nevertheless, from respect and regard to the memory of the dead. On all such occasions there are numbers of mere sight-seers; but on this we were struck with the solemn feeling that seemed to pervade the great multitudes that lined the streets or covered the parks, from which the procession could be seen—and there were many evidences of the deepest concern for the loss that had been sustained, and seemed to be that day ratified and sealed.

The number of gentlemen in the procession at the cemetery must have greatly exceeded 2,000, and it was remarkable for several reasons. It embraced the most distinguished professional men in the Scottish metropolis, who were there to evince their regard for a giant in intellect, in literature, and in moral worth, whose words and writings were never again to be embodied in their discussions.

It consisted of ministers from all evangelical communions, who, laying aside over the tomb all their causes of difference, met there to express their sense of a great apparent calamity, and carry to his grave the chief man amongst Scottish theologians.

It was thoroughly representative. Those ministers were gathered from all the districts of the land—from lonely parishes in distant counties—from the islands of the sea—from lowland straths and vales—from busy

Assembly was also in session, and of other religious bodies, besides the most distinguished professional men in the Scottish metropolis, including the Royal Commissioner to the Assembly of the Established Church, the Moderator or President of that Assembly, several Judges of the Court of Session, and the City Magistrates, in their robes of office, while tears were seen flowing down the cheeks of men who were "all unused to the melting mood,"—and in the unity of that grief which was felt from one end of Scotland to the other, and from one end of Christendom to the other, when they heard that

"————— his large deep heart,
Where world-wide love bore undivided part,
The master spirit of his native land—
The famed—the loved—of many a distant strand,
Had ceased to beat"—

in the grateful tribute of the Queen as an estimate of *his* peerless worth, who nevertheless had mustered triumphant opposition and defeat against the most firm and united counsels of the British parliament, and whose last work on earth was the noble testimony he bore against the policy of some noble Dukes;—in the unbounded eulogiums which are everywhere echoing to his praise;*— and in the anxious desire with which the relics of his greatness and his goodness,—his unpublished writings—are anticipated;—in all this we see the evidences of that glory which has been achieved by the moral greatness of the departed, and which tarnishes the lustre of the most august princes,—the most renowned of warriors,—and the most exalted of intellectual giants.

The last end of Dr. Chalmers was appropriate :

"On him benignant Heaven bestows,
For honored life, an honored close,"—

It was in unison with his path of life, which had shone more and more brightly until it was lost in the splendours of his

villages—from crowded towns, and cities densely pressed with human beings—and yet they were all thoroughly representative. They knew that through all their congregations, however differently situated, there was but one feeling of grief and of sincere mourning.

* "It may be doubted," says Dr. Campbell, "whether half so many funeral tributes, throughout the pulpits of all communities, save and except the Church of England, were ever paid to any other individual."

perfect day. "He rested in his bed" from the labors of his toilsome life. "He entered into peace." "He fell asleep in Jesus," and awoke in bliss.

"The voice at midnight came,
He started up to hear;
A mortal arrow pierced his frame:
He fell—but felt no fear.

"His spirit with a bound
Left its encumbering clay;
His tent at sunrise on the ground
A darkened ruin lay."

And now "he walks in his brightness."

"I have only farther to add," to use the language of his friend Mr. Bruce, "the following short but most descriptive narrative of his last hours, supplied to me by his family:— 'On the evening of last Sabbath he went out into the garden behind the house, and sauntered round it, and there he was overheard by one of the family, near to whom he passed, in low but very earnest accents, saying—' Oh, Father, my heavenly Father.' It was a season of close and endeared communion with his God. He then supped with his family; and, as if he had kept the brightest and most beaming of that day's smiles for the close, and the fondest of his utterances for his own, that supper, to himself and all around, was the happiest season of a very bright and happy day. After family prayer he retired to rest; and it could not have been very long afterwards, (not more, perhaps, than an hour,) when the summons came. In a season of perfect quiet and repose, he had laid himself gently back upon the pillows, which were so placed as to elevate him nearly to a sitting posture; just then his heavenly Master came, and called, and he departed. It must have been wholly without a struggle. The expression of the face, as seen in the morning—that of a calm and dignified placidity—the position of the body, so easy that the slightest ruffle of a conflict would have disturbed it—the very lie of the fingers and the hands, known to each familiar eye of those around him as being that into which they naturally fell in the moments of entire repose—all showed that, undisturbed by even the slightest strife with the last enemy, his spirit had moved away, and ascended to its own place of blessedness and glory in the heavens.'"

Oh! lovely goeth down the sun at eve,
 When crimson clouds their glorious garlands weave,—
 When golden streamlets shed their parting light,
 Till the bright morrow of a summer night.
 Thus set *thy* sun;—no tempest's power
 Darkened the brightness of thy setting hour,—
 No pang, no struggle crossed thy mighty frame:
 Swiftly the chariot for the prophet came,
 And from thy finished work—thy goal-won race—
 Bore thee to fill thy blissful blood-bought place!

And oh, our God! although we mourn that thou
 Hast torn our father from his children now,
 Yet for his joy we thank thee! And for all
 His glorious years of combat on the wall
 Of warring Zion—champion of the breach,—
 Where thou thy bucklered arm to him didst reach,
 And for his work in every land enshrined,—
 The living labours of a deathless mind,—
 We thank thee, Lord!

It was with painful interest we perused, in the volume prefixed to our article, the evidence given by Dr. Chalmers before the Parliamentary Committee. This was his last public labour, and the mental excitement to which it *must* have subjected him, (and which may have operated as an accelerating cause to his disease,) will be evident to every reader. He was like a stag at bay, surrounded by the hunters and assailed by furious blood-hounds, for it was manifestly the design of Sir James Graham to involve him, if possible, in contradiction or inconsistency. Foiled, however, in all his efforts, he was glad to leave the noble foe at rest. Yes! released from the pursuit, after having given noble evidence of his valour and the righteousness of his cause, he retired to his own favoured home, where he found that "rest which remaineth for the people of God."

ARTICLE IV.

THE RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION OF THE BLACK POPULATION.

The Gospel to be given to our servants. A Sermon preached in several of the Protestant Episcopal Churches in Charleston on Sundays in July 1847, by the REV. PAUL TRAPIER, Charleston, S. C. Printed by Miller & Brown.

Discussion on "the Religious Instruction of the Blacks" in the Charleston Mercury, between "Many Citizens" and the REV. J. B. ADGER.

The Rev. Mr. Trapier prepared and published his sermon "at the request of the Committee appointed by the Diocesan Convention of S., C. to establish a congregation of Black and Colored persons." His text was taken from Col. IV. 1, "Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a master in Heaven." The subject is introduced by a statement of the fact that the *servants* mentioned in the text were "bondmen and bondwomen, the property of their owners, and so to continue not only so long as they both should live, but to be transmitted, they and their offspring by will, or in due course of law, to the heirs of their masters through successive generations."—p. 5.

The preacher refers to Heathen writers, as showing that in those days masters possessed over their slaves "a control more nearly absolute than any of us would wish to exercise;" also he refers to the Old Testament writers as showing the existence of this institution "among God's ancient people from the era of the deluge to the end of the Jewish Economy." He remarks next on the "deep impress of it upon society, Jewish as well as Pagan, in the days of our Lord, furnishing him in his parables with illustrations, &c., &c." "As to the power itself and the rights whence it springs, no Christian can allege that those rights are in the

least impaired, or that power in its legitimate effects in any degree hindered by aught that can be found in the New Testament." The preacher then calls upon his hearers to listen "with calm and thankful spirit in *the first place* to the *Counsel* of St. Paul in our text to you as masters, and then to the *Considerations*, which in fulfilment of his duty are to be presented to you in reference thereto, by one who, born and bred in your midst, can have no other interest or object in this matter, than the good of our common country and of our beloved city."—p. 6—8.

The counsel of the Apostle is then applied by the preacher to the religious training of our servants, which duty he urges by the example of Abraham; by precepts both from the Old and New Testaments; and by an appeal to humanity, and a sense of "such favours as the humblest may confer upon the loftiest."—pages 9—11.

We quote a passage from Mr. Tapier.

"Here then, let me entreat your attention, more definitely, to the real state of the case. There are, as it appeared by the census of 1840, about 20,000 slaves in our city and its suburbs; and not more than 1000 of these are in any way connected with our six Episcopal Churches; nor in all the other places of worship, of all denominations, is it estimated that more than 5000 can be accommodated. This leaves an appalling residue of about 14,000. Where are they? and what is becoming of them? They are human beings, with thoughts and feelings of their own, which may be naturally not as keen as yours, and which ages of degradation may have rendered still more obtuse, but which yet are not, nor can be, absolutely torpid. Their hearts are in common with those of all the rest of mankind, prone to sin and averse from God and holiness. Do you imagine that, left to themselves, they will not go on from bad to worse, catching and communicating contagion by association? Or do you fancy that they are to be kept from doing so by the strong arm of domestic discipline, or detected and punished by the vigilance of municipal agency? Nay, brethren! it is notorious that such expedients, however useful and indispensable, do and cannot effect a cure of this, or any other moral disease; nor even arrest its progress; nor reach the hiding places of its real origin. For these are in the heart, and it is because our servants are not Christians that so

many of them are given to vices, and guilty of offences ruinous to themselves, hurtful to their fellows, injurious to us, and pestilential to our whole community. So that while you relax not, in the least, whatever of salutary discipline it may be in your power to exercise over them in your households; and while you increase, however much, the efficiency of your police; suffer me, nevertheless, to enquire of you again, are you doing what you ought and may for their souls? Not for the 1000 of them whom we find reported to our Convention, as attached, more or less closely, to our city Churches; but for the 14,000, who, not connected efficiently with any denomination of Christians, are within the limits of our parochial cures. Locally so, they are; but as to any influence upon them for spiritual good, I ask again, where are they? "Sitting in darkness and the shadow of death," "without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." (Eph. II. 12.) The heathen in our midst, as they have been truly named, nay, in one respect, worse off than heathen elsewhere—these at our door are exposed to the evils of civilization, and its vices are corrupting them; while of its moral benefits scarcely a knowledge have they, unless by the contrast of their own deprivation and consequent spiritual wretchedness."—pages 12—13.

This truly beautiful and affecting passage brings the preacher to the second part of his discourse: "*The suggestions which I am directed to make to you.*" Here he alludes to the action of the late Convention by which the committee who had invited him to preach "were appointed not to *consider and report*, but to make arrangements for *establishing and keeping up*" the congregation proposed. He states also that "our every step hitherto has been under the tacit sanction, and with the approval expressed or implied of those who are over us in Church and State. Care was taken at the outset to learn at the proper sources whether such a movement would be at variance with the laws. In convention persons prominent at our Bar,* and to whom we all are, in most cases, ready to defer as competent judges of the public weal, were heard to express their

* Hon. Dan. Huger, J. L. Petigru, Esq. and others.

cordial satisfaction with our proposal, and their conviction that we should not be in conflict with any existing regulations. The Convention, by its vote electing the Committee, has lent us its countenance; and our Bishop, who was not present then, has since signified to us in writing his good wishes, and bidden us God speed."—p. 15.

Mr. Trapier then states that the plan of a *separate* congregation for the Blacks is not in his view "absolutely the best."—p. 15.

"Happy were it for us, if in every one of our churches, each family of white persons could be accompanied by its group of servants to the house of prayer, to join in the same worship, partake of the same ordinances, and listen to the same preaching, simplified to the capacities of the latter, while not beneath the tastes, nor unworthy the attention of the former. But, alas! we know full well, dear friends, that not a few among us will but smile at an aspiration so seemingly utopian,—an anticipation so vain,—a suggestion so unreasonable, some will say, and to others so revolting. Many reply, at once, that "the thing is impossible; the negroes will not come; they are so fond of the Methodists and Baptists." And others add, that if they came they would not be interested in the service, for they could not follow it, nor understand the sermon, unless it were lowered to a style, which the 'educated and refined,' it is alleged, could not endure."—p. 16.

"In some of these objections," Mr. Trapier does not "see any force." He appeals to Planters and the country Clergy to prove that the "Prayer Book needs only to be explained and taught orally and familiarly, and the slaves even on our plantations will delight in them." But to others of the objections he allows "considerable weight, for we are by no means disposed to deny that, with the present tastes of our city congregations, it would be no easy matter for any pastor so to minister from the pulpit as to instruct and move the servant at once and the master* ; and we agree that,

* For this purpose it is not enough that, after the entire services, including the sermon, shall have been gone through with, in presence of the whole congregation, colored as well as white, the servants should be detained, and addressed separately, either on some distinct topic, or in continuation of the previous discourse. For not to speak of the tediousness to them of such discourse, and of a mode of worship, not explained to

until that is done, the wishes and wants of the superior must be chiefly regarded, and the inferior left, in consequence, with little to attract him to a Gospel which, however congenial essentially to the yearnings of his soul, is, in the form of its presentation, not adapted to his comprehension. We grant too, that, as our churches now are arranged and occupied, there cannot be places found for more than a small portion of the thousands who are at present excluded.—Moreover, were there changes ever so much for the better in all of these respects, there would yet remain difficulties in the way of adequate pastoral oversight, and of such instruction as is peculiarly needed by the ignorant, but which can only be imperfectly afforded, if, in addition to the many hundreds of white persons, who have confessedly, as things are now, a prior claim upon the Pastors of all our city churches, there be a large proportion of servants also professedly under their parochial care.”—pages 16—17.

“Once more then we recur to our question, What shall we do for our servants?” “In view of the many thousands who, living in practical heathenism, are in instant peril of their immortal souls, let us reason together in all friendliness about the mode now suggested for meeting in part this deplorable destitution.”

Mr. T. then explains that “in the proposed congregation they set apart certain seats for, and also count on the habitual attendance of some whites;—that the instruction, which is to be only oral, is all to be given by trust-worthy teachers—white of course;—that all cases of ecclesiastical discipline are to rest with the minister, subject to revision by the Bishop;—and that according to the Episcopal mode of church government, such a congregation, while so constituted, could not acquire any parochial existence, but must remain a *missionary station*, under the management of the Convention through its Committee.”—p. 18.

In conclusion Mr. Trapier says, that if there be any objections seriously entertained to this scheme, he will be

them, it is too much to expect of human nature, especially if so prone as theirs to somnolency. Nor does there remain, therefore, any alternative, in such case, but to address them in the course of the sermons preached to, and before their owners, who must be content, if so, to share with their servants, and to listen in their presence to instructions in mutual duty; as is in fact the method chosen of God in holy Scripture.—*Note by Mr. Trapier.*

thankful to any friends who will point them out, and he pledges himself that the scheme shall be "modified accordingly, so that the great end had in view may be attained with the least possible agitation and disquiet."—p. 18, 19.

A sermon by the Rev. Mr. Adger, on the same subject, received some notice in our last number. In reviewing now his discussion with "Many Citizens," we would take occasion to state that previously to any public step, on his part, Mr. A. was for months engaged in consulting, confidentially, all the leading minds of the community, so far as he could get access to them; and in every case, with one or two exceptions, he received the strongest encouragement to proceed. The action of the Episcopal Convention, above referred to, and of which Mr. A. was an eye and ear witness, appeared strongly indicative of the favor with which all parties would regard the undertaking. Upon his list of subscribers were enrolled gentlemen of the highest character, and of every profession. The Presbytery of Charleston gave him their strongest sanction. The public mind appeared ripe for the movement.

And we believe the public mind of Charleston is ready for every movement, respecting which it is satisfied, that it is really calculated to secure the moral and religious improvement of our slaves. It is true that on this subject a morbidness is exhibited in Charleston, which is to be found in no other city of the Southern States. It is true that in the case before us, one voice raised in opposition, one anonymous writer calling in question the safety of the plan proposed, secured for himself the profoundest attention, and appeared for a while to prevail over all the responsible names and all the calm and sober arguments that were brought forward on the other side. But although at first surprised at the unexpected opposition and its apparent success, we were soon satisfied that it was limited in its extent, and still more that it must inevitably prove temporary. Indeed, while we felt a blush of patriotic shame mantling upon our cheeks, at the thought of any in our community opposing so Christian, prudent and useful a measure; while we regretted the fresh foreign aspersions to which the printed and widely diffused record of this opposition must expose us, we were nevertheless, soon satisfied that the subject was thus only attracting more closely to itself the scrutiny and sober at-

tion of our citizens, and that so, in the end, the results must be greater and better. We have more hope of safe, sound, and permanent reforms in this matter, because they advance slowly. We are glad to have every proposition in regard to it scrutinized. And on account of the very morbidness of Charleston, we look for more judicious proceedings and sounder results from the religious instruction of slaves there, than can be expected, as we fear, in some other Southern cities where a laxer public sentiment prevails.

We must add another remark respecting the opposition. Some professed friends of this enterprise have reflected on Mr. Adger for not acting with less frankness. They blame him for not getting a new church erected on the plea of its being for poor white people chiefly or partly, but with a view to transferring it afterwards to the use of blacks. They think Mr. A. should have gone about his business with more craft, and then no opposition would have arisen.* For our part, we are free to say, that apart from the immoral tone of these censures, we greatly prefer that the real sentiments of the Charleston people should be discovered. Let this enterprise be placed upon its proper foundation. If good, it can be defended by argument;—if bad, let it be proved so and discarded. In like manner, let the opposition to it be scrutinized;—let us see plainly its character. Is it an opposition founded on a fair and candid statement of the facts at issue, and the plan under discussion? And is it an opposition which a Christian people can deliberately sanction? We intend to devote a few paragraphs to these questions.

And it will be as well to state here that "Many Citizens" wrote two articles in the Mercury, before Mr. A. felt called on to reply,—and that a *third* communication from him appeared on the day Mr. A's. first letter was sent to the edi-

* Respecting the remarkable fact that all this opposition was directed against Mr. Adger's scheme, while the *same identical plan*, pursued in the *same manner*, on the part of the *Episcopalians*, received apology, if not defence, we have little to say. The time will come, we have no doubt, when all will consider it an *honor* to have led the way in this good work. And for Mr. A. we, as Presbyterians, disclaim the merit of his having solely originated this plan. It is a striking fact that it should have had a simultaneous independent origin in two of the leading Christian denominations among us.

tor. His second followed immediately, and then a fourth from "Many Citizens" closed the discussion.

And now first as to *the facts at issue*.

The *Presbyterian statement* was, that there are "not much less than 20,000 black and colored people in Charleston and its suburbs—that the galleries of all the evangelical churches could not hold more than half of these, and that the actual attendance is not more than 6,000, of whom not more than one third are qualified to understand the preaching to the whites."

In reply to this, "Many Citizens" takes the colored population, as stated, at 20,000, but thinks that leaving out the children, the aged, the sick, &c. &c., not more than 10,000 at any one time, and probably a much smaller number, stand in need of accommodation at church.

He then proceeds to sustain the issue he has made respecting the adequacy of our gallery accommodation, by showing that—

"The Methodists have	5,000	church members;	
"The Prot. Methodists,	700	"	"
"The Baptists, - - -	2,000	"	"
"The Scotch Church,	500	"	"

"In all, - - - - - 8,200 church members."

And then he triumphantly assigns the small remainder to thirteen other churches, and appears satisfied that his work is done.

The Presbyterians reply, that they had confined their estimate of a proper supply to *evangelical* denominations, but were content to try the very different issue made by the objector. And they shew that not one item of "Many Citizens'" statements bears at all upon the case in hand. The question being the sufficiency of *gallery accommodation*, he had enlightened us about *colored membership*. There are not 5,000 seats in the Methodist galleries, for example, but so many church members, (besides any quantity of non-church members,) who need to have seats provided. The Presbyterians insist that thus a very important fact is brought out by "Many Citizens;" and it is one which will no doubt astonish our readers. The galleries appropriated to blacks do not accommodate even the colored *members* of the Methodist and Baptist churches! The latter have in

their first church alone, 12 or 1300 church members, (not 2,000,) while their gallery is crowded to suffocation, (as Baptists themselves tell us,) with 300 attendants! As for the Methodists, although Mr. Adger over liberally allowed that possibly 1200 might be accommodated in the galleries of Trinity Church, it was found afterwards, upon a careful measurement by the Rev. Messrs. Whiteford Smith, Foster, and Eaddie, of the Methodist church, and Mr. Adger, that Trinity Church has bench seats in its galleries for only 700 persons, and this at the rate of ten people to a bench eleven feet long! Between the *sets of benches*, and on the *steps* leading down room to seat themselves. While behind the upper row of seats, and next the wall, 150 more might get room to *stand*; thus the utmost capacity of Trinity, *sitters and standers altogether*, is 1000 people. Let Cumberland, then, be reckoned at 900, and Bethel at 500 more, (which is doubtless too large,) and the Methodist galleries come short of taking in half their own church members! What Christian man will say that even our Methodist brethren, far as they exceed us, in their attention to the negroes, have done their duty fully? And who can blind his eyes to the appalling want of church provision for these poor, when even the *church members*, of a denomination which does more than any other for the blacks, are not half accommodated with places in the galleries. There is surely something wrong here—either the seats are too few or the church members too many. Either the admission to church membership is altogether too easy, or else the provision for the instruction and edification of the church members is altogether inadequate. If we may speak frankly, we say both these things are probably true; and we hope no Methodist reader of these remarks will find fault with our honesty.

The Presbyterians notice another very important fact, as brought out by "Many Citizens." It is that according to his calculations the present system of gallery accommodation makes *no provision for the children*. Now really the children are to some extent present, and there are also some Sunday schools where children and adults together receive catechetical instruction. But these schools are neither numerous nor full enough to supply our wants as a religious community, even in this department. Meanwhile, as Mr.

A. well says, it is one of the greatest objections to our present system of church accommodation for the blacks, that it does not contemplate and provide for the constant presence of all the juvenile portion, the most impressible, and therefore most improvable of this, as of every other population.

And now let us refer to "Many Citizens'" management of the *Episcopal statement*, that the reader may judge how fairly he deals with the *facts at issue*.

Mr. A. quotes the very respectable and intelligent Committee of that denomination, to substantiate his own statements called in question by the objector.

They say the "The census of 1840 shewed an aggregate of upwards of 14,000 of these people, (exclusive of the free colored,) within our *incorporated limits*."

In his reply "Many Citizens" thus handles this testimony:

"Mr. A. informed us in his sermon, that the number of colored persons in the city and Neck was 20,000. We began by assuming this as correct. But the report of the Episcopal Committee makes it much less, that is about 14,000."

And upon such a misrepresentation of the Episcopalian statement was founded everything he had to say, respecting the facts at issue, in that, his fourth and final article. A more absolute yielding of the question Mr. A.'s friends could not have desired, much as they might have been gratified with more fairness on the part of their antagonist.

But there is another question of facts to which we must recur. Mr. A. states it as his opinion, that the style of preaching in the white churches is not adapted to the intellectual capacity of the blacks, and he also maintains that they need a great deal of laborious and persevering catechetical teaching in private, as well as constant individual guidance and discipline, on the part of their pastors. And because the ministers are thus unable to do their duty towards this people and to their white congregations together, he urges the necessity of special teachers and pastors to instruct and to watch over the blacks, as well as special places in which to congregate them for instruction.

Now on this point, our anonymous objector was guilty of a most flagrant breach of propriety as well as justice. He

sought to rouse the rancour of sect and party in opposition to a scheme which was only to be considered on the broadest principles of Christian philanthropy. He endeavored to torture Mr. A's. condemnation of the system of things which had grown up around us, or rather, under which we ourselves had grown up, into a "censure levelled at the preachers of the Gospel in our city." But we cast a mantle of oblivion over this part of the discussion, simply expressing our confidence, that the more Mr. A's. statements on this point are examined and considered, the more their truth and justice will be apparent.

And now for a brief examination of the manner and spirit in which Mr. A's. plan itself was discussed.

It must be perfectly manifest to every candid reader, that all which Mr. A. demands, and all that his Presbytery sanction, is *special places and special instruction*. Neither he nor they have desired or approved of any "*separate organization of churches*," but only of "the formation of separate colored congregations." And in these congregations seats are to be reserved for white attendants,—also men of Christian zeal and judgment are to be deputed to assist the minister in teaching and training his flock; and this minister and these assistants are to have in their hands alone the whole work of instruction. As to the point of government, the congregation gathered, is to be "under the discipline and spiritual jurisdiction of an existing white session, or treated as a missionary church, under the care of an evangelist."

This plan is identical with that of the Episcopalian Committee, as given in our review of Mr. Trapier's sermon.* So much so, that Mr. A., changing one or two technicalities, adopts the very language of the Episcopal Committee. "The congregation we propose to form will not only be, like ourselves, subject to (Convention) Presbytery, but its pastor must be a clergyman in good standing among ourselves, recognized by our (Bishop) Presbytery and Synod; and the teachers aiding him must be of established reputation. Nor can any share of the teaching and discipline of the people be in the hands of any others than such persons. Neither will the congregation be made up only of slaves,

* See page 90.

for the doors of the church must be always open to all who may wish to enter; a portion of the interior will be reserved for white persons, and it is expected that some such will be in habitual attendance with the congregation, and invariably in attendance upon all its meetings."

Mr. A. well asks, can as much be said of the *actual system*, as administered in every church in Charleston which has a black membership? And he asks any one knowing the present actual organization of all those churches in Charleston which have black members, "to point out a single particular in which the plan thus objected to differs practically from the one actually in operation *excepting as it brings the slave more immediately under white supervision?*"

This task we do not find that "Many Citizens" was willing to undertake. But he commenced his attack by the unfounded charge that it was proposed by the friends of this new enterprise to "teach the slaves reading and writing."

He charges, also, by strong implication upon this plan, that it tends to "diminish the influence and authority of the master;" and that it vests, "either presently or prospectively, ecclesiastical authority in the slave."

He harps upon the dangers with which this scheme is fraught. It is held up as a "fearful experiment." He seeks to excite our imaginations, already heated by a July sun. "The admissions of this sermon are damning to us. It will be emblazoned on the banners that float over the hosts now gathering for an attack on us, and while it nerves the arm raised against us, will paralyze that we raise in our defence."

The Presbyterians, recommending that this new congregation be regarded only as a branch of some existing church, *so as to join it to and subject it under that church*, he straightway puts upon the term branch the opposite construction, and cries out that it points to ultimate *separation*.

The Presbyterians' Committee undertaking to dissect for a body of Presbyterian ministers, their own system of church government, drawing certain distinctions which were necessary to reconcile their duty to the State with their duty to their own ecclesiastical system, and leading

them to see how, upon the point of the *temporary nature of the evangelist's office*, they might conscientiously modify the views of Presbyterianism they had hitherto entertained, so as to make it at once operative in the highest degree for good to the slave, and yet consistent in the highest degree with our state of society and our laws, "Many Citizens" plunges headlong into the subject, confounds the distinctions that were made, wrongly interprets the language used, and notwithstanding every disclaimer insists, not only that we contemplate some future dangerous organization, but that we are for now giving a "right to consult, to vote, to determine questions affecting the government of a church, which will induce a taste to exercise the same privileges on another theatre and for other purposes;"—that we are for allowing "the plenitude of freedom in thought, word and action in the church;" that so we are getting up an "organized community,"—"excited by the privileges they enjoy, as a separate and to some extent independent society," "brought to a fearful dilemma," "removed from a quiet and peaceable life, and agonized with the terrible doubt whether they shall convulse the whole element of our society," &c. &c! "To this end not only *may* it come, but to this end it *must* come!"

Very dreadful indeed! We fear that the nerves of "Many Citizens" can hardly have recovered even after so long a time, from the severe shock which they must have received from the bare contemplation of all these horrors. Ours have recovered tone, and so we suppose have those of the community, and we therefore hope that they, at least, have been able, ere this, to read and understand the concluding paragraphs of the critical notice of Mr. Adger's sermon, (contained in our last number,) whereby the same pen that gave, may serve also to heal the dreadful wound and the terrific visions with which it scared our friend without a name, may be proved to have had their origin altogether in his own imagination.

And now how stands the matter in dispute?

There is a plain and manifest lack of gallery accommodation for a large class of the population of Charleston. If 28 churches be needed for 20,000 whites, surely the galleries of 20 of these churches, which are less than one third the whole space, and therefore less than 7 whole churches, must fall far short of supplying 20,000 blacks.

If every church without exception gives to the blacks less room than to the whites,—if in every church there are fewer blacks than whites, while there are no separate assemblages of blacks in churches—then of course, the black population is less a church going people, and less provided for with church accommodation than their masters.

Here also is a plain and manifest deficiency of pastoral instruction for them. The negroes do not comprehend the pulpit teachings, and the ministry do not find time to instruct them to any adequate extent in private.

Here is a system which *separates* the blacks from the whites. *In church*, it separates them into galleries as a class by themselves, whereas upon the principles of some they ought to be brought as members of the family,—upon the same floor and into or along side of the pews of their masters. *Out of church*, it separates them into classes under black leaders who assemble them in private places,—or if at the churches, there altogether, scattered about through the galleries, each class with its leader, while *one* white person, it may be, is present merely to comply with the letter of the law!

Here is a system which imposes on the ministry a task they never can fulfil, and allows them to assume a responsibility they never can discharge. It is not the white minister who is really the responsible instructor in any one of our churches which has a large black membership,—the black class leaders are the real wire pullers.

And this is a system which works well, we are told, and is safe and sound, and the community is warned not to substitute any other for it! And meanwhile it is fondly imagined that the ignorant population in question is remaining stationary in point of knowledge, and consequently their enlightenment being our greatest danger, we may be quite secure if we can only keep up the present system. Wretched delusion! offspring of a false view, as well of facts, as of principles! since neither is their ignorance our safety, nor their sound instruction our danger; neither are they remaining ignorant, nor are we adequately giving them sound instruction!

Now, on the other hand, a system is proposed to us, which correctly views the facts of the case, and is also based upon sound principles. Here are two of the leading

denominations of the State publicly pledged to these views, and pledging themselves to the community for the regular and careful, the safe and sound execution of this plan. Is the Christian; intelligent and reflecting community of Charleston afraid of it? Do they hesitate to embrace it lest these churches should become scenes of conspiracy? Were wicked men ever known to conspire in public places or in large assemblages? Away with the childish bugbear!—What do the opposition dread? Is it light? We ask them can they hope to shut light out? For our part, we as Christian slaveholders dread neither light nor truth. If we fear anything it is ignorance, error and fanaticism; it is the frown of Divine Providence for our neglecting the duty of soundly instructing our slaves in his truth. We tell the opposition that we have no doubt our scheme tends to elevate and improve the intellectual and moral character of the negro. Our object is to improve their minds and hearts.—Our belief is that self interest, as well as duty, calls on us all to help on this improvement. We want this mass of intellectual and moral death removed. We want this people made better, more intelligent, industrious, tractable, trusty, better men, better servants, better Christians. Will any man, dare any man boldly and publicly, and over his own name, take the contrary position and hoist a black flag, an anti-christian banner, against the improvement of this race?

We believe that all Christian people of every denomination in South Carolina will respond most heartily to the sentiment we have just expressed. The language of that book which we all take as our only rule of faith and practice is “Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things, not answering again, not purloining, but showing all good fidelity, that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things. For the grace of God that bringeth salvation into the world hath appeared to all men; teaching us that denying ungodliness, worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world: looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.” What a

beautiful and instructive passage! In the preceding chapter certain gainsayers, unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, teachers professing to follow God, but practically denying him, are referred to by the apostle, whose mouths (he says,) are to be stopped, and whom he exhorts Titus to rebuke sharply. From this reference to the teachers of false and destructive principles, it is by a very natural train of association the apostle proceeds to charge Titus respecting the kind of instruction which he should administer. "But speak thou (says he) the things which become *sound doctrine*." He goes on to particularize under this head, and instructions for various classes, at once simple, beautiful and wholesome, distil like drops of honey or of dew from the apostolic pen. Sound indeed and wholesome are the lessons which this divinely inspired man would have taught to servants!—"Obedience, submissiveness and fidelity to their own masters." Mighty indeed the motives which he furnished for 'Titus to set before them!' "that they might adorn the doctrine of God's grace which had appeared to them, and that as a purified and peculiar people, zealous of good works, they might enjoy and realize that blessed hope, the glorious appearing of their Divine Redeemer."

Upon this passage of the Divine word we take our stand: it furnishes our defence against both those abroad who condemn negro slavery, and those at home who object to negro instruction. For this passage of scripture teaches us that *Domestic Servitude is an institution not inconsistent with Christianity*. The servants mentioned in the text were *slaves*, and the slavery of that day was far more rigorous than ours. Yet the apostle commands 'Titus to exhort them to obedience. No matter how slavery originated, the relation as now established has the sanction of scripture. The master may claim, the servant must render obedience and respectfulness and all fidelity. And God will take notice of the obedience or disobedience of the slave, rewarding or punishing him accordingly.

But again, this passage teaches us with equal plainness that *slaves are to have part in the provisions of the Gospel*. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to *all men*,"—to *bond* as well as to *free*. And it is on this ground in particular that the apostle founds his requirement of their obedience and good conduct. He re-

quires servants to obey their masters, to please them in all things, not answering again, not purloining, but showing all good fidelity, because the grace of God, in other words, *the gospel hath appeared to them and teaches them* to live soberly, righteously and godly. And accordingly where the grace of God has not appeared to them, and where they are not taught from the gospel to live soberly, righteously and godly, there it will be found they have very little sense of moral obligation. It is an immense deduction from our means of keeping such a population in order, when the mighty influences of Christianity are not brought to bear on them with full power.

The perfection of a machine is in proportion to its degree of self-regulation; and the moral perfection of man, whether master or slave, is in proportion to his power and inclination to do well, without external constraint. Christianity governs the heart and teaches servants to do their duty for conscience' sake, and as being

“Ever in their great Task-master's eye.”

And as by thus teaching them the Gospel puts slaves under these mighty moral *obligations*, so it gives them and they are to be allowed to enjoy its precious *consolations and hopes*. They are to be supported under *their* trials as the master is to be supported under *his* trials, by being taught to look for that blessed hope, the glorious appearing of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ. The two things go together, the command and the promise, the burden and the consolation God does not and man may not separate. Under the influences of the blessed Gospel the christian master and the christian slave, instructed and comforted from the same source, go along together happy in their mutual relations all through life, and when this present world shall have passed away, are united again to each other and to Christ, in a world without imperfection and without end.

Again, we learn from this passage that *however lowly their condition among men, slaves may be ornaments, or they may be occasions of reproach to Christianity*. “That they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour,” says Paul.—They are capable then of learning the doctrine, and they must be taught the doctrine. God is honored or dishonor-

ed according to their conduct. Their religious instruction then, is an affair in which God feels, and the church is bound to feel the liveliest concern.

Moreover, this passage shows that the *Bible contains a scheme of doctrine both sound and salutary* — a scheme of doctrine which may be *advantageously communicated to all classes of society*. When men preach and teach according to the Gospel, they always speak things which become *sound doctrine* — they speak *wholesome words*.— Writing to Timothy, Paul refers expressly to a class of “vain talkers,” whom we also meet at this day — those who teach otherwise than as Paul instructed Timothy to teach, viz:— “Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things (he continues) teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing; * * * from such withdraw thyself.”— I Tim. vi. 1—5.

Yes! this doctrine of “equal rights,” as held by the vain-talkers of the present day, is a proud and *know-nothing* doctrine. Facts and reason and common sense and scripture, too, all contradict it. It is the same absurdity whether applied to liberty or to property. The Agrarian is no worse than the abolition error. If every child is born with a right to equal liberty, so he is to an equal share of earth, air, fire and water. But not only so, he is born to the inheritance of all that was the fair and rightful produce of the toil of his ancestors. And his ancestors, who were the real hewers and diggers and cutters and builders, *had at least as much* right to the cleared land and the built up edifices as those rich men had, who paid them low, scant wages for their labour. The rich man contributed to the result a little money; the poor man much toil. All the while the result was being produced, the rich man revelled in luxury, but the poor man labored hard and ate coarsely and slept un-comfortably. And now therefore he and his heirs forever have as much if not more right and title to the joint produce

of his and the rich man's joint contributions, than the rich man's heirs possess. See to what a length of all-levelling, disorganizing absurdity this abolition view of *equal rights*, would lead us.

The Bible, on the contrary, teaches that God puts one above another. The Bible is conservative. Christianity is a religion of peace, order and law. Its object is not to overturn the existing forms of government, and then recombine political elements, but it is to dispense the elements of saving truth. It is the grace of God which brings *salvation*.—It turns away men's thoughts from this world to a better, for which they must prepare by living soberly, righteously and godly, redeemed from all iniquity, a purified and peculiar people, zealous not for their political rights, but of good works. "Art thou called being a servant, (thus it speaks) care not for it." Become the Lord's freeman! Deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, (among others the lust of rising above your sphere)—be content to occupy the lowest place, since God has put you there. Obey your master and seek to please him in all things, and to shew to him all good fidelity! Do this, and God will accept and reward you.

This passage instructs us, moreover that *the ministry have a special work to do for servants or slaves*. They have received from Heaven for them a particular message of exhortation and teaching. And they are to seek, and they ought to be allowed to have access to them, so as to communicate the word which God sends. Wo to that man who would hinder God's ambassadors from carrying the Heavenly message! Let the proper authorities, civil and ecclesiastical, see that the unruly, the radical, the seditious, the vain talkers, and deceivers be shut out, and have their mouths stopped, lest they beguile the simple and mislead the ignorant. But true ministers of Christ, that are no brawlers, but gentle, shewing all meekness to all men, in doctrine shewing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech that cannot be condemned, let them not only be allowed, but urged and encouraged and assisted in every possible way to exhort the slaves and to teach them soberness, righteousness and godliness.

We are also taught that *as the Bible condemns the unruly, the seditious, the radical, the abolitionist and the agrarian*, so it is equally hostile to *the infidel, the carnal,*

and the anti-christian spirit which sets itself against furnishing ample religious instruction to the slave. Paul condemns those who teach unwholesome words and unsound principles which subvert the institutions of society, overturn the authority of magistrates, and destroy the influence and power of masters ;—but at the same time he commands that we exhort and teach the servants. And these two things, this condemnation and this command, go together. The latter is the completion, nay ! the very *establishment* and *strength* of the former. If you want the wrong principle shut out, bring in the right principle. To exclude the darkness, you must bring in the light. Fill the measure with wheat and then it can hold no chaff. The unruly subverter you desire to keep out—that desire is vain and unprofitable, if alone. It is both your interest, and your solemn, Heaven-commanded duty to keep out the unruly and vain talker and deceiver, but you are also required by the same Divine authority, and the same self-interest too, to introduce the teacher of sound doctrine ; and this latter work, if performed, will secure in the simplest, safest manner, the execution of the other.

Once more : this passage shows us the *true impregnable position of the Christian Slaveholder.* The Bible furnishes to the slaveholder armour of proof, weapons of heavenly temper and mould, whereby he can maintain his ground against all attacks. But this is true, only when he obeys its directions as well as employs its sanctions. Our rights are there established, but it is always in connection with our duties ; if we neglect the one, we cannot make good the other. Our domestic institutions can be maintained against the world if we but allow Christianity to throw its broad shield over them. But if we so act as to array the Bible against our social economy, then our social economy must fall. Nothing ever yet stood up long against Christianity. Those who say that religious instruction is inconsistent with our peculiar civil polity, are the worst enemies of that polity. They would drive religious men from its defence. Sooner or later, if their views prevail, they will separate the religious portion of our community from the rest, and thus divided we shall become an easy prey.”

¶ In the soundness of these general principles, derived so directly and manifestly from the inspired word of God, we

have the greatest confidence. And in urging, as we would now do with all our strength, upon the Southern church, and especially upon the Southern ministry, the duty of more amply, efficiently, and thoroughly furnishing our slaves with the Gospel, we would draw a broad distinction between the province of the church and that of the state, in reference to this population. It is for statesmen to manage political affairs: we are urging upon religious men a *religious* duty. What belongs to Cæsar we leave with Cæsar—it is God's part for which we are pleading. Sound religious doctrine and instruction will turn the mind and thoughts of this population to their immortal interests, as coupled with and affected by the faithful discharge of their mortal obligations. And it is vastly important that the attention of all Christian people at the South should be concentrated on the same point—the *religious and immortal interests* of our servants. Foreign interference has caused us to be too much occupied with the civil aspects of this relation. The contest into which we have been forced has, no doubt, served to shew how impregnable is our position when rightly understood and maintained. But now that the tempest's rudest shock has been endured, and the stability of our foundations proved, it is time to turn back again with fresh zeal and earnest devotion to that *religious work*, which was so happily advancing when the meddling of strangers first interrupted us.

But if the church leaves politics to statesmen, she must claim freedom in religious matters; and under our happy form of Government, the State wisely and justly refuses to interfere with the freedom of the church. The duty under consideration, as limited to *religious* instruction, never has been questioned and is entirely consistent with our political duties. The interests of church and of state, of religion and of politics among us, cannot be made antagonistic without mutual and dreadful injury. There is nothing in Christian duty, nothing in that most binding religious duty now under consideration, which is not *order and law*. We are commanded by the Lord Jesus to preach the Gospel to every creature, and this command applies to all Christians in their several spheres, and never can infringe on our duty to the law. It is not an open question whether the bondman shall be taught the way of life, and what God commands

to be done cannot be against the welfare of any state. It enjoins a duty which increases instead of weakening the defences of society, and which every obligation of Christianity and of patriotism calls on us to discharge.

Now we go a step further, and we say that even were it true that the religious instruction of this population is inconsistent with our political system, there would still be no alternative for those who acknowledge Christ for their master. But we must all cease to harbour one thought of danger from the very amplest supply of sound religious instruction. The duty we are urging is not only safe, but it actually increases our security. The Gospel never made any man the worse, but contrariwise, teaches and promotes obedience, soberness, righteousness, and godliness. When it does not convert it civilizes. "The rude barbarian, with all his fierce, ungovernable passions, it curbs and softens down; it makes him more considerate of the rights of others; more solicitous of their favour; more obedient to authority; more patient even under injury; and infinitely more sensible of the value of human life, and of the responsibility he is under to an all-seeing and all-righteous God." The dangers to which our social system exposes us are only *individual* and *occasional*. There can be no competition between the two *races*; the superior is not and need not be apprehensive of any general revolt or any permanent check to its ascendancy. But against individual and occasional attempts upon this ascendancy to which we may be exposed, the Gospel is our mightiest safeguard; for it governs in secret as well as in public; it cultivates the conscience, and thus establishes a more vigilant watch over individual conduct than Foucher himself ever accomplished by his unrivalled police. If any community on earth are bound by considerations of personal interest, to encourage the diffusion of sound religious principles among the lower orders, we are that community.*

Let it be carefully borne in mind, that the question we are discussing is not whether this population shall have re-

* We take the following striking observations from a visitation sermon, entitled "Religion the Humanizer of Man and Supporter of Society," by the Rev. Aug. Wm. Hare, preached at Marlborough, July 12, 1831, before the Ven. the Archdeacon of Wilts, and published by desire of the Clergy.

"Religion can win its way to hearts barred against every other influ-

ligious instruction, but whether we shall or shall not give them *sound* religious instruction. Religion is a thing which human nature must have, for man is so constituted by his Maker. These people, unprovided for by us, will and do "after their own lusts heap to themselves teachers" who turn them away from the truth to fables. They are, as we all know, exceedingly superstitious, believing in second sight, in apparitions, charms and witchcraft; and therefore they may and do easily become the dupes of artful and designing men, who are all the more dangerous when coming in the garb of preachers of the gospel. "They have been known to be so perfectly and fearfully under the influence

ence; it can soften and conquer dispositions which would else remain intractable and savage; and hereby, in addition to all its other and higher merits, it establishes a title to be considered the great humanizer of mankind. * * *

"Experience has evinced, and is evincing daily, that men of savage hearts and savage deeds may be generated from the offscourings of civilization, no less than amid the barrenness of the desert. Nay, of the two extremes, the savages of civilization are the more dangerous; inasmuch as with the same untamable dispositions, they combine greater knowledge, fiercer passions, ampler means, and above all, a larger field for mischief. The heart sickens at considering what evil might be done by a few hands, if the rich and brittle edifice of prosperity, which by God's permission has been so laboriously reared in this country during a long succession of generations, were abandoned by him even for a few short moments, to human laws and human vigilance. When the Lord had ceased to keep the city, we should find that the watchman waketh but in vain. For what, after all, can human laws avail against men who own no moral tie? The crafty elude, the sanguine overlook, the violent defy them. Apart from their moral obligation, their only hold on man is through the medium of his bodily fears; and against these the heart easily learns to harden itself, and will even take a sort of pride in braving them.

"Since even laws then, if considered as merely human ordinances, are so manifestly inadequate to the protection of the community, what remains to supply the deficiency but religion? It is that, and that alone, which can awaken and keep alive a sense of duty in a country; which can bind the moral law upon the hearts of men; which can set before their reason an Almighty ruler, the ever-present witness of all their actions, the hater of iniquity, the punisher of the wicked. It is religion, and that alone, which has the sacred power of communicating life to institutions; and which can fix the laws deeply, as with living roots, in the imagination and conscience of a people.

Accordingly, it was the wisdom of all the ancient States to strengthen themselves by some religious sanction. In so doing, however false or corrupt the superstition they resorted to may have been, still, in appealing to it for help, and staying themselves as they might, on its authority, they paid a homage to the great principle, that nations, if they wish to stand, must rest on something superhuman. Now, if even false systems are serviceable to prop a State, how much more must truth be serviceable!

of some leader, conjurer or minister, that they have not dared to disobey him in the least particular, nor to disclose their own intended or perpetrated crimes, even to escape from impending death itself." The real question therefore is, whether such a people, dwelling side by side with us, and related to us as members of our households, are to be surrendered by us to unsound and unsafe teachers? Can we afford, as house-holders, as property-holders, as patriots, to allow such a mass of religious ignorance and superstition to remain like so much explosive material exposed to the incendiary's torch?*

What reasonable man will say the duty we are urging

If even out of the acorns and husks of Paganism a sustenance could be extracted for the body politic, how much more must the fine wheat of the Gospel strengthen and support and nourish it! This is the sum of the matter, according to the judicious Hooker. "Seeing it doth appear, (says that great writer,) that the safety of all States dependeth upon religion, and that whatever good effects do grow out of their religion who embrace instead of the true a false, the roots thereof are the truths intermingled with the errors, because no religion can wholly and solely consist of untruths; therefore we have reason to think that all well-ordered commonwealths are to love true religion as their chiefest stay."

"Such was the opinion of all practical antiquity. But it was preëminently the conviction of those great social architects, our ancestors of the middle ages: so many of whose institutions are still towering amongst us: God preserve them unimpaired from all decay and violence, to shelter and be a blessing to posterity! These institutions, which have stood such a number and variety of shocks, were all either directly founded on Christianity, or at least were intimately connected with it, and designed to be upheld by it. And surely the foundations and buttresses must have been well chosen, of buildings which have endured so long.

"A new wisdom, however, has unfortunately sprung up of later years. Religion, it seems, is no longer necessary to the welfare of nations. It is not even indispensable to the morality of individuals."

* We subjoin here some paragraphs from one who has thoroughly investigated this subject:

"The Gospel being dispensed in its purity, the negroes will be disabused of their ignorance and superstition, and thus be placed beyond the reach of designing men. The direct way of exposing them to acts of insubordination is to leave them in ignorance and superstition, to the care of their own religion. Then may the blind lead the blind, and both shall fall into the ditch: then may they be made the easy and willing instruments of avarice, of lust, of power, or of revenge. *Ignorance—religious ignorance—so far from being any safety, is the very marrow of our sin against this people, and the very rock of our danger.* Religion and religious teachers they must and will have, and if they are not furnished with the true, they will embrace the false. And what, I would ask, is the language of facts on the point under our notice?

"In the conspiracy in the city of New York, in 1712, Mr. Neau's school

is of secondary importance? It refers to near three millions of men and women. It is true they are the most ignorant and degraded part of our population. But they are far from being, on that account, unimportant. It is true, that the preaching we are now insisting upon is preaching only to negroes, to slaves; yet truly it is not a work to which any and every man is competent. Teachers of the ignorant must not themselves be ignorant. The case of this people is not such as may be met without labor and toil; without education and knowledge; without patient study, observation and research; without enlarged views and an

for the religious instruction of the negroes was blamed as the main occasion of the barbarous plot. And yet, 'upon full trial, the guilty negroes were found to be such as never came to Mr. Neau's school, and what is very observable, the persons whose negroes were found most guilty were such as were the declared opposers of making them Christians!'

"The rebellions in 1730 and the three in 1739, in South Carolina, were fomented by the Spaniards in St. Augustine, and religion had nothing to do with them. The ground of that in 1741, in New York city again, I do not precisely understand; but it is pretty well ascertained that it was not religion. It is questioned whether the whites were not wholly deluded. There is evidence to believe that there was no plot at all on the part of the negroes, although they suffered terribly.

"Of that in 1816, in Camden, South Carolina, discovered and suppressed, Mr. F. G. Deliesseline writes: 'Two brothers engaged in this rebellion could read and write, and were hitherto of unexceptionable characters. They were religious, and had always been regarded in the light of faithful servants. A few appeared to have been actuated by the instinct of the most brutal licentiousness, and by the lust of plunder; but most of them by wild and frantic ideas of the rights of man, and the misconceived injunctions and examples of Holy Writ!—E. C. Holland's *Refutation*, &c. page 76.

"Of that in 1822, in Charleston, South Carolina, Mr. Benjamin Elliott writes: 'This description of our population had been allowed to assemble for religious instruction. The designing leaders in the scheme of villainy availed themselves of these occasions to instil sentiments of ferocity, by falsifying the Bible!' Then he proceeds to show how it was done, and adds, 'Such was their religion—such the examples to be imitated.' Further on Mr. Elliott remarks,—'Another impediment to the progress of conspiracy, will ever be the fidelity of some of some of our negroes. The servant who is false to his master would be false to his God. One act of perfidy is but the first step in the road of corruption and of baseness; and those who on this occasion have proved ungrateful to their owners, have also been hypocrites in religion!—Same pamphlet, pp. 79, 80. Referring to the same affair of 1822, Mr. C. C. Pinckney remarks—'On investigation it appeared, that all concerned in that transaction, except one, had seceded from the regular Methodist church in 1817, and formed a separate establishment, in connection with the African Methodist Society in Philadelphia; whose bishop, a coloured man, named Allen, had assumed that office, being himself a seceder from the Methodist church of Pennsylvania. At this period Mr. S. Bryan, the local minister of the regular Me-

elevated patriotism, and a pure, self-sacrificing philanthropy. This is a large field, and it is a most arduous field. Where is the youth that burns with the desire of being greatly useful to his native Carolina, to his country, to his race, and to the church of Christ? Let him enter this field. He will find it enough for his noblest aspirations, and even though great apparent success should not crown his faithful efforts, his labor will not be lost. He will be a pioneer for future more successful followers.

But let us admit, in all candour, that this work is not to be looked upon, as having no parallel in other cities or coun-

thodist church in Charleston, was so apprehensive of sinister designs, that he addressed a letter to the City Council, on file in the Council Chamber, dated 8th November, 1817, stating at length the reasons of his suspicion.'—*Address, Note B. p. 20.*

"The South Hampton affair, in Virginia, in 1832, was originated by a man under colour of religion, a pretender to inspiration. As far back as 1825, the Rev. Dr. J. H. Rice, in a discourse on the *injury done to religion by ignorant teachers*, warned the people of Virginia against the neglect of the proper religious instruction of the negroes, and the danger of leaving them to the control of their own ignorant, fanatical and designing preachers. His prophecy had its fulfilment in South Hampton. If we refer to the West Indies we shall behold religion exerting a restraining influence upon the people; and particularly on one occasion, all the negroes attached to the Moravian Missionary churches, to a man, supported the authority of their masters against the insurgents.

"Enough has been said to satisfy reasonable and Christian men that sound religious instruction will contribute to safety. There are men who have no knowledge of religion in their own personal experience, and who have not been careful to notice its genuine effects upon servants, and they will place little or no confidence in anything that might be said in favor of it. They can place more reliance upon *visible preventives* of their own invention, than upon *principles of moral conduct* wrought in the soul and maintained in supremacy by Divine power, whose nature they do not understand, and whose influence, however good, is invisible, and for that very reason not to be trusted by them. Nor have they either the candor or willingness, to make a distinction between *false* and *true* religion. In their opinion, the Gospel is no benefit to the world. Such men we are constrained to leave to the influence of time and observation, and invoke for them the influence of the Spirit of God. I shall never forget the remark of a venerable coloured preacher, made with reference to the South Hampton tragedy. With his eyes filled with tears, and his whole manner indicating the deepest emotion, said he, 'Sir, it is the Gospel that we ignorant and wicked people need. If you will give us the Gospel, it will do more for the obedience of servants and the peace of community than all your guards, and guns, and bayonets.' This same Christian minister, on receiving a packet of inflammatory pamphlets through the Post Office, and discovering their character and intention, immediately called upon the Mayor of the city and delivered them into his hands. Who can estimate the value in community of one such man, acting under the influence of the Gospel of peace."—*Rev. C. C. Jones, D. D., of Liberty County, Ga.*

tries. This population is undoubtedly to be regarded as emphatically *our poor*; not of course in the sense of paupers, but of feeble, helpless dependants. Now, the religious wants of the poor are every where too much neglected. In London, Edinburgh, Liverpool, New York, Philadelphia, there is little or no church accommodation for the poorer classes. In England and Ireland and France and Germany and in our own Northern States, there is a very large population ignorant, and left in their ignorance, because Christians and Christian ministers are too few, or else wanting in zeal and faithfulness.

Let us also admit, in justice to the Southern churches, that this duty is not one hitherto altogether neglected. The work is not now to be commenced. On the contrary, the work was commenced contemporaneously with the introduction of this people among us, and the very history of the work has had its commencement. The Rev. Dr. Jones, who has labored so long and so zealously in this cause, has published a volume* of 277 large 12mo. pages, containing, among other things, a historical sketch of efforts of different denominations to instruct this people from their first introduction into the country, in 1620, down to the year 1842. He shews that from the first they were not totally neglected, and that the work of their religious instruction has gradually though slowly been advancing down to the present time. We commend this volume most earnestly to the careful study of all Christian men and Christian ministers at the South. The Christian planter will find it of more value to him than all the agricultural journals and magazines he can obtain.

The tide of feeling in our Southern community upon this subject, is manifestly rising. It was checked some fifteen years ago by foreign interference. But there has been a reaction; and yet we must not expect that the work of thoroughly evangelizing our negroes can go on without opposition. It will be opposed by some because the pride and the prejudices of early opinions disincline them to a candid investigation of this subject. Our enemies abroad, (say

* The Religious Instruction of the Negroes in the United States, by Charles C. Jones. Savannah: printed by Thomas Purse, 1842.

† See Jones' History, pages 106-7.

they,) will found new charges and reproaches on every admission of our own, and therefore the plain truth must not be told even among ourselves.

Others will oppose from an indolent misgiving that if we look diligently into the subject, we shall be driven by our own conscience to enter fully and vigorously upon this high religious duty. "New cares, new troubles, new duties, new expenses array themselves before us, and we recoil from the sight."

Others again, of a different character, will oppose this work on the ground that greater attention to religious training will, *as they tell us*, only furnish better opportunities to plan and execute insubordination and crime; because, *as they say*, religious teaching will only make the negroes worse men and greater hypocrites; and because religious instruction tends, (*as we also agree that it does*), to expand the intellect and elevate the character, and therefore, however prudent and sound in its own character, will, *as they maintain*, inevitably operate to overturn our social system.

Now, these last opposers object to *the very influence of the Gospel*. They state the question as if it were *Christianity or Slavery, the one or else the other*. If every thing which expands the intellect and elevates the character be, *as they tell us it is*, destructive of slavery, and therefore to be opposed by the South, then must Christianity, which is the greatest elevator and improver of mankind, be the most hostile of all things to slavery, and the most worthy to be opposed by the South. And then, too, the best and most efficient method of bringing Christianity to bear upon the mind and character of the slave, must be the most hurtful to our institutions, and the most to be deprecated and opposed. If there could be found out some one plan preëminently suitable for quickly and successfully indoctrinating the negroes with the truths of the Bible, and thus performing in the shortest time and in the completest manner the work, which Christianity has to do upon the human intellect and heart, that, according to these opposers, would be the worst of all discoveries, the very acme of abominations, a Pandora's box, the greatest possible curse to the South, against which every good citizen should arm himself to fight to his last breath and his last drop of blood!

The opposition just delineated is in some a misconcep-

tion; in others, a wicked offspring of infidelity itself. Some who have fallen into it, are victims with honest intentions. Others, caring nothing for Christ's last command, "Go preach to every living creature," uniting these with themselves, carry them along into unconscious coöperation against the Gospel itself. To infidels the commands of God are nothing; they confide nothing in the conservative power of the Gospel, nor in its wholesome influences on the hearts and conduct of men; they care nothing for souls, not even their own. How can they estimate the salutary influence of religion on others, who do not believe in it themselves? They seek to interdict religious instruction, because they are ignorant of its true effects,—and fear, or pretend to fear, its consequences to our civil polity.

This is a sad error, to which every obligation of Christian and political duty forbids our yielding. Against it, we must oppose example, argument and truth. The more our duties in this matter are explained and unfolded, the more we shall withdraw the well-intentioned but misguided from their opposition, and the more we shall disarm and prostrate the infidel and enemy of truth. To the revilings and misrepresentations of infidelity, we shall present the simple teachings of God's word; and vindicate the holiness of his religion, by showing from its own doctrines and their just bearing on all classes of men, that the more it is known and felt the better it qualifies every man, whether free or slave, to discharge the duties of his station—that it is indeed, both for men and for Governments, the way of life, and the source of order, peace, and safety.

Having thus considered the nature of the duty which is urged on us, and seen that it is strictly a religious duty;—that as thus limited it is unquestionable, and never has been questioned;—that it is one which disturbs not, but on the contrary fortifies and establishes the public weal and security; that the alternative of our not performing it, is a further surrender of this population to self-appointed, ignorant, superstitious, fanatical and dangerous teachers of their own; that the work to be done is immense in its extent, arduous in its execution, and most important in its results; that at the same time, this is not a duty which we have hitherto altogether neglected, and the present call to which implies

any dishonor to us;—having seen once more that this is a duty, in the performance of which, we must look for the opposition of those who hate and oppose the Gospel itself; we hasten to conclude this article, with a few reasons why a peculiar obligation to evangelize the slaves is resting upon Southern Christians.

The first is, that this people stand *in such peculiar need of it*. They have been called our domestic heathen; and though this is not absolutely true, not true in that sense which our traducers abroad have put upon the statement; it is comparatively true, true enough to justify us in using the phrase among ourselves, and for the purpose of stirring up ourselves to greater diligence in the discharge of our duty. This people are in great need of religious teaching. How could it be otherwise, since their fathers or grand fathers were Mohammedans and Pagans? How could it be otherwise, considering their number and ignorance, and the general scarcity of religious instruction even for the whites and our own scattered population? Yes! These people are exceedingly *ignorant*. Their religion consists, in a great measure, of forms and ceremonies and excitement. Conversion is with many of them a dream, a trance, a vision, a voice from heaven. One who is high authority declares that "Sometimes principles of conduct are adopted by church members, at so much variance with the Gospel, that 'the grace of God is turned into lasciviousness.' For example, members of the same church are sacredly bound by their religion not to reveal each other's sins, for that would be backbiting and injuring the brotherhood. And again, that which would be an abominable sin, committed by a church member with a worldly person, becomes no sin at all, if committed with another church member, for the brethren must bear one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ." To know the extent of their ignorance, even where they have been accustomed to the sound of the Gospel in white churches, a man should make investigation for himself;—the result will frequently surprise and fill him with grief. Some white ministers and teachers in their simplicity, beholding the attention paid by our servants to the preaching of the Gospel, when adapted to their comprehension, and hearing the expressions of their thankfulness for the pains taken for their instruction, come to the conclusion

that they are an unsophisticated race; that they form one of the easiest and pleasantest fields of labor in the world; and that they are a people "made ready and prepared for the Lord." Experiment shortly dissipates these visions, and well is it if the sober reality does not frighten the labourer away in disgust and disappointment. He who carries the Gospel to them, encounters depravity entrenched in ignorance, both real and pretended. He discovers deism, skepticism, universalism. He meets all the various perversions of the Gospel, and all the strong objections against the truth of God; objections which he may perhaps have considered peculiar only to the cultivated minds, the ripe scholarship, and profound intelligence of critics and philosophers! Extremes here meet on the natural and common ground of a darkened understanding and a hardened heart.

The second ground of our peculiar obligation to furnish the slave with the Gospel is, that "*they are the most dependent of all people upon us for the word of life.*"*

Self-preservation compels us to shut out strangers as far as possible, from all contact with this mass of minds. We rightly claim to be the exclusive guardians of their religious instruction. Our will regulates, to a great extent, the character and amount of their religious privileges. Such is their dependence on us. It is all the greater because, according to our own laws, and according also, to the circumstances of the laboring classes in all countries, they can be instructed, for the most part, only by *oral* communications. If we do not teach them the Gospel, who can do it? Religious error, and religious excitement, they can get from independent sources—sources of their own—but for "sound doctrine" they depend upon those whom God's providence has constituted the sole almoners of his mercy towards them, and who have accordingly assumed the responsibility of their *entire* Christianization.†

The third ground of our peculiar obligation to this people is, *that they are so accessible to us.* They speak our language and dwell in the midst of us; they are members of our households. Moreover, they are all nominally Christians. Take these circumstances, one by one, and com-

* See Jones, pages 126-7.

† See Jones, pages 156-7.

pare them with the same particulars in reference to any foreign field of Christian benevolence. How would our brethren in foreign lands rejoice, were they all gifted with a vernacular use of the language in which they have to preach;—were the people all free from any organized and established system of errors, and nominally believers in Christianity;—especially, were they all separated and divided out among Christian families, who had the absolute control over them, and who might thus bring a thousand influences to bear upon them in aid of the influence of the missionary!

Yes, and how inconsistent are those of us who send missionaries to the Heathen, afar off, and yet neglect those who are found at our own doors! What claims have the Armenians, the Hindoos, the Chinese upon you, which these have not? But let us recall this language. Far more justly may we tax with a shameful, guilty inconsistency, that large class of our professing Christians, who refuse their support to foreign missions, on the ground, forsooth, that they have Heathen enough at home, and yet neglect their duty to their poor sable dependents, who are living without God and dying without hope!

ARTICLE V.

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF I PETER, III: 19.

BY THE REV. W. M. SMYTHE, A. M.

Dallas Co., Alabama.

Ἐν ᾧ (πνεύμασι) καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ
πνεύμασι πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν,

In which spirit he (Christ) went and preached unto the spirits in prison.

This passage is thought to present great difficulties which the Commentators attempt in various ways to remove. It has employed more learning, and called forth more talent to expound, than perhaps any other portion of Sacred Writ,

and few subjects have given rise to so many speculations and fanciful opinions. From the time that the apostle wrote it until the present, there have not been wanting writers, who have endeavoured to explain it according to some favourite or preconceived view which they held. These expositions have been productive of much evil to the student of the Bible, in coming to a proper understanding of the passage under consideration. Instead of taking the words in their obvious import, and deducing a legitimate inference from their connection, he too often comes with his mind confused, and his judgment biased by conflicting interpretations. Every one has experienced this disadvantage in attempting to arrive at the true meaning of any disputed portion of God's Revelation.

But without farther consideration of the difficulties we have to encounter, and without wishing to invalidate the authority of the learned and good in the field of exegesis, we will proceed to an humble explanation of the apostle's words.

And on entering upon our examination we will not resort to critical conjecture, as some writers have done, which merits no attention, but our appeal will be to the sober and sound principles of Biblical interpretation.

In the early history of the Church this passage was universally considered as teaching the descent of Christ into Hades (*ᾅδης*). The ecclesiastical fathers of the first three centuries maintained that during the three days in which the body of Christ lay in the grave, his soul was in the kingdom of the dead. Thus Irenaeus says "Christ in this way fulfilled the law of the dead." Clement of Alexandria expresses the same opinion. Origen says *γυμνή σώματος γενόμενη ψυχῆ*. *Contra Celsum* ii. Tertullian also says, "Christus forma humanae mortis apud inferos (est) functus."—The opinions of these earlier fathers, soon lost ground, especially in the *Western Church*. Still the schoolmen considered *infernus* as the appropriate designation of the place of the damned, and thus the descent to hell became equivalent to the descent of Christ to the place of the damned. The same opinion appears to have been held by John Calvin, and that Christ there endured the punishment of a lost soul.

Thomas Aquinas held the same view of Hieronymus and Gregory, that Christ delivered the souls of the pious fath-

ers who lived before his incarnation from the *limbus patrum*.

Among the more recent writers, that held that the soul of Christ was in the abode of the dead, we may mention Calmet. His language is—“The opinion which states that Jesus Christ descended into hell to announce his coming to the ancient patriarchs and to deliver them from that species of prison, where they had so long waited for him, is incontrovertible, and we (the papists) consider it as an article of our faith.” Bloomfield holds the same view in his *Recensio Synoptica Annot. Sacrae*. His words are, “no interpretation seems at all natural, or to carry with it the stamp of truth, but the common one, namely, that Christ went and preached to the antediluvians in Hades;” of the same opinion are Bishop Horsley and Mr. Dodwell.

The Bishop maintains that departed souls, before the general resurrection, are neither in heaven nor hell, but in some intermediate place situated in the heart of the earth, denominated a prison or place of safe keeping, that the human soul of the Saviour, in the interval between his death and his rising from the dead, went to that part of it occupied by believers, for the purpose of announcing to them the “glad tidings” that he had offered the sacrifice of their redemption, and was about to appear as their advocate before God in heaven, and, that as it is impossible that all the people who perished in the deluge died in impenitence, this visit of Christ and his preaching might be particularly addressed to those of them who were the objects of mercy.—But, as it would occupy too much time and space to enter into an examination of the question relative to the existence of an intermediate place where spirits are confined until the general judgement, we will only advert to the arguments which have been advanced in support of this opinion, that the human soul of Christ during its separation from the body was not in heaven, but in such an intermediate place.

One text that Horsley quotes is that of the Psalmist,—“Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.” From this text, if there was no other, says the Bishop, the article in the sense in which we have explained it, is clearly and infallibly deduced, for if the soul of Christ was not left in hell, *at* his resurrection, surely it *was* in hell *before* his resurrection.

But it was not there either before his death, or after his resurrection, for that never was imagined, therefore it descended into hell after his death, or before his resurrection, for as his flesh by virtue of the divine promise saw no corruption, although it was in the grave, the place of corruption, so his soul (which by virtue of the like promise was not left in hell,) was *in* that hell where it was not *left*, until the time came for its reunion to the body. Hence, it is clearly shown that the soul of Christ was in the place called hell. Augustine says, none but an infidel can deny this.

Granting for argument sake, that an intermediate place does exist, and that it was the residence of the Saviour's soul, during the three days that his body lay in the sepulchre, it would not follow that his preaching to the spirits occurred at that time. The spirit by which he preached to them was not his *human soul*. The contrast which is stated between it and the flesh in which he was put to death forbids this interpretation. In confirmation of this opinion we quote Dr. A. Clark, who informs us that one Greek MS. reads Πνευματι Αγιω *in the holy spirit*. And in a very old Latin Bible in his possession, the verse reads thus — In quo et hiis qui in carcere erant *spiritualiter* veniens predicavit— by which he came *spiritually* and preached to them that were in prison. The conclusion to which this learned divine comes, in view of all the various readings, is, that from them there is no ground to believe that the text speaks of Christ's going to hell to preach the gospel to the damned, or of his going to some feigned place where the souls of the patriarchs were imprisoned, to whom he preached, and whom he delivered from that place, and took with him to paradise. Origen went much further than most writers on this subject. He believed that Christ rescued the *damned* who believed on him in Hades, and transported them to the abode of the blessed.

Luther spoke very sparingly upon this whole subject, and was unwilling to say anything decidedly. At first he agreed with Hieronymus and Gregory, in holding a *limbus patrum* to which Christ went, but afterwards he was accustomed to remark that Christ destroyed the power of the devil and of hell, where he went with soul and body.

Hutter, Baier, Winkler, Carpzov and others, maintained that Christ's descent to hell belonged to his state of exaltation,

and that on the moment of the resurrection he repaired to hell with soul and body in both natures, showed himself to Satan and hell as victor, and then appeared alive upon the earth.

M. Flaccius held the opposite opinion, namely, that the descent belonged to Christ's humiliation.

Beza, Russ, and Rambach understood the descent to hell to mean the *burial* of Christ.

Epinus, Agricola, Hunnius, Brentius, Cocceius, and the celebrated Witsius, were of opinion that Christ endured in hell the pains of the damned.

Enough, we consider, has been presented to show that the passage under consideration is difficult of interpretation.

Now the question arises to what preaching does the apostle refer? We confess this does not appear very plain. Whether it was to the preaching of the apostles after the day of Pentecost, to the preaching of Christ, or to the preaching of Noah while engaged in building the ark.

I. It has been maintained by some critics that Peter is speaking of the Apostles, after the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. According to their view, the spirits in prison are the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles, who are so called on account of their slavery to sin, and their condemnation by the divine law.

This interpretation is evidently forced, and on that account it must be regarded as not valid. Nothing but absolute necessity could warrant the adoption of it. Every person who reads the words of the apostle without prejudice, will conclude that the spirits in prison, to whom Christ preached, are the very persons who were disobedient in the days of Noah. This is their obvious meaning, the only one which their grammatical construction will allow, and the supposition that the antediluvian transgressors are merely incidentally referred to, for the purpose of comparing their conduct with that of the impenitent, in the time of the apostles, is one to which no person could have recourse, unless to evade a difficulty which he was unable to remove.

Some critics suppose that the word *πνεύμα*, spirit, is of the same import with *ψυχή*, but though unregenerate men are often spoken of in scripture as prisoners, yet the phrase "spirits in prison," is inapplicable to the state of the wicked in this world. The word *ψυχή*, soul, is used to denote the *whole man*. An instance of this use of it, is found in this very

chapter. "Wherein few, that is, eight souls, or *persons*, were saved by water." But no example of a similar use of the word *πνευμα*, *spirit*, can be produced. It denotes the *immaterial part* of man, as distinguished from his bodily frame, and the use of it here indicates that the apostle is speaking of persons who were dead, and whose spirits existed in a state of separation from the body. Dr. Whitby and Bishop Burnet understand the preaching refers to those who were in the darkness of heathen ignorance.

II. The opinion that the preaching refers to Christ's ministry during the period between his death and resurrection, has been embodied in the creed of the church of Rome, and on it has the doctrine of purgatory been built.

As we have touched on this opinion above, we will not further refer to it.

Mr. Cradock explains it of Christ's preaching while he was on earth, to those who were now spirits in prison.

We now come to the third interpretation, which supposes that the apostle refers to the ministry of Noah, who was a preacher of righteousness, (II Peter, ii: 5,) to the men of the old world, who perished in the waters of the deluge, and whose spirits are now in prison, reserved for greater punishment at a future day. To this view we are led by a comparison of the passage, with Gen. vi: 3, "And the Lord said, my Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh, yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years."

Beza, Elsner, and Macknight suppose the words *ἐν φυλακῇ πνευμασι* do not mean that the spirits were in prison at the time when Christ preached to them, but that he preached by his Spirit to the antediluvians, who *are now* i. e. in the age of Peter, *in prison*, detained like the fallen angels, unto the day of judgment. So Dr. Burton interprets "In which character Christ also went and preached to those persons who *are now* confined spirits, but who then were disobedient."

Dr. Whitby says the antediluvians, who lived about the time of Noah, were *ἐν φυλακῇ* in prison upon a double account, (1) by reason of their bondage to sin, for then "all flesh had corrupted their way," their "wickedness was great upon the earth" and every imagination of their heart was to do evil and that continually," and (2) they were in pris-

on, as having from God received the sentence of destruction, if they repented not within 120 years. Thus did Christ by his Spirit preach to them in the days of Noah, and therefore the antediluvian age is even by the Jews styled the age of the Holy Ghost, "according to those words, My Spirit shall not always strive with man," that is, say Ainsworth and the Bishop of Ely, My spirit in my prophets shall not always be chiding and reproving and thereby endeavoring to bring men to repentance, but shall proceed to punish them.

Hammond and Wells understand it figuratively of being in *bondage to sin*, while Lord Barrington says it has reference to Noah's preaching to his own *family*, shut up with him in the ark. But it does not appear that they were disobedient.

Dr. Doddridge paraphrases the passage thus: "Even that Spirit by the inspiration of which, granted to his faithful servant Noah, going forth as it were in that progress in which he employed him, he preached to those notorious sinners, who, for their disobedience, have since experienced the just severity of the Divine vengeance, and are now in the condition of separate spirits, reserved as it were in prison, to the severer judgment of that great day. I speak of those who were long since disobedient, when once the abused and insulted long suffering of a compassionate God waited upon them in the days of the patriarch Noah, during the succession of one hundred and twenty years."

We have now given the various opinions which have been held concerning this obscure and difficult passage, and we are forced to the conclusion, that it must refer to the preaching of Noah, and no other interpretation which we have seen is so consistent with the whole scope of the passage. To quote the words of Dr. Church, "Noah was a preacher of righteousness. He had the Spirit of Christ and Christ by his Spirit, in him, preached to the disobedient of his day, or their spirits. They did not repent, but were cut off, and their spirits cast into prison. Peter speaks of them as in prison when he wrote."

As it is universally admitted by all who believe in the divinity of Christ, that the intercourse which took place between God and man, during the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations was carried on in the person of the Son, we

must consider this declaration as made by Christ. Viewed in this light, it exhibited a perfect agreement with the language of the apostle. The 120 years of respite which was promised to the antediluvian transgressors is the period during which the long suffering of God waited for them while Noah was preparing the ark, and the preaching of Christ by the Spirit is identical with the strivings of the Spirit, which he threatened to withdraw when this period of respite was ended.

The operations of the Spirit, however, are usually carried on by external means, and the chief means employed to reclaim the sinners of the old world was the ministry of Noah. It was by his ministry, therefore, that Christ preached to the spirits in prison.

This conclusion is confirmed by the following verse, *Ἀσπόμενοι τοῖς*, which sometime or FORMERLY were disobedient. Sometime, or LONG AGO, is intended to characterize the whole of the intervening statement, or to show that the preaching referred to had occurred many ages previously, when the long suffering of God waited for the repentance of sinners.

ARTICLE VI.

THE CHRISTIAN PASTOR.

The Christian Pastor, one of the Ascension Gifts of Christ.
By ROBERT J. BRECKENRIDGE, D. D. To which are added, by way of Appendix, *Presbyterian Government, not a Hierarchy, but a Commonwealth; and Presbyterian Ordination, not a Charm, but an act of Government.* By the same Author. Baltimore, 1845.

The pamphlet whose title has been given at the head of this article, consists of three separate tracts— all bearing directly upon questions which have been recently agitated, in reference to the polity of the Presbyterian Church. The first is a sermon, preached at the installation of the Rev.

Robt. W. Dunlap, as pastor of the Presbyterian congregation worshipping in Aisquith street, Baltimore, and was intended, as we learn from its title page, "to vindicate the Divine calling of the Pastors of the Christian Church, to illustrate the Divinely appointed evidence thereof; and to lift up a warning voice against prevailing errors." The second is a speech, or rather the "substance of an argument on the composition of the Quorum of a Presbytery, delivered in the Synod of Philadelphia, met at Baltimore, on the 20th of October, 1843." And the third is "The substance of an argument," delivered in the same Synod, "on the right of ruling elders, when members of Presbytery, to impose hands in the ordination of ministers of the Word."

To say that these subjects are discussed with ability is only the statement, in another form, that they are discussed by Dr. Breckenridge. Malice itself has never ventured to deny to him the distinction of extraordinary endowments; and though he is sometimes terrible in the derision and scorn which he inflicts upon fraudulent seducers, driving the burning chariot of his zeal over the heads of impostors, hypocrites and formalists,* yet the history of his life is the history of a man "for dignity composed and high exploit" —instinct with the spirit of noble deeds—of calm and settled confidence in truth—lofty in his aims, intrepid in his purposes, and immeasurably superior to the tricks of sophistry and the arts of concealment. When his voice is for war, it is *open* war that he proclaims—and whether in behalf of his church or his country, at home or abroad—he exhibits the same unshaken magnanimity—the contempt of danger and stability of mind which fit a man, as exigencies may require, to be a hero or a martyr. We confess that we love him—love him for his own, and love him for Christ's sake. Our children will remember, though we may forget, the author of that memorable document, the Act and Testimony—a document which deserves to be placed, side by side, with the immortal covenants of Scotland; and although the gratitude of his own generation may be denied, the praises of posterity will not be wanting to the man, who, in times of amazing defection and apos-

*The reader will recollect the exquisite passage on zeal, in Milton's apology for Smectymnus.

tasy; when the profession of the truth was a badge either of weakness or ignorance, was found, like Abdiel among the conspirators of Heaven, "faithful among the faithless."

"Among innumerable false, unmoved,
Unshaken, unseduced, unterrified
His loyalty he kept, his love, his zeal."

Our object, however, is not to discuss the merits of Dr. Breckinridge as a man, but to lay before our readers, as briefly as the nature of the subjects will admit, the great principles for which he has contended in the pamphlet before us. In the present number we shall confine ourselves to the sermon.

The text is taken from Ephesians, iv : 8— "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men," and the Christian Pastor is accordingly treated as one of the ascension gifts of the Redeemer. The nature of Dr. Breckinridge's design precluded him from bestowing any "labour in establishing the distinction received by nearly all Protestants, and expressly asserted in our ecclesiastical standards, between the extraordinary and the ordinary offices constituted by Christ in his church; or in showing precisely which are permanent and which are not—or in pointing out the precise nature and boundaries of such as are perpetual." We have long felt the want of some brief, clear, and learned discussion of these points—and we know of no greater service which, in these days of ecclesiastical extravagance, could be rendered to the church, than to furnish such a treatise. Many valuable hints are suggested in the First Part of Warburton's Doctrine of Grace—and if the passages which he adduces and the general course of reasoning which he adopts be not conclusive, there is no text of scripture, so far as we know, which *directly* teaches that *any* of the offices instituted by Christ were temporary and occasional, nor is there any method by which it can be satisfactorily demonstrated. The principle upon which our standards themselves seem to justify their doctrine is, that when the gifts, which are essential to an office, are withdrawn, the office itself is necessarily revoked. Miraculous gifts are indispensable to prophets and apostles—and they having ceased, prophets and apostles have ceased with them. But the question

here arises, what is the scriptural evidence that these miraculous gifts should cease? The Papists contend that they are still to be found in the church—and though we may safely join issue with them as to the fact, how shall we show from the word of God, that it was never *intended* to perpetuate them? How shall we prove from the scriptures, that the present withdrawal of these gifts is not in anger, not a rebuke to the church's unfaithfulness and want of prayer, but an integral part of the present dispensation of the Gospel? We may say that the *end* of all these extraordinary offices has been accomplished, and that they have consequently become useless. From the accomplishment of the end to the cessation of the means, the argument may be admitted to be sound—but where is the scriptural proof of what was the end in the present case? How do we know what precise purpose God intended to effect? It may be that this purpose is now adequately met in the written rule of faith with which we are furnished, but it is certainly easier to make the statement, than to prove it from the scriptures. If our limits allowed, we would gladly enter upon this subject here, but must content ourselves with a general reference to the Second Book of the Doctrine of Grace.* It deserves to be remarked, that according to the American standards, all extraordinary offices are not necessarily temporary. The evangelist is an extraordinary officer, and yet is to be continued in the world as long as there are frontier and destitute settlements, in which churches are to be planted and the Gospel established.

This peculiarity is essential to the perfection of the Presbyterian system and makes it, what it strikes us no other system of church government is, an adequate institute for *gathering* as well as *governing* churches which are already gathered. Episcopacy, whether Diocesan or Parochial, supposes a church already formed—Congregationalism implies the previous existence of the brethren—Pastors have relation to a fixed charge, and the Evangelist is the only officer who is set apart for the express purpose of making aggressive

* We are not to be understood as endorsing Warburton's doctrine in regard to the operations of the Spirit in the calling and sanctification of men. We have an absolute horror of his low and grovelling views upon everything connected with the essence of the Gospel. But his argument in favour of the cessation of miraculous gifts is very able and ingenious.

attacks on the world. He goes where there cannot be Bishops and Pastors — he prepares the way for these messengers of Christ by making ready a people called of the Lord. It is this feature in our system which makes ours so pre-eminently a missionary church.

The general relation in which all officers, whether ordinary or extraordinary, perpetual or temporary, stand to the church is that of *ministry*. “They are all ordained, not in a way of honor, but for arduous labour; the work required is, in a proper sense, a service of the church, not a dominion over it — the great object of it is to perfect the saints and to edify the body of Christ, and they were all amongst his ascension gifts.”* This ministry, in its permanent arrangements, embraces the dispensation of the word and sacraments, the exercise of government and the distribution of alms, and is accordingly composed, as its ordinary elements, of Teachers, Rulers and Deacons. “It is not only incredible but absurd to suppose,” — as Dr. Breckinridge very properly remarks, — “that our church should first define that a ministry is divinely appointed, and then define that it consists ordinarily and permanently of Pastors, Elders and Deacons; and yet that it should mean that the word *ministry* can signify nothing but Preachers of the Gospel.”† The truth is all ecclesiastical officers are equally *ministers*, — equally servants of the church — equally appointed by Christ — equally called to be “abundant in labours” — none are to be idle — there is work for every hand — employment for every mind. Indeed “the word rendered ministry is not only used throughout the New Testament in reference to every kind of office-bearer mentioned in it, but is applied to many sorts of functions in the way of service which even private persons can perform.”‡ But if its officers are only a *ministry*, the church is not created by them nor dependent upon them. They were given to the church, but the church has never been given to them. They are servants, not lords — creatures and not creators. This point is strikingly presented in the following paragraph of the sermon.

“Christ had a church in the world before there were

* Sermon, p. 8.

† *Ibid.*

‡ See foot-note on p. 8, Sermon.

either Apostle, or Prophet, or Evangelist, or Pastor, or Teacher, and He will have His church around Him through eternal ages, after all His saints are gathered and perfected, and when oracles, ordinances and ministry shall have fulfilled their work. His bride was equally His undefiled, His only one, before any ordinance was established, or any oracle given, or any ministry constituted, as she is now that we enjoy all these proofs of His care and love; and if there had never been an office-bearer of the race of Adam given as a servant to minister unto her — if angels had been her only ministers forever, or the Divine Spirit had disdained all secondary agencies, or were now to reject the whole body of sinful men who are nothing but as he enables them; still that spotless bride would be the Lamb's wife, by a covenant reaching from the depths of eternity, steadfast as the oath of God can make it, and sacred by the blood of Jesus with which it is sealed. No! no! there is no lordship, no headship in Christ's church, but that of Christ Himself — these are but servants in the church for Christ's sake, and their Master's rule is this — "Whosoever would be chief among you, let him be your servant." (Matt. xx: 27, xxiii: 11.) And if we will but keep steadily before our minds this solitary truth, that Christ's people, his church are before, above, independent of all office-bearers ever given to them — far more than any commonwealth is distinct from and superior to the authorities which may, at any time, exist in it, or the form of administration which may, at any period, prevail in it, it will bear us clearly and firmly onward through all the snares which ignorance, superstition, fanaticism, the lust of power, and the pride of caste have set to entrap God's people into abominable will-worship, or hateful, though perverse men choose to call it, voluntary, humility." — p. 9.

The pregnant truth, presented in this passage, is fatal to the pretensions of Popery, Puseyism and every other system which makes the being of a church and the covenant mercies of God dependent upon any form of outward administration or external order. The distinction is broad and clear between the church in its essence as the mystical body of Christ, and the form in which it is rendered visible to men; and while there can be no doubt, at least among Presbyterians, who have always contended for their government as a matter of Divine appointment, that the polity by which it

ought to be distinguished is accurately and minutely described in the scriptures, that polity is so far from being indispensable to its existence, that its existence is actually presupposed as essential to the polity. Union with Christ through the effectual working of the Holy Ghost, this makes a Christian man — and whoever is joined to the Head possesses communion with all the members. He is an element of the true church, a member of the vast congregation chosen by the Father, redeemed by the Son, and renewed by the Spirit. He is in favor with God and is saved, not upon the vague principle of an undefined mercy, but through the blood of that everlasting covenant which extends only to the church. All that possess the spirit of Christ possess Christ, and all who possess Christ possess all things essential to salvation. They are complete in Him.

Recognizing the distinction between the *church* in its essential elements, and the mode of its external manifestation, the Presbyterian standards avoid the narrow and exclusive spirit which would limit God's covenant to their own little household — they can find members of Christ's church beyond their own doors. By contending, at the same time, that Christ has prescribed the model in conformity with which His people should be governed, they avoid the licentiousness which would give to man the same power and discretion in fixing ecclesiastical, which may be lawfully claimed in settling civil, constitutions. They are consequently neither bigots on the one hand, nor libertines on the other. They embrace in charity all who love Christ, and they testify, in faithfulness, against all who pervert the order of His house. "The present Reformed Churches," — says Dr. Breckinridge in the first speech contained in this pamphlet, — "the present Reformed Churches and especially those standards from which ours have been chiefly taken, are clear and positive in asserting the *jus divinum* of Presbyterian Government — a *jus divinum* of the same character as that asserted for our system of doctrine; requiring in both cases a simple and faithful adherence on our part, and requiring in neither, harshness or intolerance towards those who differ from us — asserting in both cases the duty of God's people; but denying in neither, that his people may be gathered into true churches, though their doctrine nor their order may not seem to us scriptural in all respects." It

seems to us self-evident that "we have no more warrant" — to use the language of Dr. Breckinridge near the close of his sermon,— "we have no more warrant from God to make a church government for Him, and in His name, than to make any other part of His religion. It is idle to talk about church government being *jure divino* in its great principles and not in its details; or, as they say, in *the abstract* and not in the *concrete*. The truth is, it is both; for not only are the great principles laid down for us, but the officers and courts are named; the nature and duties of the one, the qualifications, vocation and powers of the other, are set forth; the relation of all the parts to each other and to the whole are precisely set forth. A government in general, the kind of government in particular, the officers and courts in special, their duties and powers in detail; this is what God has set before us, by revelation, for the Christian Church." These views, we insist upon it, are just; but whether just or false, they are views which have always characterized the Presbyterian church, and which are distinctly and, in different forms of statement, inculcated in our standards. We have undertaken in our Formularies to make nothing, to create nothing — we have simply *declared* what the word of the Lord reveals. We have given the result of our interpretations of scripture, both in reference to order and doctrine — and our Presbyterian Polity is placed upon the same foundation with our system of evangelical truth. We might as well say that no scheme of doctrine is plainly revealed in the scripture, because learned and good men differ in their views of what is enjoined, as to say that no plan of government is commended, because there is a diversity of opinions upon this point also. Socinians cannot find the Sonship of Christ in the Bible — but what Presbyterian doubts it is there. Arminians cannot find the sovereignty of God in election and reprobation, but what Calvinist hesitates to affirm that it is not only there, but plainly there — and so Prelatists and Congregationalists may be unable to detect the elements of Presbytery, but yet they may be there, obscure to nothing but the eye of prejudice.

We have dwelt, at disproportionate length, upon this point, because we are apprehensive that a disposition prevails in some quarters to relinquish the ground which our church has heretofore uniformly held. We dread the con-

sequences of surrendering the *jus divinum Presbyterii*. The power of our system has never been effectually tried—and its full strength can never be developed until our people shall be brought to feel that it is an institute of God. As long as we hesitate to trust it, or rather to trust in the Almighty Saviour who appointed it, we shall not be permitted to do valiantly for our Master and His cause. “Obedience is better than sacrifice.”

Having defined the general relation of the pastoral and all other offices to the people of God, and deduced the inference which obviously follows from the true statement of the case, Dr. Breckinridge proceeds to the immediate subject of his sermon—the nature and evidence of a call to the ministry of the Word. He first exposes the futility of the three prominent theories to which almost every form of error upon this great subject may be ultimately reduced. All pretensions which are not founded upon a real call of God, properly authenticated according to the provisions of His word, must either claim to be extraordinary—and then extraordinary evidence should be produced—or they rest upon a perpetual succession which has transmitted the rights and properties of the office from Christ the head, through an unbroken line of office-bearers to the present incumbent—and then the succession becomes a question of fact to be proved by testimony, and the validity of the title founded upon it, a doctrine to be established by scripture—or they rest upon the conviction and belief of the individual himself, unsupported by any proof but his own extravagance or enthusiasm. These false pretensions to official authority are briefly but ably discussed. The argument against the theory of succession is neatly and conclusively presented, and, if our limits allowed, we would cheerfully extract it here.

The true ground upon which the vocation of a Christian Pastor rests are next discussed. “They have relation”—we are told,—“1. To God Himself. 2. To the man’s own conscience. 3. To the Christian people. And 4. To those who bear office in the church.”

It is the prerogative of God and of God alone to select the men who shall be invested with authority in His church, and the validity of this Divine call is evinced to others and rendered satisfactory to ourselves by the testimony of our own consciences,—the approbation of

God's people, and the concurrence of God's earthly courts. Conscience, the Church, the Presbytery — these do not call into the ministry, but only *declare* God's call — they are the forms in which the Divine designation is indicated — the scriptural evidences that he who possesses them is no intruder into the sacred ministry. Dr. Breckinridge shows that "at every period and under every dispensation God has been pleased to reserve to Himself a great and a direct agency in designating those who should minister to His people in holy things." Under the Levitical economy none could be invested with the Priesthood without the appointment of God, and under the Christian economy, the sanction of Christ the Lord is equally indispensable to any who would become stewards of His mysteries. "The analogy between the methods by which persons were admitted into the visible church and called of God to the service of religious functions, as compared with each other, under the Old Testament Dispensation, and the methods adopted for the same ends, as compared with each other, under the New Testament Dispensation," is very strikingly exhibited on the fifteenth page of the sermon.

If this great truth be admitted, and we do not see how it can be questioned, that it is God, and God alone, who can either call or qualify for the sacred office, the consequences which flow from it are absolutely incompatible with many prevailing principles and practices. The doctrine of the American Education Society, a doctrine, we are sorry to say, which has found favour in quarters where it ought to have been rebuked, that every young man of talents and attainments should devote himself to the ministry without some special reason to the contrary is exactly reversed, and the true doctrine is that no man, whether young or old, rich or poor, learned or unlearned, should presume to dispense the mysteries of Christ without the strongest of all possible reasons for doing so — the imperative, invincible call of God. No one is to show cause why he ought *not* to be a minister, he is to show cause why he *should* be a minister — his call to the sacred Profession is not the absence of a call to any other pursuit — it is direct, immediate, powerful to this very department of labour. He is not here because he *can* be no where else, but he is no where else, because he *must* be here.

The doctrine of a Divine call, it seems to us, is set aside—certainly the doctrine of an *immediate* call is set aside, by all who make the ministry a means to any other ends but those with which Christ has connected it. In the case which recently happened at Yale College, it is clear that the call to the ministry was the call to the Presidency of that Institution. Doctor Woolsey was made a minister that he might govern a college, and the evidence that satisfied his mind that God had called him to the work was the simple fact that he had been chosen by the Fellows to succeed Dr. Day. Now the vocation to the ministry is either direct or indirect—if it be direct, Dr. Woolsey could make no pretensions to it, as the intercourse between God and his conscience seems to have been conducted through the corporation of Yale College—if it be indirect, the channel through which it comes must be ascertained to us from the scriptures—and as they say nothing about human institutions for the education of the young in the elements of science, it is certain that connection with such institutions cannot be the method of vouching a title to the ministry. So that whether the vocation be direct or indirect, Dr. Woolsey, so far as appears, can make no pretensions to it on scriptural grounds. His ordination, we solemnly believe, was a mockery—an awful prostitution of the sacred office. The whole series of transactions connected with it, was an open denial that a Divine call was absolutely necessary to a legitimate discharge of ministerial functions. We do not say that the agents intended to insult God or to trample on his Word—but we verily believe that, in ignorance or superstition, they have done both. We are slow to believe that, under any circumstances, a minister of the Gospel ought to be the *President* of a College—but whether he be a President or not, his connection with it, if he has no other sphere of labour, should be as a *minister*. He should be in it to preach the Gospel. This is his direct work—and where he has not scope and opportunity to perform it, he is not called to labour. The indirect influence of religion, in the various departments of instruction, is to be sought in the selection of godly laymen, and not in the degradation of able and efficient preachers. No preacher, who has solemnly vowed to be faithful in the *public* duties of his office, ought to be content with devoting his life

to mathematics, chemistry, or Greek, while he only *insinuates* the Gospel by hints and scraps, as occasional opportunities may be furnished. How, under such circumstances, is he or can he be faithful in the public *duties* of his office? The truth is, he is fulfilling *none* of the *peculiar* duties of his office—he is only doing what any good man might do and ought to do. Every college should unquestionably be supplied with the means of grace—there should be religious instruction—there should be the regular and stated ministrations of the Word—there should be a permanent chaplaincy—the chaplain, or pastor, for the name is nothing, is the only *preacher* that any institution demands—the secular departments of instruction can be filled, and in our view ought to be filled, by men who are not under vows which such positions compel them to violate. Of course these remarks have no application to those who teach, either in schools or colleges, in order that they may support themselves in preaching the Gospel. For such laborious servants of God we entertain no other feelings but those of profound respect—they are entitled to all praise. They make secular pursuits subordinate to the ministry—they teach as Paul wrought at his trade—and if the sneers which have too often been directed at them were directed against those who merge the ministry in earthly avocations, as there would be justice in the censure, there would be more hope that good might result from it.

It is a popular error, proceeding from defective views of a call to the ministry, and indicated in our prayers and our whole theory of ministerial training, that we must look principally to *young* men, as the persons whom God shall select to become the pastors and rulers of his people. These novices, thus early ascertained of their vocation, are to be trained and educated for the profession of a preacher, as other young men are trained and educated for the bar or the forum. We expect them to be called *early*, that they may go through the discipline which we conceive to be necessary, and hence we limit our prayers to this class of persons. But if the call be Divine, it must be sovereign—and it must impart a peculiar fitness, an unction of the Holy Ghost, which alone can adequately qualify for the duties of the office. If it be sovereign, it may extend to all classes and ages—to young and old—to rich and

poor—to all professions and pursuits—to publicans at the receipt of custom—lawyers at the bar—merchants at the desk, and physicians in their shops. We are not authorized to limit God's Spirit in this more than in any other department of his operation. He can call whom he pleases—and we should pray for an increase of labourers, without respect to the classes from which they are to spring. Then again, as to their training, the old adage is certainly true—“Whom God appoints he annoints.” The characteristic qualification for the ministry—the unction from on high—is the immediate gift of the Holy Ghost, and cannot be imparted by any agency of man. Human learning is necessary—the more, the better, but human learning cannot, of itself, make a preacher. Discipline is necessary—but discipline is not Divine power—and is only an incidental help. The whole routine of theological education supposes a previous fitness in the subject, which it may aid but cannot impart.

Hence this training becomes necessary only among novices—among those whose faculties have not been developed and expanded by previous pursuits and previous studies. But in cases in which men of cultivated minds are called from other walks of life, it is absurd to suppose that they cannot be efficient preachers, unless they have been graduated in a Theological Seminary. There is no charm in such institutions—they only burnish the weapons which the minister is to use—but they do not supply him with his armour. Men may be able ministers of the New Testament, without being trained to it as a mere profession—and although human learning is indispensable, yet human learning is not of the essence of a call. He who is called must acquire it, if he does not previously possess it—but he may possess it, and want that fitness which alone can render him successful. This fitness is not simply piety—for men may be both Godly and learned, and yet utterly unqualified for the sacred functions of the ministry—It is a Divine, a heavenly gift, which can be stirred by diligence, study, prayer, meditation, and discipline—but which God alone can communicate.

Another evil consequence of overlooking or improperly conceiving God's exclusive prerogative to call into the ministry, is the institution of plans “whose radical notion,” in

the language of Dr. Breckinridge, "seems to be that in some such way God's action in raising up, and sending forth preachers, may be stimulated, or its frequency increased. Such schemes, to say the very least, seem not so much directed to enquiries for such as God has called, as to experiments which may ascertain if he has not called a multitude besides. And it surely increases the danger greatly, that youths in the first stages of religious experience—of tender years—of circumstances in which a gratuitous education is itself, very often, a powerful temptation, and the station of a minister of the Gospel, a seduction nearly irresistible—are, to a great extent, the objects of these experiments. Suppose them to succeed perfectly—and the result is almost inevitably a class-ministry; and what is worse still—an eleemosynary class-ministry.

"I readily concede that it is not only a clear duty, but a high privilege, to aid such as need it, of those whom God calls to be Pastors to his people; and that there is every way, a great reward in so doing. But I greatly doubt if it is the best way to accomplish this important end, either to throw the door wide open, and invite all to enter, that those we need may come in with them; or to cultivate the idea, as is constantly done, that God calls a very great majority of his ministers from this class, and to talk as if he called few or none from any other; or to proceed as if it were not an immense evil for men to find entrance, who are not called of God—or as if it were not a fearful calamity to weaken, in such poor youths as are called of him, the spirit which leads them to struggle for self-support; or to set aside, virtually, the tribunals of God's house, in any part of the work of training and settling ministers of the word; or to train them, because they are of this class, in any respect differently from other candidates. It is easy for us to multiply ministers of the Gospel; but it is impossible for us to multiply such as are called of God. This is the great truth which men are ready to neglect—to deride. And the results of every attempt which we can make, in disregard of it, must always be disastrous. We may supplant a ministry called of God from all classes, by a ministry raised up by ourselves from a single class; but have we thereby added anything but a principle of disorder, an element of disease?"

These views have a terrible sweep, and we ask our readers to ponder them well. It is unnecessary to state that Dr. Bæckinridge could have designed no reflection upon poor young men. His Master had not where to lay His head, and it is to the poor, rich in faith, that the most precious consolations of the Gospel are directed. But no one will venture to affirm that none others are called into the ministry, or that temptations should be multiplied to these to deceive their own hearts. His remarks are directed against a system which aims mainly at the poor, and which he believes to be full of mischief. The practical lesson is that instead of sounding a trumpet and hunting in the high-ways and hedges for those whom God has called — instead of pressing upon the consciences of boys to examine themselves with a view to be ascertained whether or not God has chosen them for the ministry, we should wait till God sends them to us, and then thoroughly scrutinize their claims. We are to be earnest in prayer for an increase of labourers, and when God answers us He will make the answer plain to those who are sent and to us who pray. None have a right, in the first instance, to deal with the consciences of others upon this subject but God Himself. We may devote our children to the Lord as Hannah devoted the son of her prayers; but this should be a solemn, secret transaction between our own souls and the Almighty. The call to our children is not to come through us — it is the Eternal Spirit who impresses it on the heart, and He knows all who are His.

We are satisfied that the whole system of urging, as it is called, the claims of the ministry upon the minds of the young is inconsistent with just and scriptural views of its nature and duties. To preach the Gospel is a privilege, a distinction, and it has consequently claims upon no one until he possesses satisfactory evidence that he is entitled to the honour. It is the *call* which makes it his duty — and until the call is made known, there can be no pressure of conscience about it. We might just as much inculcate upon the untitled young men of England that they should prepare to assume the prerogatives of Peers and Knights, before the crown has intimated any intention to promote them, as to press upon any one the claims of the ministry before God has intimated His purpose to call. The effect of just views

would be to make us pray more and contrive less, depend upon God, and trust nothing in machinery. We should look to the Lord and not to societies — and we might consequently expect a ministry of power and not of caste. What we want is faith in God, and it is simply because we *are afraid* to confide in the Lord that we resort to manifold expedients of our own devising to supply the waste places of Zion. We apprehend that the ministry will die out, lest we recruit it — and in our blindness and weakness and fear, we take God's work into our own hands.

The direction of our Saviour was plain and pointed. "PRAY ye therefore the Lord of the Harvest," — it is not to seek ministers here and there, to persuade this man, that man or the other to take the subject into serious consideration — not to offer bribes to enter the sacred office — it was not in any wise to look to ourselves or to depend upon man — but "PRAY ye the LORD of the harvest." It is His privilege to provide labourers, your duty is to ask for them; it is His prerogative to give them.

Dr. Breckinridge complains of the Seminaries that they do not correct the evils inherent in the system by which they are replenished; but it strikes us that the remedy should be sought in the church courts. A proper vigilance on the part of Pastors, Sessions and Presbyteries, the prevalence of sound principles upon the whole subject of the ministry, and a persevering refusal in any case to ordain *sine titulo* those who are not to be truly evangelists, would prevent much of the mischief which he so justly deploras. The Seminaries are nothing and can be nothing but what the church courts may choose to make them, if these courts are faithful to themselves and faithful to God. It ought not to be a matter of course, that a young man who has completed the curriculum of study prescribed in the Seminary is licensed by the Presbytery—his call and gifts should be as thoroughly scrutinized as if they had undergone no scrutiny before. To take the endorsement of the theological Professors as a sufficient proof of his fitness for the office is a criminal neglect of its own duties.

In justice to Dr. Breckinridge we feel bound to insert the closing paragraph in the discussion of the first point in his sermon, the exclusive prerogative of God to call into the ministry:

“Having thus spoken, I ought to add, that while I solemnly believe that the methods now in use touching beneficiary education for the Gospel ministry are not without great danger, and that the general system of ministerial education is both defective and hazardous; and while I dare not say, that, by these and other means, persons who ought never to have turned their attention to the office of public teachers of religion, may not have been introduced into it,—and that some who may have been truly called of God are not tolerated in systematic covenant breaking, for which they ought to be subjected to discipline; and while there appears to me to be a state of opinion upon the whole subject of a call of God to the Pastor’s office, and the proper modes of ascertaining this and training the person for the work to which he is called, by no means satisfactory: still, it is also my deep and joyful conviction, that through the rich grace of Christ the great body of our ministers are men evidently called of God — and that they would have been a rich blessing to any age of the Christian church. I pray God, and I thus labour, that it may never be otherwise; and I beseech my brethren to bear with a plainness of speech, whose only object is the common good.”

The next point which Dr. Breckinridge discusses is the proofs of a call. “The grand and ultimate fact is, the call of God, and everything else, should be directed merely to the satisfactory ascertainment of this fact, to the best preparation of the person for the work, and to his official investiture upon scriptural grounds.” He states the “first, and indispensable proof of this call of God to be the inward testimony of the man’s own conscience.”

That a supernatural conviction of duty, wrought by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost is an essential element in the evidence of a true vocation to the ministry seems to us to be the clear and authoritative doctrine of the Scriptures. Men are not led to the Pastoral office, as they are induced to select other professions in life—they are drawn, as a sinner is drawn to Christ, by a mighty, invincible work of the Spirit. The call of God never fails to be convincing. Men are made to feel that a woe is upon them if they preach not the Gospel. It is not that they *love* the work, for often, like Moses, they are reluctant to engage in it — and love, at best, can only render its duties pleasant — it is not that they *de-*

sire the office, though in indulging this desire, they seek a good thing — it is not that they are zealous for the glory of God and burn for the salvation of souls, for this is characteristic of every true believer — nor is it that upon a due estimate of their talents and acquirements they promise themselves more extended usefulness in this department of labour than in any other — for no man is anything in the kingdom of Heaven except as God makes him so — but it is that the word of the Lord is like fire in their bones — they *must* preach it or die — they cannot escape from the awful impression which haunts them night and day, and banishes all peace from the soul until the will is bowed, that God has laid this work upon them at the hazard of their lives.

No man ought to enter the ministry upon mere conjectural grounds. He that doubteth is damned. If there be a calling, in which, at every step in the progress of our labours, we need the conviction that God is with us, that we are in the line of duty prescribed by His own Eternal Spirit, that calling is the ministry of the word. A man ought to have assurance that he is no intruder, before he should dare to assume responsibilities at which an angel might tremble. He should have a commission certified to his own mind from the King of Heaven, before he should venture to announce himself as God's ambassador or Christ's herald. We do not say that his assurance will never be disturbed, or that his mind will never be tossed with doubts — but we will say that he can never preach in peace and comfort and hope, as long as he is troubled about his authority to preach at all. The assurance of a call to the ministry, is like the assurance of our pardon and acceptance — subject to many fluctuations — preserved by faithfulness — dependent on humility and singleness of heart — a source of joy when clear — of agony, when darkened or disturbed. We cannot persuade ourselves that a man who has never had this assurance at all has ever been called of God. We see not how such a man can have the testimony of a good conscience. Conscience supposes light, but in this case, according to the very terms of the supposition, there is no light.

These have long been our fixed and deliberate convictions upon the subject — and we have often lamented that vague calculations of expediency have been, in too many instances, substituted in the place of a divine call. "My

object," says one of the profoundest thinkers of modern times, "my object shall be through life the *greatest good*, and I hold myself, and will ever hold myself, at liberty to seek it in *any line* that appears most promising; and so to change one line for another, when another more advantageous presents itself." A vaguer rule of conduct could not be prescribed—and if this was the secret of Foster's call to the ministry, we can readily understand why his labours, notwithstanding his brilliant talents, were so little blessed of God. Duty must ever be the measure of expediency—and a man can only know in what line he can promote the greatest good, by knowing in what line God has called him to labour. A man may have the zeal of Paul, the eloquence of Apollos, the boldness of Peter, and the meekness of John—he may be adorned with all human gifts and enriched with all human attractions, and yet, if the Lord withhold his blessing, he may preach in vain and prophesy in vain. All the deductions of a cold, utilitarian philosophy will absolutely come to nought. The grand question then is, will God bless? and that question can be satisfactorily answered only by answering another, "has God called." Here conscience, under the guidance of the Spirit, must *first* answer, and until it is prepared to answer in the affirmative, the first step should not be taken in seeking the ministry.

"In every act we can perform on earth, we are entitled to expect before we can be required to perform it, and we are bound to have, before we venture to perform it,—the testimony of a good conscience; and the clearness and force of our conscientious convictions should be analogous to the magnitude, the perplexity, the difficulty, of the contemplated duty. For a man then to presume to be an ambassador for Almighty God, and that touching questions no less awful than the glory of his throne, and the endless states of his rebellious subjects, without a settled conviction in his own soul that this fearful trust is laid on him by the King Eternal—is insane audacity. I say not, he must be convinced he ought to be sent; Moses plead hard against his mission: the conviction must be that he is sent. I say not, he must judge that he is fit to be sent, for no man is fit. I say not that this or the other motive—as many will assert—or any motive at all, beside the simple one of obe-

dience to the voice of the heavenly monitor—should mingle with the inward fixed conviction; nor that this proof, or the other proof—as many will contend—or any proof at all, beside the testimony of consciousness itself, should beget within us this strong assurance that it is God's Spirit which has wrought us for this self same thing. I say not there may not be doubts and perplexities, trials very sore, and temptations of the adversary,—fightings without and fears within, and troubles on every side; for if these things be not, it is either that grace is overwhelmingly abundant, or that Satan judges us to be workmen that he need not fear. Nor do I deny, that like as the kingdom of heaven itself is but as a grain of mustard planted in the broken heart, which must be watered by many a tear, and watched amid long and anxious vigils, as its roots strike down and its branches spread strongly and widely abroad; so this inward testimony of a divine vocation may be a whisper to the soul, almost inaudible in the profoundest stillness of the spirit of man,—lost—restored again—strengthened—repeated—struggling amidst the passions that toss us to and fro, and fighting against the sins that would quench it—following us, if need be, as God followed Jonah, till out of the belly of hell the right of the Almighty Disposer is confessed.”

The testimony of conscience, however, is not final and conclusive. We may deceive ourselves as well as be deceived by others, and to fortify our hearts and diminish the dangers of deception, God has appointed the approbation of his own people and the concurrence of the courts of his house, as additional links in the chain of evidence, which in all ordinary cases, is to authenticate a call from him.

“The grand object of the work of the ministry,” we quote from the sermon, “the grand object of “the work of the Ministry,” divinely announced in the very context before us,—is “the perfecting of the saints”—“the edifying of the body of Christ.” (verse 12.) He who cannot—in his ministry—build up the saints—cannot have from God any part of “the work of the ministry,”—least of all that part to which the preaching of the Gospel appertains. But, beyond all controversy, the saints are the best of all judges whether the ministrations on which they wait fructify them or not. Their call

and their rejection, are therefore alike decisive, so far as the case depends on their testimony. Again, he who cannot, in the work of the ministry, edify the body of Christ, cannot be called of God to that ministry. But, surely, the church must decide for itself whether or not it is edified by the ministrations offered to it. Its decision, therefore, is conclusive, so far as the case depends on its call. It is impossible to escape from this direct testimony of the word of life. It does not follow that every man who could edify the church and build up the saints, is therefore called of God to some public ministry: for to labour after both these precious objects, is in some form or other, the duty of every member of the household of faith. The *positive* testimony of the Christian people, is not therefore conclusive, as I have before shown that two previous testimonies are indispensable. But it is otherwise of its *negative* testimony. Many may have neglected, through ignorance, to seek this trial of their call—who might have obtained its testimony; and it is doubtless this conviction, which justifies us in acting as if their call of God could not be questioned. Many may have obtained it after their ordination; a course, dangerous and irregular, but not therefore fatal. But he who cannot obtain it, seems to me to be shut out of the ministry, by the direct prescriptions of the word of God. Nor am I able to conceive it possible, that any character or amount of proof, can sufficiently attest the divine call of any human being to be a Christian Pastor, if he is unable to obtain this attestation of the Christian people. For how is it possible for us to believe that he has been appointed of God, expressly to perform a particular work, for which nothing but divine grace can fit him; of whom it is made certain that God has not given him the grace needful to the accomplishment of the work?"

The ordinary form, in which the approbation of the Christian people is to be manifested, is through the call of some particular congregation. Our church, in conformity with the example of other Presbyterian churches, has adopted the plan of subjecting candidates for the ministry of the word, to a probationary exercise of their talents and their gifts, in order that "the churches may have an opportunity to form a better judgment respecting the talents of those by whom they are to be instructed and governed"—and no

such probationer can be ordained at all, except upon the call of some particular congregation, or upon the solemn pledge to discharge the functions of an Evangelist in "deserted and frontier settlements." The approbation of God's people is an element in the proof of God's call, which no conscientious man should be willing to relinquish. He should know that he is able to edify the saints, before he undertakes the solemn task. In the case of Evangelists, this proof cannot be directly had—but that office is confessedly extraordinary, and in its privations and sacrifices presents fewer temptations to self-deception than the ordinary work of a Bishop. But, where men are not to become scriptural Evangelists, we do not believe that any court on earth, has a right to ordain them without a reference to some special charge—or that, being ordained, they themselves have a right to act, deliberate and vote in any ecclesiastical judicatory. The thing is contrary to the whole spirit of Presbyterianism—utterly unsupported by the word of God—and directly subversive of a free, representative government. It was unknown to the purest ages of the church—was expressly rebuked and forbidden when it began to be practised—and has wrought nothing but mischief wherever it has prevailed. That such men, ordained without reference to a cure, are not true ministers, we will not venture to assert—but that *they* want, and that the *church* wants, a very important element of the proof, that they are true ministers—that their credentials, in other words, are only partially authenticated, we have no hesitation in affirming. But it may be said, that the church is not a single congregation as the independents represent it to be—but embraces the entire body of believers—that the ministry was given to the church as a whole, and that, therefore, the voice of the whole church, and not of an insulated fragment, is necessary to vouch a divine call—that the action, consequently, of any single congregation, is of no further importance than as giving a minister a right to teach and govern in it. Dr. Breckinridge, in presenting what we conceive to be the scriptural doctrine, concerning the unity of the church and the relation in which the parts stand to the whole, has supplied a complete refutation of this plausible cavil.

"But our received faith is, that into how many parts so-

ever our church may be divided, for convenience sake, or from necessity, either as congregations, or as larger portions; still the whole of these parts constitute but one church. It follows, that all the office bearers who may be more particularly attached to any one portion of this church, are in the same sense, office bearers of the whole body, as the particular part is one portion of the whole; and therefore, the action of any particular portion—as a single congregation—in virtue of which any particular office bearer is set apart, is necessarily taken as decisive of the entire question concerning his vocation, as completely as if the whole body had acted upon every case—which is physically impossible. And this is the more evident, when it is considered, that in the nature of the case, the same principle is applied to every conceivable state of the church, however small it may be, or however great; for each particular congregation is supposed to have every thing which the whole church has; the same officers, the same ordinances, the same kind of powers, derived from the same divine source; every one in all respects like all the rest, and like the whole united into one;—so that if it was possible for the whole church to be met in one place on one occasion, there would be absolutely nothing except a vast increase of what every single congregation should possess. Thus contemplated, we see, not only the evil, but the folly and uselessness of divisions amongst Christians; since the Lord Jesus has erected his church upon such a model as to provide perfectly for its indefinite extension, and at the same time to secure its perfect unity. And when it is considered that the seal which each particular congregation gives by its call, to the vocation of any office bearer in the church, bears with it the highest and the most impressive evidence which can be given of human sincerity—in this—that they take the person to be their teacher, or ruler, or distributor—that they commit their own highest interests into his hands; it is plain that no greater security is possible.”

In regard to the sanction of the Christian people, three theories are conceivable in regard to the form in which it may be expressed. The first may be denominated prelatial—not that it is proposed in so many words by the advocates of prelacy—but it assumes a fundamental principle of that system, touching the relation in which the

rulers stand to the ruled. The Bishop is potentially the church—the voice of the Bishop is consequently its voice—and the act of the Bishop, its act. Any theory which makes the approbation of the ordaining power the putative approbation of God's people—whether that power be a Prelate or a Presbytery, is essentially the same; and any hypothesis which maintains that ministers can be created at large, sustaining an official relation to the whole church, independently of the cure and oversight of any part of it, which makes a call, not an important element in settling the preliminary question, whether the office shall be conferred—but simply the ground of a right to exercise its functions in a particular place—which entitles a man to become a Pastor because he is a minister of the entire church, instead of making him a minister of the entire church because he is a Pastor—any such hypothesis is utterly destructive of a free government. It leads necessarily to monarchy or aristocracy—it makes the people *as such*—as distinct from their rulers, and as putatively represented by them—absolute cyphers, as well in the choice of their masters, as in the administration of the government.

The second theory is that of Independents, who virtually deny a Catholic Church, and limit all offices to single congregations.

The third is the one which we conceive to be developed in our own standards, and which Dr. Breckinridge has so happily illustrated in the preceding extract. In it the unity of the whole and the integrity and perfection of each part are beautifully preserved. Upon this hypothesis the visible church is one body, consisting of many members—and as the motions of the hand, the head, the foot, are the motions of the man, so the healthful and regular action of any single congregation is the action of the universal church. The voice of a part, properly expressed, is the voice of the whole. He who is called by a single congregation, is called by the entire church—he who is supported by a single congregation is supported by the entire church, and he who can edify no congregation, can, under no circumstances, become a shepherd of the Lord's flock. Every pastor is a minister of the whole—his call gives him at once a general office and a special field of labour.

We shall conclude this branch of the subject with the

following note, which occurs on the 29th and 30th pages of the sermon :

“I presume it will hardly be questioned, that it has always been the common doctrine of all foreign Presbyterian churches, that ministers of the word, when they are ordained, ought to be assigned to some particular ecclesiastical charge: nor that it is the received theory of church order amongst them generally, that the moment such a minister is without an ecclesiastical charge, he is without the least right or power to sit in any church court, or exercise any rule in the church, as a minister of the word. A recent and memorable instance illustrates this, in the Church of Scotland. The Rev. Dr. Welsh, who was Moderator of the Scottish Assembly of 1843, and a member of the Free Assembly of 1844, and constituted that body as its presiding officer, at its first meeting; sat in both those Assemblies as a Ruling Elder, by delegation as such; and this, notwithstanding he was one of the Theological Professors in the University of Edinburgh. It is well known that the original Secession under Ebenezer Erskine, and the subsequent one, under Thomas Gillespie, in Scotland, had both, but especially the latter, direct relation to the question of ordaining and inducting Pastors without a real call. Witherspoon, throughout his *Characteristics*, and the *Apology* for that work, every where holds this proceeding as monstrous in itself, and one cause of the corruption of the Church of Scotland; and this same Witherspoon was, more than any other man, the author of our church constitution, under which his name is used to justify what he not only abhorred, but had like to have been deposed for ridiculing and denouncing. In the year 1768 the Secession Church of Scotland decided this question point blank, that McAra, minister at Burntshield, having demitted his charge, and having no charge of any congregation, ought not to sit and judge in any ecclesiastical judicatory, and that his name should be dropped. And in 1773 this decision, upon full consideration, was affirmed upon general grounds, as unquestionable Presbyterian doctrine. (*See McKerrow's History of the Secession Church, p. 546—51, Glasgow, 1841.*) The conclusions and grounds of the Synod are given at large by McKerrow; and I must say, that it affords a singular gratification to me, to find every general principle therein set-

tled, precisely in accordance with all I have contended for, in this country, in regard to the nature of scriptural Presbyterian order; and the offices of Ruling Elder and minister of the word: although I did not know of the existence of McKerrow's book, nor of this important decision of this question, until after my opinions had been several years published."

The last point which Dr. Breckinridge discusses is, "the relation which the question of any man's call to the Pastoral office bears to those who already hold office, of whatever kind, in the church of Christ." He contends that "the final testimony which we want to the fact that we have been Divinely called to preach the everlasting Gospel is that of a Divinely constituted spiritual court, met in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and acting by his authority." Dr. Breckinridge differs from many of his brethren, though not, as we believe, from the word of God, in regard to the essential elements of such a court, and the rights and privileges which pertain to each class of its members in the business of ordination. These points, however, we shall reserve for a future occasion, when we propose to review his speeches before the Synod of Philadelphia.

We hope that our readers will not be satisfied with the rapid and meagre sketch which we have given of this masterly discourse upon a subject of vital interest. We hope that they will procure it, and read it for themselves. The warnings of Dr. Breckinridge are wise and seasonable—and if the principles which he defends are not the doctrines of our standards, we have altogether mistaken their true, and, as it seems to us, obvious import. There are some subordinate matters, not at all affecting the merits of the sermon, in which we cannot concur with the author—such, for example, as the statement on the 22d page, in reference to an extraordinary incident in the experience and ministry of the great Apostle to the Gentiles. It seems to us, that the vision recorded in Acts, xxii: 17—22, took place upon Paul's visit to Jerusalem, immediately after his conversion, and not upon the visit which he made after his return from Arabia. So, again, we doubt whether there is any provision in our constitution, similar to that contemplated in the recent overture to the General Assembly, for the demission of the ministerial office on the part of preach-

ers. But the doctrine of a Divine, supernatural call to the ministry, by the immediate agency of the Holy Ghost—evinced by the testimony of conscience, the approbation of God's people, and the sanction of God's judicatories—we hold to be alike the doctrine of our standards and of the sacred scriptures. Ordinations, *sine titulo*, except in the case of real evangelists, we hold to be irregular, unscriptural, and dangerous—and the right of ministers without charge, to rule God's heritage, we hold to be contradicted by every distinctive principle of Presbyterianism. In these great principles, we express our full and hearty concurrence with the author of the sermon, and we bid him a cordial God-speed in his efforts to spread them.

ARTICLE VII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Notes on the Parables of our Lord.* By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, M. A., *Vicar of Ilchen Stoke, Hants; Professor of Divinity King's College, London; and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford.* First American, from the third English edition. New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1847. 8vo., pp. 409.

This truly valuable work on the Parables of the New Testament deserves a more ample notice than our time and limits allow us now to give. In the introductory remarks the learned author first defines the Parable, pointing out the distinction between it and the Æsopic fable, the Mythus, the Proverb, and the Allegory; he next points out the design of our Lord in teaching by parables; then he discusses the true method of interpreting them; and then speaks of the parables not found in the

scriptures, e. g. those found in the Jewish and early Christian writers. After this introduction, every page of which is luminous with instruction, he proceeds to comment upon the several Parables of our Lord. The author is evidently a man of extensive reading, especially of those writers, whether ancient or modern, who have sought to illustrate the sacred scriptures, and he makes all his learning tributary to the work he has undertaken, of revealing the true sense of those divine parables uttered by Him who spake as never man spake, and of whom the sacred poet, in his prophetic song, said — “Thou art fairer than the sons of men, Grace is poured into thy lips.” On every page Professor Trench shows himself to be a man of ability and discrimination, and what is more, a man, as far as we have yet discovered, of an evangelic spirit, to whom Christ and his truth is precious. His numerous quotations from the Greek and Latin Fathers, from the Reformers, and the more modern writers, Romish and Protestant, enrich his work, and increase its value to the intelligent and thoughtful reader. His style, too, is the style of a scholar, and if not marked with beauty, is free from all verbiage, and is suggestive of far more than he expresses. The book has reached three editions in England, and is a valuable contribution to our theological literature.

-
2. *General History of the Christian Religion and Church: from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander. Translated from the second and improved Edition. By JOSEPH TORREY, Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in the University of Vermont. Volume First. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1847. 8vo., pp. 740.*

The above is the title of the American Translation of the *Algemeine Geschichte* of the celebrated Neander, of Berlin. It is a beautiful volume, and does honor to the enterprising publishers. A second volume, we are informed, is soon to follow. The

present contains the history of the Christian Religion and Church, for the first three centuries. It covers the same ground with the translation of H. J. Rose, which has before been printed in this country, but as Professor Torrey has translated from a second and improved edition, and is well known to be fully competent to the task he has undertaken, his translation will doubtless be preferred by American scholars. Neander has obtained the first name among the ecclesiastical historians of the age. One great characteristic of his researches is, that they are apparently free from all shackles of party. He has his own philosophical views of the causes which were in operation to influence society in each period of which he treats, and he does not confine himself to the bare statement of facts, but uses ascertained facts to bear him out in his philosophy. The evil is, that the facts are sometimes too few to sustain the theory, and that very different reasons might be given by a different mind, for precisely the same facts. It is pleasant to know that the researches of this distinguished scholar have led him to the Presbyterian form of government, as the one according to which the first churches were modelled. To this conclusion we are persuaded every unbiased mind must be guided by the declarations of scripture, and by the evidence still to be found in the ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries.

-
3. *The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit.* By JAMES BUCHANAN, Professor of Divinity, New College, Edinburgh. From the Sixth Edinburgh Edition. New York: Robert Carter, 1847. 12mo., pp. 519.

This is an important and valuable treatise on the work and offices of the Holy Spirit. The number of editions through which it has passed in Scotland, shows the esteem in which it is there held. It has not the depth and completeness of the great master work of Owen, considered as a discussion of the entire doctrine of the scripture respecting the Holy Spirit. The au-

thor appears to have aimed only at treating of the work of the Spirit upon the hearts of men, in their translation out of the kingdom of Satan into that of God, and their subsequent edification as His people. This subject is handled with that ability which might be expected from one of Scotland's most distinguished divines.

4. *Personal Declension and Revival of Religion in the Soul.* By the Rev. OCTAVIUS WINSLOW. Robert Carter: New York. 1847.

This work is a seasonable contribution to the devotional literature of the age, and is destined, we think, to strengthen the hold which the author has already obtained upon the sympathies of Christians, by his older publications. The statements of doctrine are clear and discriminating, and the practical operation of truth in the heart and life of a believer, is accurately unfolded. But the great charm of the book is the spirit of elevated piety which pervades it from the beginning to the end, and this, it appears to us, must commend it to all who love the faith and holiness of the Gospel. The reader will feel the inspiration of a fervour very different from that which distinguishes many of the religious publications of the day. There is none of that frothy ebullition of feeling, occasional and spasmodic, which finds its appropriate theatre upon the platforms of the Tabernacle and Exeter Hall, and passes for the only genuine piety in these days of noisy, busy, ostentatious religionists: but a fervour springing from lofty and commanding views of the covenant of grace, and perpetually bubbling up from the depths of that hidden life which is with Christ in God. By resigning himself to his spiritual impulses, and writing as he feels, the author invests his pages with extraordinary attractions for the believer. Our minds are impressed with the conviction that we are holding communion with one who has been within the veil, and has gazed upon the face of the Lamb: and we rise from the perusal with a clear-

er apprehension of the dignity that belongs to us, as the members of Jesus, and a deeper sense of the momentous responsibility which the possession of that dignity involves.

We have said that it was a seasonable publication. It is acknowledged on all hands, that a revival is greatly needed. Professors of religion are indulging, to an alarming extent, in the vanities and fooleries of the world, and we find only a few, here and there, who sigh and cry for the abominations committed in the church. As a natural result of this indifference on the part of those who have named the name of Christ, the ungodly are sleeping profoundly in spiritual death. How are believers to be aroused? By proclaiming the law, and stating its obligations? We think not. No man's love — and love is the grand principle of evangelical obedience — was ever excited by the "hearing of the law." He is not made good by obeying the law: he obeys the law because he has been made good. It is by the exceeding great and precious promises of that covenant which is sealed with the blood of Jesus, that he is made a partaker of the divine nature, and escapes the corruption that is in the world through lust. Then we must hold up the Lord Jesus, in whom the promises are yea and amen. When the gaze of the church is fixed upon His glory, a marvellous transformation will be the result, Christians will recognize the dignity that belongs to them, as the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, and will walk worthy of their high vocation.

These are the views which will be found to pervade this book. Jesus and his glory are the Alpha and Omega of it, and therefore we cordially commend it to the perusal of all who are thirsting for the kingdom of God.

We subjoin the titles of the chapters: I. Incipient Declension. II. Declension in Love. III. Declension in Faith. IV. Declension in Prayer. V. Declension in connection with Doctrinal Error. VI. On Grieving the Spirit. VII. The Fruitless and the Fruitful Professor. VIII. The Lord, the Restorer of His People. IX. The Lord, the Keeper of His People.

5. *The Lands of the Bible Visited and Described, in an Extensive Journey, undertaken with special reference to the Promotion of Biblical Research, and the Advancement of the cause of Philanthropy.* By JOHN WILSON, D. D., F. R. S., &c. &c. 2 vols. Edinburgh: 1847.

A missionary of the Church of Scotland, (now the Free Church,) at Bombay for fifteen years, Dr. W. was ordered home on account of his impaired health, and took Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor on his way. This gentleman is known to the public, as author of a learned work on the Religion of the Parsees, and of one of the most interesting volumes of Religious Biography, viz: that of his own wife, Mrs. MARGARET WILSON. To his friends in both hemispheres he is also known as a man of extraordinary mental activity, and of great zeal, both in literary and missionary pursuits. The result of his sager enquiries and intelligent observations, during his stay in the Lands of the Bible, has been two large and valuable 8vo. volumes, embellished with Maps and Illustrations.

The author claims the attention of his readers, on the novel, and we will add, reasonable, ground, that "while most travellers have entered the Lands of the Bible from the distant West, in consequence of which almost every thing has presented itself in an aspect of entire novelty, and called forth a burst of fresh European feeling," he "betook himself to them from the distant East, in which he had resided about fifteen years, and not altogether a stranger to the nature of their climes, and the manners and customs and languages of their inhabitants, with many of whom he had been brought into contact."

Dr. Wilson pays the highest compliments to our learned countryman, and his predecessor in a considerable part of the journeys detailed, Dr. Robinson, but in several matters of great interest has seen reason to differ with the conclusions of Dr. R.—as the place and circumstances of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea; the Mount of Communion at Sinai; the

route of the Israelites immediately after the giving of the Law ; the use of some of the ancient excavations at Petra ; and various questions connected with the topography of the Holy Land.

These volumes present much that is interesting and valuable respecting the Jews and the Samaritans. The Eastern churches also, were special objects of Dr. W.'s enquiries, and he has presented us with a valuable exposition of their creed and condition, and their more general historical connections. The friends of evangelical truth will read with interest what he details respecting the state and prospects of the American Missions in Syria and Asia Minor. We regret, however, that while the costliness of the English edition will prevent its circulation in this country, the size of the work is likely to hinder its republication.

6. *The Protector : A Vindication.* By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D. D. *New York : Robert Carter, 1847. 8vo., pp. 281.*

To those who have revelled in the "earnest" vindication, furnished by Carlyle, of the most "earnest" men and times England ever saw, this little work may seem a superfluity. It does not so appear to us. Admirable as the defence of Carlyle is — and we believe that it is destined to a most triumphant success in rectifying the verdict which the world will render upon Oliver Cromwell — it still has its defects. It views the Protector as a man, as a soldier, as a statesman, and as a prince ; but not sufficiently as a Christian. It recognizes, indeed, his religious character ; but not so much for the independent interest with which this invests Cromwell, as from the fact, that religion was the great element in his character, giving to it that deep seriousness and inflexible decision which made him the hero of the seventeenth century.

This book, too, presents a happy conjunction of names : we are glad it was written, for the mere poetry of the alliance.

The great historian of the Protestant Reformation, the defender of Luther, of Calvin, and of Zuinglius, who has recorded for us the birth agonies of Protestantism, to see this man standing up in the midst of the busy Protestantism of England of the nineteenth century, and turning out before us the most Protestant English heart of the seventeenth century, may well set us musing. The long dishonored Protector, now that the world is rising up to do him reverence, is happy in his defenders. Cromwell's religious character cannot be sketched, except by those whose views have been expanded by looking across centuries, and whose souls can sweep into lofty sympathy with those master spirits, who, as occasion serves, flesh now their pens and now their swords, in the sides of the great red dragon.

We think, too, that this work does fuller justice to the Scotch Presbyterian party of that day. Carlyle treats them and their errors with a bitterness which is a blemish upon his book. The Presbyterian sympathies of D'Aubigné led him to a truer estimate of this party; and with all their admitted errors he commends them to the respect of the reader. On these two grounds, we think this work supplies a chasm in the otherwise more perfect work of Carlyle.

In one particular, however, we are constrained to dissent from the opinion of the author before us. In our view the regicide requires neither defence nor apology. We see no reason why a traitor king should not be brought to the block, as well as a traitor subject: they are both inferior to the laws and to the commonwealth. To Americans, "the divine right of kings" appears in truth as "a time-worn fallacy;" and the haughty rulers of the earth need, at times, the salutary lesson taught by the sturdy republicans of that day, that princes were given to the people, and not the people to them.

We fear that the literary execution of this work will not add to the fame of the author. It gives evidence of haste in composition, and lacks that profound and original research which characterizes the other historical labours of Dr. Merle D'Aubigné. Perhaps a sufficient explanation of this is found in the fact that

the work was at first designed only as an article for a Review, and subsequently swelled into the form in which we now receive it.

7. *Life and Religious opinions and Experience of Madame De La Mothe Guyon: together with some account of the Personal History and Religious Opinions of Fenelon, Archbishop of Cambray.* By THOMAS C. UPHAM, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Bowdoin College. 2 vols., 8vo. Harper & Brothers: New York. 1847.

This work was on our table previous to the issue of our last number. We have delayed hitherto to notice it, in the hope of being able soon to furnish an article reviewing it, at length, together with other productions of Professor Upham's pen, and the whole mystical school to which they belong. Not having abandoned this hope, we will only say, at present, that the work at the head of this notice, records the history of a very remarkable woman. The reader will find himself, before perusing many pages, deeply interested in the strong intellect of the heroine, the extent of her accomplishments, the bitterness of her domestic sorrows, and the vicissitudes of her earthly lot. But the charm of the book, at least for the more serious and thoughtful, lies in her intimacy with the Archbishop of Cambray, in the exposition she gives of the mystical piety which glowed intensely under the ashes and lava of Romish superstition — the only type, however incorrect, of true piety, which at that time prevailed — and in the persecutions which she suffered from the Beast. We cannot say more, without encroaching upon ground which calls for lengthened remark, for which we have not now space. The book will be read with absorbing interest, by all who have heart enough to be impressed by a most romantic grief, or piety enough to sympathize with a soul struggling in the midst of thick darkness after communion with God. We advise, however, that it be read with patient and discriminating thought, which can winnow the chaff from the wheat.

Bielfield, who defines it to be the art of expressing our thoughts by fiction; from Coleridge, who says it is the proper antithesis to science, as prose is to metre; from Jeffrey, and from all others who have written before,—he defines it to be an affection of the mind itself. The whole of his definition is too long to quote, and though it is sustained by ingenious reasoning, the view it gives us of poetry is too *subjective*, while it seems to us to lack that great quality of a good definition, perfect perspicuity. This indeed, is the greatest fault of the little work of our young friend, and has resulted, we presume, from too great haste in writing upon a subject in some of its aspects so abstruse, and in all so difficult. Yet we are glad that he has found time, and has had the inclination, amid other occupations, to use his pen in promoting the interests of literature and religion. There are points of contact between Religion, Poetry and Philosophy. The two last may be made tributary to the first, and have been in every age, both when inspired men availed themselves of them in communicating truth, and since. Both are busied with that world of which the God of revelation is the creator. Though what may be regarded *spirituel* in poetry is not necessarily *spiritual*, in the religious sense, “Poetry is most just to its own divine origin when it administers the comforts and breathes the spirit of religion.” And “Divine Philosophy” is most truly entitled thus, when it acknowledges in every step that the material and moral world, whose laws it investigates, are the creations of infinite wisdom, and when it leads us ever upwards to the Father of Lights.

THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, S. C.

VOL. I.—NO. IV.

MARCH, MDCCCXLVIII.

COLUMBIA, S. C.
PRINTED BY I. C. MORGAN.

1848

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Will be published Quarterly, in June, September, December, and March, at Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance.

It will be devoted mainly to the exposition and defence of the Doctrines and polity of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Still, as it is designed to be thoroughly Evangelical and Protestant, its Editors hope to give it attractions for all who love the truth as it is in Jesus.

All Communications should be addressed to the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review, Columbia, S. C.



TO OUR PATRONS.

Our third number has been delayed, to the great disappointment of the Editors, by circumstances connected with the Printer's department, and over which neither they nor he had any control, the paper for the impression, which was seasonably ordered, not having arrived sufficiently early. It was our hope to have issued it in December, but it has been delayed beyond the close of the month. What we have before announced will be borne in mind by our readers, that each Editor is not responsible for all that appears in the Review; that it is intended to be a free Press, within certain limits, and to invite rather than repress discussion. On no other principle would it be possible for the present Editors to conduct the work which they have undertaken.

We again request our patrons to inform us immediately whenever they fail in receiving the numbers of the Review as they are issued. Some irregularity may occur, until our mail books shall be fully adjusted.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER IV.

1848.
MARCH, 1847.

ARTICLE I.

LECTURES ON FOREIGN CHURCHES, *delivered in Edinburgh and Glasgow, May, 1845, in connection with the objects of the Free Church of Scotland.* FIRST SERIES. *Edinburgh, 1845.*

LECTURES ON FOREIGN CHURCHES. SECOND SERIES. *Edinburgh, 1846.*

The first series of these lectures is by the Rev. Drs. Candlish, Wilson, and McFarlane; and the Rev. Messrs. Thomas McCrie, Robert W. Stewart, Wm. K. Tweedie, and J. G. Lorimer.

The subjects are as follows:

- I. The Mutual Relations of the Churches of Christ.
- II. The Independent Eastern Churches.
- III. The Ancient History of the Waldensian Church.
- IV. The present condition and future prospects of the Waldensian Church.
- V. The Religious History of Holland and Belgium since the Reformation.
- VI. Past and Present State of Evangelical Religion in Switzerland, and especially Geneva.
- VII. The Past and Present State of Evangelical Religion in France.

The *Second Series*, contains seven lectures by Messrs. Wilson, Forbes, Fairbairn, Bryce, Tweedie, Hetherington, and Buchanan. Their subjects are:

VOL. I.—No. 4.

1

- I. The Papal Eastern Churches.
- II. The Reformation in Germany.
- III. The Present State and Prospects of Evangelical Religion in Germany, with a sketch of its history, from the time of Luther.
- IV. The State of Religion in Italy, from the Fall of the Western Empire till the Council of Trent, including an Account of the Introduction of the Reformed Doctrines into that country.
- V. Italy and its Religion.
- VI. The Religious Condition of Spain at the period of the Suppression of the Reformation, and in particular the great leading features and events in the History of Popery in that country at that period, whereby it was enabled to crush the Reformation.
- VII. The Prospects of Christendom.

These are all very interesting subjects, and handled in a very interesting and instructive manner.

In the introductory lecture to the first series, Dr. Candlish undertakes to solve "the great and urgent Christian problem of the day, viz: in what sense and manner, split as she is into sections and fragments, by innumerable peculiarities of thought and feeling, brought out in the exercise of that right of private judgment and free scriptural enquiry, which is her just privilege and boast, (let no man take her crown,) the Protestant Evangelical Church of the living God is yet in every land, and over all the earth, to recognize herself and be recognized by the world, as one." And in the prosecution of his undertaking, the author dwells on the manner in which "Christianity, as introduced by its divine founder, was fitted to penetrate all nations and possess and occupy the world." It was "first to be divested altogether of the local, territorial and ceremonial character which belonged to the preceding dispensation." "Secondly, no universal empire, or monarchy was established. The principle contained in the New Testament, is substantially that of self-government, fitted to give the church the aspect of a number of free and separate commonwealths, rather than of one single, vast and gigantic empire." Thirdly, there was provision for "a close and frequent interchange of good offices among these spiritual republics,

and the exercise of much mutual deference in the way of constantly consulting one another, &c. &c." Thus, the author makes out the "general principle of a sort of federal union of kindness and consultation among the independent Christian communities throughout the world."

Viewing primitive Christianity as having a constitution thus elastic, yet cohering, Dr. Candlish beholds her making her way among the nations, congregations every where springing up, spreading their branches out, forming themselves into connected bodies, and under their pastors and elders, consulting and acting together in consistories, or colleges, or presbyteries, or synods. "Union, not isolation, being the law and tendency of the Gospel, these Christian communities become provincial and national." "Considerable diversities, however," and even in some things "great dissimilarity may prevail." "The general rule of decency and order, and the precept of mutual forbearance being observed in all, with whatever in the discipline and worship of the church has not warrant of the word of God, being repudiated and disowned, there will still be room for shades of peculiarity, occasioned by climate, customs, or circumstances;" and, "instead of insipid and enforced uniformity," there will be a "real unity."

Dr. C. admits that this pleasing delineation exists more in theory than in fact; but "the hour (he says,) is now come, and the longing is generally felt for the current of evangelical sympathy to circulate again, and the grace and strength of evangelical union, not artificial, forced and fettered, but free, elastic, unconfined, to be manifested at last for the conviction of an unbelieving world." p. 17. The remarks which follow, we should suppose must have had some influence in originating the great "Evangelical Alliance," which met August, 1846, in London, at which were present not less than 1200 ministers of various denominations. His views respecting the objects to be kept in view by such convocations for Christian union, are thus given: "Few would anticipate good at present from national conventions to settle the affairs of the nation's Christianity. But, nothing could be more practicable, nothing more safe or becoming, than the meeting together from time to time of brethren representing the various Protestant churches, at convenient seasons and places, for prayer and

conference on all that relates to their common Christianity. Let them have no power or authority, but let the time be spent in Christian fellowship and devout exercises of the soul before God; let missionary intelligence and information regarding the Lord's work be interchanged. * * * Controversies need not be agitated, since there would be no competent tribunal to settle them; * * * all may be occupied in brotherly conversation, &c. &c." p. 19, 20.

It was a lovely vision, and entranced many a gentle, peace-loving soul, but it soon vanished. First, came the difficulties, (which Candlish himself anticipated,) of "adjusting such a test or criterion of genuine Christianity, as might exclude the avowed holders of error, and yet be comprehensive enough to embrace all who love the truth" — "the difficulties of meeting the views of this body and obviating the scruples of that." We fully accord with all our author says respecting its being "a hazardous thing to set about drawing a line between essentials and non-essentials in religion, and selecting out of a creed which is compact and consistent as a whole, what portions are deemed to be indispensable, and as such, detached from the rest, on which a slur may be thus imagined to be cast." "We fully admit, indeed, the propriety of Christians substantially drawing this distinction for the recognition of one another's Christianity, and the regulation of their mutual intercourse. But the risk is, when they begin also to do this, in forming their own opinions, and determining their own conduct; for a door is thus opened to much subtle casuistry and refinement, and a sophistical tampering with conscience, as to the harmlessness of ignorance and error, upon minor points. Now, in this view, it is not safe for any man to count any point a minor point on which Scripture may be found to give any deliverance at all, if he use such an idea as an apology for either not enquiring, or not making up his mind in regard to it. For not to speak of the relaxed conscientiousness and impaired moral tone that may be thus engendered, we really know too little of the mutual relations and influences of the truths of God, as they stand in his word, all harmonizing and meeting together; or of their mutual bearings, as they balance one another in the believing mind, to be able to assure ourselves, that an error, even in non-fundamentals, may not, to us, at least, be per-

icious and fatal; and it were to be regretted, if the adoption of a vaguer and more general profession, in the adjustment of the fellowship of the churches, should seem at all to warrant a loose and latitudinarian interpretation, even of the details of their particular creeds. But, besides, we have another fear. All experience shews that the omission or disparagement, or doubtful interpretation of a single clause in a well-weighed doctrinal statement, may be held to cover far greater laxity than was ever contemplated. It is by no means the same thing for a Christian man, or a Christian church, to abandon a doctrine previously held, as it is never to have known it; the abandonment of it necessarily involving more than the mere absence of it would have done. Hence, as has been often remarked, degenerate Calvinism is not so spiritual and evangelical as reviving Arminian Methodism." p. 21 and 22.

But differences as to abstract points of doctrine, were not the only breakers which endangered the ship of that Alliance. The American proposal for introducing such an item into the doctrinal basis, as by asserting a future judgment, and the everlasting punishment of the finally impenitent, (strangely overlooked by the British brethren,) should exclude *Universalists*,—this *American*, had in the outset of the deliberations, well-nigh shivered all hopes of an oecumenical confederation. But, towards the close, the *English* proposal, for introducing a clause which should exclude *slaveholders*, actually destroyed every such hope, turned the whole affair into an Anti-Slavery meeting—and amidst hoarse murmurs and bitter complaints from the rabid Irish Abolitionists, Nelson and Stanfield, because the Alliance took no stronger ground, together with solemn protests on the other hand from some of the Americans against any interference whatever with slavery, sent the soundest and best men of all countries then present back to their homes again, in mingled sorrow and vexation at the conduct of those, who cared too little for Christian union, to make a sacrifice to it of their own mad fanaticism, and too much for their Anti-Christian theories, to lose so good an opportunity of thrusting them before the eyes of the whole world, then turned towards the meeting in Freemason's Hall.

Dr. Candlish absented himself entirely from the Alliance. Some said it was because he foresaw the rising storm. Be

this as it may, the Doctor is reputed the father of the Church of Scotland's last letter to our General Assembly, on the subject of slavery,—and we cannot let this occasion slip of remarking that only with the observance as respects ourselves on the part of the Church of Scotland, of those "*Relations of the Churches of Christ to each other*," of those "*Principles of Union*," which we quoted above from the Doctor's lecture; only thus can a continuation of the epistolary correspondence between us be either pleasant or useful. We do not charge upon the last letter of the Scotch Church, (what the Irish letter certainly breathes,) a spirit of unkindness or untenderness, but we do charge upon it, that it does not observe the principle of Union which Dr. C. lays down—that it does not "*repudiate and disown that in discipline which has not warrant in the word of God*." Our Church treats slavery as the Bible treats it, and as the Apostles treated it. We act towards the State as the primitive church acted. The Church of Scotland ought not to condemn our course. But, if she must do this, we prefer to dispense with an annual lesson from her, on a subject which we are sure she does not yet comprehend. "Mutual deference among these spiritual republics!," we echo back the correct Scotch principle to the ears of our Caledonian *sister*. She is too good a Protestant to demand that we call her *mother*, or defer to her as such.

We have dwelt longer than we designed upon this introductory lecture. Our object requires us to call the special attention of the reader to the two lectures of Dr. Wilson. And we do this with the more pleasure, because they are to be found embodied in his valuable work on the "*Lands of the Bible*," of which we were able in our last Number to take only the most cursory notice. The theme of these two lectures, is one which has the highest claims upon our interest—the Independent and the Papal Eastern Churches.

"The East, (says Dr. W.,) is associated with all that is interesting in the past history, and glorious in the future prospects of the world."

From this new theatre of human action, the eyes of Americans also look back with eager animation to those Eastern climes, where were enacted so many of the most stirring scenes of the old world's history. "Westward, the

star of empire takes his way;" but, Eastward, roam the thoughts of every student of the past—especially, of every student of the Bible. There are the Euphrates and Tigris, rivers of Paradise; and there the sacred Jordan, the brook Cedron, and "that ancient river, the river Kishon." There is the Dead Sea, covering the ruined cities of the plain—and there the blue waters of the Sea of Galilee. There is Mount Ararat and Carmel, and the mounts

"Of Oreb and of Sinai, and which delights us more,
Sion hill; and Siloa's brook that flowed
Fast by the oracle of God."

There is Olivet, and there is Gethsemane. In the East, fell the first Adam. The gate, where entered "Death into the world and all our woe," was in the East. And there, the second Adam was manifested for the destruction of death. The blessed feet of God's Incarnate Son pressed that soil—his eye gazed on those Judean hills, and grew familiar with the shores of that Tiberian lake. In the East, the traveller finds that town which (as no other town on earth ever did or shall) once gave birth to a sinless child! And, there he finds that city, which has the equally solitary but gloomy distinction of having brought death upon the Prince of Life. The East is associated with the first and most conspicuous triumphs of Christianity, when Apostles were its missionaries and martyrs, its living and dying witnesses. And, although its golden candlesticks, lighted under Apostolic ministry, have been removed, and a decayed and deformed Christianity now shares with Turkish bigotry and Jewish prejudice, the sway of mind in those fair regions, yet do the Eastern Churches claim a more than classic interest—the sacred interest, which belongs of right to the Gospel's earliest home, and to the inheritors of the dwelling places and names of the primitive Christians.

As to the future prospects of the world, with all the glories of which Dr. W., as above quoted, thinks the East is to be associated, we shall sufficiently indicate his views by the following quotation:

"Though the Mosaic economy and law shall not be restored, and though spiritual privileges shall not be dispensed alike throughout the world, yet the birth-place of

Christianity will be its great metropolis, the central spot or focus, where the rays of light from all God's providential dispensations towards the nations of the earth, and especially the seed of Abraham, his friend, will converge," &c. &c.—page 45.

But Dr. W. complains that the regard paid by the people of the Lord, in highly favored Scotland, has not comported with these high claims. And we may, to a considerable extent, apply his language to the Presbyterians of the United States also, and say, that "With those in Eastern lands, who have borne the Christian name, we have scarcely formed the least acquaintance." Individual missionaries from the Presbyterian Church have, in another connection, gone to them; but as a church, and through our Board of Foreign Missions, "we have conveyed to them neither instruction nor warning, nor exhortation nor entreaty. We have mourned more over the desolations of the natural, than over those of the spiritual Zion. Our past neglect has been complete, and I will add criminal." The aim of this article, as of the lectures of our author, is to stimulate enquiry and lead our readers to further investigation.

We must here introduce some observations from a quarter, all whose sayings and doings are, or should be, interesting to us Protestants. Rome does not imitate the Presbyterians either of Scotland or the United States, in her manner of feeling or acting towards the Eastern churches. The expensive and extensive efforts she is making to effect their conversion, declare the estimate she has formed of their importance. Rome glories in the efforts she is making in their behalf. Hear what the Society for the propagation of the faith, (whose headquarters are at Lyons, in France, and the stream of whose pecuniary contributions empties largely in the United States,)—hear what this society says, in 1840: "But above all, it is the soil which has been fertilized by the Savior's blood, and consecrated by his tomb; the territory of the primitive churches; the native land of those countless generations of martyrs, of anchorites, and teachers of the faith. Finally, is it not to this region that an irresistible influence seems to be drawing the partialities and interests of modern times, as if the destinies of the human race must be decided in the very places whence

they parted to meet again—from the Tower of Babel to the Valley of Jehoshaphat? So also, the Catholic Church maintains a filial regard for that maternal land. She avoids no expense to save her from calamity. She went there to die and conquer in the middle age, with the millions of the Crusaders; she has watched there for six centuries, over the holy sepulchre, with the intrepid monks, whom no outrage has discouraged; she shows herself there still, surrounded by all the lights of learning, and and all the treasures of charity, raising up, from Smyrna to Tauris, from Damascus to Beirut, her schools, her colleges, her benevolent institutions, her apostolic stations. There she encounters all the hostile systems which the spirit of evil has raised up to oppose the truth. Idolatry survives in the mysteries of the Druses; the Gnostic sects show themselves at some obscure points of Mesopotamia; Nestorianism sits among the ruins of its ancient greatness; the Eutychian delusion unites half the population of Armenia and Chaldea; the Greek schism sits still in many Episcopal chairs; the Muhammedan scourge chases before it the wandering flocks; and in addition to all the rest, Protestantism has lately come to spread new snares, by scattering in all parts its disfigured Bibles and slanderous tracts. It may be said that all lies clothe themselves in immortality under the heavens of the East, which seem to smite men and things with an incapacity of change. Yet the signs of better times are too plain to be misunderstood. The three Musalman powers, among whom these vast regions are divided, the Porte, Egypt, and Persia, all desire and solicit the benefits of Christian civilization. Their ambassadors have appeared at the Vatican. A tolerance, before unknown, allows the preaching of the Gospel to the followers of Muhammed, and the word has not fallen among them in vain(?). Heresy has seen several of its bishops return to our ranks. The water of baptism has flowed upon the face of the Druses, whom neither instruction nor force had formerly been able to tame(?). Vainly does a powerful patronage attempt to rally the schismatics of all denominations for the promotion of its designs. Asia will see the dangers which are concealed under that haugh-

ty protectorate,* The only disinterested proselytism which seeks her conversion, she will at length perceive, is that which belongs to no political interest, to no earthly ambition—that of the holy Roman Church.”

Now the conduct and measures of the Roman Church correspond to this language. Allied, as all the Eastern churches are, to herself in spirit and doctrines, Rome has not been content to dispense with their subjection and obedience. They have disputed her domination, and she has therefore perseveringly sought, either to subdue or to dissolve them.

“She has tried to secure their allegiance by publicly accredited messengers and disguised emissaries, by open effort and concealed artifice, by boastful declamation and gentle insinuation, and by the falsification of history and the misrepresentation of present events and occurrences. She has allured by promises, and conciliated by compromise, and by gifts of wealth, of title, of patronage, and of power. She has excited and fomented quarrels and disturbances. She has terrified by threats and curses, and restrained by oppression and persecution.”

As to her success:—

“She has had her converts among every one of them, and some of them she has reduced to small dimensions. She has formed out of each of them a body, in communion with herself; and she is now diligently plying the work of further proselytism. She boasts of distinct societies, devoted to her interests, occupying the sublime and beautiful ridges of the gigantic Lebanon; seated on the hills of holiness, in the land of Israel’s inheritance and the Saviour’s incarnation; scattered over the fertile plains of ancient Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylon, and the classic regions of the Lesser Asia; visible on the prolific banks of the mysterious Nile; about to appear on the crest of the mountains of ‘jealous Abyssinia;’ and discernable even on the romantic heights of Malabar and Travankur, in distant Hind.”

Let us glance at the several bodies of Papal Eastern Christians, brought to our view in these lectures. The first

* The allusion here, perhaps, is to Russia, the Guardian of the Greek Church.

is the *Maronite Church*, which is especially boastful of Romish patronage, and which on the other hand Rome regards with greater confidence than she reposes in any other of her oriental adherents. "They trace their name to a Syrian monk, named Maro, a contemporary of Chrysostom, who lived on the banks of the Orontes, about the year 400, but more particularly to John Marun, or Maro, who flourished about the year 700."* "They are doubtless the descendants of the Christians who remained unconquered and independent, and who took refuge in the mountains of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, on the invasion and conquest of Syria, by the Muhammedan khalifs, in the seventh century."

Dr. Wilson, in opposition to the boasts of many Romish writers, shews,† from the testimony of ecclesiastical annalists, both within and without the church of Rome, such as Eutychius, Makrizi, William of Tyre, Jacob de Vitry, and Torsellus, that the Maronites, for a long period, stood altogether aloof from Papal communion, and were supporters of what has been called the Monothelite heresy. They appear to have been gained over to Rome, towards the close of the twelfth century, by Aymeric, the third Latin Patriarch of Antioch, backed by the kings of the Crusades. But the connection was probably, in the first instance, more nominal than real, the Maronite Patriarch receiving the *pallium* sent to him from Rome, but probably retaining, at the same time, his own original authority.

"To the present day each of his successors has denominated himself 'Peter, the Patriarch of Antioch,' thus insinuating that he considers himself as the genuine representative and spiritual descendant of the Apostle Peter, in the East. To the ordinary seal of the Patriarchate, an engraving of which is given by La Roque,‡ I refer, in corroboration of this statement." There are Papal Bulls of Innocent III, of Alexander IV, and of Leo X, accusing them of various errors, both in doctrine and practice. Marc de Lisbon, in his chronicle of the Order of the Franciscans, boasts that Father Gripho had to bring them back from heresy and idolatry, so late as the year 1450. In 1576, al-

*Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis, I, pp. 496—520.

† See also Ethridge's work on the Syrian Churches and Gospel, pp. 178, 9.

‡ Voyage de Syrie et du Mont Liban, p. 11.

so, Clement VIII, sent the Jesuit Dandini to Lebanon, to enquire into certain unpleasant reports concerning them, and to reduce them, if necessary, to order and submission. Coming still further down, we find Pope Gregory XIII, in order to increase the church's influence over them, founding a college at Rome for the education of a select number of their youth.

"Of its many distinguished Alumni, Joseph Simonius Assemanus and Joseph Aloysius Assemanus are the best known. The former is the author of the *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, in which there is a review and analysis of the Syriac, Arabic, Persic, Turkish, Hebrew, Samaritan, Armenian, Ethiopic, Greek, Egyptian, Iberian and Malebaric manuscripts in the Clementine collection of the Vatican, which was mostly formed by his own industry in the East. The latter is the collector, editor, and translator of all the ancient liturgies, both oriental and occidental. The former, who was a native of Tripoli, and born in 1687, was the deputy of Pope Clement XII, at the great Synod of Lebanon, held in the year 1736, by which the affairs of the Maronite Church were finally settled, and according to whose decrees they are still administered."*

Down to the present day, however, the Maronites have been allowed to retain most of their own customs and observances, although considerably at variance with those which Rome is usually content to sanction.

"They are allowed to preserve their own ecclesiastical language, the Syriac, while Rome has shewn her partiality for the Latin rite. They dispense the communion in both kinds, dipping the bread in wine before its distribution among the people. Though they now observe the Roman calendar, as far as the time of feasts and fasts is concerned, they recognize local saints which have no place in its commemorations. They have retained the custom of the marriage of their clergy previous to their ordination. Though they profess to be zealous partizans of Rome, it dare not so count upon their attachment as to force upon them all that, in ordinary circumstances, it thinks desirable. In order to secure its present influence over them, it is subjected to an expense of no small magnitude."

The Maronites now form a population of about 200,000

* See *Lettres Edifiantes et Curienses*, Tom. 1, p. 406, &c. &c.

souls, chiefly inhabiting the mountains of Lebanon, which they hold in common with the Druses. These are a mongrel Mohammedan and Heathen people, of great spirit and bravery, with whom the Maronites, (themselves a spirited race,) are often engaged in the most murderous civil warfare.

We make only one more quotation to shew the religiousness of the Maronites.

“Their Patriarch’s agent at Rome gives us, in 1844, (*Notice Historique*, pp. 18, 19,) the following statements. ‘The monasteries, or convents, both of monks and nuns, amount to 82. Those for monks, 67 in number, contain 1410 religious. The remaining 15 contain 330 nuns. Besides these, there are 356 churches, served by 1205 priests.’”

Thus the priests stand to the people in the ratio of 1 to 166, and over and above these, the monks in the ratio of 1 to 143! In other words, every eightieth man, (we leave out the fraction,) is a clergyman!

Next in order, we glance at the *Papal Greeks*. They are about 40,000 in number, and are found chiefly in Aleppo and Damascus, with perhaps 500 families in Constantinople.

“As far as I can ascertain, (says Dr. W.,) the Greek-Catholic Church is the fruit of the Jesuit missions to Aleppo, which, as already said, had their commencement in the year 1625. These crafty Fathers soon saw that it was inexpedient to force their converts from the Greek Church to the adoption of the Latin rites; and they, and the other Roman coadjutors in the East, in due time, succeeded in getting the Papal authorities to sanction a compromise, on terms even more disadvantageous to Rome than we have seen exemplified in the case of the Maronites. The great object which the Greek Catholics have sought after, in their alliance with Rome, seems to be that of securing its assistance in disseminating among their families, the civilization of the West, and securing greater splendor for their religious services. It has succeeded in getting from them little more than an acknowledgement of its supremacy, and the renouncement of the Greek dogma, that the procession of the Holy Spirit is from the Father only. They retain the oriental calendar, regulating by it their feasts and fasts as therein entered, and according to the computation of what has been called the ‘old style.’ In Syria they cele-

brate their liturgical services in their vulgar tongue, the Arabic, which must be viewed as a great desecration, as, according to papal notions, nothing is sacred that is not mysterious. They receive the communion in both kinds, using unleavened bread and the cup, like the members of the orthodox Greek Church, from which they have separated. Their priests are allowed to marry before entering into sacred orders; but their bishops must observe the celibate. They claim the right of the popular use of the sacred Scriptures, though alas! they too seldom avail themselves of its advantages. All that I have seen and heard of them, leads me to believe that they are amongst the most liberal and intelligent native Christians in the East."

The *Papal Armenians*, in Constantinople, are estimated at from 10,000 to 13,000 souls. They are found also in Angora, Tokat, Trebizond, and Smyrna, and in small numbers in various parts of Armenia. They have no monasteries in Asia Minor, but they have one in Venice and another at Vienna. These, especially the former, have long been engaged, (both creditably and with great pecuniary profit,) in the publication of books in Armenian, such as writings of the ancient historians of the nation, translations of the Greek and Latin classics, and other works of literary and scientific merit.

Besides the Maronite, the Papal Greek, and the Papal Armenian churches, there are also other smaller bodies of Papal Christians in the East, converted to Rome by the labors of her zealous missionaries, and known respectively as *Syrian Catholics*, *Chaldean Catholics*, and *Coptic Catholics*.

Our author has also collected much valuable information respecting what he calls the *Eastern Latin* church, made up of the descendants of those who, for various reasons and in different ages, have gone thither from the West.

"The only remains of the church establishment of the crusaders at present in the East, are the monastic institutions of the Terra Sancta, intrusted to the friars minorites of the observance, better known among us as the Franciscan monks, who are the recognized custodiers and guardians of the holy places, and the pastors of the small portion of the population which adheres to the Latin ritual. Of these I shall allow the Romanists to give their own ac-

count. 'They' (the monks now mentioned,) 'are indebted for this glorious inheritance to the piety of their patriarch, St. Francis, who, with twelve of his earliest disciples, sought in Syria the labours of the apostleship and the crown of martyrdom. This last he failed to obtain, but he secured for his order the privilege of praying and dying between the cradle and the sepulche of Christ; and to this day these good monks, whose costume even the infidels respect, and whose hospitality calls down the benedictions of numerous pilgrims, have a roof and an altar at Jerusalem, at Bethlehem, at Nazareth, at Jaffa; indeed, wherever the history of redemption has left a memorial. Their superior, whose title is 'Most Reverend Warden,' and who holds his appointment immediately from Rome, has under his direction about 100 Italian or Spanish priests, divided among twenty-two convents, and having under their pastoral care 11,000 Latin Catholics, residing in their vicinity; thirty-eight secular priests and sixty lay brethren take part in their labours: two colleges, raised by their industry, contain more than 460 students.'—(Report of the Soc. for Prop. the Faith, 1840.)

"The grants made to these monastic institutions by the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, now the principal organ of the support and extension of the Papal cause in foreign parts, according to the report for 1844, was 25,267 francs, 16 cents. It is entered 'to the Most Reverend Guardian of Jerusalem for the Missions of the Holy Land.'"

Dr. W. gives us the names of the twenty-two convents referred to above:

"They are those of Jerusalem, where there are two convents, Bethlehem, A'in Karim, or St. John's, in the desert, near Jerusalem, Ramlah, Yáffa, Nazareth, Haifa. (now reduced to nonentity,) A'Kka Sidon, Harissa, Tripoli, Latakia, Aleppo, Damascus, Constantinople, Larnica and Nicosia in Cyprus, Rosetta, Alexandria, Cairo, and Faiyum in Egypt, and Beirut."

"Besides the Terra Sancta monks, we have several other European fathers in the Holy Land, and in the countries adjoining. 'Several monastic orders,' says the report for 1840 of the Society for the propagation of the Faith, 'have been desirous to be represented by some of their members at this rendezvous of all Christian tradition. They are by

no means inactive there. 1. The Carmelite fathers have rebuilt the useful retreat, which they have possessed from time immemorial, on Mount Carmel, the first seat of their order, and chief place of their missions in Palestine. Five of them reside there.* 2. The reverend fathers, the Capuchins, reckon four missions, Beirut, Tripoli, Damascus, lately stained with blood by the murder of one of them; Aleppo, where their charity supports one school; and three other stations on Mount Lebanon. 3. The Reverend fathers, the Jesuits, having reëstablished their ancient residence on Mount Lebanon, are laboring with an effective zeal to found a college at Beyrout. 4. Messrs, the congregations of St. Lazarus have four missions, occupied by six priests; Antoura, with a college; Aleppo, Damascus, with two schools for both sexes; Tripoli, with two stations, and the schools of Eden and Sgorta.' All this is exclusive of what is called 'The Apostolic Delegation of Mount Lebanon and Apostolic Vicariate of Aleppo,' of which it is said in the same document, 'The Latin Catholics of Aleppo, to the number of about 1000, are alone under the immediate jurisdiction of the Apostolic vicar; but the prelate who bears that title is also the representative of the holy see, to the patriarchs of the United Communions which are spread through those countries.'

"As the name of Jesuit in the East, is even perhaps more horrible and abominable than in the West, the Jesuits at Damascus, Aleppo, and some other places, denominate themselves Lazarists, or brethren of the company of Paul of Vincent, a fact which those who seek to trace their movements in different parts of the world would do well to keep in mind."

"There are in *Smyrna* one Roman Catholic bishop, (archbishop,) and sixty-seven priests. Of the latter, forty are secular or parish clergy, nine are Capuchins, seven are Zoccalonti, ten are Lazarists, and one is a Dominican. The Capuchins and the Zoccalonti are friars of the Franciscan order, and derive their names, the one from their hoods, and the other from their wooden shoes. There are also twelve

* They principally devote themselves, (the author truly says,) to the rites of hospitality, and every person who may have paid them a visit, admits that their "Hotel," for such it may be called, is the best in Syria.

'Sisters of Charity.' In Smyrna there are three large churches and two chapels.

"The Roman Catholics, by whom the Latin rite is observed at *Constantinople*, are under the Apostolic Vicar of that place, and are principally the descendants of the Genoese and Venetians, who have long been established in Pera and Galata, the European merchants, and the members and agents of the different embassies of the countries which profess the faith of Rome. A good many Roman Catholic individuals, too, some of high influence and attainments, are connected with the Russian, Prussian, and English embassies at the Sublime Porte. They are reckoned about 9000 in number at the capital."

In concluding his lecture on the Papal Eastern Churches, our author dwells on the "*dishonorable means*" Rome has been accustomed to use "in the different countries of her proselyting enterprise." We copy but one of his quotations. It is from the pen of *M. Eugene Borté*, one of her missionaries, which is found in the "*Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*," March, 1845, p. 71.

"In Turkey, (says this son of the church,) the Christian can offer to God the prayers and homage appointed by his liturgy, without ever fearing that the Governor or the Imam, interfering with the interior of the sanctuary, will disturb its rites and ceremonies. But, through a capricious contradiction, this church in which he is so free, he is not free to build. He must, in the first instance, show an anterior title, acknowledged by the Musalman authority, and proving that this place was, before the conquest, dedicated to divine worship; otherwise, the erection of a monument would not be permitted, whose destination is opposed to the faith of the Coran. It is true, that we easily elude this legal interdiction, *and then, particularly, we have recourse to the decisive argument of the Richoet, a special word, which is happily unknown to our language and our usages, as it expresses the present offered to the great and to the judges to purchase their approbation.* This defect has invaded all classes of society, — the palace, the ministry, the divan or tribunal of justice, the mosque, the market, and the artizans' stall." Rome has yet to learn (adds Dr. Wilson,) the meaning of the divine maxim, that of those who do evil that good may come, the damnation is just.

Our author also dwells on the *concessions* of Rome :

“Of this compromise and accommodation, she actually boasts, having, in communion with her in the Eastern Churches, to use her own language, ‘people of six different rites,’ with ‘all their ancient liturgies, respected as so many monuments of the unity of belief in the midst of the variety of rites and discipline.’ Mr. Perkins, in his interesting work, entitled ‘A Residence of Eight Years in Persia among the Nestorian Christians,’ says, ‘one of the newest measures that has been reported to us, is an order purporting to be fresh from the Pope to his agents in this region, to *canonize Nestorius*, whose name and memory every Papist has been required for so many centuries to *curse*; and to *anathematize* the Lutherans, i. e. the Protestant Missionaries.’ In the view of what has been done in the East, we may clearly see, that to secure the assent of our own country to the supremacy of the Pope, she would gladly permit the formation of an Anglo-Catholic Church, not differing in a single principle from the tenets and observances of the Tractarians of *Oxford*.”

One more extract, which will perhaps surprise, and should encourage our readers to more zeal for Foreign Missions :

“Great though the missionary efforts of Rome be among the Eastern Churches and the heathen nations, it is worthy of notice, that taking them as a whole, those of the Protestant Churches already surpass them in magnitude and importance, as far as the free and open dealing of mind with mind is concerned. Such a statement as this may be entirely novel to some of my auditors; but it is one which I do not rashly hazard. The contributions of the whole Papal world to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, which is now the universal nurse and support of all its missions, when reduced to English money, at the most favorable rate of exchange, amounted, in 1843, to no more than £165,131 : 7 : 3, which is not equal to the income of two of our largest missionary societies. I am aware that, in aid of this sum, old endowments are, to a large extent, applied; but making every allowance for these, the whole sums expended by Protestants in missionary efforts *in partibus infidelium*, are annually double those expended by Rome. In the dissemination of education, in the wielding

of the press, and in the work of public preaching, Protestantism is actually doing throughout the world an in calculably greater extent of work than Romanism. It is instructing and training the minds of nations in some quarters, while Rome is content merely to allure individuals and bodies of men to change by the promise of secular advantages, and the fictitious splendor of her idolatrous and theatrical services. It is in the number of her foreign adherents in all parts of the world, principally, that Rome has the advantage of us; but, these adherents, are the fruit of her missions when the Protestant Churches were doing nothing abroad, and not, generally speaking, of the missionary effort of the present day, extended though it be in the different regions of the world. In the distribution of her missionary force, which, as in the case of the Eastern Churches, is regulated by consummate wisdom, she excels us too; but Christian union and consultation, I trust, will not long permit her exclusively to possess this advantage."

We turn now to our author's other lecture, which introduces to us *the Independent Eastern Churches.*"

The Copts, are a body of Christians inhabiting Egypt, the descendants and representatives of the early Christians of that country. Their number is estimated at from 150,000 to 200,000 souls. Their history has, for ages, been one of degradation and of persecution.

The Abyssinian Church reckons itself a branch of the Coptic, but far outstrips it in the multiplicity of its superstitious ceremonies, absurd legends, and idolatrous devotions. "How far it has strained its inventive faculties in the exercise of will-worship, appears from its giving Pontius Pilate, and his wife, Procla, a place in the calendar of its Saints; the former, because he washed his hands before he condemned our Lord, and the latter, because she said, "Meddle not with that just person."

Our author's notices of the Copts and Abyssinians, are full of interest, enriched with striking quotations from Boring's Report on Egypt, Harris' High Lands of Ethiopia and Gobat's Abyssinnia. M. Gobat, for many years missionary to the Abyssinians, has lately succeeded to the English-Prussian Bishopric of Jerusalem,—a man of the highest character and most catholic spirit.

The *Nestorian Church*, since the late subjugation of their Mountain tribes by the ferocious Kurds, has its chief locality in the plains of Urmiah in Persia. It numbers about 140,000 souls. Without doubt, this is the purest of all the Oriental churches, rejecting with the deepest abhorrence all image and picture worship, likewise auricular confession and purgatory; and acknowledging the Holy Scriptures as far above all human traditions. The Nestorians are not free however from bondage to human traditions, for they attach the greatest importance to their periodical fasts. To this we must add that the morals of both clergy and people are among the Nestorians also deeply degraded. The American Board has a very flourishing mission at Urmiah.

We cannot enter upon the question of the justice or injustice of the condemnation of Nestorius by the third general Council. Dr. Wilson, and the American missionaries at Urmiah, defend Nestorius. Palmer, in his "Treatise on the Church," and all the rest of the Oxford school, of course, bow to the decisions of the "holy Oecumenical Synod of Ephesus." It is however important to notice that the Nestorians themselves never did, and do not now acknowledge this name, much as they revere the memory of Nestorius. They claim the name of Chaldeans, or that of Syrians, and sometimes call themselves (in accordance with their current national tradition, that they are Jews by descent,) Nazrani or Nazarenes.

Let it also be borne in mind, as above stated, that to this day, these followers of the anathematized heretic have preserved the faith of Christ in far greater purity, than any of those other Eastern churches with which the prelatists are so ready to sympathize.

And let not their indefatigable missionary zeal ever be forgotten. Anathematized by their Christian brethren, as well as cruelly persecuted by their Saracen masters, the Nestorians had to struggle for existence at home, and yet were indefatigable in efforts to extend the Gospel to other lands. And this, at a time when a sepulchral sleep had fallen upon the entire Western church. Even Gibbon pays homage to their self-sacrificing beneficence. "The missionaries of Balch and Samarcand, pursued without fear the footsteps of the roving Tartar, and insinuated themselves

into the camps of the valley of Imaus and the banks of the Selinga,—entered China by the port of Canton,—were diffused from China to Jerusalem and Cyprus—preaching Christianity successfully to the Bactrians, the Huns, the Persians, the Indians, the Persarmenians, the Medes, and the Elamites—having almost an infinity of churches from the gulf of Persia to the Caspian Sea,—and being found as well on the pepper coast of Malabar and the Isles of the Ocean, Socotora and Ceylon.” *Decline and Fall*, vol. viii., 345–8.

The Jacobites, Dr. W. distinguishes by the title of “the Syrian Church.” We think this objectionable, on the ground of its indistinctness and confusion. The Maronites, the Nestorians, and the Christians of St. Thomas, in India, all have as much title to this name as the Jacobites. This body of nominal Christians are Monophysites, or believers in the dogma, that the divine and human nature of Christ were so united as to form only one nature, yet without any change, confusion or mixture of the two natures. This opinion seems to have had its origin in a zealous antagonism to the alleged doctrine of Nestorius, respecting two persons in our blessed Redeemer. Eutyches, an Archimandrite of a monastery of 300 monks, near to Constantinople, carried away by a too common tendency of our nature, run into extremes; became in this manner himself the author and advocate of a new heresy, and taught that the humanity of Christ had actually been transmuted into, or absorbed by, his divine nature. The Jacobites, however, indignantly disclaim all connection with Eutyches, and draw a broad distinction between his doctrine and their own. So do the other Monophysite Churches, the Armenian, the Coptic, and the Abyssinian. Dr. Wilson is of opinion, that with the exception perhaps of the case of Eutyches, the Christian Church in the fifth century was divided by “little more than a logomachy respecting the nature of Christ.” The anarchy produced by the long and bitter controversies of the Nestorians on the one hand, and on the other, the Eutychians, properly so called, together with all the other various divisions of the Monophysites, as the Acephali, the Julianists, the Theopaschitae, the Severians, with all the subdivisions of these last as the Damianitae, the Petritae, the Conomitae, the Philoponiaci, the

Agnoetae and the Condo banditae—all this anarchy was doubtless deplorable. And yet what a needful lesson does it teach the church and the ministry respecting their own weakness! And how does it present the testimony of human nature, fallen and feeble as it is, to the value of truth—for which men in all ages have striven and contended, even unto death! And who can deny the infinite importance of the questions which gave rise to all these divisions? Etheridge well points to such passages as Rom. i., 3, 4: 1 Peter iii., 18: Heb. ix., 14: John i., 14: Phil. ii., 6, 7: Col. ii., 9, as emphatically enunciating the distinctness of the two natures; and he well observes, respecting the views of Eutyches, for example, that they lead inevitably to the overthrow of both the atonement and the mediation of Christ; for if the Messiah was not really man with men, and therefore, physically capable of death, he could not have redeemed our nature; and if he does not continue to be man, he can not have that eternal sympathy with his church which is made known to us in the Gospel. Compare Heb. ix., 12: vii., 24, and iv., 15.

The Jacobites call themselves "*Yacobeæ*," giving as a reason for this name, that they are "*Bnee Israel*," children of Israel or Jacob, and descended from the first Hebrew Christians—the converts of the Apostle James. But, doubtless, there was another reason, viz: that their consolidation from the various sectaries who held to the Monophysitic doctrine in Syria, and the countries on the Tigris and Euphrates, was mainly brought about by the agency of a monk, named Jacob, surnamed Al Bardai or Baradæus. Their chief seat is Mesopotamia, where they number about 150,000 souls. They hold to but three of the first seven general councils, for which the Greek Church anathematizes them. Their liturgies (of which Etheridge gives translations,) will be found to contain much evangelical doctrine and prayer, addressed directly to God and to the Saviour; but they are not free from idolatrous references to the *θεοτοκος*, and to John the Baptist, besides other gross Popish errors. On the whole, however, they are decidedly less corrupt than the Greek Church. And yet, Palmer and his colleagues pronounce them, as well as their old antagonists, the Nestorians, to be "no part of the Church of Christ;" (vol. i., p. 422,) while the Greek Church is lauded

as "not schismatical," "not heretical," but "Catholic," "Apostolical," and "True." p. p. 179-213. As to Apostolical succession, however, which is denied to the Jacobites, their claim to it is as loud and as tenaciously held, and we will add, as well made out as that of any prelatical church in the world. They glory in St. Peter, as their first Bishop of Antioch, and they exhibit at this day an unbroken series of more than an hundred and eighty names of successive bishops of that See, from his day to our own.* This must have been the book, which Bishop Southgate said that he saw, where the *hand-writing of Peter himself* was still visible, with those of all the rest. At least, so the bishop's audience in N. Y. understood him to say, Episcopalians, as well as others; and no explanation at all would Bishop Southgate vouchsafe afterwards, though earnestly called on to explain.

The Armenians stand next in the order in which we have chosen to view the Eastern Churches. They are from two to two and a half millions—an ancient and peculiar race, long taught in the school of national affliction. Their country lying between Persia on the one hand, and the Greeks and Romans on the other, the strength of the nation was gradually exhausted by aggressions from both sides, until at length in the 11th century, there burst forth from Central Asia those hordes of Tartars, which carried devastation year by year through Armenia, and completely subjugated her people. In the 14th century, Armenia had experience of the cruelty of the famous Chingiz Khan; subsequent to which, Tamerlane the Great, "traced repeatedly his bloody track across her mountains." And, finally, Shah Abbas the Great, literally depopulated and made desert this unhappy land, in order to protect Persia from the incursions of the Turks. And thus, Armenia, once rich in teeming cities, impregnable castles, and fertile provinces, has been brought to the lowest condition of national degradation. One of her sons, a resident of Calcutta, thus feelingly apostrophizes his fallen country:

"Oh, Armenia! Armenia! Oh, my country! Oh, our common mother, Armenia! I weep over thy fallen greatness! I weep over thy departed power! Thy mighty

* See Etheridge, p. 145. •

empire has mouldered into dust, and the general havoc has left no traces of thy magnificence, except the wreck of the stately structure, where every traveller of the race of Haig, is invited to give way to his feelings, and mingle the dew of his heart with the earth of his beloved country." Ardall's *Armenia*, vol. ii., p. 552-4.

The chief instrument of the evangelization of Armenia, was *Kircor Loosavorich*, or *Gregory the Enlightener*, son of Anax, a Parthian prince. So early as 302, A. D., Tiridates the Great, and a large portion of the Armenian people received baptism at Gregory's hands. We cannot forget, however, that before this period, Christianity had extensively degenerated from its original purity as a religion of the heart, to a mere profession of external rites and theoretical dogmas. And such, it is natural to expect, was the degenerate Christianity to which Gregory converted his countrymen. Indeed, Gregory the Enlightener, himself, partook largely of the monastic spirit of his age, consecrating 400 bishops and an immense number of priests, erecting various convents and nunneries, instituting religious feasts and other ecclesiastical ceremonies, and oftentimes betaking himself to solitary places, and remaining there for considerable periods plunged in the deepest abstraction. In fact, towards the close of his life, he actually retired to a cave in a mountain, where he spent the remainder of his days, (says an Armenian historian,) "more like an incorporate cherub than a carnal creature."* Nierses, his sixth successor in the Armenian Pontificate, and one of his own descendants, so far improved upon the example of Gregory, as to erect no less than 2000 convents. This was only 63 or 64 years after the national conversion.

It was not long after the conversion of the Armenians to Christianity—and partly in consequence of this event, that the Zoroastrian persecutions commenced in Armenia. Dr. Wilson hardly touches this subject, nor do our limits allow us to enter into particulars. The intolerant hatred of the Persian monarchs, Shabooh II., and Hazgerd II., against Christianity, and their relentless and bloody persecutions, unsuccessfully employed to turn the suffering Christians, (as one of their writers has it,) to the worship of "ashes

* Agiall's *Chamchean*, vol. i., p. 164.

(as one of their writers has it,) to the worship of "ashes and cinders;" the selfish and unnatural efforts of Merugan, (a renegade Armenian,) to convert his nation to the religion of Zoroaster, upon the promise from Shabooch II., of his being made the Sovereign of Armenia; the steadfast adherence of the Armenian chiefs and clergy to their newly received faith, against the most tempting offers, as well as under the most severe and trying sufferings, imprisonment and death; and, finally, the deliverance which God wrought for this persecuted people, through means of the Mamigonian chiefs, are all topics on which we should delight to enlarge. Equally interesting would it be to investigate the history of the Armenian alphabet, and of their admirable version of the Bible, (particularly the New Testament,) by Isaac and Mesrop, A. D., 411. But we must pass on from these subjects, and take a mere glance at the present condition of this interesting people. They are now a scattered race—numerous at Constantinople, dispersed throughout the whole of Asia Minor and Syria, found also in Persia and in India, and even as far eastward as Batavia in Java. Russia holds numbers of them, and westward they have proceeded as far as Trieste, Venice, Vienna, and even Amsterdam. Sober, temperate, thoughtful, industrious, patient, persevering, of a genius decidedly commercial, and manifesting every where a growing spirit of patriotism, they bear a stronger resemblance to the Anglo-Saxons than any other Oriental people. They are void of courage, but have well learned fortitude in their long school of suffering. They have little taste for either music or poetry. They are not so light-minded, imaginative or versatile as the Greeks; less dull and sluggish than the Turks; less degraded and wretched than the remnant of Israel, that other peeled and down-trodden people. It has been well said that the rich Armenians of Constantinople are the real lords paramount of the empire, being the bankers of the Sultan, and all his pashas; and, therefore, able to make their power felt to the remotest ends of Turkey.

We have one more of these Independent Eastern Churches to notice, and we shall do it briefly. It is *the Greek*, by far the largest, and I may add, the farthest removed from the simplicity of the Gospel of Christ. "It agrees (says Dr. W.,) with the Church of Rome in most matters of the

greatest moment, and, as has been said, its superiority to her in any respect, arises principally from its inability or unwillingness to follow out principles to their legitimate length." One great practical difference there is, however, between the Greek and the Papal systems—the former does not pretend to any infallible head upon earth, and, accordingly its ghostly power is far less consolidated and effective.

The Greek Church is found in large numbers all through Turkey and Syria; in Arabia, also, and in Egypt. At Constantinople, it has as many followers as the Armenian and Roman churches together. It is almost the only church found in the Turkish-European provinces, as Bulgaria, Servia, &c.; while north of the Danube, it occupies Wallachia and Moldavia. In Hungary, also, it has a population of more than two millions. It is the established religion of the kingdom of Greece, and of the mammoth empire of Russia. Strong in her extensive dominions, and confident in her claims to the very highest antiquity and the purest orthodoxy, she absolutely denies the very name of Christian to any but her own children, would, doubtless, re-baptize the Pope of Rome, the Armenian Catholics,—not to say the Archbishop of Canterbury, before receiving one of them to her communion, and denominates herself *ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία ἡ ἀνατολική*, THE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLICAL ORIENTAL CHURCH.

We have thus accompanied our readers, under Dr. Wilson's guidance, on a hasty tour among the Eastern Christians. If our notices appear meagre and unsatisfactory, it is what we expected, and in one view what we desire. Our labour will have received its reward, should any one of our fellow-travellers be thereby stimulated to fuller investigations. Looking back now on the ground passed over, we group all the Eastern Churches together, (excepting always those "Asiatic Protestants," the Nestorians,) and call the reader's attention to three important features which characterize them all.

I. They are all idolatrous. There is not of them whose priests do not first make a God out of bread, and then lead on the people to worship it. There is not one of them that does not pray to the Saints, of whom the Armenians, for example, reckon 26,400. There is not one of them that

does not worship pictures, although some of them are much more given to this than others; the Greeks, for instance, much more than the Armenians. And as to their apologies for picture worship, they are in no sense or manner different from those of the Roman Church for her worship of images; so that if any Protestant is ready to excuse the idolatry of the Oriental Church, he must stand ready also to cover up that of the Church of Rome. What would our readers say to a picture of the Trinity, which we saw once over the front door of the Greek Church in Thyatira—the Spirit, as a dove, the Son, as one hanging on a cross, and the Father, as an old man with a grey beard? Now, hear an Oriental distinction, relative to picture worship. Nerses, surnamed Thuorhaly, (or Full of Grace,) one of the most distinguished saints of the Armenians, who flourished in the twelfth century, says: “As a picture without the substance is not to be worshipped, and the saints are not every where present to dwell in their pictures, as Christ is in his, their pictures are not to be worshipped. We honor and reverence the pictures of the saints, but the picture of the Creator only is to be worshipped.”*

II. We find among all the Eastern Churches the real principles of Popery, respecting the church and the priesthood, only more imperfectly developed.

The Armenians, for instance, have a regularly constituted ecclesiastical hierarchy of nine orders of clergy. The parish clergy, it is true, must be married before ordination; nay, a man cannot be ordained as a parish priest, unless he be the father of at least one child. Thus, the Armenian Church, (and we may add the Greek too,) gives her testimony against allowing the freedom of pastoral intercourse to an unmarried clergy, and shuts out her monks of all ranks from the duties of confessing, baptizing, marrying, or burying her people. Nay, there is another important circumstance which distinguishes the Armenian priesthood—their appointment rests always with the inhabitants of the village where they are to officiate, and rarely does a bishop attempt to interfere with it. *The people fix upon some one of their own number, pay his ordination fee or present to the bishop, and he becomes their priest to go in and out among them.* But, on the other hand, all the

* Unthanragan, p. 132, 133, quoted by Smith & Dwight, vol. i., p. 229.

ecclesiastical dignities and preferments are in the hands of a hierarchy of monks. And this church power is equalled by no other among the Armenians, except the money power. The only rivals of the hierarchy are the great bankers of Constantinople. Moreover, every ecclesiastical dignity, from the highest to the lowest, is sold for money. The clergy of the Eastern Churches, and this is most emphatically true of the Greek Church, are all guilty of Simony. The Archbishop of Ephesus, (Greek,) demanded three thousand piastres to ordain a man to the priest's office, but after long chaffering, they struck a bargain for five hundred piastres, or about five and twenty dollars! We know this man personally, having often visited the family where he exercised his skill in the culinary line. His wife also was at that time a very worthy young woman, a servant in the same family. And this man, though rather weak-minded, is, we have often been told, one of the best educated and most intelligent Greek priests in Asia Minor. Indeed, the Oriental priesthood are almost universally inferior in point of knowledge and character to their people. Some of our readers will remember Coray's Account of Papa Trechas.

Thus under the ecclesiastical organization of the East, quite as much as under that of the West, you will look in vain for a *teaching priest*—a priest whose lips keep knowledge and deal it forth for the spiritual sustenance of the people.

The business of the Hierarchy is not to instruct the people, but to perform certain ceremonies, which have an inherent holiness, and the very doing of which confers holiness upon the doer and upon others. The original idea of the Christian ministry is totally lost. The priest has driven out the minister; sacrificing and sanctifying have taken the place of preaching the Gospel. The occupation of the clergy, in their various ranks and spheres, is to sweep the church; to dress and undress it; to take charge of all the holy utensils and sacred garments; to say daily masses for the living and for the dead; to chant or to read prayers in a holy, that is, a *dead* language, at burials and at marriages; to sanctify water and baptize therewith; to hear confession of sins and pronounce a form of absolution therefrom; to go about and bless the houses of their parishioners at Christ-

mas and Easter, and to perform the regular visitations of their dioceses, for the collection of their dues; to make wafers for the mass, and, preceded through the streets by one bearing a light, to carry bits of the consecrated bread in a sacred box, to the houses of the dying, and to administer it to them as a *viaticum* for their journey to the unseen world. Such are the occupations of eight of the nine orders of the Armenian clergy, while the peculiar office of the Catholicos or Armenian Pontiff literally is to *consecrate the meiron* or sacred oil, and with it to *ordain bishops*.

And yet we should greatly err, if we imagined that the men who are thus occupied, wield no more power than ought fairly and justly to attach to offices so trifling, nay so ridiculous and degrading. Looking at these very duties of the priesthood from another point of view, we shall see what an immense power they are calculated to confer. For, to begin with the consecration of the *meiron*,—the Catholicos, in this act, performs a *miracle*! He causes the sacred oil to *boil* merely by the act of consecration, and he employs in this operation, two instruments which not a little enhance the wonder of all who look on—a bit of the true cross and one of the hands of St. Gregory, both which are among the treasures of their ecclesiastical metropolis, the Holy City of Echmiadzin. Now this holy oil is *essential in every ordination* of a catholicos, bishop or priest in the Armenian church, and without the application of it, the whole ceremony is null and void. It is also used in anointing children at the time of baptism, and is considered by the common people as even more essential than the holy water itself, in making the child an heir of Heaven. And what a mighty influence must attach, therefore, to the office and character of that reverend pontiff, to whom is given the power of preparing such a sacred and useful material!

Consider next, the power conferred on the priesthood by the doctrine of *transubstantiation*. The priest is a man endued with the power of miraculously converting a piece of bread into the body, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ.

And see too, what power he receives from their doctrine of *baptism*. Therein the priest administers a rite which *regenerates the soul*, and without which *there is no salvation*; and this mighty regenerating and saving rite it is the

privilege of no one but the priest, the bishop, or the catholicos to perform!

But let us go a step further. This same priest becomes *keeper of the conscience* of this regenerate child. From time to time he probes the wounds of his sins, and remains always master of all his secrets! Here is an influence which must grow with the growth of the youth, and extend itself with the gradual increase and spread of families!

But look still further, and you will see that this same priest holds in his hands the tremendous power of *binding and loosing*. It is for him to prescribe the appropriate penance for every sin, according to a code of crimes and punishments made out by the church; and when once the priest has decided on the penance due, not even the bishop or the patriarch can interfere to annul it. Thus he *sits in judgment* upon the sins of his fellow, and sentences him to a mock retribution!

It is for him also to *pronounce the pardon* of the sinner, which he does after this manner — “By right of my priestly authority and the divine command ‘whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven,’ by that same word I do absolve thee from all connection with thy sins of thought, word and deed; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

Mighty and impressive, though blasphemous words, and mighty the office to which the authorized use of them belongs!

Again, the Armenians steadfastly deny the Popish doctrine of *Purgatory*, and yet they believe in a place called *Gayan*, where go the souls of those who have died in venial, but not mortal, sin; and also the souls of those good Christians who have confessed their sins, but were cut off before they had time to perform the whole allotted penance. It is believed that prayers, alms, and the masses of the priest, can free these souls from their sins, and procure them admission to Heaven. And here, you perceive, is another mighty weapon whereby the priesthood influence and govern, not only in this, but also in the world to come!

Once more, the Oriental priesthood wields the terrible power of *excommunication*, whereby they cut off, whom they will, from the assembly of the faithful, both here and

hereafter. A man under this sentence is not spoken to by any one in the street or the market place;—no one may buy at his shop or visit at his house; he is avoided by the whole community,* and exposed to every kind of insult and abuse. He is debarred the holy communion while he lives, and is shut out from christian burial and from the Kingdom of Heaven, when he dies. Nay more, his very body will not consume in the grave, like that of a good Christian, but is possessed of an evil spirit, which causes the accursed excommunicant to wander about at night, and allows him no rest. In these cases the body must be taken up and sprinkled with holy water, and then laid in a new grave,† or cut to pieces and boiled in wine, so as to dislodge the evil spirit, and dispose the body to dissolve.‡ But still there is no certain remedy for the evil, except the absolution of the priest, which is no sooner pronounced than the devil is expelled, and then immediately and peacefully the body dissolves into its first principles of earth.§

Is it any wonder that this priestly power of excommunication is so fearful in the eyes of an ignorant, superstitious people? He whom the priest blesses is blessed, and he whom the priest curses is cursed, and no man in the community is so profligate or obdurate but his conscience is startled at this sentence, nor is any so highly exalted by riches, power or reputation, but he can be reached by this influence, and made to tremble under this infliction.

III. There is among all the Oriental Christians an utter ignorance of fundamental truth. They all believe baptism to be essential to salvation, but have no idea of any *internal regeneration*. All the special influences ascribed among them to the Third Person of the adorable Trinity, have reference to miracles. They know nothing of his peculiar operations on the hearts of men.

Neither have the Oriental Christians any knowledge of the *evangelical doctrine of faith*. Faith is with them a mere belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, or an assent to the Nicene creed, or the receiving whatever the

* See Ethridge on the Syrian Churches, p. 105.

† Covell's Greek Church Preface, p. xxxvi, and p. 296.

‡ See Rycaut's State of the Greek and Armenian Churches. London: 1679.—pages 279—281.

§ Rycaut, p. 282.

church teaches. But of justifying faith they have either never heard, or heard of it only to denounce the doctrine as abominable heresy. "What must I do to be saved?" appears to them a very unnecessary question, since all baptized persons are saved already, and need only be regular in confessing, doing penance, and communing, and they are sure to go to Heaven. Their dependence, therefore, is not upon the atoning blood of Christ, for justification, but upon *works of merit* for being justified, and again upon the same works for being sanctified. The Gospel is thus made to give place to a round of superstitions imposed by men, and the common people have almost no idea of spiritual religion, or of evangelical truth. Their whole knowledge of Christ is to learn when and how to make the cross—when and how to fast, to feast, to confess and to commune; and their whole practice of religion is the careful and self-righteous performance of these ceremonies.

How dishonoring to God and to his Son, Jesus Christ, therefore, is the whole system of the Oriental churches! God's worship displaced by idols, and Christ's office usurped by priests! There is something very awful in a Christianity which thus dethrones both God and Christ!—something fearfully, unnaturally, cruel in a church which hides from the view of her own sinful children both the one God and the one Mediator.

How degrading also is the religion of the Eastern churches to those who live under its influence. The system has no sanctifying power. Hardly do they know whether there be any Holy Ghost, and yet it is he only who can sanctify! Scarcely any knowledge have they of the great fundamental truths of the Gospel; and yet it is by and through these the Holy Ghost sanctifies! Vain and unprofitable indeed are those points which they deem most essential; concerning which they dispute most fiercely; and on account of which they hurl upon each other the most terrible anathemas! How degrading is all this, both to their religion and to themselves! Alas! that religion is all *external*, all *materializing*, and all *mechanical*. It is a system of *spiritual gymnastics*, of "*bodily* exercise which profiteth nothing." It is "will worship" which *deserves not to be* "in any honor," and it only works like every other carnal

scheme, "to the satisfying of *the flesh*," that is, of the *proud and self-righteous human heart*.

How evident, also, it is that whenever preached to people living under such a system, the Gospel is destined to inevitable and even cruel opposition. We reason *a priori*, that such an apostate and anti-Christian system will rouse itself against the pure truth: and facts justify the reasoning. Witness the present hatred and malice of the Greek clergy against Dr. King, of Athens: and witness, too, the late persecutions against the evangelical Armenians by their Patriarch. But this is a tale not to be entered upon at the conclusion of our article, and so we lay down the pen.

ARTICLE II.

PRESBYTERIANISM—THE REVOLUTION—THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, AND THE CONSTITUTION.

1. *The Superiority of the Calvinistic Faith and the Presbyterian Government. A Discourse, by Rev. D. K. JUNKIN, A. M. Easton, 1844.*
2. *Ecclesiastical Republicanism, or the Republicanism, Liberality and Catholicity of Presbytery, in Contrast with Prelacy and Popery. By Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D. Boston, 1843.*
3. *Life and Correspondence of President Reed. By his Grandson, WM. B. REED. Philadelphia, 1847. 8vo. 2 vols.*
4. *The Baccalaureate Address in Miami University, August, 1842, by Rev. GEORGE JUNKIN, D. D. President, on the Bearings of True Religion upon Republican Government.*

5. *Relative Influence of Presbytery and Prelacy, on Civil and Ecclesiastical Liberty; a Sermon. By Rev. T. V. MOORE, of Carlisle, Penn. Preached by Appointment before the Synod of Philadelphia. Oct. 16th, 1844.*

In a previous article we endeavored to trace the religious element which constituted the germinating and motive principle of the American Revolution, and the basis of its free and tolerant institutions.

Thomas Payne indeed claimed, "that he was not only an efficacious agent in effecting the independence of the colonies; the very prop and stay of the house, but that the Revolution, of which he was in a great measure the parent, led to the discovery of the principles of government."* "He considered himself as a second Columbus, and that as we owe the discovery of the land to the genius of the one, so we are indebted for the principles of government to the researches of the other." We believe, however, with the Hon. Daniel Webster,† that the American Revolution could not have lived a single day under any well founded imputation of possessing a tendency adverse to the Christian religion. Even Jefferson and Franklin, therefore, felt it to be unavoidably necessary, in order to give spirit to the enterprise, and moral heroism to the people, to bring into operation the religious principle. This was the electric power which made men stand erect upon the basis of liberty.

And we believe further, that all the essential principles which lie at the basis of the Government of the United States—the principles of republicanism in contrast with democracy, on the one hand, and an aristocratic sovereignty, on the other—were found in the Jewish Church;‡—were fully developed in the Christian Church;—are clearly and prominently presented in the system of doctrine and government adopted by the Presbyterian Church;—were

* See *Life by Cheatham*, p. 48, and *Rights of Man*, Part 2. Mr. Cheatham, however, speaks of him as follows: "As a political writer, celebrated as he has been by the illiterate, for originality, he was original in nothing but *intention*. In the United States, or rather in the colonies, and during the war for Independence, he was a very subordinate retailer of the works of great men in England."

† *Bunker Hill Oration*, 1825, p. 30.

‡ See *Ecclesiastical Republicanism*, p. 31, &c. and *Professor Wines' Lectures*.

maintained and acted upon the Waldenses, (who have always been thorough Presbyterians,) during all their history;—were brought to life, and revived in the reformation of the sixteenth century;—and are illustrated in the modern history of the Presbyterian Church in Europe, in England, and in this country.

The spirit of our Revolution is embodied in the Declaration of Independence, and in the Constitutions of the several States, and of the United States. Our inquiry, therefore, leads us to trace the influences which, in their measure, led to the spirit, form, and character of these productions.

There are two prominent Declarations of Independence—that of Mecklenburgh, issued May 19th, 1775—and the national Declaration, adopted in July, 1776. Between these there has been exhibited a similarity of sentiment, and of phraseology, which *necessarily* leads to the conclusion either that Mr. Jefferson, in writing the latter, was indebted to the former, or that both papers may be traced to a common source, accessible to the authors of both. Such a source is found to exist in the ecclesiastical covenants of Scotland, between which and the Declarations we pointed out a remarkable analogy, not only in their general form and character, but also in their style and language.

The favorable manner in which our argument has been reviewed by many of all denominations—Episcopalian, Methodist, Roman Catholic, as well as Presbyterian—has far exceeded our most sanguine expectations. Still, however, there appears to many to be an utter incompatibility between ecclesiastical and civil Declarations, and the attempt to trace the latter to the former, must, as it appears to such persons, be altogether visionary. In the minds of such individuals—where they are not blinded by sectarian prejudice—these ecclesiastical covenants are associated exclusively with religious matters and persons, and the political Declarations exclusively with political struggles and political leaders.

The truth, however, is, that the religious covenants and bands, to which we have referred, were *political* as well as *religious*—national as well as ecclesiastical; while the latter were as certainly originated and carried forward by the religious principle, and, in good part by the religious men, of the age of American Independence.

The covenants of Scotland were "subscribed by persons of all ranks and qualities, by ordinance of council"—"subscribed" (for their title is thus doubly explicit) by the nobles, barons, gentlemen, burgesses, ministers and commoners." This is the title of the National Covenant of 1638. The "General Band" of 1568 was "subscribed by his Majesty and divers of the estates, and afterwards by persons of all ranks and degrees by an act of council." The General Confession of 1580, bears exactly the same title and declaration. The solemn league and covenant of 1643, and subsequent dates, begins thus: "We noblemen, barons, knights, gentlemen, citizens, burgesses, ministers of the Gospel, commoners of all sorts in the kingdom of Scotland, England, and Ireland"—and has explicit reference to "the true liberty, safety and peace of the kingdom, where every one's private condition is included." Once more, "The solemn acknowledgment of public sins and breaches of the covenant, and a solemn engagement to all the duties contained therein, namely, those which in a more special way relate to the dangers of these times," a paper of considerable length, and eminent ability, adopted in Scotland in 1648, commences in the very same style, and in the name of the very same parties, "within this kingdom," and was "unanimously and heartily approved by the Committee of Estates in Edinburgh, Oct. 14, 1648." Now, in this paper, large reference is made to the fact that "neither have the privileges of the parliaments and liberties of the subject been duly tendered. But, some amongst ourselves have laboured to put into the hands of our king, an arbitrary and unlimited power destructive to both. And many of us have been accessory of late to those means and ways, whereby the freedom and privileges of parliaments have been encroached upon, and the subjects oppressed in their consciences, persons and estates: Neither hath it been our care to avoid these things which might harden the king in his evil ways. But, upon the contrary, he hath not only been permitted, but many of us have been instrumental to make him exercise his power in many things tending to the prejudice of religion and of the covenant, and of the peace and safety of these kingdoms; which is so far from preserving his Majesties' person and authority, that it cannot but provoke the Lord against him, unto the hazard of both.

Nay, under a pretence of relieving and doing for the king, whilst he refuses to do what was necessary for the house of God, some have ranversed and violated most of all the Articles of the Covenant."

The civil and political bearing of these covenants, therefore, and their notoriety, as national and most important acts, is plain and evident, while the influence which they must naturally have had upon public men in this country is equally obvious.

It was against the *double* despotism of the king and royalist party, these acts were framed—a tyranny, the effect of which was "the utter annihilation of all liberty, civil and religious." The civil bearing of these covenants, and the fact that they became *the law of the land*, so far and so long as their *political* adherents were in power, is the true source of that plausible but most unrighteous charge of intolerance, so often made against Presbyterians. Speaking of the Act of Parliament, and of the Committee of Estates in Scotland, in 1644, Mr. Hetherington remarks: "But this, it will be observed, was the act of the civil, not the ecclesiastical authorities in Scotland; and it proceeded mainly upon the principle, that the bond thus enforced was not only a *religious* covenant, but also a *civil* league. It was unfortunate that civil and religious matters should have been so blended, because whatever civil measures were adopted or civil penalties were inflicted, were sure to be unfairly charged against the *religious* element, instead of the *civil*, to which it owed its origin. But even this unpropitious circumstance was forced upon the Covenanters; partly by the fact that the proceedings of the king were equally hostile to civil and to religious liberty, and partly by their unavoidable union, with the English parliament, in which the struggle was even more directly for civil than for religious liberty."

Of the solemn League and Covenant, which was a summary of the preceding and a model for the subsequent covenants, Mr. Hetherington justly says: "It is difficult to conceive how any calm, unprejudiced, thoughtful and religious man can peruse the preceding very solemn document, without feeling upon his mind an over-awing sense of its sublimity and sacredness. The most important of man's interests, for time and for eternity, are included within its ample scope, and made the subjects of a solemn league with each

other, and a sacred covenant with God. Religion, liberty, and peace, are the great elements of human welfare, to the preservation of which it bound the empire; and as those by whom it was framed, knew well that there can be no safety for these in a land where the mind of the community is dark with ignorance, warped by superstition, misled by error, and degraded by tyranny, civil and ecclesiastical, they pledged themselves to seek the extirpation of these pernicious evils. Yet, it was the evils themselves, and not the persons of those in whom those evils prevailed, that they sought to extirpate. Nor was there any inconsistency in declaring that they sought to promote the honour and happiness of the king, while thus uniting in a covenant against the double tyranny which he sought to exercise. For no intelligent person will deny that it is immeasurably more honorable for a monarch to be the king of freemen, than a tyrant over slaves; and that whatsoever promotes the true mental, moral, and religious greatness of a kingdom, promotes also its civil welfare, and elevates the true dignity of its sovereign. This, the mind of Charles was not comprehensive enough to learn, nor wise enough to know, especially as he was misled by the prelatie faction, who, while seeking their own aggrandizement, led him to believe they were zealous only for his glory,—a glory, the very essence of which was the utter annihilation of all liberty, civil and religious. And as this desperate and fatal prelatie policy was well known to the patriotic framers of the solemn league and covenant, they attached no direct blame to the king himself, but sought to rescue him from the evil influence of those by whose pernicious counsels he was misled."

This solemn league and covenant, be it remembered, was first suggested* "when the English Parliament had fallen into great distress by the progress of the royal arms: and they gladly sent to Edinburgh commissioners, with ample powers to treat of a nearer union and confederacy with the Scottish nation. The persons employed, were the Earl of Rutland, Sir William Armyne, Sir Henry Vane the younger, Thomas Hatcher, and Henry Darby, attended by Marshal and Nye, two clergymen of signal authority. In this negotiation, the man chiefly trusted was Vane, who, in

* Hume's History, vol. 6, p. 462. Eng. ed.

eloquence, address, capacity, as well as in art and dissimulation, was not surpassed by any one, even during that age, so famous for active talents. By his persuasion, was framed at Edinburgh, that solemn league and covenant, which effaced all former protestations and vows taken in both kingdoms: and long maintained its credit and authority." So speaks Hume.

From what has been said, it will be seen that the objections to our theory which have been raised by parties of opposite religious views, is founded upon ignorance or forgetfulness of the real nature and origin of the national and religious covenants.

It was the spirit and principles of these covenants, which were embodied and carried out in their application to *civil* and *constitutional* liberty, by the Harringtons, the Sydneys, the Miltons, and the Lockes, from whose immortal writings we have confessedly drawn all that is excellent in our Constitution, and all that is worthy in our practice.* And as we have shewn the indebtedness of the National Declaration of Independence to the Mecklenburgh Declaration, and also to the Scottish Covenants, we will now prove that its principles and language may be found in the writings of Milton and Locke, the former an actual co-worker in the great revolution to which these covenants led, and the latter an inheritor of the principles and spirit to which they gave permanency and strength.

TABULAR VIEW of *Mr. Jefferson's Declaration, in comparison with the language of Locke and Milton.*

MR. JEFFERSON'S DECLARATION.

"Prudence, indeed, will dictate, that government should not be changed for light and transient causes, and accordingly, all experience has shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed."

"But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing the same course, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future safety."

LANGUAGE OF LOCKE AND MILTON.

"It is true, men may stir whenever they please, but it will be only to their own just ruin and perdition, for until the evil be grown general, and the evil designs of the rulers become visible, the people, who are more disposed to suffer than to right themselves by resistance, are not apt to stir."—Locke of Government, vol. 5, p. 474-5. Lond., 1801.

But, if a long train of abuses, prevarications and artifices, all tending the same way, make the design visible to the people, and they cannot but feel what they lie under and see whither they are going, it is not to be wondered at that they should then rouse themselves, and endeavour to put the rule into such hands, which may secure to them the ends for which government was first erected."—Locke of Government, vol. 5, p. 472. Lond. 1801.

* See Cheatham's Life of Paine, p. 50.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; and that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Speaking of "reason and free inquiry," Mr. Jefferson says: "Give a loose to them, they will support the true religion, by bringing every false one to their tribunal, to the test of their investigation: they are the natural enemies of error, and of error only."—Notes on Virginia, p. 236, New York, 1801.

"Men being, as has been said, by nature, all free, equal, and independent, no one can be put out of his estate, and subjected to the political power of another without his consent. It is true, that whatever engagements or promises one has made for himself, he is under the obligation of them, but cannot by any compact whatever, bind his children or his posterity; for his son, when a man, being altogether as free as his father, an act of his father can no more give away the liberty of his son than it can of any body else."

And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously misconceive her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple, —who ever knew truth put to the work in a free and open encounter?—Milton's speech for the liberty of unlicensed printing, works vol. 1, p. 326. Lond. 1806.

It is thus made manifest that the ecclesiastical covenants referred to, were of such a public and national character, as to influence national opinion and lead to open avowal of sentiments similar to those embodied in our American Declarations.

But from what has been advanced, it may now be thought that these ecclesiastical documents, whatever may be their importance, are to be attributed to *political*, rather than to *religious* sources. We are led, therefore, to remark, that while these covenants were *adopted* by the political authorities in both the kingdoms of England and Scotland, they were originated, framed, drawn up, and presented by the ministers and ruling elders of the Church of Scotland. The earlier covenants were framed by Knox and his associates. The National Covenant was the production of Alexander Henderson,—the John Knox of what is known as the second reformation in Scotland. It was* "on the 23d and 24th of February, the Presbyterians, now wonderfully increased in numbers, met in Edinburgh, in defiance of the proclamation. Here they seriously considered the alarming situation in which they were now placed by their opponents. It was recommended, with great affection, by Henderson, that all their hearts should be strongly united one to another, in a bond of union and communion. He said, that as they were now declared outlaws and rebels by

* See Dr. Aiton's Life of Henderson, p. 264.

their sovereign, they should join in covenant with their God, and avow their obedience to him as their protector; for he alone would save them from the present and all such evils. As they were not assembled mutinously by one, or a few, but by God and a good cause, he recommended that all, in a conjunct motion, nobility, gentry, burgesses, ministry, and people should now renew the covenant which was subscribed by their forefathers, in the year 1550, with such additions as the corruptions of the times required, and such Acts of Parliament as were in favor of true religion. The idea was not only at once adopted by the meeting, but sounded like an alarm-bell throughout the kingdom. To that effect, Henderson and Johnson were appointed to frame a Confession of Faith, and Rothes, London, and Balmerino, were requested to revise it. By way of preparing the minds of the people for it, Sunday was appointed as a fast, and Dickson, Rollock, Adamson, and Ramsay, were desired to preach, and to accommodate their sermons to the circumstances. It was also suggested by Rothes, that a voluntary contribution should be raised, for putting the zeal of every one to the test, and defraying the common charges which the business might require. Next day, (Sunday,) the ministers in the stern, yet affectionate eloquence of the times, called on the people to descend into themselves, and thoroughly to search their own hearts, and their consciences would tell them, that they had broken their covenant with the Lord, and brought his wrath on the land. They were urged, at great length, seriously to repent, as the only means for obtaining the special favour of the Most High; and many precedents for renewing their covenants were pointed out from Old Testament history. The minds of the populace had been long and warmly excited, and it may well be conceived, that the hearts of all of them reëchoed the sentiments of the preachers. On Monday, (26th.) the three noblemen met in the morning, to receive from Henderson and Johnson the draught of the covenant; but they were told that, notwithstanding the utmost diligence, it could not be ready before Tuesday.

Wednesday, the 28th day of February, 1638, was a proud day for Henderson, and one of the most memorable mentioned in the history of that period. By this time the Presbyterians had crowded to Edinburgh, to the number of

sixty thousand; and to give all solemnity to the occasion, a fast had been appointed to be held in the Church of the Greyfriars. All were astir by the morning's dawn; the Commissioners of Barons were early met, and about half-past eight, Rothes and London joined them. Long before the appointed hour, the venerable Church of the Greyfriars, and the large open space around it, were filled with Presbyterians from all parts of Scotland. At two o'clock, Rothes, London, Henderson, Dickson, and Johnston, arrived, with a copy of the Covenant, ready for signature. Henderson constituted the meeting by prayer, "Verrie powerfullie and pertinentlie" to the purpose in hand. London, then, in an impressive speech, stated the occasion of their meeting. After mentioning that the courtiers had done every thing in their power to effect a division among the Presbyterians, and when thus weakened, to introduce innovation, and that they should therefore use every lawful mean for keeping themselves together in a common cause, he said that in a former period, when Papal darkness was enlightened only from the flaming faggot from the martyr's stake, the first reformers swore in covenant to maintain the most blessed word of God, even unto the death. In a later period, when apprehensions were entertained of the restoration of Popery, King James, the nobles, and people throughout every parish subscribed another covenant, as a test of their religious principles. The covenant now about to be read, had a similar object in view, and had been agreed to by the commissioners. In conclusion, he, in their name, solemnly took the Searcher of Hearts to witness, that they intended neither dishonor to God, nor disloyalty to the King. The covenant was next read by Johnston, "out of a fair parchment, about an elne squair." When the reading was finished there was a pause and silence still as death. Preliminaries occupied till about four o'clock, when the venerable Earl of Sutherland stepped forward, and put the first name to the memorable document. Sir Andrew Murray, minister of Ebdy in Fife, was the second who subscribed. After it had gone the rounds of the whole church, it was taken out to be signed by the crowd in the church-yard. Here it was spread before them, like another roll of the prophets, upon a flat grave-stone, to be read and subscribed by as many as could get near it. Many, in addi-

tion to their names, wrote "*Till death*," and some even opened a vein and subscribed with their blood. The immense sheet, in a short time, became so much crowded with names on both sides, throughout its whole space, that there was not space left for a single additional signature. Even the margin was scrawled over; and as the document filled up, the subscribers seem to have been limited to the initial letters of their names. Zeal in the cause of Christ and courage for the liberties of Scotland, warmed every breast." Such was the covenant of 1638.

"The solemn league and covenant"—afterwards adopted by the Westminster Assembly and by the English Parliament and nation,—was also the production of the Rev. Alexander Henderson. When the commissioners from England, in 1643, arrived in Edinburgh, the General Assembly, of which Henderson was Moderator, was then in session, by whom they were received. "The English ministers first held a private conference with Henderson, who stated to the Assembly, that they required to know the most convenient way of dealing with the court. Henderson, Ruthersford, Dickson, Baillie, Douglas, and Gillespie, as ministers, with Maitland, Angus, and Warriston, as elders, waited upon them to compliment them, and offer them free access as spectators. A loft of the High Church, next the Assembly House, was appointed as a place of conference between them, and the Committee of the Assembly. The Convention of Estates sent a similar Committee, consisting of Balmerino, Argyle, and others."

After long and earnest debates upon their line of conduct, it was agreed that, "as this cause of liberty and religion was dear to them, it was best to enter into a confederacy with Parliament. In the conferences with the Committees, the English argued for a *civil* league, and the Scots for a *religious* covenant. The English tried, in a covert way, to keep an open door for Independency, while the Scots were equally eager to keep it shut. After a time of much painful discussion, Henderson was appointed to frame a draught of the well known solemn league and covenant of the three kingdoms.

From the private conferences, Henderson carried this important document to the Assembly, on the 17th of August, 1643. Henderson recommended it to their favorable recep-

tion, by a long and splendid oration. It was publicly read, and received with the greatest applause, says Ballie, "I ever saw, and with hearty affection, expressed in tears of pity and joy, by many grave, wise, and old men." It was then read the second time, and many of the most eminent ministers and lay elders were desired to deliver their opinions about it, who did all magnify it highly, and although the King's Commissioner pressed a delay till, at least, it was communicated to the King, yet the approving of it was put to the vote and carried unanimously; and it was ordered that Maitland, (afterwards Duke of Lauderdale,) Henderson, and Gillespie should carry it up to Westminster. From the Assembly it was instantly sent to the Convention of Estates, and in the afternoon of the same day it was passed with the most cordial unanimity.

The *religious* origin of these national covenants of Scotland and England, is thus incontrovertible, and while, therefore, their political importance renders them the *very probable* models and sources of the American Declarations, their ecclesiastical origin claims for the religious spirit, principles, and conduct of the Puritans and Presbyterians, the glory, under God, of their undoubted inspiration.

In reaffirming this claim, we would again repeat what we have already said, that in tracing to these covenants the original models of the Declarations of American Independence, we have no intention to lead to the conclusion, that in our opinion, these covenants led to the purpose and plan of American Independence, or that no such political declarations would have been framed, had not these ecclesiastical covenants existed. On the contrary, the same spirit prevailing in this country which led to the original framing of those covenants, would have led to the framing of these declarations, in a style and manner of correspondent strength and unction.

But the question before us is a question of *fact*—not as to what *might* have been, but what actually *has* occurred. Here are two separate Declarations, which are unquestionably indebted for many phrases and much of manner—the national to the Mecklenburg—or else both are indebted to *some* common papers of similar character. Which of these conclusions is the true one? This is the question, and the only question—and it is a question altogether distinct from

the literary merit of these papers, or the *primeval* source of that spirit of freedom which they breathe.

Tom Paine says he discovered the principles from which they sprung. Others say that these principles were the native growth of instinctive liberty. We can regard them as the offspring neither of infidelity nor of chance; and having found a religious source from which they may, and probably did, originate, we rejoice in giving that glory to the Bible and to the God of the Bible, which the enemies of both have claimed for themselves.

We have now done with the Declarations of American Independence, and turn our attention to the American Constitution, and to that struggle of opinion and that heroism of feeling which nerved the most loyal and devoted citizens that ever owed allegiance,* to take up arms in defence of their "immemorial rights," and seal their triumphant conquest with the blood of husbands, fathers, and friends.

Speaking of our national independence, Lord Brougham, in his treatise on Political Philosophy,† says, "After a series of extraordinary successes, considering their inadequate resources for military operations, and an uninterrupted display of political wisdom as well as firmness and moderation, they finally threw off the yoke of the mother country, gloriously establishing their own entire independence, and winning for themselves a new Constitution, upon the federal plan, and of the republican form.

"This is perhaps the most important event in the history of our species. Its effects were not confined to America. It animated freemen all over the world to resist oppression. It gave an example of a great people not only emancipating themselves, but governing themselves without either a monarch to control, or an aristocracy to restrain, and it demonstrated, for the first time in the history of the world, contrary to all the predictions of statesmen, and the theories of speculative inquirers, that a great nation when duly prepared for the task, is capable of self-government—in other words, that a purely republican form of government can be founded and maintained in a country of vast extent, and peopled by millions of inhabitants. The principal variations from the British Constitution, were the sub-

* See Cheatham's *Life of Paine*. † London, 1844—p. 329.

stitution of an elective chief magistrate, personally responsible, for one hereditary, and only responsible through his ministers and agents; the upper house being elective like the lower; and the nation consisting of a confederation of republican states, each independent, in many essential particulars, but all combined, as regards foreign relations, under one head, and all governed by a central Legislature, of powers limited by law as to its jurisdiction over each individual member of the Union, though quite absolute as to the general concerns of the whole confederacy, and the federal relations of its component parts. The fundamental principle of the Constitution is, the vesting of the supreme authority, executive and legislative, in the people, to be exercised in every case by their chosen representatives—in no case, except in their elections, by themselves. And this at once distinguishes the great modern republic from all the democracies of ancient times. The representative principle is fully and universally introduced into it, and the people depart completely with all their power to their chosen deputies. It is another, and an essential principle, if indeed it be not involved in the former, that the choice of representatives and a chief magistrate is the only elective function exercised by the people—all civil and military officers, and especially all judicial functionaries being appointed by the executive government.”

CONFEDERATION and REPRESENTATION are therefore the two essential principles which lie at the basis of the American Constitution. Now to detail all the points on which the ecclesiastical constitution of the Presbyterian Church develops these principles as its grand, prominent, and most ostensible features, would require a volume, and has been spread out in the work on “Ecclesiastical Republicanism,” placed at the head of this article. It would seem as if, in defining the two cardinal features of the American Constitution Lord Brougham were transferring those of the Presbyterian system, both doctrinally and ecclesiastically.

“Wherein,” says Mr. Junkin, “does *liberty* consist? I answer in the right use of the principles of *covenant representation* and *imputation* resting upon the principle of *faith* as the only legitimate basis of the whole. That is—where a people, under a social covenant, do, in an enlightened manner and in the fear of God, make and execute

laws and transact their own business by *representatives of their own choice*, they are a free people. Where they are deprived of the privilege of choosing their representatives—i. e. where they are not represented by those in whom they, or a majority of them, have *faith*, they are not a free people. Here then we have the elements of all social government: and the principles of all *practicable* democracy, i. e. *representative republicanism*. And where did we get them? *From the Calvinistic creed*, as clearly deduced from the Book of God. There and there *only*—there *primatively* are they found. There is the doctrine of *covenants*—there the doctrine of *representation* or *vicarious agency*—there the doctrine of *imputation*, and there the vital spirit of them all, the doctrine of *faith*. * * *

A corollary from the statement made is, *that Presbyterian government is the natural and necessary result* of Calvinistic doctrines. The principles of Presbytery are found in the very bosom of this creed. Presbytery is but the natural development, in the external form of the church, of the doctrines of grace which warm her bosom. And for a Calvinistic church to wear any other form of government would be a monstrous development—so monstrous indeed, that the world has never for any great length of time witnessed such a wonder. *No other form of government can naturally grow out of Calvinism*—and although repeated attempts have been made to preserve a union between this faith and other forms of government, none has ever succeeded.*—pp. 22, 23.

In the above volume on Ecclesiastical Republicanism, will be found evidence to shew that in its history, Presbyterianism has ever been found working out the spirit and principles of constitutional, representative, and republican government, and giving impetus to the onward progress of

* It is indeed said that as our ruling elders hold their office permanently, and our ministers are ex-officio members of our session and Presbytery—the analogy fails. But in our view, it is by these very circumstances rendered more complete. “The Constitution of the United States peremptorily denies to the PEOPLE in mass, absolutely withholds from them, the election of their President, (Cheatham’s Life of Paine, p. 142,) and of Judges and of numerous other officers. It is not a DEMOCRACY, but a REPUBLIC. The people wisely act through REPRESENTATIVES, and not INDIVIDUALLY. Neither is suffrage *universal*, for women and children, and foreigners, and all who have not become members or citizens by an open

civil and religious liberty. Such has been its glory, when glory has been attached to such principles, and such its infamy, its reproach and its standing denunciations by all its enemies.

"History," as Mr. Junkin remarks, "with the augmented voice of eighteen centuries, proclaims the truth, that the Calvinistic faith, united to the Presbyterian government, has been most productive of glory to God and good to man. It was in the use of this simple and unpretending, but mighty and majestic moral machinery, that the illiterate fishermen of Galilee, assisted by the learned and indefatigable Paul, accomplished, in the face of the bitterness of Jewish persecution, and the iron sternness of Roman cruelty and power, one of the mightiest revolutions that have ever changed the aspect of our world. It was Presbyterianism that preserved religion in its purity, throughout those centuries of trial and corruption, which commenced with the day when the cross was planted on the throne of Constantine. And when Rome, that "mother of harlots and abominations," extended her leaden sceptre over the world, and began to be "drunk with the blood of the saints," the Presbyterian Church furnished a large proportion of her victims. And throughout those ages of darkness, that gloomed at the rise of Popery, and reached their midnight after the inundation of the barbarians of the north—*where* and *who* were the *seed* that God, according to his promise, had preserved to serve him? If some Christian Elijah, had heard the voice of Jehovah proclaiming, "yet have I left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees that have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth that hath not kissed him"—where, in that age of darkness and rebuke, could the prophet have found the faithful remnant? At the foot of an *European* and not an *Asiatic* Horeb were they found. In

profession of their allegiance, and by a regular form of naturalization, are excluded. In all this there is the exact counterpart of Presbyterianism, as there is also in the system of progressive courts, not merely as advisory bodies, but as courts of review and controul. Our government, too, is a confederated GOVERNMENT—OR UNITED BODY—and not a mere congeries of local and independent communities, which would not be a government or COMMONWEALTH at all; and in like manner there are independent CHURCHES—but there is no independent church or government in any sense analogous to our national government. Presbyterianism is the true ecclesiastical analogy to our civil commonwealth.

the fastnesses of the Alps, those mighty barriers which have baffled many a tyrant's rage, the people of God, driven from their eastern home, and hunted for the truth's sake, from land to land, had taken refuge, and there, despite the rage of the Romans and the fury of the Frank, they preserved and practiced the truth in its primitive beauty and simplicity. And *who* and *what* were these dwellers of the Alpine vallies? *Presbyterians all!!* The faith we hold was their faith—the government under which we rejoice was their government. And faithfully did they maintain them. Amid the flames of their burning villages—or unsheltered amid the desolation of Alpine winter—hunted from mountain to mountain and from valley to valley—oppressed—imprisoned—burnt and driven from their homes, still, with unbending firmness, they held on to the truth of God; until by that very *dispersion*, by which Rome thought to crush them, was sowed the seeds of that Reformation that makes Rome totter to her fall. The great Reformer of Geneva learned much from the Waldenses in regard to that primitive and Apostolic Christianity, of which he was so learned and eloquent an advocate: and the enemies of the other Reformers often charged them with deriving their opinions from these godly and faithful victims of Rome. Indeed, the candid searcher of history will be constrained to believe, that from the Apostolic times, a church maintaining the Presbyterian doctrine and order, was by the providence of God preserved, until she gave to the purest branch of the great Reformation, the doctrine and ecclesiastical image, which she had preserved unmarred, through so many centuries of darkness and of blood."

In this argument, we repudiate altogether the artifice by which the glory due to Presbyterianism is given to the Independent denomination. As it regards the origin and progress of constitutional principles in England, there can be no distinction drawn between Presbyterians and Independents. They were but the two wings of one great army. Originally, and for a long period, their common name was "The Puritans," and their common principles were—the supremacy of the Scriptures, as the constitutional directory of the church, in doctrine, order, worship and laws;—the purely ministerial and teaching character and authority of the ministry;—the purity of the ministry,

the purity and simplicity of ordinances, and the sacredness of the Sabbath;—the constitutional character of government;—and the responsibility of kings to the laws and liberties of their kingdoms.

Adhering to these *common* principles, the Puritans began to differ in ecclesiastical views, and finally divided into the two main bodies of Presbyterians and Independents, differing originally not in doctrine, not in order, not in worship, but in the single point of the NECESSITY of regular and standing courts of AUTHORITY review and control.

As it regards the principles of toleration and liberty there have been noble examples and numerous exceptions among both these parties. Luther was a Presbyterian, and yet a constant advocate of toleration. Zuinglius was the same. So was Calvin in his earlier and wiser opinions. And in like manner, says Archdeacon Blackburne, "It is to the controversy about the Geneva discipline, that we owe the efforts of the excellent Castalio, to disgrace the infernal doctrine of punishing heretics capitally."* Howe, too, who was the favorite chaplain of Cromwell,† a Presbyterian, and Owen, his chief divine, have left on record the evidences of their Presbyterian preferences.

It is true that independency was, under the circumstances of the times, and the fact that these were a hampered minority, the most natural outlet for those free and tolerant principles, which were even then restrained in their full development, by the spirit of antiquity and of national establishments. The Independents of the Westminster Assembly and the Commonwealth, were in fact the real prototypes and representatives *in almost every sentiment* of the present Presbyterians, while the Presbyterians of that day would only find their perfect likeness in the lingering relics of some of the smaller branches of Presbyterianism. Presbyterians and Independents are, therefore, of common origin—the former being Puritanism in its development of democracy; and the latter in its form of constitutional and representative government, as in England and in these United States. Both denominations have worked off the slough of Romish and prelatial intolerance;—both discard

* Ecclesiastical Republicanism, p. 133.

† See Roger's Life of Howe, p. 361, 365.

and denounce the principles of tyranny and bigotry;—and both rejoice to run together *pari passu* the race of freedom.

In every question of a political bearing, we regard the Puritans as the parents equally of the Presbyterians and Independents, between whom, (as they were found among the colonists of New England and these Southern States,) there was but little difference and no separation.*

And looking at the subject in this light, will any man question the influence of Puritanism, and of the Puritans in gradually fashioning those elements of *republican* government which gave origin to the Commonwealth, to the Revolution, to these United States, and to the still rapidly extending measures of reform in England? Surely not.

Here again we wish to be understood. We are not now inquiring into the ultimate and original source of English liberty. That many forms of popular privilege, on the part of landholders and men of note, existed in Saxon times, and were, under a regulated form, continued under the Norman dominion, we believe; and that many struggles were from time to time made to regain these privileges, when subsequently destroyed, we also believe. But the question now before us is, as to the origin and source of POPULAR power, in contrast with the power of THE RICH AND NOBLE of the people;—of popular representation and not merely of constitutional monarchy. What we seek to trace up, is the theory and doctrine of a COMMONWEALTH OR REPUBLIC, in which the people are *recognized* as the ultimate source of power, and their welfare as the ultimate end of government; and in which the *jus populi* takes the place of the *jus regis* and the *vox populi* of the mere arbitrary *dictum* of a king.

Now, it will not be pretended that any such form of government, by which a whole people govern themselves under the guidance of a constitution of their own adoption and by representatives of their own election, ever existed either in Greece, or Rome, or in Britain,—in Saxon or Norman times. The only ancient model of such a government, we find in the Jewish Commonwealth; and the only fountain from which its principles have flowed in modern times, has been the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. Christianity

* See also Mr. Junkin's Discourse, p. 25.

alone originated, and this alone can sustain a free, representative republic. And it was only at the era of "The Commonwealth," the spirit of free discussion and of popular liberty, nerved by the genius of Christianity, burst all the fetters of power, prejudice, and bigotry, and gave birth to a REPRESENTATIVE REPUBLIC.

It was not, therefore, in America, but in England, the theory of a representative republic was perfected. The principles, the spirit, and the general outlines of American republicanism, were all fashioned in the great laboratory of English freedom; and the Puritans, who were originally Presbyterian, and who, up to the time of the Protectorate, when the constitution of a republic was formally and forcibly crushed—were still by an overpowering majority Presbyterian—these were the artizans by whose skill, industry, sufferings and genius, the heavenly form was gradually shaped.

It is therefore by what these Presbyterian Puritan ancestors have achieved, we are republicans. Had the British Parliament been left free, England would have been a Republic; and it was only when the Presbyterian Parliament and city of London were overawed and dispersed by an army of independents; and when the constitution of a republic was snatched from the very hands of the members who were about to adopt it as the government of the country—that the first practical organization of a representative republic was left for these United States.*

For the liberty we enjoy, therefore, we agree with Mr. Cheatham, a warm advocate of England:† "For the liberty we enjoy in the United States, we are indebted to our ancestors. We have acquired nothing of it ourselves: not a jot of it is our own. All that we have done, is the effecting of a separation from the parent country: all that we have achieved is independence. But we have no liberty but that which we have received from England. We owe it all to our ancestors."

And when it is said that much of the Magna Charta and

* "Had Presbytery," says Mr. Junkin, "obtained the ascendancy in the English mind;—had it stamped its system of a *regulated and balanced Commonwealth, England, and not America, had won the glory of having first solved the problem of national self-government.* Disc., p. 27.

† Life of Paine, p. 193.

other ancient instruments of English liberty were adopted into our Constitution,* we ask, who was it that brought these all to light from amid the darkness under which they had been long buried; and who gave them fresh unction and authority and power, by republishing and reestablishing them in the popular mind? Can any one deny, that for this we are indebted to the Presbyterian party in Scotland and in England, who waged the war with Charles, and led to the establishment of the Commonwealth? Calvin, and Luther, and Zuingli, taught men to be free and independent in the exercise of all their *spiritual* rights and in the government of the church;† and having learned to be free, religiously, they soon learned to seek freedom politically. Knox, the Reformer of Scotland, and founder of the Presbyterian Church there, “was a great admirer of the polity of republics.”‡ Under his teaching,§ “more just and enlarged sentiments were diffused, and the idea of a Commonwealth, INCLUDING THE MASS OF THE PEOPLE, as well as the PRIVILEGED orders, began to be entertained.” “Buchanan’s Treatise,” says, the Anti-Republican and Tory Edward Irving, and Knox’s “first blast of the trumpet against the monstrous regiment of women,” contains essentially what makes Scotland the most formidable seat of radicalism and rebellion in the world.”||

“The Puritanism of Scotland became,” says Carlyle, “that of England, of New England.”** Buchanan’s great work, ‘*De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, published in 1579,” powerfully contributed to awaken the people of both kingdoms to a just sense of their own rights and of the king’s responsibilities. Andrew Melville, in his lectures, fanned the flame of popular liberty, and deepened the conviction of sovereign accountability.†† Welwood, his friend, and professor of laws, was silenced by king James, because, as he said, his writings were apologies for rebellions and trea-

* Cheatham’s Life of Paine, 131, 141.

† See this subject illustrated in *Ecclesiastical Republicanism*, p. 112, 113, &c.

‡ M’Crie’s Life of, vol. 1, p. 303.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 304.

|| Lectures on Heroes, p. 235.

** M’Crie’s Life of, vol. 2, p. 115, 116.

†† Irving’s Confessions of Faith, Historical Introd., p. 130, 131. Lond. 1831.

sons.* These principles of popular liberty were promulgated and diffused by Rutherford, in his "Lex Rex;"† by Guthrie, in "The Causes of God's Wrath," a work which was burned by the common hangman;‡ by Brown, of Wamphray, in his Apologetical Narration;§ by the "Jus Populi," a work written by Stewart, of Goodtrees; by "Naphali," and by many other works, which brought down upon their authors and abettors the severest penalties of an enraged government.||

To these sources, of which the Covenants were summaries, the Harringtons, the Sydneys, the Vanes, the Miltons, the Cokes, and the Lockes, were indebted for much of that light and enthusiasm, by which their genius was fired in the defence of popular freedom. And hence, it is a remarkable fact, to which we will have occasion to refer, that Roger Williams, Lord Baltimore, and William Penn, had all matured their views of freedom of conscience in England, and under the influences of these Puritan controversies and instructors.**

Sir Henry Vane, who technically was neither an Independent nor a Presbyterian, but the true archetype of the *modern* religious views and religious principles of both—did more probably than any other man in his day to defend and develop the true principles, as laid down by Lord Brougham, of a CONSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVE REPUBLIC. He was a member of the Westminster Assembly, and a chief commissioner from the Parliament and Assembly to Scotland, when, as has been seen, he was instrumental in affecting the solemn League and Covenant. After the death of Hampden and Pym, he was the acknowledged leader of the Commonwealth party.†† He was so true to his republican principles, that he *openly* condemned the powers assumed by Cromwell, and in 1659, as president of

* In his True Law of Free Monarchies.

† Pub. in 1644.

‡ History of Westminster Assembly, p. 363.

§ Published in 1660.

¶ See in Watt's Bibliotheca Britannica, vol. 4, under the head "people," the titles of the numerous works in which these principles were propagated.

** See Bancroft's History of the United States.

†† Forster's Statesmen of the Commonwealth, p. 329, 330. Harper's edition.

the council to whom the supreme power was entrusted, until the parliament could make further arrangements,* "he discharged his last noble effort for the great cause his life had been devoted to, by reporting a bill for the future and permanent settlement of the government, of which the following were the heads: 1. That the supreme power delegated by the people to their trustees, ought to be in some fundamentals not dispensed with; that is, that a CONSTITUTION ought to be drawn up and established, specifying the principles by which the successive trustees, or representatives assembled under it, should be guided and restrained in the conduct of the government, and clearly stating those particulars in which they would not be permitted to legislate or act. 2. One point which was to be determined and fixed in this Constitution, so that no legislative power should ever be able to alter or move it, was this: That it is destructive to the people's liberties, (to which by God's blessing they are fully restored,) to admit any earthly king or single person to the legislative or executive power over this nation. 3. The only other principle reported as fundamental, and to be placed at the very basis of the Constitution, was this: That the supreme power is not entrusted to the people's trustees, to erect matters of faith and worship, so as to exercise compulsion therein."

The interest Vane took in this matter, and in the solemn league and covenant, were prominent charges brought against him in his trial, and prominent topics in his noble vindication and defence at the bar of the house, and upon the scaffold. On the former occasion, speaking of his adherence to the government, he says—"*And whatever defections did happen by apostates, hypocrites, and time-serving worldlings, there was a party among them that continued firm, sincere, and chaste unto that cause to the last, and loved it better than their lives — of which number I am not ashamed to profess myself to be; not so much admiring the form and words of the covenant, as the righteous words therein expressed, and the true sense and meaning thereof, which I have reason to know.*"

These sentiments Sir Henry Vane carried with him to

* Forster's *Statesmen of the Commonwealth*, p. 338, and 341.

New England, where he was governor, and where he no doubt watered the seeds of liberty and independence which had been carried over by the Puritan settlers. And in this constitution he unquestionably stated, according to the analysis laid down by Lord Brougham, the elemental principles of the Constitution of the United States.

"The spirit of liberty was, therefore, grafted, as we have affirmed, upon the stock of religion, and was *thus* quickened with a heavenly ardour, and an impetuous zeal which nothing could stand. 'When the Protestant faith,' says Swift, 'was restored by Queen Elizabeth, those who fled to Geneva returned among the rest, home to England, and were grown so fond of the government and religion of the place they had left, that they used all possible endeavors to introduce both into their own country. From hence they proceeded by degrees to quarrel with the KINGLY GOVERNMENT, because, as I have already said, the city of Geneva, to which their fathers had flown, for a refuge, was a commonwealth, or government of the people. During the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth, the youthful Hercules was found strong enough to crush the serpent, in the question of monopolies. While Whitgift contended for the absolute despotism of monarchy, Cartwright, in England, and Buchanan and others, in Scotland, gave utterance to the principles of a democratic republic. In the reign of James, the number of Puritans in England became greater, and their exertions in the cause of freedom more apparent. With their growing intelligence and wealth, the spirit of popular liberty increased until in the reign of Charles I, a universal enthusiasm seized the nation, pervading not only the middle classes, but also many of the gentry, which declared not only in words, but actions, that while the King was resolved to be absolute, the people were determined to be free. THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, in England, as an open and organized body, dates its origin from the early campaigns of the civil war. Coke laid its foundation in the Petition of Right, endued with the form of law, in 1628. Selden built on this foundation. Hampden, Pym, Vane, St. John, Cromwell, and Sydney completed the superstructure which Sydney has immortalized by his writings, as both he and Vane have by their blood. "Protestantism," says Carlisle, "was a revolt against *spiritual* sove-

reignities, Popes, and much else. PRESBYTERIANISM CARRIED OUT THE REVOLT AGAINST EARTHLY SOVEREIGNTIES and DESPOTISMS. Protestantism has been called the grand root, from which our whole subsequent European history branches out; for the spiritual will always bodies itself forth in the temporal history of men. The spiritual is the beginning of the temporal. And now, sure enough, the cry is every where for liberty and equality, independence, and so forth; instead of kings, ballot-boxes, and electoral suffrages." "The honest truth is," says Archdeacon Blackburne, "that these very controversies, (respecting the Genevan discipline,) first struck out, and in due time perfected those noble and generous principles of civil and religious liberty, which too probably without those struggles, or something of that sort, would hardly have been well understood to this very hour."*

We have thus endeavored to point out the relationship between American and English Republicanism, and to trace the spirit and theory of a representative republic to its true source, and that is, as we honestly believe, the religious freedom, as it is found embodied in Christianity, quickened and diffused by the reformation, and systematically applied to civil liberty by the reformers and covenanters of Scotland, and by their coadjutors, the Presbyterian Puritans of England and of these American colonies. From this nursery, the original stock of that tree, American Republicanism, which now waves its branches over twenty-six States and several Territories, was first transplanted.†

We now proceed to draw out another link of evidence, in confirmation of this opinion, from the depths of history. In his "History from the Accession of George III, to the Conclusion of the Peace, in 1783," Mr. Adolphus, in tracing

* Ecclesiastical Republ.—pp. 130, 137, 131, 132, 133.

† In a recent lecture on the wrongs of Ireland, as published in the Catholic Herald, we find the following candid admissions, which are more important as coming from a Roman bishop and an Irishman:

"Some indeed assert that the Catholic religion is the cause of the degradation of Ireland. I have said enough to show that, in part, it has been the occasion of the degradation of Ireland. But I am willing to go farther, and admit, that in one sense the Catholic religion has been the cause of that degradation; for I have no hesitation in expressing the opinion, that if the Irish had been by any chance Presbyterians, they would have from an early day obtained protection for their natural rights

the causes of the *combined and determined* opposition of the colonies to the impositions of the mother country, has this language—"The **FIRST** effort towards an **UNION** of interests was made by the Presbyterians, who were eager in carrying into execution their favorite project of forming a synod. Their churches had hitherto remained unconnected with each other, and their union in synod had been considered so dangerous to the community, that in 1725 it was prevented by the express interference of the lords justices. Availing themselves with great address of the rising discontents, the convention of ministers and elders at Philadelphia, inclosed in a circular letter to all the Presbyterian congregations in Pennsylvania, the proposed article of union. They digested a plan by which a few gentlemen of Philadelphia, with the Presbyterian ministers, should be chosen to correspond with their friends in different parts, to give and receive advices, and to consult on measures tending to promote their welfare either as a body or as connected in particular congregations. A number of what were termed most *prudent and public spirited* persons in each district of the province and three lower counties, were to be elected for the purposes of corresponding jointly with the ministers in those districts, with one another, and with the gentlemen in Philadelphia. A person was to be nominated in each committee to sign and receive letters in the name of the whole, to convoke the committee, and for their deliberation, impart the advice they should obtain. Deputies were to be sent by the committee in each county or district, yearly or half-yearly, to a general meeting of the whole body, to consult and give advice; and each committee to transmit to Philadelphia their names and numbers, with periodical accounts and alterations. In consequence of this letter, an

or they would have driven their oppressors into the sea. The Scotch escaped all these calamities. They were never conquered. Their soil was never trodden beneath their feet. They merged themselves spontaneously, and at their own time, into the state of England. They kept always the property of their own religion for their own social and religious use. Already, before the change, parish schools had been established in Scotland, afterwards they were multiplied, improved, and endowed out of the church property. Yet in Ireland every thing was the reverse."

See also a long and corroborative testimony to the spirit of Scottish Presbyterianism, by Victor Cousin, in his work on the History of Moral Philosophy, in the *Presbyterian*, March 6, 1817.

union of all the congregations took place in Pennsylvania and the lower countries. A similar CONFEDERACY was established in all the southern provinces, in pursuance of similar letters, written by their respective conventions. These measures ended in the establishment of an annual synod* at Philadelphia, where all the Presbyterian congregations in the colonies were represented by their respective ministers and elders, and where all general affairs, POLITICAL as well as religious, were debated and decided. From this synod orders and decrees were issued throughout America, and to them a ready and implicit obedience was paid.

The discontented in New England recommended an union of the congregational and Presbyterian interest throughout the colonies. A negotiation took place, which ended in the appointment of a permanent committee of correspondence, and powers to communicate and consult on all occasions, with a similar committee, established by the congregational churches in New England. Thus the Presbyterians in the southern colonies, who, while unconnected in their several congregations, were of little importance, were raised into weight and consequence; and formed a dangerous combination of men, whose principles of religion and policy were equally adverse to that of the established church and government.

BY THIS UNION A PARTY WAS PREPARED TO DISPLAY THEIR POWER BY RESISTANCE, and the stamp law presented itself as a favorable object of hostility. Yet sensible of their own incompetence to act effectually without assistance, and apprehensive of counteraction *from the members of the Church of England, and those dissenters who were averse to violence*, they strove with the utmost assiduity to make friends and converts among the disaffected of every denomination.

The prevailing discontent which extended to the most respectable ranks of society, was favorable to their hopes, and when the news arrived that the stamp act had passed in Great Britain, the measures adopted were conformable to their most sanguine wishes.**

The influence of this course of proceeding, on the part of the Presbyterians, was not remarked by Mr. Adolphus

* Vol. 1, p. 203.

alone. Mr. Reed, of Philadelphia, himself an Episcopalian, in a published address, remarks—“The part taken by the Presbyterians in the contest with the mother country, was indeed *at the time often* made a ground of reproach; and the connections between their efforts for the security of their religious liberty, and opposition to the oppressive measures of parliament was *then distinctly seen*. Mr. Galloway, a prominent advocate of the government, ascribed, in 1774, the revolt and resolution, *mainly* to the action of the Presbyterian clergy and laity *as early as* 1764, when the proposition for a general synod emanated from a committee appointed for that purpose, in Philadelphia. Another writer of the same period says—“You will have discovered that I am no friend to the Presbyterians, and that I **FIX ALL THE BLAME** of these extraordinary American proceedings upon them.”

“A Presbyterian loyalist,” adds Mr. Reed, “was a thing unheard of.” Patriotic clergymen of the established church, were exceptions to general conduct; for while they were patriots at a sacrifice, and in spite of restraint and imaginary obligations, which many found it impossible to disregard, it was natural sympathy and voluntary action that placed the dissenters under the banner of revolutionary redress. It is a sober judgment which cannot be questioned, that had independence and its maintenance depended on the approval and ready sanction of the Colonial Episcopal clergy, misrule and oppression must have become far more intense before they would have seen a case of justifiable revolution. The debt of gratitude which independent America owes to the dissenting clergy and laity never can be paid.*

“This testimony of our Episcopalian, is corroborated by Dr. Elliott, the able editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, the organ of the Methodist Church in the west, in noticing an attack made on the Presbyterians by Bishop Purcell: “The Presbyterians” says he, “of every class, were prominent, **AND EVEN FOREMOST**, in achieving the liberties of the United States; and they have been all along the leading supporters of constitution, and law, and good order. They have been the pioneers of learning and sound

* See in *Eccl. Republ.*, as above.

knowledge from its highest to its lowest grade, and are now its principal supporters.*

These opinions are sustained by further and numerous facts. The Synod of New York was the very first body, a year before the declaration of independence, to declare themselves in favour of open resistance, and to encourage and guide their people then in arms.†

This is certainly a most remarkable fact. "Of the independence of the colonies, for some time after the affair at Lexington,—that is, in 1775," says Mr. Cheatham, "few thought and no one wrote. Here and there it was indistinctly mentioned, but no where encouraged."‡ "Independence," says Thomas Paine, "was a doctrine scarce and rare, even towards the conclusion of the year 1775."§ Even in October, 1775, when the news of the rejection of the petition of Congress to the king was received, and had produced universal indignation, still even now few thought seriously of independence. The mind was overpowered by fear rather than alive to safety."¶ And yet among those few, who not only thought upon, but *openly* advised independence, were the Presbyterians as a body; they having openly commended it months before the publication of Paine's *Common Sense*, which was not issued until Jan., 1776, and which was itself the offspring of a suggestion made by Dr. Benjamin Rush,** who was brought up under the Rev. Samuel Finley, afterwards President of the College of Princeton, of which college he became a graduate under the presidency of the Rev. Samuel Davies.

During the continuance of the revolutionary war, the Presbyterian body sustained and invigorated the forces of their beleagured country; so that Presbyterians were every where treated with special cruelty and revenge, and at the close of the war, they again addressed their people, and offered up praise to God who had given them the victory.††

* The whole article is one of the most enlarged Christian liberality and generosity.

† *Life of Thomas Paine*, p. 41.

‡ See his *Crisis*, No. 3 and 7.

§ Cheatham *do.*, p. 45.

¶ See Cheatham, as above, p. 37.

** See Hodge's *Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church*.

†† In this connexion it may be interesting to our readers, to hear the sentiments expressed by the Old Synod of New York and Philadelphia,

“And after the conflict was over,” says Mr. Junkin, “and the sages of America came to settle the forms of our government, they did but *copy* into *every* constitution, the simple elements of representative republicanism, as found in the Presbyterian system. It is matter of history that cannot be denied, that Presbyterianism, as found in the Bible, and in the standards of the several Presbyterian churches, gave character to our free institutions. Am I reminded of the glorious part which New England Congregationalists took in our country’s deliverance? My heart’s best feelings kindle at the recollection: and in according to New England all the glory that she has so well earned, I yield not my position, for New England is *substantially Presbyterian*. It must not be forgotten that the Pilgrim Fathers, after witnessing the sad effects of simple independence in their own land, had been nursed in the bosom, and had drank of the spirit of Presbyterian Holland and Geneva, *before* they reached the rock of Plymouth, and from the very first, their institutions partook of the Presbyterian form.” Dis., p. 28.

in their Pastoral Letter, published in 1783, just at the close of the Revolutionary war. The following is an extract:

“We cannot help congratulating you on the general and almost universal attachment of the Presbyterian body to the cause of liberty and the rights of mankind. This has been visible in their conduct, and has been confessed by the complaints and resentment of the common enemy. Such a circumstance ought not only to afford us satisfaction on the review, as bringing credit to the body in general, but to increase our gratitude to God, for the happy issue of the war. Had it been unsuccessful, we must have drunk deeply of the cup of suffering. Our burnt and wasted churches, and our plundered dwellings, in such places as fell under the power of our adversaries, are but an earnest of what we must have suffered, had they finally prevailed.

The Synod, therefore, request you to render thanks to Almighty God, for all his mercies, spiritual and temporal, and in a particular manner for establishing the Independence of the United States of America. He is the Supreme Disposer of all events, and to Him belong the glory, the victory, and the majesty. We are persuaded you will easily recollect many circumstances in the course of the struggle, which point out his special and signal interposition in our favour. Our most remarkable successes have generally been when things had just before worn the most unfavorable aspect, as at Trenton and Saratoga at the beginning—in South Carolina and Virginia towards the end of the war. It pleased God to raise up for us a powerful ally in Europe; and when we consider the unwearied attempts of our enemies, to raise dissensions by every topic that could be supposed inflammatory and popular, the harmony that has prevailed, not only between the allied powers, but the troops of different

The service rendered in securing the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, by the Rev. Dr. Witherspoon, a Presbyterian clergyman from Scotland, and also President of the College of Princeton, and who was a member of the Continental Congress, is thus graphically described by Dr. Krebs: "When the Declaration of Independence was under debate in the Continental Congress, doubts and forebodings were whispered through that hall. The houses hesitated, wavered, and, for a while, the liberty and slavery of the nation appeared to hang in an even scale. It was then that an aged patriarch arose, and venerable and stately form,—his head white with the frosts of years. Every eye went to him with the quickness of thought, and remained with the fixedness of the polar star. He cast on the Assembly a look of inexpressible interest and unconquerable determination; while, on his visage, the hue of age was lost in the flush of a burning patriotism that fired his cheek. 'There is,' said he, when he saw the house wavering, 'There is a tide in the affairs of men—a nick of time. We perceive it now before us. To hesitate, is to consent to our own slavery. That noble instrument upon your table, which insures immortality to its author, should be subscribed this very morning, by every pen in the house. He that will not respond to its accents, and strain every nerve to carry into effect its provisions, is unworthy the name of a freeman. For my own part, of property I have some—of reputation, more. That reputation is staked, that property is *pledged*, on the issue of this contest. And although these gray hairs must soon descend into the sepulchre, I would infinitely rather they should descend thither by the

nations and languages acting together, ought to be ascribed to the gracious influence of Divine Providence. Without mentioning many other instances, we only further put you in mind of the choice and appointment of a *commander-in-chief* of the armies of the United States, who in this important and difficult charge, has given universal satisfaction, who [was] alike acceptable to the citizen and the soldier, to the State in which he was born, and to every other on the Continent, and whose character and influence after so long service, are not only unimpaired, but augmented. Of what consequence this has been to the cause of America, every one may judge; or, if it needs any illustration, it receives it from the opposite situation of our enemies in this respect. On the whole, every pious person, on a review of the events of the war, will certainly be disposed to say with the Psalmist, 'The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad.'"

hands of the public executioner, than desert at this crisis, the sacred cause of my country.' Who was it that uttered this memorable speech, potent in turning the scales of the nation's destiny, and worthy to be preserved in the same imperishable record in which is registered the not more eloquent speech ascribed to John Adams, on the same sublime occasion? It was John Witherspoon, at that day the most distinguished Presbyterian minister west of the Atlantic ocean—the father of the Presbyterian Church in the United States."

"We have the authority, also, of the late Chief Justice Tilghman for stating that the framers of *the Constitution of the United States* were (chiefly through the agency of Dr. Witherspoon, who was one of them,) greatly indebted to the standards of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, in modelling that admirable instrument, under which we have enjoyed more than half a century of unparalleled national prosperity."*

And still further, the Hon. W. C. Preston, of this State, has given publicity to the following remarkable words:

"Certainly it is the most remarkable and singular coincidence, that the constitution of the Presbyterian Church should bear such a close and striking resemblance to the political Constitution of our country. This may be regarded as an earnest of our beloved national Union. We fondly regard our federal Constitution as the purest specimen of republican government that the world ever saw; and on the same pure principles of republicanism, as its basis, we find established the constitution of this republican church. The two may be supposed to be formed after the same model."

An inquiry into the matter would shew, by an actual biography of the veterans of the revolution, that a large proportion of them were members of the Presbyterian Church. Without attempting to make such an investigation, we will merely state the following facts which have incidentally fallen into our hands, in reference to South Carolina:

The battles of the "Cowpens," of "King's Mountain"—and also the severe skirmish known as "Huck's Defeat," are

* See Fourth of July Discourse, by the Rev. Mr. Stedman, of Wilmington, N. C.

among the most celebrated in this State, as giving a turning point to the contest of the revolution. General Morgan, who commanded at the Cowpens, was a Presbyterian elder, and lived and died in the communion of the church. General Pickens, who made all the arrangements for the battle, was also a Presbyterian elder. And nearly all under their command were Presbyterians. In the battle of King's Mountain, Colonel Campbell, Colonel James Williams, (who fell in action,) Colonel Cleaveland, Colonel Shelby, and Colonel Sevier, were all Presbyterian elders; and the body of their troops were collected from Presbyterian settlements. At Huck's Defeat, in York, Colonel Bratton and Major Dickson were both elders of the Presbyterian Church. Major Samuel Morrow, who was with Colonel Sumpter, in four engagements, and at King's Mountain, Blackstock, and other battles, and whose home was in the army, till the termination of hostilities, was for about fifty years, a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church.

These facts we have collected from high authority, and they deserve to be prominently noticed. Here are ten officers of distinction, all bearing rule in the church of Christ, and all bearing arms in defence of our liberties. Braver or better officers cannot be found in the annals of our country—nor braver or better troops. It may also be mentioned in this connection, that Marion, Huger, and other distinguished men of revolutionary memory, were of Huguenot, that is, full blooded Presbyterian, descent.

Joseph Reed, whose memoirs we have placed at the head of this article,—the military secretary of Washington, at Cambridge—Adjutant General of the continental army; member of the Congress of the United States; and President of the Executive Council of the State of Pennsylvania—Joseph Reed, in whom more than in any other man, General Washington confided—was the son and grandson of Irish Presbyterians. His grandfather came from Carrickfurgus. His father was one of the trustees of the Third Presbyterian Church, Arch street, Philadelphia.* He was educated at Princeton. "He was firmly attached to the Presbyterian Church, in which he had been educated. In one of his publications, when far advanced in life, he

* Memoirs, vol. 1, p. 26.

said of it: "When I am convinced of its errors, or ashamed of its character, I may perhaps change it. Till then I shall not blush at a connection with a people, who, in this great controversy, ARE NOT SECOND TO ANY, IN VIGOROUS EXERTIONS AND GENEROUS CONTRIBUTIONS, AND TO WHOM WE ARE SO EMINENTLY INDEBTED FOR OUR DELIVERANCE FROM THE THRALDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN."*

In his will, General Reed desired,† "If I am of consequence enough for a funeral sermon, I desire it may be preached by my old friend and instructor, Mr. Duffield, in Arch street, the next Sunday after my funeral." "He was buried in the Presbyterian ground, in Arch street, above Fifth, by the side of his wife."‡

One of the two chaplains appointed by Congress in 1777, was Mr. George Duffield of the Third Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia§—the other being Bishop White.

The venerable and patriotic Mr. Duponceau, of Philadelphia, remarked to a gentleman known to the writer, that he considered George Bryan, Samuel Adams, and Patrick Henry, the three men of the Revolution. Now Mr. Bryan, who was a member of the stamp-act Congress of 1765—President of Pennsylvania—a Judge of the Supreme Court, and a member of the Council of Censors, and one of the leading whig members of the new Assembly,|| was also a Presbyterian.** To him *principally*, in conjunction with a Mr. Cannon, a schoolmaster, is attributed by Mr. Graydon, the Constitution of Pennsylvania.†† "These," says Mr. Graydon, constituted the "duumvirate, which had the credit of framing the Constitution, and thence laying, in Pennsylvania, the corner-stone of that edifice which, however retarded in its progress by aristocratical interferences, towers like another

* Memoirs of Gen. Reed, vol. 2, p. 172.

† Ibid. vol. 2, p. 420.

‡ Ibid. p. 416, where is given the inscription on his tomb.

§ See extract from letter of Mrs. Adams, in Updike's Narraganset Church, page 242.

|| Mem. of Gen. Reed, vol. 1, p. 36—vol. 2, pp. 23, 133, 197, 481.

** His son and grand-children are members of a Presbyterian congregation in Charleston, S. C.

†† Memoirs of his own Times, and Reminiscences of Men and Events of the Revolution, by Alexander Graydon—Philadelphia, 1846—p. 286—who was himself brought up very strictly by a Presbyterian grandmother. pp. 20, 21, and 43.

Babel, to the skies, and will continue to tower, until finally arrested and dilapidated by an irremediable confusion of tongues—for anarchy ever closes the career of democracy.” For a correct statement of this fact, Mr. Grandon was a most competent witness; and President Adams, therefore, in associating Timothy Matlock, Thomas Young, and Thomas Paine in this work, was doubtless misinformed.*

From this Constitution we make the following extracts, to shew that this Presbyterian Constitution of Pennsylvania was the first in the United States, since the Revolution, which provided for THE COMPLETE AND UNIVERSAL TOLERATION OF RELIGIOUS OPINIONS. This constitution was adopted in 1776, (from July 15th to September 28th.) Article II. is as follows:† “That all men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of their own consciences and understanding: and that no man ought, or can of right be compelled to attend any religious worship, or erect or support any place of worship, or maintain any ministry, contrary to, or against his own free will and consent. Nor can any man, who acknowledges the being of a God, be justly deprived or abridged of any civil rights as a citizen, on account of his religious sentiments, or peculiar modes of religious worship: that no authority can or ought to be vested in, or assumed by any power whatever, that shall in any case interfere with, or in any manner controul, the right of conscience in the free exercise of religious worship.”

IT THUS APPEARS THAT THE DECLARATION OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE WAS FIRST FAVORED BY THE PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD, THEN THE HIGHEST BODY IN THAT CHURCH—THAT THE FIRST ACTUAL AND PRACTICAL DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE WAS MADE BY PRESBYTERIANS IN MECKLENBURGH, N. C.—THAT THE FIRST STATE CONSTITUTION MADE UNDER THAT DECLARATION, PROCLAIMING UNIVERSAL AND COMPLETE TOLERATION OF RELIGIOUS OPINION, WAS FRAMED BY A PRESBYTERIAN, AND THAT THE OVERTHROW OF THE THEN EXISTING ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION IN VIRGINIA AND SOUTH CAROLINA, AND THE COMPLETE DIVORCE OF THE

* See Cheatham's Life of Paine, pp. 317, 318.—Note.

† See the Constitutions of the several Independent States of America. London, 1783—pp. 182, 183.

CHURCH AND THE STATE WAS MAINLY OWING TO THE EFFORTS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

These observations we have ventured to make, in order to give just weight to the claims instituted on behalf of the ancient standards and spirit of the Presbyterian Church, and to shew that when Isaac Taylor calls "Presbyterianism the republican principle,"* he had well considered the nature of a system, of which, doctrinally and ecclesiastically, representation is the fundamental element.† For to use the words of Dryden, while we deny the appropriateness of his epithets :

"As the poisons of the deadliest kind;
Are to their own unhappy coasts confined,
So PRESBYTERY and its pestilential zeal,
CAN FLOURISH ONLY IN A COMMON WEAL."‡

It is no part of our business to depreciate the patriotic character and claims of Episcopalians before or during the revolutionary struggle, nor to undervalue their services in contributing to the formation of the Constitution of the United States, and the permanent glory of the country. God forbid that we should have either the desire or the design to do so. *Their* fame, and character, and glory, are ours—are the common property of the nation—and he must have a heart dead to all true patriotism, and to all true charity, who can reverence and admire Washington or Patrick Henry the less, because they were members of the Episcopal Church. Unquestionably, there were many great, and wise, and brave men in all parts of the Union, and proportionably more in the Southern States, than any others, who were Episcopalians.

Still, however, and for the reasons stated, the fact is undeniable, that while Presbyterians were *to a man* revolutionists, Episcopalians were *very generally* loyalists. "During the revolutionary war," says Bishop White, "a considerable number of the American people became inclined to the British cause; and of them a great proportion were Episcopalians."§ "During this period," Bishop White further

* *Spiritual Despotism*, Sect. iv., p. 177. Eng. ed.

† See Woodgate's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 20, 349, 352.

‡ Dryden's *Hind and Panther*.

§ *Memory of Protestant Epis. Church*, p. 48.

informs us,* "there was no resource for the supply of vacancies, which were continually multiplying, not only from death, but by the retreat of very many of the Episcopal clergy to the mother country, and to the colonies still dependent on her. To add to the evil, many able and worthy ministers, cherishing their allegiance to the king of Great Britain, and entertaining conscientious scruples against the use of the liturgy, under the restrictions of omitting the appointed prayers for him, ceased to officiate. Owing to these circumstances, *the doors of the far greater number of the Episcopal Churches were closed for several years.* In the state in which this work is edited, there was a part of that time in which there was, through its whole extent, but one resident minister of the church in question who records the fact."

"Again," adds Bishop White, "many worthy ministers entertained scruples in regard to the oath of allegiance to the States, without the taking of which, they were prohibited from officiating, by laws alike impolitic and severe." "There is a remarkable fact in Virginia, countenancing the sentiments delivered. After the fall of the establishment, a considerable proportion of the clergy continued to enjoy the glebes—the law considering them as freeholds during life—without performing a single act of sacred duty, except perhaps that of marriage. They knew that their public ministrations would not have been attended."†

In the Convention of 1785, a service for the fourth of July was prepared. Of this, Bishop White says: "What must further seem not a little extraordinary, the service was principally arranged, and the prayer alluded to was composed by a reverend gentleman, (Dr. Smith,) who had written and acted against the Declaration of Independence, and was unfavorably looked on by the supporters of it, during the whole revolutionary war. The greater stress is laid on this matter, because of the notorious fact, that the majority of the clergy could not have used the service, without subjecting themselves to *ridicule and censure.* For the author's part, having no hindrance of this sort, he contented himself with having opposed the measure; and kept the

* *Ibid.*, p. 8 and p. 60.

† *Memory of Protestant Episcopal Church*, p. 59.

day from respect to the requisition of the Convention; but could never hear of its being kept in above two or three places besides Philadelphia."

Dr. Hawks also testifies that in Virginia, "The error" of taking part with Great Britain, "was not confined to the clergy, a portion of the laity adopted their opinions; it was, however, very small, for the great mass of the population in Virginia was opposed to England; and this rendered the situation of the clergy only the more disagreeable. Nor were all the clergy loyalists; they numbered in their ranks some sturdy republicans, though these formed a minority, including not quite one-third of the whole body."*

In 1767, Dr. Chandler published "An appeal on behalf of the Church of England in America," in which he claims for it peculiar privileges and support, because "Episcopacy can never thrive in a republican government,—nor republican principles in an Episcopal church. For the same reasons, in a mixed monarchy, no form of ecclesiastical government can so exactly harmonize with the State, as that of a qualified Episcopacy. And, as they are mutually adapted to each other, so they are mutually introductive of each other." The same argument was urged about the same time, and for the same purpose, by Archbishop Seeker.† And it is to this very opinion, then generally entertained, "that Episcopacy itself was unfriendly to the political principles of our republican government," Bishop White attributes the violent prejudices which universally prevailed against it.‡ Dr., now Bishop Hawks, admits the same fact. "The effect," he says,|| "of the American revolution upon the church, had been to attach to it no small share of odium, and few cared to enrol themselves among the clergy of a communion, small in numbers, and the object also of popular dislike."**

* Protestant Episcopal Church in Va., p. 136, where he enters into an explanation of the reason.

† This is in our possession, and quoted in *Ecclesiastical Republicanism*, p. 153, 154.

‡ See in *Ecclesiastical Republic*, *ibid.*, p. 154.

§ *Mem. of Prot. Epis. Church*, p. 48.

|| *Constitutions and Canons of the Prot. Epis. Church*. N. York, 1841.

** President Adams has shewn from facts which fill a long letter, dated Quincy, Dec. 2, 1815, and represented in the *N. Y. Evangelist* of Nov. 9, 1843—that Episcopacy was one cause of the Revolution.

It is true the Rev. Jacob Douche, an Episcopalian of Philadelphia, was appointed chaplain to the Congress in 1776, and officiated for a short time. But, it is equally true, that Mr. Douche turned traitor to the cause, and wrote a long letter to General Washington, urging him to do the same, and with or without the consent of the people, "to negotiate for America at the head of his army;"—that is, to employ the army, in order forcibly to suppress the spirit of independence.*

In support of the opinion, as to the anti-republican character of the Episcopal Church, the whole weight of *English* authorities might be produced, during every period up to the present time.† And hence, in order to revive and

* See this letter,—General Washington's letter, enclosing it to Congress,—and the letter of Mr. Hopkinson, (a signer of the Declaration, and brother-in-law of Mr. Douche,) in Graydon's Memoirs, p. 428, &c. Mr. Updike, in his History of the Narraganset Church, alludes to the fact of Douche's officiating as chaplain, as a striking proof of his declaration, that "EPISCOPALIANS WERE THE LEADING ARCHITECTS OF THE GREAT WORK OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE." (See p. 241.) and gives Adams' letter, written on the occasion, (see p. 242-244.) Mr. Updike is *very* careful, however, not to *allude* even to the subsequent conduct of Mr. Douche. And among the list of his *Episcopalian* architects of independence, culled from all quarters of the Union, he is under the painful necessity of introducing Franklin! Thomas Jefferson!!! and John Randolph. But, while eminent names are, and may be found among the *laymen* of that church, who favored and advanced the cause of Independence, Mr. Updike does not quote the names of any *clergymen*, except Mr. Douche!!! and Bishop White. In the course of the volume, however, he shews that the few Episcopal churches in Rhode Island were closed during and after the Revolution, *because the ministers* would not act as their *lay* brethren thought patriotism required. See p. 265, 358, &c. Here lies the difference. We have a curious pamphlet published in Charleston, in 1795, (*Strictures on the Love of Power in the Prelacy, &c.*, by a Member of the Protestant Episcopal Association of S. C.,) which combines, with many other facts, to shew that the laity of the Episcopal church then were much opposed to the clergy and to prelacy, because of their anti-republican tendency and bias. Mr. Updike's enthusiasm, however, is so great, that he ventures in the face of all such facts, to allege, that "it is also possible that a majority of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were Episcopalian"—and in demonstration of his position, he affirms that out of the *FIFTY-ONE* signers, *eighteen* (of course including Franklin and Jefferson,) were certainly such.—*Q. E. D.*

† See *Eccl. Republicanism*, pp. 108, 127, 152, 172, &c. Mr. Bartlett, in his *Memoirs of Bishop Butler*, speaking of his plan for introducing the Episcopate into this country, says; (p. 122.) "It is much to be regretted that the deliberations of the government upon this reasonable and important measure, should have terminated without its adoption. It is said to have been the opinion of that distinguished statesman, Mr. Pitt, that had the Church of England been efficiently established in the United

reëstablish the Episcopal Church in this country after the revolution, it was found necessary to embody in the Constitution of the church, some essential principles of the Presbyterian system, so that Bishop White was openly charged with "a design to set up an Episcopacy on the ground of presbyterial and lay authority."* But, if Presbyterianism had influence enough to commend itself in any measure, as a model or type for the reconstruction of the Episcopal Church, it is easy to conceive that it might exert a silent and indirect influence in shaping to some extent the outline of our civil constitution.

¶ We have heard it urged that the liberal views of Episcopalians in South Carolina and in Virginia, during the period referred to, are evidenced by the fact, that while in both cases they enjoyed the monopoly of a religious establishment, they voluntarily resigned them. Now, while we freely admit that the revolutionary spirit prevailed among the members of the Episcopal Church in the States mentioned to a far greater extent, proportionably, than it did at the North; yet still facts constrain us to believe that in both cases the abandonment of the Establishment was more a matter of NECESSITY than of CHOICE. The truth is, that during the continuance of these establishments, the great proportion of the people in both States were non-Episcopalian. In Virginia, the Dissenters, as they were called, constituted at least two-thirds of the people;† and it was only when the Baptists and Presbyterians *required* the abolition of the establishment and common privileges, as a *necessary* encouragement to their brethren to enlist in the service of the country, any steps were taken for its removal.‡ To the Presbyterians, Dr. Hawks justly attributes

States, it was highly probable that those States would not have been separated from Great Britain." "We can easily believe," adds the Churchman's Monthly Review, "that if this design had been carried into execution, or if the noble undertaking of Berkeley had not been arrested by Walpole, the United States might, at this day, have been a well-ordered possession of the British crown."

* See Bishop White's "Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered," which is obviously drawn from the Presbyterian Model; and also his Mem. of the Prot. Epis. Church, p. 82 and 345.

† See Dr. Hawks' Prot. Epis. Church, in Va., p. 140, where he admits that such may have been the case, and offers little argument to disprove it.

‡ See Dr. Hawks' Prot. Epis. Ch. in Va., p. 138, and the petition of the

the zeal, talents and energy, with which the subject was publicly discussed, and the abolition of the establishment finally carried. Of this fact, the evidence is given at some length in one of the volumes before us.* The divorce therefore between church and state in this country, was not effected, as has been lately affirmed,† “by the agency of Mr. Jefferson.” The very contrary can be proved. Mr. Jefferson did indeed do much to divorce and drive away *religion* from the state, but “Presbyterians,” says Dr. Laing, “forced upon the state, the doctrine of the entire independence between Christianity and the civil power.” Presbyterians first proclaimed this doctrine on the American shores. Presbyterianism was opposed by Episcopacy, in her efforts to establish this doctrine in Virginia. And the universal establishment of this doctrine throughout the United States, and in the Constitution, was the result of the movement made by Presbyterians.”‡

Nor was the case different in South Carolina. Here too the great body of the people were non-Episcopalians. Episcopalianism was indeed the established religion, but not as has been recently affirmed, “the *predominant* religion.” Presbyterians were among the first settlers in South Carolina. They have been proportionably numerous in all periods of its history, and during the latter part of the eighteenth century, the great majority of emigrants were Presbyterians. In 1704, when there was but *one* Episcopal Church *in the whole province*, then numbering towards six thousand white inhabitants, the dissenters had *three* churches *in Charleston alone*. As early as the year 1690, the Presbyterians, in conjunction with the Independents, formed a church in Charleston, which continued in this united form for forty years.

Williamsburgh was settled by a Presbyterian colony from Ireland,§ and multitudes more thronged into this State from that country, at a later period.|| Indeed the great majority

Presbytery of Hanover, which sought the complete removal of the establishment, “and gave it a decisive blow,” p. 139-140. The Methodists he represents as being generally suspected. See p. 133, 134, 137.

* Eccl. Repub., sec. xi., p. 94-103.

† Charleston Courier, Jan. 25th, 1848.

‡ Religion and Education in America.

§ Hewett's History of South Carolina, vol. 2, p. 64.

|| *Ibid.* pp. 270, 271.

of the emigrants, during the latter half of the eighteenth century were Presbyterians,* and a Presbytery existed at *an early period of that century.*† Great numbers of French Protestants sought an asylum in South Carolina, at different periods,‡ who were also Presbyterian. And the adherents of this form of ecclesiastical government were led to continue and uphold it, under every discouragement, not merely because of early education, but because, as Mr. Hewett testifies, they believed it to be most in accordance with the spirit of civil and religious liberty.§ The establishment of the Episcopalian religion in South Carolina was the act of a small minority—there being, in 1698, when it was formed, but one Episcopal Church in the province, out of a white population of between five and six thousand, while non-Episcopalians had three churches in the city, and one in the country.|| That establishment was also obtained surreptitiously,—by surprise,—and by a majority, even then, of only *one* vote.** It never expressed the views of the colonists, and was never otherwise regarded than as unjust, tyrannical, and unchristian. Failing to receive justice here, the non-Episcopalians appealed to the British House of Lords.†† “In consequence of their application a vote was passed, ‘that the act complained of was founded on falsity in matter of fact—was repugnant to the laws of England—was contrary to the charter of the proprietors—was an encouragement to atheism and irreligion—was destructive to trade, and tended to the depopulation and ruin of the province.’” The Lords also addressed Queen Anne, beseeching her “to use the most effectual methods to deliver the province from the arbitrary oppression under which it lay, and to order the authors thereof to be prosecuted according to law.” To which her Majesty replied, “that she would do all in her power to relieve her subjects in Carolina, and protect them in their just rights.” It was not, however, until the period of the revolution, that this monopoly

* Ramsay's History of South Carolina, vol. 2, p. 26.

† Ibid. pp. 25, 26.

‡ Ibid. p. 38.

§ History of South Carolina, vol. 2, p. 53.

|| Ramsay's History, vol. 2, p. 2.

** Ibid. p. 3.

†† Ibid. vol. 2, pp. 4, 16, 17.

of religious privilege was broken up, and Presbyterians and other denominations of Christians were restored to equality of rights, and freed from a taxation which required them to support an established faith, with which, in many things, they could not agree. Nor was this deliverance *then* granted them, but from stern necessity. For they had now an unquestionable majority in the colony, and the physical force necessary for war and defence was theirs. Without union among all parties there was no prospect of success, and therefore after seventy years of exclusive authority, the established church was under the necessity of yielding to a constitution which gave equal laws, equal rights, and full and free toleration to all sects and parties.* Thus it is doubly proved, that to the efforts of Presbyterians we are indebted for the overthrow of all establishments of religion in this country, and for the complete and final divorce between church and state.

In concluding this article, let us once more say, that in

* We have been favored with a copy of a manuscript letter, from which we make the following extracts :

"To Hon. George Bryan, Vice President of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Lancaster—fav'd by the Hon. Ric'd Hutson, Esq, Delegate in Congress— from James Cannon.

"CHARLESTON, S. C., March 14th, 1778.

"Dear Sir,—I was greatly surprised when I arrived here, to find, notwithstanding we were told so confidently by the opposers of our Constitution, that the people of South Carolina had reformed their Constitution, and were extremely happy under it, that they had not yet established their Constitution, and had several reasons to fear that it would not pass. It lately passed the Council with great difficulty, as they made a bold effort to continue the choice of their Legislative Council, (now Senate,) in the Assembly, because then Charlestown would have governed the State. However they were obliged to give that up. They then tryed two other ways, one by reducing their Legislature to $\frac{1}{2}$ of their present number; the other to have the members of their Senate chosen any where in the State. In either of these cases Charleston must have ruled the State, and they failed here too.

"But at the very time that every body expected to have a Constitution in a few hours he called the Council and Assembly into the council chamber, and in a farewell speech, gave the Constitution the negative. This produced great consternation for a day or two, but the Assembly resolved to choose another; made an adjournment for three days, which they were obliged to do before they could bring in any rejected bill, chose a President, and passed the Constitution, and it is expected to have the new President's sanction in a day or two. Several propositions were made by the party opposing the Constitution, to have it set aside, but those for it prevailed, having determined to pass no tax bill, nor do any other business,

thus asserting and vindicating the patriotism of Presbyterians, and the influence of this denomination in all ages of its history, (and especially since the reformation,)* in defending and diffusing the principles of civil and religious liberty, we neither stigmatize nor detract from the patriotism of other religious denominations.

To the Roman Catholic colony of Maryland must be attributed the glory of having founded a colony and established a constitution upon the principles of toleration and liberty of conscience. To Roger Williams and his Baptist associates, belong still greater glory, for having through so much suffering and endurance, laid the foundations of the colony of Rhode Island in the most unlimited principles of civil and religious liberty. To the Baptists also as we have seen, every honor is due for their patriotic efforts during the Revolution, and especially in Virginia. To William Penn, also, and the Quakers, the same undying gratitude is most justly due. And many a record of glory and many a hero of renown, in the annals of American patriotism could be doubtless produced to deck the brow of each of these bodies. Let them flourish and abide, green and radiant forever, since patriotism is patriotism wherever it is found, and by whomsoever it is displayed. Let it, however, be borne in mind, that all these parties matured their liberal principles under the influence of that very Puritan teaching we have described, and only sought in this country an oppor-

until the Constitution was established. The church, I mean the church clergy, seem by their sermons very much displeased, that their establishment is likely to be abolished. One of them told me that a State could not subsist without an established church. That an establishment was the support of the State, and the State of an establishment—being inseparable. I told him that we had in America two happy instances to the contrary, viz: one where all religions were established, and one where none were established. That these two were the most populous and flourishing on the continent. He made no reply. There is, however, great nervousness on the religious head in the South Carolina Constitution. Your merits in supporting it, and vigorous measures are such as Pennsylvania can never sufficiently reward, and I shall ever be ready to exert every thing in my power, to procure every reward which such merit deserves." * * * * *

"P. S.—The President's name is Rawlins Lowndes, who was proclaimed the 11th inst., under the discharge of the artillery both from the troops and forts, and the discharge of small arms."

* On the history of Presbyterianism prior to the Reformation, see Smyth's *Presbytery and not Prelacy the Primitive Policy of the Church*, B. III, p. 441—542.

tunity of carrying them into practical operation.* Lord Baltimore was brought up a Protestant and had in him, therefore, the innate seeds of its liberal principles, and naturally sought, as the founder of a colony, to obtain preëminence for it by its liberality, as Romanism could not be legally or successfully† established. And when Bancroft lauds him as the first in the Christian world “to advance the career of civilization by recognizing the rightful equality of all Christian sects,”‡ he contradicts himself and contradicts the facts of the case. For as Lord Baltimore’s colony was only chartered in 1632, and established in 1634, while Roger Williams arrived in New England in February, 1631, from which time, until 1636, when he established his colony, he was fighting the battles of freedom with his own brethren of the independent persuasion, so of him Mr. Bancroft justly says “he was the first person in modern christendom to assert, in its plenitude, the doctrine of the liberty of conscience—the equality of opinions before the law”§—“he was a Puritan, * * * and he alone had arrived at the great principle”|| on which “it became his glory to found a State.** The chartered Constitution of Maryland limited its toleration and equal rights to Christians. It was “of all Christian sects it recognized the equal rights,” and Christianity by this charter, was made the law of the land.”†† This also is the provision of the Constitution of Maryland, adopted in 1776, which even admits of taxation for supporting the Christian religion.‡‡ The toleration of Roger Williams, however, was unlimited.§§

Of William Penn it is also certain that he inherited Puritan feelings, and was personally intimate with the expounders of Puritan liberty,||| and yet even by his Constitution of 1682, Christians alone were eligible to office.***

* See Bancroft’s Hist. of U. S., vol. 1, pp. 244, 367, 239, and vol. 2, p. 378.

† See *ibid.* vol. 1, p. 242.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 244.

§ *Ibid.* pp. 375, 376.

|| *Ibid.* p. 367.

** *Ibid.* p. 375.

†† *Ibid.* pp. 243, 244, 248.

‡‡ Const. of the several States, &c. London, 1783, pp. 243, and 244.

§§ See Bancroft’s History of the United States, vol. 1, pp. 367, 375, 376.

||| *Ibid.* vol. 2, p. 378.

*** *Ibid.* p. 387.

Nay, even in his revised Constitution, of 1701, the assent of the Governor is necessary to any law, and "a profession of faith in Christ," is made necessary for any public employment.*

These apparent exceptions, therefore, only substantiate our claims for Puritanism, and leave all that we have advanced in favor of the liberal and free spirit of Presbyterianism and of its patriotic achievements in America, untouched. Our glory is not sought in the humiliation or depreciation of others.

On the contrary, in speaking of the early Puritan principles and spirit, we have already shewn that it characterized alike all its divisions and burned in all its denominational churches, as a flame of pure and ardent patriotism and liberty. To suppose, therefore, that facts, illustrating the glory of a common ancestry, even though that be in the form of Presbytery, is derogatory to the dignity or honour or patriotism of any branch of the now widely extended family of non-Episcopalian churches, is certainly a most selfish and suicidal policy. And he who would tarnish the lustre thrown around **THE RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES AND SPIRIT OF THE REFORMERS AND PURITANS**, as the fountain of our constitutional laws and liberties, and attribute these to the mere natural impulses of the human heart, is not more absurd in reasoning than he is profane in spirit.

We may have been somewhat hyperbolic in claiming for the **GENERIC SPIRIT AND PRINCIPLES** of Presbyterianism the founding of empires. But he who will consider its influences in sustaining the Jewish Republic; in preserving the system and independence of the Waldenses; in creating the republic of Geneva; in confederating the republic of Switzerland, and making Geneva "the focus of Protestantism and of practical republicanism;"† in combining the States of Protestant Germany against the threatened extermination of the Emperor and the Pope; in resuscitating the united provinces of the Netherlands, when they threw off the yoke of Philip II., and founded in their morasses a confederation, very nearly resembling that which

* See Bancroft's History of the United States, vol. 3, p. 42.

† See the Oxford Chronological Tables of History, p. 26.

had been founded on the mountains of Helvetia;* in creating an empire within the despotic and unquestionably Popish France;† in erecting the Commonwealth of England upon the ruins of civil and religious despotism; in giving origin to that liberty and reform which are still at work in the gradual transformation of the British Constitution; in moulding and fashioning the character of the Scottish people, so as to make them preëminent among the nations of the earth; and, not to enlarge,—in giving birth to the spirit of independence in these colonies, inspiring courage to declare it, union to maintain it, and wisdom, in some degree at least, to mould the Constitution of these United States;—when, we say, these facts are contemplated with a searching and unprejudiced eye, our words may well be tolerated as not unwarrantably eulogizing the genius of Presbytery as the genius of civil and religious liberty.‡

ARTICLE III

THE MORAL CONDITION OF WESTERN AFRICA.

By REV. JOHN LEIGHTON WILSON, of S. C.

Missionary at the Gaboon River, Western Africa.

The Prophet Isaiah, in the 18th chapter, and 7th verse of his prophecies, has these words: "In that time shall the present be brought to the Lord of Hosts of a people scattered and peeled, and from a people terrible from the beginning hitherto; a nation meted out and trodden under foot, whose lands the rivers have spoiled, to the place of the name of the Lord of Hosts, the Mount Zion." As may be

* Viller's Essay on the Reformatton, p. 71, 136, &c. Baird's Northern Europe, vol. 1, p. 82-93.

† In fact, in France the Huguenot body soon made pretensions equivalent to a partition of the monarchy. See Villiers' Essay as above.

‡ This was the title selected for a work, for which the late Rev. Dr. Winchester, of Natchez, had made large preparation, when death cut short his labours.

seen, by reference to the context, he speaks of their inhabitants of Ethiopia, a name which was anciently given, not only to those regions in Africa, now known as Nubia and Abyssinia, but to all the country south and west, and including, consequently, the entire Negro population of the African Continent.

There are some historical statements in the passage, as well as some geographical allusions, that are not well understood, and may be passed over without comment, inasmuch as neither have any important bearing upon the general subject which we intend to present. The leading idea is sufficiently plain, and it is to considerations arising out of this, that attention is invited.

The inhabitants of Ethiopia, are spoken of as "a people scattered and peeled," as "a nation meted out and trodden under foot;" and in immediate connection, it is declared, that "they shall be brought as a present to the Lord of Hosts," and "to the place of the name of the Lord of Hosts, the Mount Zion."

Divested of all figurative dress, it is here affirmed in substance, that the inhabitants of Ethiopia would, for a certain period, "be scattered and peeled;" be "meted out and trodden under foot;" after which, they would be converted to the Lord Jesus Christ, and participate in all the blessings of that salvation which he has purchased with his blood.

We have then in this passage a prophetic description, not only of the present and past condition of Africa, but likewise of her conversion and future prosperity. Her history is characterized, in the first instance, by a period of deep and protracted degradation, to be followed by another, not less remarkable for the prevalence of evangelical piety and solid happiness. And who is there, though ever so slightly versed in African history, that does not feel that her condition is described with singular accuracy and fidelity?

Who needs to be reminded that the inhabitants of Africa have been "scattered and peeled," "meted and trodden under foot," when there are living evidences of this in almost every country on the face of the earth? What nation under the sun is there, whose history is not tarnished by deeds of aggression against this defenceless people?

But it is not more certain that one portion of this prophecy has already been fulfilled, than it is that the other will be, and that perhaps at no distant day. That same wise and Almighty Father of the universe, who foresaw and foretold her protracted degradation, as clearly foresaw and will as certainly bring to pass her promised deliverance.

Her past wrongs and injuries, as well as her present ignorance and degradation, as much as they are to be deplored for themselves, are nevertheless a sure token,—aye! a prophetic guarantee of her conversion and well-being.

We look forward, then, to a great change in the moral condition of this great continent. This expectation is not founded, however, upon any newly discovered tendency in the character of that country to renovate itself—nor is it expected as an immediate or necessary consequence from the advancing state of human affairs in other parts of the world. It has a surer foundation than any thing of this kind. It may be expected, because it is an event that has been determined in the councils of Heaven, for the fulfilment of which, the power and the veracity of Jehovah are alike and indubitably pledged.

In pursuing this subject, it will be our object to give, in a comprehensive view, a general outline of the moral condition of Western Africa.

It is not expected that the picture we are about to sketch, will be contemplated with feelings of unmingled satisfaction. A true description of heathenism any where, is little else than an exhibition of human depravity, in its worst and most revolting forms. And however painful may be the details which we shall feel constrained to give, let it not be forgotten, that they are nevertheless but too true a picture of the actual condition of the great mass of mankind; they are but the exhibition of scenes with which the missionary *must* be familiar; and they are facts with which the Christian church must be made acquainted, before it can be roused to suitable exertions in their behalf.

We would be justified, if we followed out the thoughts suggested by the prophet, in taking a wide range of observation. We might dwell specially upon the wrongs and injuries that have been practiced upon the African race by the rest of mankind. We might cite before the bar of pub-

lic opinion the slave trade, that foulest of all abominations, and by disclosing its deeds of cruelty, more flagitious than any other the world has ever heard, hold it up to universal abhorrence. We might excite public indignation, by exposing abuses practised upon that people, at the present day, by those from whom better things ought to be expected. But we refrain from these things. It is more consonant with our object, to inquire into the condition of the country, as affected by the prevalence of heathenism—and to ascertain by what means she may be raised up from her deep degradation, and be made to participate in the blessings of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The inhabitants of Western Africa, considered generally, are somewhat removed from that condition of society usually denominated the *savage state*, inasmuch as they have permanent habitations, are surrounded by herds of domestic animals, and depend for subsistence, mainly, upon agriculture. This statement, however, should be made with due qualification. Herds of domestic animals are kept, because they serve many important purposes, and maintain themselves, in a climate like that, without cost or care to their owners. The soil is cultivated, but in a very imperfect manner, and to an extent barely sufficient for their immediate personal wants. They construct houses that shield them from the scorching heats of a meridian sun, and from the chilling damps of night; but neither health, comfort, nor cheerfulness enter into any of their domestic arrangements. These possessions, and this mode of living, do not indicate, therefore, so much a relish for the improvements of civilized life, as aversion to the hardier and more perilous pursuits of the chase. The inhabitants of the country have made no progress in civilization. The condition of the country, in all important respects, is now substantially what it was three centuries ago; and we anticipate no improvement or amelioration, except such as shall result from the diffusion of Christianity.

There are no political organizations, in the maritime regions of Western Africa, that deserve to be dignified by the appellation of governments.

Villages are scattered over the country in every direction, at the distance of two, three, and four miles from each other, and varying in size from two or three hundred to

eight or ten thousand inhabitants. Each one of these villages, as a general thing, no matter how insignificant in the number of its inhabitants, or destitute of the means of defence, is entirely independent, and manages its internal concerns, without reference to any higher authority.

In imitation of what they have heard of the usages of European nations, and with the view of enhancing their importance in the estimation of foreigners, every village has its king, its prince, and its governor. But these distinguished personages, exercise none of the functions, and enjoy none of the emoluments of royalty; and indeed these titles are scarcely known, except in their intercourse with white men.

So far as there are resemblances to any of the known forms of government in the world, they are the extremes either of democracy or despotism. A specimen of the democratic form prevails at Cape Palmas, St. Andrews, and along the grain coast generally; and of the despotic, in Ashanti, in Dahomi, Lagos, and Cape Lopez.

At the last mentioned places, the authority of the chief, over the lives and property of his subjects, is absolute; and the deeds of barbarous cruelty that are constantly perpetrated, in obedience to the commands of these capricious tyrants, are too revolting to be recited.

Nor is the democratic form any better. Wherever it exists, it is, no doubt, the reaction of excessive despotism. But in a community where ignorance is universal, where moral restraint is unknown, and where the worst passions of men have uncontrolled sway, what could be expected but anarchy and oppression? The fact is, the people of Africa, every where, are strangers to the blessings of good government, and nothing but habit of long standing, and extreme insensibility of heart, can render their situation tolerable. It is doubtful whether a man in that country, ever composes himself to sleep at night, with a feeling of entire security. If he shall be so fortunate as to escape the machinations of witchcraft, which is supposed to be specially active in the night season, yet he knows not but he may rise from his bed in the morning, to witness a storm of lawless passion, that may not only strip him of every article of property he possesses, but may hurry him into the jaws of a cruel and violent death.

Nor is the peace of neighboring villages secured by any well established principles of international laws. Among those of the same neighborhood there are perpetual jealousies and strifes. The only point in which the people of any one village are ever heartily united among themselves, is their extreme hatred to their nearest neighbors. These antipathies are always heartily reciprocated, and necessarily lead to aggression and war, but without producing any beneficial results to either party, and without placing their political relations upon any better footing. The people of Africa seem incapable of forming themselves into extended political combinations; a fact that cannot be ascribed to their natural intractability, (for no people in the world, perhaps, are more easily governed,) but to a want of confidence in the integrity and ability of each other—to an excessive reliance upon their personal cunning, and still more perhaps than either, to their inability to see that the welfare of each individual is most effectually promoted, by securing the rights and interests of the whole. As a general thing the people live together in disorderly masses, without law, without legislation, without courts of justice, and without any kind of security, either of persons or property. If an enlightened and permanent government is ever established in that country, it must result from the diffusion of education—the spread of knowledge, and sentiments of patriotism, which Christianity alone can impart.

In point of morals, the condition of Africa is precisely what might be expected of any portion of the apostate race of man, utterly destitute, for centuries, of the influence of Christianity, and the restraints of morality. Selfishness, absolute selfishness, is the master passion of every heathen heart—the demon spirit which presides over every heathen community. It is not that chastened selfishness, however, which acknowledges the supremacy of law, and has regard to the rules of decency and propriety. In heathen countries it disregards all the conventional rules of society, and stretches forth its hand to appropriate everything desirable within its reach. The principles of justice, the rights of individuals, the rules of decency, the voice of humanity, the ties of kindred and friendship are trampled under foot with indiscriminate contempt. Theft, falsehood, fraud, deceit, duplicity, injustice, and oppression are favorite agents

and constant companions. Intemperance, licentiousness, gluttony, and debauchery furnish the aliment upon which it feeds—hatred, jealousy, and revenge pervade the air which it breathes, and is the atmosphere with which it is perpetually surrounded.

Now, when we reflect that this grasping, insatiable selfishness is not the spirit of one man alone, but is substantially the spirit which pervades and controls the mass of the people—when we reflect, further, that these conflicting and discordant elements are perpetually active, what must be the character of society formed under such auspices? To this question we have an ample, unequivocal answer, in the present moral condition of Western Africa. It is almost impossible to say what vice is preëminent among these degraded natives. Falsehood is universal: it may be safely said, that no man speaks the truth, who can find a motive for telling a lie. Theft is not only unrebuked, but when it is perpetrated for the public good, it receives the reward of public applause. Fraud is not only practised by every one, but the man who scruples to take advantage of another, when an opportunity offers, is regarded as deficient in manly worth. Intemperance is considered a lordly indulgence, and the only restraint which any one feels, in relation to this vice, is the want of ability to procure the means of intoxication. Chastity is a term for which they have no word in their language, and is a virtue of which they can scarcely form any conception. Envy, jealousy, and revenge enthrone themselves in every heart, and wield their triple sceptre with uncontrolled power.

We scarcely need turn aside to trace the practical operations of such principles upon society—suffice it to say, however, that there can be no confidence between man and man—no sympathy of interests, and no harmony of action—no man sees in the face of another “a friend or a brother.” Every man must be the sole guardian of his rights, his interests and property, and defend them against the evil designs of all around him. But we pass to the consideration of the *intellectual condition* of the country. Here, however, we can find nothing upon which the eye of humanity can rest with satisfaction. The African mind, though it may not possess all the peculiarities, or manifest the same amount of energy, activity and penetration, as have distinguished

the mind of other portions of the human race, is nevertheless capable of great improvement—much more so perhaps than is generally supposed, by those who wantonly under-rate its capabilities.

But, in their present ignorance and heathenism, it is freely admitted, that the intellectual faculties of the sons of Africa are obtuse and circumscribed, almost beyond conception. Their minds not only bear all the marks of ignorance and superstition, but of the deep degradation of centuries of neglect and inactivity.

None of the natives can read or write, except those who have been taught by the missionaries on that coast. Until recently they have had no books, no schools, and no systems of education; they have grown up, therefore, generation after generation, without any intellectual culture, and in the most abject ignorance.

A few local associations; a limited number of acquaintances, among their own people, (all equally ignorant;) some knowledge of the art of raising the bare necessities of life; a few traditionary stories handed down from father to son, and rehearsed in their social groups, as a pastime; and a superficial knowledge of the superstitious customs of their forefathers, comprise about the sum total of their stores of knowledge. Surrounded by an endless variety of outward objects, the native African knows but little about their properties, or their relation to each other. He knows nothing, and perhaps cares as little, about the origin or the destination of his species. He saunters through life, conscious that he shall exist hereafter, but strangely indifferent as to the nature or conditions of that existence. Every object in nature, upon which his eye rests, tells him that there is *one great first cause* of all things, but who he is, where he is, or what he requires of his rational creatures, are topics which seldom engage his thoughts, if they do not lie altogether beyond the ordinary range of his mental vision. He has marked the daily revolutions of the sun—he has gazed upon the bright moon, which cheers his nocturnal dance, and marks his seasons for him—he has watched the “state-ly march of the stars across the heavens,” but he has no adequate conceptions of the real grandeur of the heavenly bodies, and he is equally ignorant of the object for which they were created, or the laws by which their motions are

regulated. On all these points, the ideas of the most intelligent native on the coast of Africa, are not one particle more rational or dignified than the speculations of a child, in this country, of two or three years of age. Untrained to logical reasoning, and ignorant of the researches of science, the natives of Africa ascribe to every phenomenon in nature a mysterious origin. An eclipse of the sun is always portentous of some great calamity, and never fails to produce the utmost perturbation. They can see no connection between a lightning-rod and the transmission of electricity, and therefore this is always accounted the white man's charm. A leopard or an elephant that has invaded their premises and destroyed their property, is regarded as a malicious human being, metamorphosed, and an innocent man must pay his life as the forfeit of this absurd credulity. The powers ascribed to one who is supposed to possess the art of witchcraft are nothing short of *omnipotence*. He is supposed not only to hold dominion over all the elements of nature, but every object in the universe, which can possibly be converted into an instrument of harm to man, is supposed to come and go at his command. If the tempest spreads desolation over the face of nature — if the sea yawns and swallows its victim — if the lightning smites to the earth — if sickness invades the habitation of the living, and death bears away its prey, all is ascribed to the machinations of one of their fellow men, who possesses not one particle of power more than themselves.

Nor is the imbecility of the African mind less conspicuous in the undue importance which they attach to dreams. These are regarded as visitations from the dead, and the hints, cautions, admonitions, and advice, which are received through this medium have infinitely more weight in determining the general course of their conduct, than the clearest deductions of reason in their waking hours. Duties which no persuasion, no sense of shame, and no hope of gain could induce them to undertake, are cheerfully performed at the slightest instigation of a dream. Important enterprises are sometimes abandoned, long and fatiguing journeys are undertaken, houses are built, the streets and precincts of the largest villages are swept in obedience to the visions of the night. Nor are the results of these dreams

always harmless or mirthful. In many instances they are brought forward as evidence of the guilt of an accused man, and not unfrequently result in his condemnation and death. But we forbear to enlarge. In whatever point of light we contemplate the African mind, it presents little else than one inextricable maze of ignorance, credulity, and superstition, from which it can never be disengaged, except by the life-giving and light imparting influence of Christianity. •

But let us turn to the *social condition* of the country. And here we are met at the threshold of our inquiries, by the anomalous fact, of a people by nature preëminently social, and yet, in a practical point of view, entire strangers to all social happiness. And how shall this singular and anomalous fact be accounted for? The most comprehensive answer would be involved in ascribing it generally to the absence of true religion. But there are subordinate and more immediate agencies to which attention may be called. Among these may be mentioned the *existence of polygamy, the influence of the slave trade, and the prevailing belief in witchcraft.*

We shall not pretend to determine which of these has exerted the most powerful agency in undermining the social foundations of that unhappy land.

Polygamy is one of those forms of social evil, the disastrous influence of which can be fully comprehended by those only who have lived in the midst of it and seen its practical workings day by day.

In Africa, as in all countries where this practice prevails, the number of a man's wives, is the standard by which his importance in society is regulated; and as the love of distinction is natural to man—his strongest passion perhaps—every one adds as many wives to his train as he can, without regard to the peace and quiet of his household, and with as little forethought of the means by which they are to be supported. These matrimonial connexions, (if indeed they may be designated by this term,) are formed without any affection for their basis, and are afterwards regulated by no sound principles, either of morality or expediency. The wife performs the commands of her husband, not from sentiments of affection, nor from any enlightened sense of duty, but because he has the physical power to compel her

obedience; and perhaps the strongest detestation that ever occupies the heart of an African woman, is towards the companion of her bosom and the father of her children.

Nor is the relative position of the women of the same household, arranged on any better principles. A number of women are thrown together, without adequate means of support, without previous acquaintance or personal attachments, without the faculty of forming new friendships, and totally unaccustomed to govern their passions; what could be expected from the congregation of such discordant elements, but strifes, jealousies, and endless bickerings?

Nor are these the only bitter fruits of polygamy. The practice itself, is equally a violation of the order of nature and the law of God, and cannot therefore be otherwise than prolific of all sorts of social disorder. In communities where it prevails, and especially in Africa, where all the joints of society hang so loosely, conjugal fidelity is unknown,—chastity is not regarded as a virtue, and deception, insincerity, and the most indiscriminate profligacy have the countenance of universal practice.

These are the schools, too, in which each succeeding generation begins and ends its moral training. Should it occasion surprise, therefore, that the inhabitants of that land have reached the lowest abyss of moral debasement?

The prevailing belief in *witchcraft*, is not less prejudicial to the social well-being of Africa. We have already alluded to this belief, as illustrating the obliquity of the African mind, and must recur to it again, to exhibit its influence upon the social character of the country. This idea or belief, is of such long standing,—is of such constant recurrence, and is so intimately interwoven with all their actions, their projects, their reasonings and their speculations, that it seems to form an essential part, both of their mental and moral constitution.

Of course, we cannot give an extended exposition of this somewhat natural but most absurd belief. It ascribes to those who are supposed to possess this mysterious and hateful art, power not only over the health and lives, but over the property and fortunes of all around them. Every event in life, if adverse or calamitous, is ascribed to this malignant agency. Sickness, no matter what its type or how contracted, the loss of property, no matter by what means or

under what circumstances of mismanagement, the disappointment of cherished hopes, however extravagant or unreasonable they may have been; the loss of friends by death, except it be the result of extreme old age, are indiscriminately ascribed to some one who is supposed to exercise this mysterious power. A death seldom occurs in one of their villages, that is not atoned for by the life of some one else. Other feelings than those of heartfelt sorrow, are awakened by the sound of the death drum. It is the voice of the accuser, that sends a thrill of concern to every heart. No man is exempt from the suspicion of having caused that death. To fly from the scene of anticipated danger, is a virtual confession of the charge of guilt. Uprightness of character and benevolence of heart afford no shield; the intimacy of friendship and the endearments of kindred ties, are alike unavailing; suspicion *may* fasten upon the son as the perpetrator of his father's death; the *mother* (Christian mothers, hear it!) the mother may be the victim upon which popular fury shall seize, as the destroyer of her own offspring.

How the inhabitants of Africa have any repose at all, is a matter of surprise to all who are familiar with their superstitious creed. Beings differently constituted, in their circumstances, would be utterly miserable and wretched. The senseless expedients to which they resort, not only to shield themselves from the power of witchcraft itself, but from the suspicion of practising against others, (for the one is to be deprecated as much as the other,) is scarcely credible of rational beings. Their persons, their houses, and almost every article of property, are not only guarded by *feteishes*, but a man must be careful what path he walks, whose house he enters, on what stool he sits, where he sleeps, and what he touches. A glass of water may not be taken into his hand, or a particle of food tasted, until the ceremony of what is called "taking off the feteish," is performed. The hair of the head and the pairings of the toes and fingers are concealed with studied care; and notwithstanding all these and ten thousand other expedients, yet more silly and stupid, these miserable people enjoy no sense of security. They are wretched and miserable among themselves, and know not where to turn for relief. Having forsaken God, the fountain of living waters, they have nothing left to them but broken cisterns that can hold no water.

But whatever desolations may have been made in the social condition of Africa, by the existence of polygamy and the prevailing belief in witchcraft, it has been reserved to the foreign *slave trade* to complete the work of ruin. Much has been said and written, and perhaps without material exaggeration, about the "horrors of the middle passage"—the merciless waste of human life, both before and after the embarkation of the unfortunate victims of this traffic. But these, after all, are but the lesser evils of this nefarious trade. It is upon the moral and social condition of the country, that it has inflicted its severest, most enduring and deadliest wound. The sufferings and misery, which result from this traffic, to those who have been violently torn from their homes, and transported to foreign countries, revolting as they are to every sentiment of justice and humanity, are nevertheless transient in their nature—they may be forgotten—they may be overruled by a wise and merciful Providence to their good and salvation. But who shall measure the length and breadth and depth of that torrent of iniquity which has thereby been let loose upon the mother country? Who shall devise a name for that terrible scourge, which has traversed the land in every direction, and has almost deprived the inhabitants of the attributes of humanity? Where shall a parallel be found for that monster, which having undermined all the deep foundations of society, dissolved the bonds of friendly alliance between neighboring villages, and destroyed the peace of families, *pauses because there is no more work of destruction?* What is there, it may be asked, ennobling in human nature, upon which its polluting, unhallowed influence has not been exerted. Aye! it has invaded the sanctuary of a mother's heart, and by tempting her cupidity, has made her a traitor to her own offspring. Strange and almost incredible as it may seem, yet it is a matter of no rare occurrence, that an African mother, for a gallon of rum and a few yards of cloth, will sell her own child.

It remains for us to take a hasty review of the *religious condition* of the country. And here we are constrained to observe, that whatever humanity may see in her social misery and mental degradation to deplore, Christianity will find in her religious condition, a theme for still more intense commiseration.

The forms of false religion in Western Africa, may be classed under three heads. 1st. *The Worship of Evil Spirits.* 2d. *The Worship of Reptiles;* and 3d. *Image Worship, or the Worship of Ancestry.*

1st. Image Worship, or *the Worship of Ancestry*, is practised at the Gaboon, at Cape Lopez, at Congo, and perhaps to a greater or less extent, over the whole of the Southern portion of the African continent. Images, carved out of wood, are set up in the secret corners of their dwellings, and are treated as the representatives of deceased ancestors, whose memories are held in veneration. Offerings of food and drink are stately carried to them, as expressions of filial affection; and their aid is often invoked, especially in times of perplexity and distress. The influence of this, like every other species of idolatry, necessarily stupifies the mind; but it is less hurtful than the other forms of religion in the country, inasmuch as it promotes a lively sense of a future existence, and softens the character of the people, by exciting and cherishing feelings of filial and parental affection.

The *homage paid to reptiles*, is confined mainly to those regions of country bordering on the Gulf of Benin. At Dixcove, the crocodile is a sacred animal; the snake is worshipped at Whydah and Popo; the guana is an object of religious veneration at Benin, and the shark at Calabar. At the last mentioned place, human victims are stately offered to these voracious monsters of the deep.

But *Devil worship is the religion of Africa.* With some unimportant variations, it is practised in all parts of the country. Its object is to court the favour, or ward off the displeasure of evil spirits, with whom they fancy themselves to be constantly surrounded. They offer such homage only as is dictated by their avarice or prompted by their guilty fears. We need scarcely turn aside, to point out the influence of such a religion upon the moral character of the people. If it be true, and it undoubtedly is, that our moral characters constantly assimilate to the character of the Being we worship, it follows as a necessary consequence, that African character has been approximating for centuries, to a model the most hideously immoral and depraved the human imagination can conceive; and here is at once the secret cause of all that cunning, duplicity, and cruelty, that have ever characterized this people. The lineaments of the

divine image have been effectually effaced from their hearts, whilst those of the spirits of the infernal pit, have been drawn with too bold a hand to be mistaken or misapprehended.

In nothing are the debasement and worthlessness of this religion more palpable, than in the fact that it has no reference to the improvement of the heart, and makes no pretensions to conduct mankind to a happier state of being in the world to come. In this respect, it falls short even of all other Pagan religions. Intent upon securing some temporal good, or of avoiding some impending evil, it blots out from the mind of man all thought of the future. So completely does it engage the thoughts of men with the things of this transient world, that eternity is lost sight of, God is forgotten, and the immortality of the soul becomes a mere inoperative speculation. We think of the millions of Asia, as fellow creatures panting after higher good, but pitifully misled as to the means of attaining that good; but of the degraded inhabitants of Africa, as fellow beings who have sunk too low to care for the salvation of their souls.

They believe in the existence of *one Supreme Being*; his name is constantly upon their lips, but they no where offer him any kind of religious worship, nor have they any suitable conceptions of his mysterious and glorious character. On the contrary, their conceptions of him are the most grovelling that can be conceived.*

The belief in a future existence is common, if not universal, but they have no definite ideas of what is to be their condition in another world. In relation to the great and

* 1st. Once after preaching at Graway, (the first sermon the people had ever heard,) I told my interpreter to tell the people that I was now going to pray to God, when he turned upon me a look of unutterable surprise, and said, "God cannot hear you—he is not close here—he is far away."

I was asked once by a native of considerable intelligence, "if God drank rum." He was an intemperate man, and could conceive of no higher happiness than the feeling of intoxication.

By another native, not less respectable, I was asked "what kind of a hat God wore." He was a vain man, and no doubt transferred his feelings of vanity to the Supreme Being.

By a woman, I heard it remarked that the old God must be dead, and a new one taken his place, for that she and her people were once rich and had many vessels to visit their town; but that now they were poor and forsaken by white men—whilst others, who were then poor and insignificant, have since risen to favour and wealth.

glorious light of the Gospel, the inhabitants of Africa generally, are as profoundly ignorant as if no such light had broken upon the world. They sit in the region and shadow of death, as unmoved and as unblessed, as if no Saviour had been born,—as if no atonement had been made,—as if no Gospel had been proclaimed to a dying world.

This then, *is a sketch of the moral condition of Africa.* Contemplated, therefore, from any point of view, Africa presents little else to the eye of humanity, than one vast continent of sin, misery, and superstition. No race of men in the world, perhaps, are endowed with stronger social propensities, and yet in that land social happiness is a term without a meaning. Possessed of intellectual faculties, if not of the highest, yet of a respectable order, and unquestionably capable of great improvement; yet the African mind is completely buried in superstition and ignorance.

No people in the world have a stronger *religious bias*; and yet up to the present moment their religious propensities are prostituted to the most pitiable and grovelling forms of idolatry in the world.

Occupying as she does, a central and advantageous position in the geographical world, and possessing unbounded natural resources, she ought to take a high stand among the nations of the earth; but is nevertheless, and justly too, regarded as one of the poorest and most degraded portions of the globe. Her shores, for three centuries, have witnessed little else than one unvaried scene of plunder, rapine and blood; and the most painful and anomalous feature in the picture is, that Africa herself has not only countenanced, but has even participated in this conspiracy against her own peace and happiness.

When we cast our eyes over this great continent, to which Providence has assigned so central a position on our globe—when we remember the complete obscurity in which the history of the great mass of her inhabitants, is involved—the entire absence of all traces of former greatness—when we remember the protracted moral darkness that has overshadowed that land—the deep degradation in which her children have been involved for centuries—the scenes of violence and cruelty that have been enacted upon her shores—the contempt and disgust with which that people have been treated by all the rest of the world. When we re-

member how her sons and daughters have been "peeled and scattered"—"meted out and trodden under foot" by the rest of mankind, we are constrained to ask, why has all this been permitted, under the government of a wise and merciful Providence? To what great results in the moral government of God, are all these things tending?

We know of but one probable solution, and that is, that as Africa has heretofore been the scene, upon which have been enacted the foulest deeds ever perpetrated by man, so it is to become the theatre upon which shall be displayed the most illustrious triumphs of Divine grace, that the world has ever witnessed. These views are not only founded in reason, and are strictly analagous with the providence God, but they are amply authorized by his word.

It can scarcely be expected that we could enter into any detailed speculations, in relation to the probable character and efficiency of the African race, under the influence of Christianity. Let it be summarily stated, however, that if they never discover the same amount of energy and enterprize as that evinced by other races, they will be behind none in the fervor of their love and the steadiness of their zeal. If they shall be among the last to receive the blessings of the Gospel, they will be unsurpassed in their devout and steady adherence to the cause of their Saviour.

But the *great question*, the one which most immediately concerns us is, how is this great change in her moral condition to be brought about? This is a question from which no friend of the Redeemer should avert his eyes. * * *

It will not be attained by the operation of any active, inherent principle in herself. Of her own insufficiency, we have had ample proof in her past history. If left to herself, her future progress, as has been her past, must be perpetually downward.

Nor will it result from the suppression of the slave-trade, as devoutly as this object is to be desired. The extinction of this traffic, may relieve the land from many of its sufferings—it may prepare the way for a better state of things—but it can never rectify the moral and social disorder of that unhappy land.

Nor will the development of her commercial resources necessarily effect any important change, either in her moral or religious condition. On the contrary, modern commerce,

though an invaluable, and in some respects an indispensable auxiliary to the cause of missions, yet, if it goes forth unattended by Christianity, it goes to curse, and not to bless. Abundant proofs of this are not now wanting on the coast of Africa.

Nor will any other secular enterprize, or even any moral or religious enterprize, which unavoidably involves much of a secular character, effect the renovation of the land. They may have their use—they may effect indirect and subordinate good—they may follow in the footsteps of Christianity, and turn to good account the new life which she shall stir up, but of themselves they are utterly impotent to awaken the dormant energies of a heathen mind. * * *

It is reserved to the *preaching of the Gospel*—that simple, but powerful and divinely appointed instrumentality to effect this great object. The more tenaciously and exclusively we cling to this, the more surely and the more speedily will the great end be attained. Let us relax our hold upon this, or let us turn aside to any of the expedients of human device, and we put farther off the great object for which we labour; we are taking steps, that must be retraced by ourselves, or others, who shall be wiser than ourselves; and what is still worse, we shall leave that people, for the present at least, in all the misery and hopelessness of heathenism.

We conclude with a single reflection—and that is, *what we propose to do for Africa should be done speedily*. There never was, and there never will be, perhaps, a more favorable crisis for the introduction of Christianity into that land. The providence of God is before us, preparing the way, and if we do not fall in, and coöperate in the work, it must be ten-fold more difficult at any subsequent period. The adversary watches the movements of Providence there, with an untiring and sleepless eye. If the openings that are now made in his kingdom, for the establishment of Christianity, are not speedily occupied by us, his forces will be concentrated there with redoubled power.

But of all the evil agencies at work, none are to be more dreaded than the workings of *heathenism itself*. It is common remark of the present day, that the heathen world is as depraved now, as it was in the days of Paul. But this does not meet the case. It is *worse* now, than it was then.

There are but few modern missionaries who cannot testify to the existence of forms of human depravity among the heathen of the present day, of which there is no mention in the Apostle's category, and of which perhaps there was no existence in his day. And is it unnatural or improbable, that such should be the case? Can it be supposed that the heathen world has not been made worse, by the unrestrained, unqualified workings of *heathenism*, for eighteen centuries? What is modern heathenism, but human depravity embodied, and tottering with old age. But let it be borne in mind, that although it may appear to us to be decrepid with age, and on the borders of dissolution, this is only a disguise. Yea, it is operating at the present moment, with undiminished energy. The depth of infamy and pollution to which heathen tribes have already reduced themselves, can scarcely be conceived. To what they are yet to attain, if not wrested from the powers of darkness, God only knows. When we reflect upon their deep degradation, their vices, their crimes, and their excesses, we cease to wonder that they are beginning to disappear from the face of the earth. We see in their gradual extinction, the fulfilment of Divine threatenings—the hand of exhausted forbearance—the operation of natural laws, in cause and effect.

But all this accumulated guilt of the heathen, and this fearful depopulation in their ranks, are chargeable to the neglect of those who ought to have sent them the Gospel. We have in our hands the means of arresting these disastrous evils, but we have not applied it. Every day the work is put off, but renders it the more difficult to be performed. What, therefore, we would do, let us do without delay.

ARTICLE IV.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE DOCTRINE OF IMPUTED SIN.

No fact is capable of stricter proof than the universal existence of sin. The uniform testimony of conscience, the various expiatory rites which enter into every system of

worship among men, the stringent restraints of human law, the universal prevalence of suffering and death in their almost endless diversity of forms, and the direct testimony of the Bible—are all separate, but certain, lines of evidence. From whatever point in the circle of inquiry we start, by one or other of these radii we are conducted to the great central fact that man is a sinner: always and everywhere, in all changes of time, place and circumstance, it is an ever-present characteristic of him that he sins. But the induction stops not here: this truth reached, we press behind it and generalize a more sweeping and startling conclusion, that this universality of sin is due to a sinful nature lying behind the act and prompting it—which nature every human being brings with him into existence. The proof of this latter position is exceedingly short to those who bow with reverence before the authority of Scripture: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." To those, however, who are presumptuous enough to decline this inspired testimony, we affirm that upon principles of sound philosophy, a rigid induction of particular facts will lead the inquirer to the same result. For if we regard sin merely as one of the phenomena which we observe in the world around us, like any other effect, it must be assigned to an adequate cause. If the effect be universal, the cause likewise must be all-pervading and universal: and no universal cause, at all satisfactory, can be named other than a sinful nature, whose necessary development, under all conceivable circumstances, must be sin and only sin. Thus even philosophy brings us upon the grand division of sin made by theologians into actual, and original. These terms define themselves: the former embraces all transgressions of the law of God, both of omission and commission, whether of thought, word or deed: the latter is the sin of our nature, which we bring with us from our own original, and is itself the origin of all our actual offences.

The reader stands now upon the threshold of the gravest inquiry which can possibly engage his thoughts: how come all men into the possession of this depraved nature, by virtue of which they are sinners from their very birth? Does sin form an essential part of the original constitution of this world? Is this sinful nature the immediate product

of the Deity, resulting from his active efficiency? Is man a sinner because God made him such? Surely it were frantic blasphemy to say so: all the perfections of God—his wisdom, his goodness, his power, his holiness—are impeached by the supposition. The only remaining hypothesis philosophy cannot clothe in better language than this of Scripture: "God hath made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions." The same process of reasoning, which leads to the inference of a universal deluge in the material world, would establish the inference of a convulsion just as great in the moral. Geologists observe the continuity of the earth's surface frequently interrupted; they discover shells and the bones of marine animals upon mountain tops where they could never be except by transportation; they observe valleys and deep ravines where, judging from the stratification of the earth and the configuration of adjacent hills, the surface was once uniform and level: facts numerous and strong enough to infer some mighty shock of nature occasioning these irregularities. When, therefore, the most ancient records detail the account of a universal deluge, sound philosophy simply requires that the phenomena shall be compared with this fact, and the latter proved adequate to occasion the former, in order to settle the creed of geology upon these points forever. Thus in the case before us: it being certain from the divine perfections, and from the plain testimony of Scripture, that God made man holy and in his own image, the universal corruption of the race can only be explained upon the supposition of some mighty and dismal shock which has shattered the human nature into the ruin we now behold. When, therefore, the Scriptures reveal the sin of the first man, we find in his dreadful apostasy that moral convulsion which has thrown his unhappy race, broken and blasted, under the avenging wrath of Heaven. The competency of this one sin to draw after it this awful consequence—as the immortal Milton sings,

Of man's first disobedience and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world and all our woe—

will appear in the progress of this article; thus fulfilling

the last requirement even of an exacting and sceptical philosophy.

Thus far every mode of inquiry we adopt leads to the same conclusion : if, with a teachable faith, we abide by the testimony of Scripture, this instructs us, that "by one man sin entered into the world:" if with a bolder spirit we throw ourselves upon the inductive process, the last generalization places us upon the same platform. We have however reached at last a point where philosophy must extinguish her torch, and sit with a veiled face before the oracles of God, meekly learning what she cannot discover. How is it that the fall of Adam passes a sinful nature down to his posterity, a bitter and inalienable inheritance? The final reply—which exhausts all inquiry—is furnished from the Scriptures. Let the reader fix his eye upon the fifth chapter of Romans, and he learns that the first offence of the first man is reckoned to his race: ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, εἰς κατάχρημα, &c. "As by the offence of one, (or it may read, as through one offence,) judgment came upon all men to condemnation." A reason then is here assigned, which goes to the roots of the case. Sin exists universally, because all have a sinful nature : and a sinful nature is possessed by all, because by the established ordinance of God, Adam's one offence was the offence of all : all men, therefore, together with the great representative offender, were brought under divine wrath, which of necessity separated them at once from holiness. As in a remoter stage of our inquiry we fell upon the theological distinction of actual and original sin, so now we are brought into one more acute and subtle, the distinction made by divines between original sin imputed, and original sin inherent : the first consisting of this imputation of Adam's sin ; and the second, of that sinful nature which is the consequent of this imputation. This distinction is clearly drawn in the familiar language of the catechism, which we quote as far as necessary : "The sinfulness of that estate wherinto man fell, consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature ; which is commonly called original sin," &c. Here are presented, and in their natural order, the two integral parts of original sin ; the first term indicating it as imputed,

the third term indicating it as inherent, while the middle term, as a vinculum, connects the two, and exhibits the one as resulting from the other.

Placing the reader upon the outermost circumference of this inquiry, he finds himself wound within the circle, and drawn by each generalization nearer to the centre. All investigation terminates upon this fixed and final fact, unresolvable by further analysis, of imputation. The whole account of sin hinges here: by a particular constitution, (into the nature of which we shall have occasion soon to enter,) Adam's sin was the sin of his posterity: and the reckoning of it to them lies behind all explanation, as the *ultima ratio* of the corruption of man's whole nature. If, then, we invite the reader to a special consideration of this, it is not an idle speculation, a mere balancing of straws, to which he is referred. This doctrine of imputation is the only key fitted to the wards of that difficult, and otherwise locked question, the existence of sin. It affords the only true solution of man's present state; and thus becomes alike interesting to the curious, who wish merely to penetrate the secret of their condition, and to the pious, who would know in order to be released. This doctrine lies equally at the foundation of the whole scheme of redemption revealed in the Gospel: the mystery of which is opened to us in the words, "he was made sin for us." The sins of all the elect were imputed to Christ, and thus he bore the penalty for them: in like manner, all his "obedience unto death," was reckoned to them, so that there is no condemnation. The whole justification of the believer is unrolled from this double or reciprocal imputation, on the one hand of their sins to Christ, and on the other hand of Christ's righteousness to them. Both are conducted upon the same eternal principles of justice and of law; and both find their complete illustration in the reckoning of Adam's sin to his natural seed. To inquire here, then, puts us in possession of a principle which will lead us down to the granite foundations of a saved sinner's hope.

It will be our aim now to show that the cause of our condemnation and the cause of our depravity, is that single offence of Adam, committed by him in eating the forbidden fruit, and which becomes ours by a strict and proper legal imputation. The first proof of this will be drawn from the

fact that God entered into a special covenant with Adam, in which he was appointed the representative and head of his posterity. If this compact shall be established, the inference of the imputation of Adam's sin will appear but as the inevitable result of the whole constitution. It will be needful to elaborate this point, for two reasons: first, because being most usually assumed by Calvinistic writers as an admitted truth, many persons, who have not access to works in which this subject is systematically treated, have found themselves perplexed in drawing out the proof: and, secondly, because it is denied by gainsayers in so challenging a tone. Whitby, for example, inter alios, in his treatise upon election and reprobation, denounces the doctrine of Adam's Federal relation thus: * "The Holy Scripture is perfectly silent in every part and tittle of this *school divinity*; it hath not one word of this free decree, or this dismal compact with Adam, or I know not who; not one iota of our propagation from the loins of Adam more than from the womb of our mother Eve, the 'mother of all living;' or that he bore the person of all mankind more than she bore the person of all womankind; or of any decree, that Adam's posterity should be charged with the guilt of any sin personally committed by him, rather than the woman with the sin of Eve; or that they should be charged only with his first, not with his following transgressions; or, that his guilt should be imputed to them, rather than his repentance." In like manner, discoursing in another treatise upon the imputation of Christ's righteousness, he says: † "This proposition is founded upon a chimerical covenant between God the Father and the Son, of which there is not the least item in the Holy Scriptures; so that the whole scheme of this doctrine, being built upon this vain imagination, must be also vain." This bold language, striking at the whole doctrine of the covenants, held by one justly considered 'primus inter primores' of the Arminian school, makes up as fair an issue as we can desire, and justifies on our part a close scrutiny of this point. The question is one simply of fact: was Adam made the federal representative of the human race by

* Discourses upon the Five Points, p. 72.

† Patrick, Lowth, &c. Commentary on the Scriptures, new edition, vol. 4th, p. 669.

the special constitution of God himself? Two dilemmas will exhaust the suppositions which are possible in the case: the arrangement made with Adam was either a dispensation merely of law, or it was of the nature of a free compact: if the latter, then it was formed with Adam as a single and private person simply, or with him as a public and responsible trustee, acting for others beside himself. We will attend to these in the order named. As to the first, it is promptly admitted that Adam was under a dispensation of law: as a moral being, he could not be otherwise than subject to a rule which should not only be the guide of his conduct, but also the test and regulator of his nature. This law or rule lay over against those very faculties which constituted him a moral being, and gave occasion to their first exercise; and then as an unchanging standard stood up to them the perfect measure of obligation. This statement seems to us fully to meet the objection frequently raised against the Adamic covenant, that in Scripture it is so often termed a law. With great propriety it is so called; for Adam was a being necessarily under law: the first breath which he drew commenced that career of accountability, which could only be terminated by the annihilation of those powers which were requisite to his moral agency. What we contend for is, that it was not an arrangement *merely* of law; it was law, but law reduced to the form of covenant. We are greatly deceived if the reader is not made soon to perceive the distinct characteristics of both; as Dr. Ridgley truly distinguishes: * "let it be considered that the dispensation Adam was under had two ideas included in it, which are not opposite to or inconsistent with each other, namely, that of a law and a covenant. * * * * * And therefore the dispensation may justly take its denomination from one or the other idea; provided, when one is mentioned, the other be not excluded. If we call it a law, it was such a law as had a promise of superadded blessedness annexed to it: or if we, on the other hand, call it a covenant, it had, notwithstanding, the obligation of a law, since it was made with a subject who was bound, without his arbitrary choice in this matter, to fulfil the demands thereof."

* Body of Divinity, vol. 2, p. 85.

The first thing which strikes us, in reading the brief history given in Genesis ii : 16, 17, is the limitation of Adam's obedience to one single particular : " of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat ; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it." Here nothing is said of a law of nature covering the whole area of man's responsibility : but a single precept is given—obedience enjoined only upon one point. Are we then rashly to conclude, as some have done, that Adam knew no other command than this ? that there was no law of nature separate from this, which as a moral being he must recognize ? Most surely not : the moment Adam was created, he sustained, as a moral being, definite moral relations to God, and these were summed and represented in an immutable moral law. As already argued, we cannot separate a perfect law from the fact of moral agency, because without that there could be no exercise of this. To deny the existence of a natural law, which should express to Adam all his moral relations, and be the exact measure of his accountability, is simply to deny that he was a moral being. If then, from the instant of his creation, Adam was subject to that unchangeable moral law, under which we his descendants lie, what use was this superadded precept designed to serve, and what relation, if any, did it sustain to the preëxisting law of nature ? Upon the hypothesis that the Adamic dispensation was one of simple law, these questions will not soon be answered. All that was necessary to such a dispensation, was the endowment of man with moral faculties, and the discovery to him of an adequate moral law : and by the term adequate, we mean a law whose precepts and whose sanctions shall be coextensive with the whole nature it is designed to regulate. Under a strict legal dispensation, moreover, the probation of man would be unlimited. The law simply tells him his duty, and states clearly the hazard of disobedience. As there can be no discharge from the obligation to obey, the law must continue to lay its injunctions without a limit upon the conscience, and obedience is always rendered within view of the penalty. Whatever then puts a limitation to man's probation, shutting it up within a definite period, must be aside from the province of law, and come by virtue of a special arrangement. Now, we ask what important use could this positive command serve to

Adam, considering him as exclusively under the jurisdiction of God's law? Is it answered that in this one prohibition the whole moral law was summed up and thus given to Adam in the briefest compass? * Very true: but what occasion is there for this short-hand edition of the law? The entire code, touching upon every point of his accountability and engraved upon his nature, could be known as easily and be as well comprehended as this condensed precept itself. Is it further urged, that this precept was designed as the memorial of God's supremacy, since obedience is enjoined in what is in itself wholly indifferent? or simply as a memento of man's emptiness and want until furnished with gifts by the author of all good? Collaterally, indeed, it may answer this purpose: in the beautiful language of Boston, "this forbidden tree was a sign of emptiness, hung before the door of the creation, with this inscription, 'this is not your rest.'" Yet, surely there is no need of a special institute to teach the very lesson which is conveyed by the law of nature itself, the supremacy of God and the insufficiency of the creature.

But let us suppose now that God wishes to place man upon a limited probation, and to make all its conditions favorable to him; he must make a special arrangement to this end. He says to Adam, at present all your blessings are conditional, and the law does not provide but that they shall be so perpetually. In my benevolence, I will now assign a period to your probation: at the expiration of a given time, if you remain steadfast in your loyalty, all these blessings shall be secured to you without the contingency arising from conditions: and to facilitate your accomplishment of this probation, I make this single prohibition the exponent of my authority: I compress the whole law within it: all your energies are to be concentrated upon it; all the temptations to which you shall be subject, shall be confined to it; and this shall be recognized in our compact as the test of your loyalty and love. In this case now, the superadded precept answers a specific purpose. It does not supersede

* See Boston's Four Fold State, p. 87, edition of the Board. Also the Marrow of Modern Divinity, part 1, chap. 1, in both which it is shown how all the ten commandments were broken at once in the breach of this command.

the law of nature, nor does it eke out its moral teachings; but it is the acknowledged test of man's obedience and subjection. This argument we do not offer as *positively concluding* the existence of a covenant between God and man: for the test might have a place even under the law, and man might be subjected to it through an indefinite probation. But the fact that it answers no important end under such a dispensation, and that it fills so important an office under a covenant, as to seem even necessary to it, affords at least a strong *presumption* in favor of the latter. The limitation and facilitation of man's probation, must certainly be provided for by a special arrangement, since they both lie without the province of simple law.

Again, we argue the federal nature of this dispensation from the fact that we find in it all the parts of a covenant. It has indeed been objected that the word covenant is not applied to this transaction in the history given of it. To this, a fit reply has been furnished by the author* of the *Marrow of Modern Divinity*:† “God does not tie men to verbal expressions, but doth often contract the covenant in real impressions in the heart and frame of the creature: and this was the manner of covenanting with man at the first.” Boston also silences the objection, by showing that on the same ground we may‡ “deny the doctrine of the Trinity and sacraments, because those words do not occur where these things are treated of in Scripture, nay, are not to be found in the Scripture at all.” We may add, that just as reasonably might we conclude that Adam was not placed even under a law, because this term is not employed in the immediate narrative. But if we discover all the constituent parts of a law and a covenant, the mere absence of the technical designation is wholly immaterial. Can we then draw out from the history all the elements which make up the essence of a covenant? These elements are, separate parties acting freely—mutual stipulations between them—and seals ratifying the instrument, so that it may be pleaded in law.

In this enumeration, the threatening of death is not in-

* Said to be one Edward Fisher, who wrote about 1644. See M'Kerrow's *History of the Secession Church*, vol. 1, p. 14.

† *Marrow of Divinity*, part 1, chap. 1.

‡ *Boston on the Covenants*, vol. 2, p. 16.

cluded: not, however, because we do not regard this as being actually the sanction of the Adamic covenant, but because we now confine the reader's attention to those characteristics of a covenant which distinguish it from law. Boston seems to regard the sanction of death as peculiar to the covenant. He says: * "God put to the natural law a promise of eternal life and a threatening of death, and so it became a covenant of works." This language is ambiguous: if it implies simply that God incorporated the sanction of the law, so that it became also the sanction of the covenant, this would be exactly our own view. But if it means, that the threatening had no existence at all until the covenant was formed, so as to be one of *its* distinguishing properties, we must demur. The latter opinion, he seems to state without ambiguity, in his notes upon the Marrow: † "indeed he (the author of the Marrow) is not of opinion that a penal sanction is inseparable from the law of nature; that would put the glorified saints and confirmed angels in heaven—to say nothing more—under a penal sanction too; * * * * * *there is no place for a penal sanction where there is no possibility of transgression.*" With all our deference for the godly men who bore such an honourable testimony for the truth in an age of corruption and strife, we must be allowed to enter a dissent from this proposition. We cannot see but that the separation of a penal sanction from the law of nature sinks the latter into a mere institute. We have been accustomed to regard the two essential elements of law as being direction and obligation; and that while the first is expressed in the precept, the second is embodied in the penalty. To this statement, in the main, Boston and the Marrow men would readily assent, as may be seen from their answers to the third and fourth queries propounded by the Commission of the General Assembly. Yet, they evidently consider this obligation, ‡ "resulting from the nature of God and of the creature, and being eternal and immutable," as not requiring any formal embodiment in the law itself. To us, on the contrary, it seems that this obligation must have a formal expression in

* Boston on the Covenants, vol. 2, p. 32.

† Marrow of Modern Divinity, part 1, chap. 3.

‡ Answer to query 4th of the Commission.

the law, and that it is embodied in the penal sanction: so that to suppress this, would be to separate obligation from law, to destroy its formal nature, and to degrade it into mere advisory counsel. Besides, in our judgment, the Marrow men seem not to distinguish between the penalty, as it simply lies in the law the exponent of the lawgiver's authority, and as it is drawn forth in active exercise upon the offender: for in their answer to query 3d. of the Commission, they say: "as for the other consequent act of the law, to curse and to punish, this is but an accidental act, not necessary to a law, for it comes in upon supposition of transgression." A being surely may be secured from the penalty, as in the case of glorified saints and confirmed angels, and still the penalty remain an essential element of the law he is under. Indeed, the very confirmation in question, is predicated in part upon the existence of a penalty: for the term confirmation is a relative term, and suggests the corresponding ideas of holiness and security. If the former of these stands related to the sin which might be committed, the latter should stand related to the peril which might be incurred. So far as the glorified saints are concerned, we do know that their security turns upon the very fact that Christ bore the penalty in their stead. *Their* confirmation, consequently, must include the idea of a penalty which has been satisfied. This last thought, too, suggests another and fatal objection to the view of the Marrow men above presented: which is, that if the penalty forms no integral part of the law of nature, the absolute necessity for an atonement in order to the pardon of sin disappears. We have been accustomed to build the proposition, "without the shedding of blood there is no remission," upon the very nature of God as a holy being, which imperatively requires the punishment of sin. But we are at a loss in making out this absolute and a priori necessity, unless it be written upon the face of that original law, which reveals the nature and perfections of God, as well as his particular relations to his creatures. Briefly, then, our own opinion is, that the whole law, consisting of precepts and penalty, was incorporated into the covenant: the precepts were condensed into one prohibition, and the penalty went into and formed the sanction of the covenant. We enlarge no further, because a

penalty is not of the essence of a covenant—if made between parties who are equal, it properly would have no place: but as one of these parties was a subject, it is proper that the same sanction should guard the covenant, which fenced the law; in order that man, while rejoicing in the benefits of God's condescension, might still remember his supremacy, and never forget to render the grateful tribute of a dependent being.

It is time now to return to the three characteristics already named, as differencing a covenant from a dispensation of law. We clearly have the two parties, God and the first man. But the difficulty is raised, that one of the parties could not possibly act freely. He was not only a subject to the other party, but that very law, under which he was placed, formed the substance of the covenant: how, under these circumstances, was he competent to form a treaty? This inquiry assumes a principle which is false in fact, and there lies the fallacy of the argument it seems to state; which is, that obligation destroys freedom. Why, this principle would render impossible all obedience of law: for no compliance with law is obedience, if it be not spontaneous and free: and yet it is of the very essence of law that it binds duty upon the conscience. The fact is, all Adam's obedience, so long as he continued holy, was free, because his nature was in such harmony with that of his Maker, that his choice could not be otherwise than in the channel of duty. The certainty of his obedience, arose from no constraint upon his will, bending it forcibly from its own direction, but from the polarity (if we may so speak) of the will itself, by which it swung in free motion towards the law which governed it. So in this case: Adam could not but agree to any compact which God should propose: for God could propose nothing inconsistent with his own holiness: and the nature of Adam beat so true to that, of his own motion he would choose all the terms of such a compact. We go therefore much beyond the difficulty raised above, when we affirm not only that *obligation* does not interfere with choice, but that even a strict *moral necessity* does not. Nay, if it were not for the digression, it could be shown that no other foundation exists for the liberty of a moral being but this very necessity which is supposed to

destroy it. Again, why should not Adam assent to the terms of this covenant? they are singularly liberal and advantageous. His probation, which under the law was indefinite and perpetual, is reduced within a given compass—all his present blessings, after that period, are to be enjoyed free from contingency and fear—all outward temptations, which under the law might be directed against every precept, are narrowed down and made to bear only upon one point—his attention and care are concentrated upon this only avenue of danger—and invaluable blessings, beyond any which now enrich him, are secured to him at the close of his probation. With his understanding clear and vigorous, what should hinder from appreciating these advantages and making them the objects of his choice? The certainty of Adam's assent to the covenant does not then, in any view of it, impair the freedom of his act.

The next element of a covenant is mutual stipulations between these parties. On the one hand, Adam pledged a most religious obedience to that particular positive command, which was set as the test of his acquiescence in the whole moral law: on the other hand, "God," in the language of Witsius,* "promised to Adam life eternal; that is, the most perfect fruition of himself, and that forever." That Adam did acquiesce in the prohibition to eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge, is apparent from the shame and remorse which he evinced so soon as the command was violated; emotions which could have no place in his breast, did he not freely assent to that law as "holy, just and good." But it has already been shown that this command could have no place aside from the covenant of which it was the test, so that Adam's acquiescence must be viewed as a voluntary covenant stipulation. We gather the stipulation of the other party from the language of the penalty, "thou shalt surely die," which clearly implies a promise that, if he continued steadfast to the end, he should live. But here we meet a difficulty: as this threatening belonged to the law of nature before it became the sanction of the covenant, what more was secured to Adam by the covenant than by the law? The difference is this: the law secured life to man only so long as he obeyed, affording no guarantee for the obedience

* Witsius on the Covenants, vol. 1, p. 50.

itself: but the covenant secured to Adam, after he finished his trial, both obedience and life—the promise of the latter was a permanent life, secure from all risk of forfeiture. Divines differ as to what was included in this promise of life; some supposing that Adam would have been advanced to a much higher state of felicity than he enjoyed during his probation;—others restricting the blessing to the perpetuation of his original condition. Of the first class, we may adduce Witsius, who says:* “What kind of covenant would it have been to have added no reward to his obedience and his faithful compliance with the conditions of the covenant, but a continuation of those blessings which he actually enjoyed already, and which it was not becoming God to refuse to man whom he had created? * * * *

A greater therefore and more exalted felicity still awaited him,” &c. Of the second class, we may cite Dr. Williams, the celebrated Annotator upon the writings of President Edwards, who employs this language:† “Much has been said by some divines about the probability of Adam, had he kept the condition, being *promoted* to some situation still more exalted. But there is reason to suspect that such a sentiment proceeds on the supposition of Adam possessing a less exalted situation than he really did possess. The idea seems to be founded upon a probable promotion for continued obedience. But what could be a greater reward than a continuance of his chartered privileges.” We care not to adjust the difference between these writers. Both agree that a promise was made to Adam in the covenant greater than that made or implied in the law: on condition of obedience to one command for a given time, God stipulates to confirm him in holiness forever. This is enough for our purpose, because as it goes beyond the law, it must be a free covenant stipulation. The inquiry now turns upon the fact itself; did God make such a promise as this to Adam? In establishing this, we feel at liberty to gather evidence from any portion of the inspired word. In the whole Scriptures, there is a constant opposition between the law of works and the law of faith. But this opposition consists not so much in the blessing secured, as in the con-

* Witsius on the Covenants, vol. 1, p. 52.

† Note on p. 536 of Edwards' Works, vol. 2.

ditions of obtaining it. In both cases the same promise of life is made: "Moses describeth the righteousness of the law, that the man that doeth those things shall *live by them*;" the law of faith reads, "the just shall *live by faith*." Here there is a marked difference between *the means*: in the one case it is by *doing*; in the other case it is by *believing*; but in either, the end attained is *life*. Now, it is plain that the life which comes by the law of faith is eternal life, confirmation in holiness and the full fruition of God forever. Of course, if the life secured by the law of works is the same, the promise, which secures this permanent holiness, must come by a covenant, and not by the law which secures life only during an uncertain obedience. Furthermore, when the Apostle Paul, in his epistles both to the Romans and to the Galatians, insists upon the impossibility of justification by the law, the argument never turns upon the assertion that the law has no promise of complete justification; but simply, that through the weakness of the flesh, or our corrupt and fallen nature, we can no longer fulfil the conditions annexed to the promise. It is plain, therefore, that under the first dispensation, the promise of life made to Adam included the idea of his confirmation and safe enjoyment of God forever. But no such promise can belong to a merely legal dispensation: this then is a superadded blessing, and proves the existence of a covenant, in which this was a free stipulation of the Deity.*

The third element of a covenant is a ratifying seal, designed to give it legal force, as well as to guard against imposture and fraud. The form of the seal is immaterial, and depends simply upon conventional agreement. We will not enter upon the four sacraments which systematic writers sometimes assign to the covenant of works. Two of these, Paradise and the Sabbath, Adam would unquestionably have enjoyed under the law: the first, as the place of his abode; the second, because under the law, no less than under the covenant, he was bound to worship God. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil, we have already considered as the prescribed test of Adam's obedience. So that the tree of life alone remains, having no place but in the covenant, and discharging no office to it other than of a

* Witsius on the Covenants, book 1, chap. 4, vol. 1, pp. 50, 51.

seal, giving validity to it as a legal instrument. We might judge this to be its office from the title given to it, the "tree of life:" for unless we fall back upon the puerile supposition that this tree possessed the physical property of bestowing immortality upon those who ate of it, we can see no reason for this designation, but its relation to the covenant. The covenant being a covenant of life, this tree, as its seal, might well be termed the tree of life. So long as Adam fulfilled his own stipulations, so long he enjoyed a right to this tree: but so soon as he should break the covenant, this right would be forfeited. This view is confirmed by the circumstance, that when Adam was driven forth from the garden after his fall, the reason assigned is, "lest he put forth his hand and take of the tree of life." The supposition of some that the fruit of this, if eaten, would have conferred immortality upon Adam, though a sinner, and thus would have prevented the curse of the broken covenant from reaching him, is both silly and wicked: and the suggestion of others, that God utters this language in bitter mockery is, to say the least, both unsatisfactory and harsh. But if this tree was the sacrament of the covenant, Adam by his sin forfeited all right to it: and to signify that he was debarred, God might both expel him from Eden and employ this language. Nay, so material was it that fallen Adam should not touch this tree, that angry cherubim, with flaming swords, guarded the way of approach to it: which cannot well be explained upon any other view, than that this tree was the seal of the covenant.

If then we clearly trace all the elements of a covenant in this transaction—contracting parties, reciprocal stipulations, and ratifying seals—we surely must adjudge that to exist of which these are the parts. And if we have shown Adam's probation to have been limited, and superadded blessings to have been connected with his obedience, a chain of proof is certainly made out that Adam was not under a dispensation of law merely. But we are committed to another task: if this was a true covenant formed with Adam, it is incumbent on us to show that it contemplated him as a public trustee, and not as a private and single individual, before we can infer any thing as to the doctrine of imputation.

We believe the Scriptures to teach that in this covenant

Adam was appointed the representative of his whole natural seed—that as a public person, their interests together with his own were committed to his keeping—that by virtue of this relation of moral or covenant head which he sustained to his posterity, he and they were constituted a legal unit, so that each covenant act of his was equally their covenant act—that his obedience, if he had rendered it, would have been theirs,—and of course his breach of the covenant was their breach of it, and his guilt was their guilt. All these expressions indeed are but modifications of the one general idea of federal headship: each will hold true, if Adam possessed in the covenant a strictly representative character. Now, as to this, it should be conclusive that no other hypothesis will solve the most observed and admitted facts connected with the present condition of the race. All men, without exception, commit actual sin; and all men have too a sinful nature, which is antecedent to the sinful act. How comes this to be? If Adam stood on trial for himself alone, the consequences of his sin should terminate upon himself. How come they to be visited on his posterity, if there be no legal identity between them by which they are involved with him in the same ruin? Some are satisfied with tracing this to the relation Adam sustained to them as a natural root, and plead here the operation of that physical law by which like begets its like. Adam, then, did not beget a holy race, because he was himself a sinner; upon the same principle that a lion does not beget a lamb, nor a tiger a kid. We shall soon have abundant opportunity to expose the baldness of this plea; in advance, however, we may denounce it as incompetent, since it leaves unexplained how moral qualities shall be transmitted by physical generation; and as impious, since it cannot be defended from the charge of making God the direct author of sin. But to return: if Adam was not the representative of his race in that covenant, then they have enjoyed no probation. He was put on trial, fell, and was condemned: but they begin precisely where he ended; they are born with that sinful nature, which he acquired by the fall; and they are subject to that death which was threatened against him as the sanction of the covenant. They evidently have had no trial, for they are in the same condition with one who has been condemned; unless in-

deed it be granted that their probation was representatively accomplished in Adam, which at once solves the entire problem.

Again, the federal relation of Adam may be argued from the fact, that in all the language addressed to him the race is clearly contemplated. The institution of marriage has not more reference to the first pair in Eden than to those whose union shall constitute the last family on earth—the injunction, “be fruitful and multiply,” contemplated the race then lying seminally in the loins of the great progenitor—the name Eve, given to the first mother, proves that Adam knew the tie which bound him to his posterity—the dominion given to Adam over the beasts of the field, though impaired by sin, is yet retained by his fallen offspring—the several curses denounced against Adam and against Eve are yet in force, painful memorials to all generations of men of their interest in the first transgression—the great promise of the woman’s seed, the fountain of all later promises, breaks not more fully upon the despair of the first, than of the last sinner saved. All these present accumulating proof that Adam, the race, stood before God in the person of Adam the man, the latter being the head and spring of the former.

But the prevailing evidence of Adam’s representative character is found in the close parallel instituted in Scripture between himself and Christ. Adam is expressly said, (Rom. v: 14,) to be the type or “figure of him that was to come,” that is, of Christ. In I. Cor. xv: 45, the two are distinguished as the first, and the second, Adam; and again, verse 47, as the first man and the second man: and their respective offices are set forth with the characteristic trait of each, the one “was made a living soul,” the other “was made a quickening spirit.” Now, in what particulars does this resemblance hold? Certainly not that Christ had a true human nature as Adam had; for in this respect Christ was not more like to the first man than to any other of the race. The point of comparison cannot be the miraculous production of the bodies of both Adam and Christ, the one from the dust of the earth, the other from the womb of a virgin. For there was no greater exercise of divine power in these cases than in the ordinary generation of men; the last differing from the other two, only in proceeding after a settled

order. Besides, the whole object of the inspired writer is to account for the resurrection of the saints, which he ascribes to Christ, and explains the reason of it by the introduction of death through Adam. The two then are compared simply as to the relations they sustain to the rest of men. This is plain: (verse 22,) "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive"—again, (verse 49,) "As we have borne the image of the earthy (Adam,) we shall also bear the image of the Heavenly" (Christ.) Nothing is compared here but the moral relations of both to their respective seeds: Christ shall raise the one by virtue of that covenant headship he sustained to them, precisely as Adam brought death upon the other through his covenant headship over them. The wretched gloss will not answer here that death is transmitted to Adam's seed merely through the law of a physical generation: for in the parallel case there is no such physical connexion between Christ and his seed. If the blessings of Christ accrue to his people through a moral connexion, the parallelism requires that the curse of Adam shall descend in the same way: which establishes his federal relation to the whole human family.

The final argument upon this point drawn from the particular testimony in Rom. v. ch. should be fully presented: but our limits will not allow us to enter into that field of verbal criticism: a passing reference, therefore, must suffice. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men ($\epsilon\phi' \omega$) for that all have sinned.—(verse 12.) The leading idea here conveyed is, that all men sinned and died in that one man, by whom sin and death entered into the world: in this way it is, that death came to pass upon all. For if it be affirmed that death passes upon all men, not on account of Adam's covenant sin, in which all participate, but merely on account of their own personal and actual sins, the Apostle immediately replies, (verse 14,) by the case of infants. If death arises only from sin, and yet reigns over these, it must be that they also have sinned: but it is expressly said, they have "not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," that is, in the exercise of their own agency, as personally responsible for their acts. It is impossible that these should have sinned, except representatively in their great head. Further, the testimony given in is, that judg-

ment, (a forensic term,)* came upon all men "by one of offence, δι' ενός παράπτωματος: But how can this be, except there is a legal identity between all men and Adam, by which a judicial decree shall arrest both and bring both into condemnation. Lastly, the grace of the Gospel is represented as coming by one, precisely as the sin from which it relieves came by one. But this grace comes by Christ, as the head of his seed in the covenant of grace; by consequence, sin and death must come through Adam, as the head of his race in the covenant of works.

We collect now these scattered threads of argument and weave them into one final conclusion. It has been shown that Adam was placed upon a distinct covenant platform, and stood there the representative of other interests besides his own. His whole posterity were united to him, not only by the natural tie of physical descent, but also by this moral relation of covenant headship; and in consequence of the latter, he and they were constituted a legal unit. It will necessarily follow that his act, whether of obedience or of sin, must be a *public*, not a *private*, act; and by this constitution of God, must be their act as well as his. It belongs not more to the representative than to the represented: the title of each one of the latter class is as perfect and indefeasable as that of Adam himself. The imputation of it, therefore, to them, in their successive generations, is only a formal recognition of this title: it is simply the judicial decree, rendered in due process of law, by which this whole constitution is carried out to its last and necessary result. No sooner was the forbidden fruit tasted than Adam fell under condemnation; and each descendant of his by ordinary generation is born under the same condemning sentence. This condemnation is the same in both cases, be-

* "The word *κατακριμα* is used in Scripture, in a forensic sense, in three places of the New Testament, where it is found: thus Rom. v: 16, and chapter viii: 1, and accordingly it signifies a judgment unto condemnation; as also do those words, the sense whereof has an affinity to it, in Rom. viii: 34, *τις ο κατακριτων*; and also *ακατακριτος*, as in Acts xvi: 37, and xxii: 25. So that according to the construction of the word, though *κριμα* signifies judicium in general, *κατακριμα* signifies judicium adversus aliquem, or condemnatio."—Note on p. 110, vol. 2d of Ridgley's *Body of Divinity*.

cause it is predicated upon the reckoning of this one covenant sin to both; and this is reckoned to both because it belongs to both; and it belongs to both in the same sense, because both were under the covenant when the trespass was committed. Both being now condemned, they are both deprived, by judicial sentence, of all original righteousness; and by necessary consequence, as shall be more largely shown, the nature of both became depraved and vicious. It thus clearly appears that the corruption of our whole nature depends directly upon the fact that we belong to a condemned and guilty race: and we are all condemned, because that one offence upon which the covenant makes the condemnation to proceed, attaches to all whom the covenant itself included: to wit, the whole race which was representatively put upon its trial.

Before dismissing the argument in favor of the doctrine of imputed sin, we turn the reader's attention to another distinct line of proof: without the admission of this principle, it is impossible to explain the transmission of a sinful nature from Adam to his posterity, without seriously implicating the justice and goodness of God. Of course it does not fall within the scope of this article to refute the detestable doctrine that sin is necessary to every moral system, and that God could not have prevented its introduction among men, even if he had willed to do so. We rebuke the blasphemy of such an assertion, because it ventures to place a limit upon Almighty Power: the falsity of it is shown in the regeneration and sanctification of actual sinners. Surely if God has wisdom and power to frame and execute a scheme by which a guilty and polluted being is both redeemed and purified, he is wise and strong enough to have prevented the declension from holiness to sin, at the first. Our present discussion has no reference whatever to the origin of sin with Adam, but to the question how a corrupt nature comes to be transmitted from him, through successive generations, to the last individual of the race. There are only two explanations of this mystery offered by those who admit inherent depravity and yet deny the strict imputation of Adam's offence. The first is, that by "*a divine constitution* the descendants of Adam have, in their natural state, the same character and condition with their progenitor"—the second is, that by the necessary law of

physical generation, Adam's corrupt nature must descend, *as a natural consequence*, to his posterity.

The first of these theories embraces substantially the doctrine of *mediate imputation*, a phrase invented about the middle of the seventeenth century, in order to cover the denial of the orthodox doctrine. Placæus had taught that original sin consisted solely in the inherent depravity of men. A national synod condemned this doctrine, because it so explicitly denied the imputation of the first sin of Adam—Placæus then invented the distinction of *mediate* and *immediate* imputation; professing to hold the doctrine of imputation, and to differ from the synod only in this, that while they viewed the imputation of Adam's sin as *immediate*, he regarded it as *mediate*. This distinction unfortunately did not die with Placæus—at this moment, and in this country, there is a large school of divines who impose upon their understandings by this *fraudulent* title. *Mediate* imputation is really no imputation at all, as it empties the doctrine of all its substance. It allows only the most remote and indirect connection between the sin of Adam and the guilt of his posterity. It predicates their condemnation simply upon the inherent corruption of nature which they derive from him; and it is only *mediately*, that is, through this corrupt nature, they have any thing to do with Adam's offence. If it is asked how this inherent depravity comes to be inherited: the answer is, through their natural relation to Adam as the great father of the race. This theory precisely inverts the orthodox belief: for while that considers imputation as prior to condemnation, and of course as prior to inherent corruption, this regards depravity of nature as the cause of condemnation, and thus, remotely, of imputation also. But the point left unexplained by this theory is, *why* should this sinful nature be transmitted? There is no dispute as to *the fact* of the transmission, nor as to *the channel* of transmission, which is by ordinary generation: the question is not *how*, but *why*—there must be a *reason* for this transmission lying yet behind, which is not drawn forth. When this inquiry is pressed, the only answer given is, that such is the constitution which God ordained: Adam should transmit his own nature, whether holy or sinful, to his posterity: he did transmit a sinful nature, and on account of this they are condemned; but there was no ante-

cedent imputation of his sin, as the orthodox hold, to be the foundation of the condemnation in question. But in what sense can such a constitution be reconciled with the justice, wisdom, or goodness of God? Here are moral beings created with a sinful nature, and, as soon as they are created, condemned because of that which they simply inherit; and yet, with the exception of the great progenitor himself, no one individual of them all has ever been put upon his trial. Condemnation should imply a previous probation—a season during which the subject is placed both under the direction and protection of law: the contravention of which law terminates at once his peaceful and happy relations with the same. Such a probation, it is admitted, Adam enjoyed; but his posterity, by an arbitrary constitution, (for it is denied that their probation was representatively accomplished in him,) are born sinful, and for this reason, put immediately under sentence of wrath. According to our view, however, it is essentially just that a moral being shall first be placed under law, subject to a fair and equal probation; and that whenever condemned, he shall be condemned in due form of law, and not by an arbitrary exercise of supreme authority. It is a serious impeachment of the government of God to refer the present condition of the human family, not to the operation of righteous and wise law, but to the simple dictate of unregulated power.

The advocates of this opinion have been accustomed to refer, for illustration and defence of it, to the curse which God laid upon the irrational and inanimate creation. In consequence of the apostasy of Adam a long train of miseries has fallen upon brute animals and even upon the insensible earth. Yet a strict imputation cannot be affirmed of these; at least not in the sense it is predicated of men. All that can be said is, that by the appointment of God the effects of the fall are visited upon them. Precisely so with the posterity of Adam—there was no antecedent imputation of his offence to them; but by God's ordination simply the effect of his sin is felt in the corrupt nature they derive from him, and being sinners in their own persons they are condemned. This is the argument in all its strength. We remark incidentally that the reference to brutes is the most unfortunate defence which could be chosen: for the relation of these to the first sin is as direct and close as their

nature will admit. Simply and alone because Adam broke the covenant, not because of any demerit in them, are these cursed. Whatever of imputation there is in the case, it is direct instead of circuitous, and close instead of remote. The analogy certainly does not clear up to us the doctrine of mediate imputation. All this, however, is by the way: our desire is to expose the singular fallacy perpetrated in the above reasoning. Though we should grant all the premises, the conclusion is lame and impotent from the inherent viciousness of the argument. If thrown into a logical form, the syllogism will be as follows:

Men and brutes suffer from the apostasy of Adam :

Brutes suffer simply by God's appointment, and without the imputation of his sin :

Men, therefore, suffer simply by God's appointment, and without imputation.

Without stopping now to challenge the minor premiss, (which to say the least requires explanation,) the deduction is wholly inconclusive. What is affirmed of brutes may not be necessarily true of men; indeed cannot be, unless these two classes are either identical, or the latter included in the former. Before the above conclusion can be sustained, it must be shown that the same principles apply in the government of rational agents and of irrational beings. The whole argument, therefore, is a beggarly assumption of the point in dispute. We cannot infer from brutes to men, because they belong to distinct classes—new attributes (for example, that of reason) are introduced when we pass from one to the other; which not only allow, but imperiously require a very different administration in the two cases. We hold it to lie in the very notion of a moral being that he shall be the subject of a law, and shall be dealt with in the way of law. This excludes all suppositions of an arbitrary constitution, that is, a constitution aside from law. But if moral beings are dealt with through law, they must hold a distinct relation to that precept and that sanction which together make up the law—and further, as the precept goes before the sanction and is presupposed by it, they cannot come under the latter but through failure to the former. But the theory we are combating places the human race before us lying first under the penalty, having sustained no previous relation to the precept: or in other

words, having had no previous trial of their obedience. To suppose this, is violently to assault the government of Him, the habitation of whose throne is justice and judgment, and before whose face mercy and truth continually go. There is no escape from this unpleasant dilemma but in the admission of Adam's covenant and representative character, and the consequent reckoning of his sin to his seed. This fulfils all the conditions of a moral government just described. God will be seen to deal with the race, not by an arbitrary constitution, but by regular administration of law. It will appear also, that the race came not under the penalty before they had failed to render obedience to the precept. This disobedience was representatively rendered through their moral head, and condemnation fell upon them in him. This gives us the moral reason for the transmission of a sinful nature from Adam to us, to wit, the imputation of his sin and condemnation thereby.

It only remains to dispose of the second theory, that a corrupt nature is transmitted, as a natural consequence, by the law of physical generation. This answer is indeed summary; and the reader should suspect its soundness from the ease with which it professes to brush away all the perplexities of a really difficult problem. Like begets its like; this is the whole secret—lions do not beget lambs—"men do not gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles"—if Adam had begotten a son during his innocence, that son would have been holy like himself—but as Eve conceived not till he fell, the race that issued was unholy by the operation of the same law. It is perhaps necessary to say that no one disputes ordinary generation being the channel of this transmission. What we seek is a moral reason for the transmission through this channel—and we demur to the statement that this physical law opens all the mysteries of the case. This theory clearly involves the derivation of the soul *ex traduce* from the parent, in the same manner as the body. It is the soul that is the seat of sin: "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, thefts," &c. The old notion of the ancient philosophers, who considered matter as inherently vicious and communicating its taint to the spirit, originated from their utter inability, without revelation, to account for the existence of evil. But this awkward and absurd explanation has long been set aside by the

clear testimony of Scripture. Manifestly then, if we rely alone upon the law of physical generation to account for the transmission of depravity, it is because we believe the soul, like the body, propagated from father to son. If this shall be disproved, we are thrown perfectly afloat for a reason of the transmission in question.

Many of the earthly Fathers, as for instance, Tertullian, Apollinaris, and most probably Augustine, contended for the traduction of souls, because this seemed necessary to the transmission of sin. Zanchius gives this account of their views: * "Nulla alia ratio superesse videbatur, qua peccati originalis propagatio defendi posset, quàm si dicerent animas, etiam simul cum corporibus, ab anima illa prima peccato contaminata propagari. Ergo ut retineretur doctrina de peccato originali, qua omnino negari non potest, quin totum Christi beneficium pereat, sententiam de propagatione animorum per traducem acriter defenderunt." We are too near the end of this article to go into an extended discussion of a collateral issue like this. Indeed this labor is rendered superfluous by the fact that this opinion, though long maintained from the most pious of motives, is now generally conceded to be erroneous; and it is seen to be unnecessary to the defence of the transmission of sin. The reader who desires to sift this question to the bottom will do well to consult the work of Zanchius already quoted, the work of Burgess on Original Sin, and the *Theologia Maastricht*, Lib. 3. Cap. 9, § 20; also Lib. 4, Cap. 2, § 35: in all which the arguments on either side are fully stated. The following reasons, among others, will probably satisfy the more hasty reader, that with justice the doctrine of the traduction of souls is now generally surrendered. 1. It is difficult to guard it from running into a view of the soul, as material and corporeal, as compounded, divisible, and of course exposed to decay. Even the ingenious analogies of the ancient writers, such as that of "lux ex lumine," do not relieve the theory of this materialistic tendency. 2. There are many passages of Scripture which are careful to ascribe the creation of the soul immediately, and in a high sense, to God: the following may be consulted: Num. xvi: 22; Ps.

* Zanchii Opera. Tom. 3. Lib. 2. de Origine Animorum.

xxxiii: 15; Eccl. iii: 21, and xii: 7; Isa. lvii: 16, and Zech. xii: 1. 3. The soul of Christ was evidently not thus derived, but was immediately created. Yet he is said to have been made in all points like us, sin excepted. At least he should have the two parts of human nature, substantially like ourselves—his body was formed, supernaturally indeed, yet still from the body of the woman; and by parity of reason, we may infer the immediate creation of all human souls from the immediate creation of his. 4. The correlative doctrine of justification through the righteousness of Christ effectually displaces this dogma of condemnation because of a physically generated sinful soul. We are justified in Christ clearly upon the same principles by which we are condemned in Adam. But there is only a moral or spiritual connection between Christ and his seed; which renders it plain, that however a physical generation of the body may be the medium of transmission, the reason of the transmission is to be found in the moral relation of the race to the first man. It will not be necessary to expand any of these points.

Discarding now the theory of the traduction of souls, we are met by the very difficulty which pressed the ancients: how, if the souls of men are created immediately by God, shall we exempt him from the charge of being the author of sin? The doctrine of immediate imputation alone relieves from the difficulty. It is important to trace this matter through. The moment Adam fell, he became subject to the penalty, the essence of which is "the wrath of God." This wrath takes effect upon each department of his nature—it dissolves the body, which is temporal death—it separates the soul from communion with God, which is spiritual death—it exposes the whole man, soul and body, to the vengeance of God forever, which results in eternal death. This is the condition of fallen Adam, and equally the condition of each one of his seed. These are all born under condemnation through the immediate imputation of his sin; of course the penalty takes effect upon them in this threefold way also. The body which is generated is a mortal body, having "the sentence of death written in its members," and the soul is created in a state of estrangement from God. Instead of being formed, as Adam's was, in the

image of God, "in knowledge and true holiness," it is formed without that image, and simply endowed with those faculties which essentially belong to it as soul—entire corruption of nature follows upon this immediate loss of God's image and union with him in that image. In the language of Turretine,* "distinguendum sit inter animam puram, impuram et non puram. Illa pura dicitur, quæ ornata est habitu sanctitatis; impura, quæ contrarium habitum injustitiæ habet; non pura, quæ licet nullum habeat habitum bonum, nullum tamen habet malum, sed creatur simpliciter cum facultatibus naturalibus," &c. This last is the state in which we suppose the soul to be created: without the "habitum bonum" or the "habitum malum;" only "cum facultatibus naturalibus." But spiritual life consists in the union and communion of the soul with God: of this it is judicially deprived, on account of the covenant sin of Adam, which—because it is a covenant sin—is equally theirs. Entire corruption of nature ensues necessarily, just as darkness and death from the perpetual withdrawal of the sun. God is not the author of this sinful nature, unless he infuses sin into the soul: this he does not: † "non propterea"—we quote still from Turretine—"Deus potest censeri author peccati, quia aliud est impuritatem infundere, aliud puritatem non dare quâ homo se indignum reddidit in Adamo." Indeed, God is seen clearly to be not "author peccati sed vindex." In the carrying out of a judicial sentence simply, he creates the soul void of that original righteousness of which the judicial sentence itself deprives it. As stated by Turretine, ‡ "hic exercitium justitiæ attendum est, et aliquod sanctissimum, licet arcanum ac admirabile Dei judicium." The moment the human nature is completed by the union of the soul with the body (at whatever point of time this is effected) entire depravity ensues, because the soul no longer possesses the image of God, and derives no spiritual life from communion with him.

It has not been the design of this article to make a full showing of the proofs of the doctrine of imputation; but simply to develop two of the principal: 1. That it flows

* *Institutio Theologiae Eloquentiæ*, Tom. 1, p. 706.

† *Ibid.*, p. 708.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 685.

from the very nature of the covenant which God made with Adam: 2. That without the antecedent imputation of his sin, there could be no transmission of a corrupt nature to his posterity. It is a doctrine, we know, which peculiarly excites the enmity of the carnal mind, and the opposition it has met has induced many to enter upon the defence of the truth, after it has been demonstrated. It would be easy, for example, to show that the only attack upon the doctrine must really be directed against the great principle upon which the imputation rests, to wit, that of representation. This principle is wholly right or wholly wrong. How shall men undertake to prove it wholly wrong, when in the most common transactions of life they employ it, and when it can be shown to enter, more or less an essential element, into every government under heaven? If right among men, how can it be challenged as wrong when employed by God? We confess however to a latent scepticism of all these illustrations and defences of the divine economy. We sympathize deeply with the following remarks from Haldane: * "The defenders of scriptural truth take wrong ground when they rest it on any thing but the testimony of Scripture. It is highly dishonorable to God to refuse to submit to his decisions till we can demonstrate their justice. Those who have endeavored to vindicate the divine justice in accounting Adam's sin to be ours, and to reconcile the mind of man to that procedure, have not only labored in vain, but actually injured the case they meant to uphold. The connexion, according to which we suffer with our first Father, is not such as is to be vindicated or illustrated by human transactions. The union of Adam and his posterity is a divine constitution. The grounds of this constitution are not to be found in any of the justifiable transactions of men; and all attempts to make us submit by convincing us of its propriety from what we are able to understand upon a comparison with the affairs of men, are only calculated to impose on credulity and to produce unbelief." Here, then, we rest. We leave the doctrine with the reader, not without proof of its truth, but without defence of its propriety. In this propriety we ourselves cheerfully acquiesce: but

* Commentary on Romans, p. 227.

the doctrine will be a stone of stumbling to some, a corner stone of salvation to others, just as it may please God.

There is however one gross misapprehension, originating as we conceive less in ignorance than in malice, which we must expose before laying down the pen. It is alleged that imputation involves a transference of personal character and acts from one being to another. This absurd charge is principally built upon the ambiguous terms which, for want of better, have been employed to define the doctrine. For example, the phrase "moral person" has been applied to Adam and his race, representing the idea of a strict union between them, which is the ground of the imputation: and in this article we have several times spoken of the legal identity of Adam and his seed. Upon these terms, endless changes have been rung, as though they confounded all notions of personal identity and consciousness. We are charged with holding that each of Adam's race committed personally the sin of eating the forbidden fruit, and must feel his remorse, &c.: in other words, we are accused of this huge nonsense, that each member of the human family is transfused into the personal Adam, having his consciousness and doing his act. But can it be overlooked that when the terms "person" and "identity" are employed, they are limited by qualifying epithets, which precisely define the use that is made of them? If a bank or rail road company are spoken of as a *legal person*, is this term understood as confounding all the personal consciousnesses of the individuals who compose the corporation? Surely not: the epithet legal restricts the term person to a legal sense: the phrase simply indicates that these persons are one only in the eye of law, and that too only so far as their corporate acts are concerned. So again, if the endorser is called to pay a note instead of the principal, it is because the law regards the drawer and the endorser as a legal unit: but does this destroy the personal identity of either? There is only a transference of legal responsibilities, not of personal character, to the endorser. The original drawer may have failed in his obligations through open fraud—yet the endorser neither repents for him nor feels his remorse—he is only identified with him as to the payment of the note. So in the imputation of Adam's sin, there is no transference of personal character and acts to the race: they are one in

law, because Adam is invested with a representative character: his sin therefore is, in view of law, equally their sin, and accordingly is so imputed. If they possess a vicious character also, like that of Adam, it is not by transference from him, but by inheritance: by ordinary generation from him and in consequence of their own just condemnation, they came to be depraved.

The confusion, so far as it is honest, arises from not distinguishing between Adam's private relation to the law as an individual, and his public relation to it as the head of a covenant. What is imputed is not any of the private acts of Adam, but that one offence committed by him in his representative character. The distinction is well presented by Dr. Williams thus:* "Adam's breach of law as a *rule*, which brought guilt upon him as an *individual*, is not the guilt imputable to his posterity. During his long life, no doubt he was guilty of innumerable offences after the first transgression, but not one of these is imputed to us: the reason is that after he broke the condition of the charter, he stood upon the bare ground of personal moral obligation. But personal guilt, on such ground, cannot in equity be transferred from one to another. The sins of the father, whether the first father or any other, considered merely as a *personal* deviation from rectitude, or a breach of moral obligation, cannot be imputed to the children." So too Turretine:† "Actus unius non potest esse et dici universorum, si sit actus mere personalis." * * * Adam sane fuit unus individuo et persona singularis; sed in hoc actu non spectatur ut persona singularis, sed potius ut principium et caput totius generis," &c. There is then no transference of his acts, but simply the imputation of this one offence. We feel no remorse for his sin, nor do we repeat specifically of it, any more than we are self-complacent in view of Christ's federal work. But it is our duty to deplore Adam's breach of trust, and to bewail that sinful nature which we inherit because of it. As too in every actual sin, we assume and endorse the sin which is imputed, it becomes us in our confessions to acknowledge it—and while we look with shame and sorrow upon our connexion with the first Adam, to look with faith and joy upon the second.

* President Edward's Works, vol. 2, p. 535, Notes.

† Institutio Theologiae Elencticæ, Tom. 1, p. 689.

ARTICLE V.

The Earlier Prophecies of Isaiah. By JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. New York and London: Wiley & Putnam, 1846 8 vo. pp. 652..

The Later Prophecies of Isaiah. By JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. New York and London: Wiley & Putnam, 1847. 8 vo. pp. 501.

These volumes have been before the American public, the first for nearly two years, and the last nearly a twelve-month. As yet they have not been noticed, so far as we have observed, in any other than those passing introductions to the reader's acquaintance, with which the editors of our daily and weekly journals are wont to greet every new claimant. It was our purpose to have given them that extended and careful review their importance demanded, ere the present moment, but having been interrupted in carrying into execution this design, we greatly fear that the remarks which on their perusal occurred to us, have escaped our memory beyond the power of recall. What we may therefore lack in minute criticism, must now be made up in giving those general impressions which are left behind, and which perhaps are better suited to the ends we should keep before us in such a publication as ours, the general edification of our readers, than those details which so few, comparatively, are disposed to appreciate.

When one undertakes to write a commentary on the Scriptures, there are various plans suggesting themselves to the mind, according to which such commentary may be written. It may be the aim of the writer to produce a work which is practical wholly, whose object shall be to cultivate religion in the heart,—or doctrinal, to deduce and inculcate the doctrines of religion,—or critical, to explain the words merely, and to lay bare the train of thought in the mind of the sacred writer. The methods pursued, are as various as the employments, the genius, tastes and

ends of the interpreters themselves. Those commentaries which have been elaborated, in the first instance, for public expositions from the pulpit, will differ from those which have grown out of the private notes of the biblical student, designed, when first undertaken, merely for his own satisfaction. Those which have arisen from the academical prelections of a professor, and those which were designed to be taken in the hands of the student and leisurely perused;—those which have a parenetic object, and those which aim at the calm reason of the reader;—those which seek to exhaust the subject, and those which aim to give a brief and cursive view of the train of thought and the main points handled, must of necessity have each its own method, and are valuable or not, according to the degree in which they accomplish the ends at which they aim. But where the end is precisely the same, much depends upon the genius, tastes and studies of the writer. One will devote his principal labour to the explanation of the manners and customs alluded to, or to antiquarian researches amid the monuments and institutions of ancient nations; another will develop the poetic beauties of the sacred writer. One will enrich his pages with patristic, another with rabbinic lore. This one will strive to draw forth the meaning of the author by a view of the context chiefly, and deduce it in a given passage from the supposed train of thought, and that will seek the same end by a process purely philological. And whether he shall do this by resorting in the Hebrew Scriptures to that language alone, or to its cognate languages, or shall explain the New Testament by illustrations drawn from the fathers or from the classic models, will depend on the tastes and previous studies of the interpreter himself. Much was expected from Professor Alexander. His reputation was deservedly high as a scholar and an instructor. In his previous criticism of others who had ventured on the same field of interpretation, he had shown that he well knew what a commentary on Isaiah ought to be. He had been for years engaged in accumulating the materials, under the most favorable circumstances of access to the best labours of his predecessors, and of constant study of the author he interpreted, with the view to impart instruction to others. With these facilities and this preparation, it was expected that his work would supply a desidera-

tum in theological literature which was felt by all students of the original Scriptures. If there was in some a measure of disappointment when the work made its appearance, it may be accounted for in part from these high raised expectations,—in part from the intrinsic difficulty of this species of composition, and in part from the fact that to appreciate fully the work, it is almost necessary to peruse it at large, with the original Scriptures before you, and in the use of other commentaries with which it may be continually compared. That it holds a very respectable place among the best of these works, and is a truly valuable aid to the student of the Scriptures, we presume cannot be denied.

The author informs us in his preface, which of the various plans on which commentaries are written, he designed to adopt. He aimed, he says, at the specific end “of making the results of philological and critical research available for purposes of practical utility.” For this purpose, “it was found indispensable to fix upon some portion of the reading public, whose capacities, acquirements and wants, might be consulted in determining the method and form of the exposition.” Profound orientalists are too few amongst us to authorise a work addressed exclusively to them. The obscurer parts of Scripture are more successfully opened to the popular mind by the agency of an intelligent ministry. To this ministry, therefore, he proposed to furnish a “partial succedaneum for many costly books,” “enabling them to profit by the latest philosophical improvements and discoveries, without the inconveniences and even dangers which attend a direct resort to the original authorities.” Among other reasons why the professed interpreter should content himself with furnishing the raw material to the preacher’s hands, is the impression of the author that “much of the fanciful and allegorical interpretation heretofore current, has arisen from the failure to discriminate sufficiently between the province of the critical interpreter and that of the expository lecturer or preacher.” The author has aimed too to give, to some extent, a history of the interpretation of this prophet; and in this, while he has drawn from various sources, he has given a prominence to the modern German writers, not of choice, he says, but of necessity, because of the abundance of their labours in this department, their extensive influence, and his own design

of combining "the valuable processes and products of the new philology with sounder principles of exegesis."

The two volumes are prefaced with suitable introductions, in which the several questions of a general nature are discussed, touching the prophetic character and office, and that of Isaiah in particular; the various controversies respecting the genuineness of different portions of these prophecies which the misplaced and irreverent learning of the German mind has originated, as well as the characteristics of the several commentators who have attempted to explain the book of Isaiah, and the various sources of illustration, which presenting themselves in rich profusion, proffer their aid to the enquiring scholar. We presume we shall best meet the wishes of our readers, if we run through the several topics on which our author has spoken, somewhat in his own manner, but with as much brevity as the nature of the subject will allow.

The Hebrew prophets were extraordinary teachers whom God raised up from time to time by a special call, and on whom he bestowed a peculiar inspiration. They did not succeed each other, as did the ordinary teachers, the priests and Levites, by hereditary descent, nor were they usually inducted by any outward ceremony of man, or by any appointment of a preceding prophet to the office they were called of God to occupy. The one case of Elisha, who was called by the agency of Elijah, who first became his assistant and then his successor, both as president of the prophetic schools and in the general office of prophet, is not sufficient to indicate to us a *general* rule of appointment. The cases of Saul, rather, who was temporarily under the prophetic impulse, and those of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and John, show that the prophet was moved by a direct and powerful operation of the Spirit, to the performance of those acts of instruction, by which his office was indicated to others. In some instances, as in Moses and Jonah, there was a felt reluctance to entering upon the office, which was allowed by the Holy Spirit to interpose a temporary delay in the performance of its duties. In others, Jehovah spake to the prophet by a strong seizure of the hand, (*behezka^h yad^h*) and holy men of old spake as they were borne along (*φερομενοι*) by the Holy Ghost. Yet was there a succession of

* Isaiah 8: 11.

prophets, with but few and occasional interruptions, from Moses to Malachi, a period of 1200 years, fulfilling thus the promise to the Jewish people through their lawgiver, "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you like unto me,"*—a prophecy which while it principally looked forward to Christ for its fulfilment, included also the whole circle of prophets, whose office it should be, from Moses down, to speak of him, and to hold up before the people this great Deliverer, in whom the prophetic office would find its most illustrious example, and who should speak as never man spake:† "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."‡

It is a very limited view of the prophet's office, to suppose it confined to the predicting of future events. Professor Alexander, agreeing with other writers on this subject, has shown, that neither the Greek terms *προφητι* and *προφητης*, nor the Hebrew *nabhi*,§ admit of being restricted to the utterance of predictions merely. The former terms were used of him who spoke authoritatively in the name, and as the *nuntius* of God, and the latter, in its primitive form and meaning, expresses the idea of utterance; *nabha*, *protulit verba*, *nunciavit*. The classic passage, which explains, of itself, the meaning of the word, is Exodus iv: 1—17, where the Lord says to Moses, "Aaron shall be thy *nabhi* unto the people, and thou shalt be unto him instead of God." As Aaron stood related to Moses, received from him what he should say, and communicated it to the people, so the prophet stands to God, an *internunciatus* between Him and his people. The prophet was sometimes inspired to speak of the past as well as the future, as Daniel told Nebuchadnezzar the dream which he had forgotten; and the substance of their prophetic teaching shows that they inveighed against the sins of the people, stood as watchmen on the walls of Zion, to espy the approach of danger, and that it was their especial commission to maintain the principles of the theocratic government, the fundamental basis of which was the law given by Mo-

* Deut. 18: 15—18.

† Hengstenberg's Christology, vol. 1, pp. 71, 72. Calvin on Deut. 18.

‡ Rev. 19: 10.

§ Hengstenberg strives to shew that this has a passive form, and implies also the receiving as well as the uttering of revelations.

ses. Hence they as fully filled their office of prophets when they inveighed against alliances with foreign nations, and trusting in any arm of flesh, against the finery, affectation, and luxury of Jewish females, and against idolatrous worship, as where they had visions of future things, and made known the calamities or blessings in store for Israel.

Professor Alexander seems to extend the term prophet to those men who were raised up on special emergencies, as were the Hebrew judges, as Sampson and others, who were directed and controlled by a special divine influence. But though Joshua is reckoned in Jewish tradition as a prophet, and though Samuel, the prophet, was also a judge, we presume the term is not properly applied to any except such as were occupied in part or principally in communicating, by oral or written teaching, the divine will to men. Saul, the first Hebrew king was, for a season, guided by a special influence from above, until the spirit of God departed from him in anger, and the kingdom was given to the son of Jesse. Yet it was not, we conceive, by virtue of that influence that he was called a prophet, but because he was suddenly inspired to pour forth utterances similar to those of the prophets, when on two occasions he visited Samuel at Ramah, and came for a season in contact with the schools of the prophets. Even to him as a king appointed and guided by the Spirit of God, these utterances, and this prophetic *afflatus* were unusual, so that it excited surprise, and became a proverb—"Is Saul also among the prophets?" Joshua was called a prophet, in like manner, not in his capacity of leader of the armies of Israel, but rather as one of the writers of the sacred Scriptures.

On the nature of the prophetic inspiration, we see nothing in the views of Professor Alexander, to which we are disposed to except. We have supposed that in those portions of their teachings, whether oral or written, in which there is no discernible difference between them and other sacred writers, their inspiration was of the same nature with theirs. The Holy Spirit used them as his instruments, *such as they were*, possessed of those intellectual endowments, peculiarities and culture, which they had through the more ordinary providence of God. And as they were *human* instruments, possessed of human attributes, which it was no purpose of the spirit to obliterate or to depress, the characteris-

tic genius, style, temperament of each, appears in whatever was written. And yet this did not occur because the Spirit merely suggested thoughts to their understandings, and then left it for them to express them as they might, but because, in some way — which, though in some points analogous to other operations of the divine Spirit upon the human understanding, can nevertheless not be properly understood by us — without destroying their mental identity, he accompanied their intellectual efforts, leading them on till every thought was clothed in language, appropriate when they were considered, because it was the natural expression of the thought within, and appropriate when the divine Author himself is considered, because clearly conveying, and without defect, what he designed to convey. In this respect the inspiration of the prophets was not peculiar. But there *was* a peculiar state, which *marks* the prophetic inspiration: it is that which is termed by Professor Alexander, Hengstenberg, Jahn, and others, *the state of immediate vision*.* “If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto you *in a vision*, and will speak unto him in a dream.” “I *saw* also the Lord sitting upon a throne,” said Isaiah. “Balaam, the Lord of Beor, hath said, and the man *whose eyes are open* hath said: he hath said which heard the word of God, which *saw* the vision of the Almighty, falling into a trance, but having his eyes open. I *see* him,—but not now: I *behold* him,—but not nigh.” And Michaiah said “I *saw* all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd.”† The name *seers*, given to the prophets, and *visions* applied to their oracles in a multiplicity of synonymes, which our want of proper type prevents us from presenting to the eye, mark the grand peculiarity of the prophetic inspiration. And it is for this reason, as Hengstenberg remarks, because the communications made to them were in this form, that Abraham and other patriarchs are sometimes called prophets. This view of the method of prophetic revelation will probably account

* Hengstenberg's Christology, I, p. 229. Also in Kitto's Cyclopædia of Bib. Literature, Article Prophecy. Jahn calls it *the prophetic perspective vision*. Introduction, p. 367. In istis antem duabus partibus, *somnio* inquam et *visione*, continentur omnes Prophetiæ gradus. Maimonides' Moreh Nebhochim, p. 293. Comp. pp. 307—9.

† Numb. xii: 6; Is. vi: 1; Num. xxiv: 3, 4, 17.

for all those bodily affections and states with which the seasons of their inspiration were sometimes attended. Professor Alexander differs from the supposition of Hengstenberg, that the prophet was in that state of passive subjection to a higher power, in which the free exercise of his faculties was suspended, which the Greeks called *κωπια*. And if *ecstasy* is understood in that sense, of a "morbid" state of mind, not natural to it when under strong and overpowering impressions, we are disposed to yield our concurrence. But the term was also used of other mental states, from ordinary wonder and surprise, up to the highest species of trances. The passages on which Hengstenberg relies are that in Peter, "Holy men of God spake as they were *borne along* by the Holy Ghost"—the condition of Balaam, who fell to the ground—of Ezekiel, John, and Daniel, all of whom were overpowered by the prophetic visions, falling to the ground as if dead, sinking down with faintness, as did Daniel, who, after the vision was sick certain days. To these we may add the case of Paul, who was caught up to the third heaven, and heard unspeakable things which it was not lawful to utter; who says of himself, that whether he was in the body or out of the body he could not tell—but speaks of himself as enjoying at this time abundance of revelations. If it is understood that these states of excitement, and of exhaustion and temporary bewilderment, were the *effects* of the astonishing visions presented to the mind, and not the states necessary to their first perception, we see no evil in the idea. But it is right, and even especially necessary, that we should guard against any representation which would imply any dethronement of the reason or suspension, even temporarily, of any of the powers of the understanding. The physical effect was the natural result of powerful mental excitement, of revelations to the mind of stupendous, or fearful thoughts, an effect which is analogous to what takes place now, from the communication of exciting truth, for which the mind is unprepared.

It has always been the favorite resort of sceptics to represent the Hebrew prophets as affected in the same way as Cassandra or the priestess of Apollo, with a kind of *sacred madness*.* But the heathen was but a profane counterfeit

* Furor Divinus.

of the true inspiration, and the oracles of Paganism but the awkward imitation of what rumor or hoary traditions had conveyed to them, as having existed in earlier times, among the chosen people of God. Between these and the intelligent utterances of the Hebrew prophet there is an immeasurable distance. And a care should be had to distinguish accurately the one from the other.

Whether the prophets understood their own predictions has been much disputed. On this point our author does not touch. But even to ourselves, we seem sometimes to be led on, in our unprompted reasonings, to the discovery and utterance of truths whose full import we do not perceive, till we afterwards make it the subject of reflection. Much more the prophet, who was borne along by the prophetic impulse, must often have been carried onward, if not beyond his own perceptions of what he announced, yet beyond his own realizing understanding of what the vision which he clearly saw with his mental eye, should mean. If, as is probable, near events were seen in the same mental vision with those remote, and both were commingled in the representation, there was abundant reason why this revelation should become the subject of after study and reflection, and abundant room for the prophets to "search diligently what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ, which was in them, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." I. Pet. 1: 10, 11.

Professor Alexander, though he considers the whole subject of prophetic education one of surmise and conjecture, does not discard the idea that there may have been a preparation for the proper discharge of the prophetic office, through the process of education. Not that they could act as prophets without inspiration, but he would probably agree with what is expressed by Witsius, Hengstenberg, Lightfoot, Stillingleet, and others, that God for the most part conferred the prophetic office on those who had been educated in the schools of the prophets.* Amos speaks of it as an unusual procedure, that he, who was neither a prophet nor the son, [i. e. the pupil,] of a prophet, but a herdsman and a gatherer

* Witsius *Miscellanea Sacra*, Tom. 1. L. 1. C. 10. §10; and Hengstenberg.

of sycamore fruit, should be taken as he followed the flock and made to prophesy unto the people of Israel.—Amos vii: 13, 14.

On the promulgation and preservation of the prophecies, the author briefly recounts the several theories. The opinion we regard as most probable, and which accords in general with his, we proceed to mention. After the establishment of the Mosaic economy, the prophetic office seems gradually to have become more and more distinct and well defined. Under the judges the influence of the prophets was great, but about the time of the institution of the monarchy under Samuel, and in some measure in connection with the prophetic schools, it became more distinct and powerful. Until this period, their mode of publishing their prophecies was by oral speech; but about this time, perhaps because their communications now looked forward more to the future condition of the people of God, and were of increasing importance to after times, they were written down for the benefit of the church in future ages, as well as for their wider dissemination among the cotemporaries of the prophet. In all probability they were also orally delivered in some public place, before the people, either before or after they were written: or, if the prophecy was made, as it sometimes was, by symbolic actions, instead of words, these acts were subsequently, under the divine inspiration, made a matter of record. Though circulated probably in private manuscripts among the people, they were also carefully engrossed, and formally deposited within the precincts of the temple, it may be supposed, with the same care with the law of Moses, and perhaps in the very place where it was repositied.

Professor Alexander supposes that the arrangement of the sacred writings, which was made by Ezra, was determined thus: The five books of Moses, the foundation of the whole, had, as was natural, the first place; then came the writings of those who had not only the *donum propheticum*, but the prophetic office, and who were also by divine appointment, the historiographers of the Jewish nation, viz: the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, constituting the collection of the early prophets, then the later prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, who were called the larger prophets, to distinguish them from the twelve

minor prophets; then, in the third place, the writings of men who enjoyed inspiration without holding the prophetic office, including the Psalms, the writings of Solomon, Job, Ruth, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. These answer to the New Testament division of the Law, the Prophets, and the other books.

Of the noble fraternity of the prophets Isaiah was an illustrious member. Endowed, as we should judge, with the loftiest natural gifts, and, as has been supposed, favored with even a courtly education, imbued with the deepest piety as a subject of sanctifying grace, and lifted to the most exalted height of prophetic inspiration, his writings have been in the highest degree attractive to the student of the Scriptures, and have been illustrated and explained by the first minds of modern and ancient times, beyond almost any other of the Jewish books. His prophetic ministry was a long one, extending through the entire reigns of three kings, and part of the reign of a fourth, perhaps of a fifth, continuing at least forty-seven, and perhaps, as some suppose, for the extraordinary period of seventy years. He was a cotemporary of Micah and Joel, as Hengstenberg supposes, in the kingdom of Judah, and of Hosea, Amos, and Jonah, in the kingdom of Israel—and belonged to the first prophets whose oracles are preserved in separate written documents. The affairs of the Jews were become exceedingly involved with those of neighboring countries; Egypt on the West, and Assyria on the East, made Palestine a conterminous country to both, alternately tributary, the highway of their armies, and the theatre, even then, before it was trodden by the heels of the Macedonian phalanx, of civil wars, and the object of oppressive exactions. Other lesser nations, meanwhile, on every side, were in restless excitement. The church and people of God were environed with unexampled dangers, both as to their civil independence and their religious purity. Judah, too, was vexing Ephraim, and Ephraim Judah, when Isaiah and his cotemporary prophets came on the theatre of action. Every thing was in commotion. There was distress of nations, with perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring, and men's hearts failing them for fear. And then, with a proneness to forget God, as danger retired to a distance, relapsing into security, they began anew to live in open injustice and indulgence,

and in secret idolatry. Into this scene of various excitement, Isaiah and his fellow-prophets are commissioned to come forward and denounce judgments upon the chosen people, and on surrounding nations. He names, by the divine command, the first of his two sons, Shear Jashub, "A Remnant Shall Return," and the second, Mahershalahashbaz, "Hastens the Spoil, Speeds the Prey." His whole domestic state and arrangements were made to be symbolic and prophetic: while he himself wore a garment of sackcloth, as did many other prophets, the badge of grief and repentance. He was commissioned also to administer consolation, to predict the downfall of the oppressors of Israel, the return of his people, under Cyrus, to their own habitations; and, through the gloom which brooded over the future, to proclaim the coming of the Messiah, to describe, with historic minuteness, the circumstances of his death and burial, and to speak of the future glories of the church. These are moving themes, and are spoken of with a beauty, pathos, lofty grandeur, and surpassing sublimity, of which, out of the Scriptures, the world can show no other equal examples.

One of the most remarkable and characteristic features of the modern learning in Biblical Criticism and Interpretation, especially of the Germanic European school, is its disposition to sit in judgment upon the books of Scripture, to call in question the genuineness of particular words, phrases, passages, chapters, and sometimes of whole books; to set aside the entire testimony of past ages, whether cotemporary with the sacred writers, or subsequent, whether belonging to the Jewish or Christian Church; to arraign before their tribunal each individual portion of a sacred author, and to place the *disjecta membra* the one on the right hand and the other on the left, according to the decisions of their daring but capricious judgment. Just in proportion as past times have concurred with a satisfied faith in the authorship, and integrity as it respects the parts which compose the writing, of any portion of the Old Testament, have these learned but sceptical divines uttered their doubts, as if it were a *virtue* to differ from what has been before unhesitatingly received—as if it were *heroic*, just in proportion as a writing is deemed sacred by the church, to lay on it their ungodly hand, and deprive it of all the authority with which it has been invested by the belief that it is the indu-

bitable writing of men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

One main point of value in the commentary before us, is the antidote it furnishes to these speculative opinions of the German critics. While the learned author is alive to all which is truly valuable in their writings, he furnishes, in his historic account of the progress of their opinions, in his discriminating objections to their principles of criticism, in the dexterity with which he brings forward one theory to demolish its predecessor, and sometimes in the caustic satire with which he notices their decisions, the best antidote to these unscrupulous critics which we have met with in our English literature. To their critical, or as *we* should term them, to their *uncritical* processes, the book of Isaiah has been unmercifully subjected. We already have historic doubts of this school in circulation on this side the Atlantic, in the Introduction to the Old Testament by De Wette, translated by Theodore Parker;* and though the American translation of Hengstenberg's Christology, and a few other books, give to some extent the opposing arguments, we regard it as timely that these theories should be exposed, and the fallacies on which they rest laid bare, and deeply imprinted on the minds of every student of the Scriptures.†

The Jewish Synagogue and the Christian Church, alike concurred in the integrity and genuineness of the text of Isaiah, down to the middle of the 18th century. Koppè was the first one who called this in question. In his edition of Lowth's Commentary, he suggested the idea that the book of Isaiah was a prophetic Anthology, first collected after the Babylonish exile. Eichorn took up and improved upon the hints of Koppè.‡ "If I am not deceived," says

* 2 vols. 8vo. Boston, 1843.

† There are means of refuting these loose critics of Germany from other Germans of a sounder faith. It is right that Greek should be brought forward to meet Greek. And since the German learning will come to us and is likely to reach us through less desirable channels, it is with peculiar pleasure that we find it here winnowed and sifted, animated with a more sacred glow, and purged by passing through the menstruum of the high and holy doctrines of our own exalted but condemned faith. We certainly prefer that it should come through the alembic of Princeton, rather than through the conduit of the Minister of the Second Church in Roxbury, the translator of De Wette, and the author of "The Transient and the Permanent in Christianity."

‡ Kleinert erben die Weissagen in Iesaia, T. 1, iv. vii.

he, "in my opinion of the origin of our present Isaiah, it grew out of an Anthology of the prophetic poetry which had survived the Babylonish exile." He ascribes the preservation of the prophetic writings to such collections, 'made by individual members of the Jewish State, sometimes out of partiality to the writings of particular prophets, sometimes out of religious motives, or for other unknown reasons. These collectors indulged themselves in all manner of liberties, prefixing titles according to their views of the contents of each particular prophetic fragment, commingling the older and the more modern, those relating to their own and those relating to foreign lands, without any regard to chronological arrangement. When, after the captivity, the Jews gathered into a library the fragments of their national authors, they brought together into one book, all that tradition ascribed to a particular author as his work, and all which contained any thing that especially concerned him. Thus, under Isaiah's name, they placed all historical fragments in which his writings were mentioned, (as Is. 36. 39,) although they did not acknowledge him as the author. When the collectors of our canon proceeded to the arrangement of the prophets, Daniel was probably not in their hands, on which account it was put in the third collection, the Hagiographa. As the whole stock of prophetic oracles, consisted of the fragments now found in our Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, these divided themselves into four parts, adapted to four rolls of about the same size and volume. Jeremiah and Ezekiel, by themselves, filled each one parchment, leaving no room for any thing else. There were now found among the smaller (and perhaps private) collections of prophecies: 1. A more considerable one, of which Isaiah was the foundation, but with which were united many other fragments of earlier, cotemporaneous, and later prophets; and 2. A larger, and many smaller ones, in which last the prophecies of our so called minor prophets were written together; and 3. A series of oracles without the name of their author. This remainder they divided again, as it appears, into two parts. The collection of prophecies with Isaiah's name, was indeed sufficiently respectable by itself, but it was too small to constitute an entire roll. They united with it the extracts from the historic books, in which Isaiah appears as an actor,

(Is. 36—39,) and the remaining anonymous prophecies. The materials thus grew to the size which was requisite to fill a parchment of about the same dimensions with the roll of Ezekiel and Jeremiah. Finally, to the fourth roll they assigned the shorter prophecies, which had been passed by, which were accompanied with the names of their authors, and which yet remained from the times before the exile, and to these they appended the latest prophets Haggai, Zecacharias and Malachi. In this way originated four collections of prophecies of nearly equal size.* We are more particular in giving the theory of Eichorn, because of the great influence it had in shaping the opinions of those who followed him. It was brought forward by Eichorn with that brilliant eloquence and dexterity which make his writings so captivating. It was advanced to a wider occupancy of the public mind, by the writings of Doederlein, Justi, Paulus, Baner, Bertholt, De Wette,† Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Ewald, Umbreit, Hitzig, and others, either with some variations from the theory of Eichorn, or in entire accordance with it. By flattering the reigning spirit of the age, its contempt of the ancient, its idolatry of reason and of unlimited speculation; by the splendor of their learning, and the appearance of profoundness which they gave to their cause; they won for these opinions a wide control over the German mind. There were not wanting able opponents of these views. Hensler, Piper, Beckhaus, Jahn, Dereser, Van der Palm, Moëller, Uhland, Greve, Arndt, and more lately Hengstenberg, Kleinert and Schleier, have lifted up their voice with equal ability in the cause of truth. This voice for a season was unheeded, and though there seems to be a turning back to the old paths by gradual approaches, is still unheeded by the great body of German scholars. In part,

* Eichorn *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4 te Band. S. 50–52.

† As a specimen of the objectionable manner in which De Wette speaks of the prophetic books, take the following: "Some prophets, in writing down their oracles, seem to have designed to produce a complete literary work; others, at least, wrote down their separate speeches in a collection. Only a few flying leaves of some other prophets appear to have got into circulation; and these have been badly interpolated, in a course of uncritical treatment, provided with false inscriptions, put in a false connection, or worked over anew. Finally, it has happened that later predictions have been falsely attributed to the old prophets. This has been done, not merely as an idle sport of fancy, but with real, prophetic design!"—De Wette on the O. T., vol. ii., p. 363.

this is ascribed by Kleinert and also by Prof. Alexander, to the fact that these men conceded too much to their opponents, and admitted too far the principles on which they reasoned. But it was more owing to the restless spirit of the age. A sneer at the opinions of their opponents, as antiquated, "*antiquirte Meinungen*," or an exclamation, "*sonderbar genug!*" was sufficient in most minds to settle the question forever. States of mind often prevail among a people, favorable to the uprooting of all that has been acquiesced in, and it only needs some man of genius and influence, to lead the way, for the majority to leave substantial good in the mad pursuit of that which is ideal, to overlook the substance and grasp the shadow.

Almost every portion of the first part of Isaiah has been assailed by some one of the writers we have mentioned. The only portions which have not been, are chap. i., 3-9: xvii., xx., xxviii., xxxi. But the principal point of attack has been the later prophecies, from chapter xl.-lxvi. These, as we have seen in the theory of Eichorn, were regarded by him as a collection of prophecies, or a prophetic anthology, composed of the productions of various unknown authors, collected subsequently to the exile. To this, Gesenius, and others, have stood opposed. They have shown, and this conclusively, that this latter portion of Isaiah constitutes one continuous discourse, and proceeded from one author. But this author, *the Pseudo-Isaiah*, they affirm could not have lived in the days of the real Isaiah; he must have lived after the exile. The reasons given for this opinion, as summed up by Kleinert, who has brought them together out of the writings of Gesenius and De Wette, are briefly these: (1.) The allusions to the circumstances of the Jewish people and of foreign nations, especially the Chaldees, are those of the last period of the exile. (2.) All this seems to have reference not to the future as something *predicted*, but to the *present* state and circumstances of the nation, to the (stand-point) existing circumstances of the prophet himself, and with these circumstances the prophecies of the future stand conjoined. (3.) In *Isaiah's* mouth, such language must be as unintelligible as it is devoid of aim. Before a return from captivity could be announced, he must first predict the captivity itself. (4.) It is against the usage of the Hebrew prophets to prophecy so

individually and specifically, as Is. 44: 28. 45: 1. 48: 14, 20. 43: 14. (5.) He appeals to earlier predictions concerning the return of the people from captivity, which had now been fulfilled, and which he subjoins, 42: 9, 45: 19, 21, 46: 16. This presupposes a later prophet, who was contemporary with the events. (6.) In all which the prophet says of the existing circumstances of the people and of their political connections, he stands on firm historic ground, and all agrees in the exactest way with the historic truth. But whatever he says of their future condition, is ideal, joyful, animated hope, which far exceeds the reality. Had Providence deemed it best that Isaiah, in a supernatural way, should prophecy respecting Cyrus, he would have disclosed the state after the exile also with historic truth, not in exstatic ideal scenes which would never be realized. (7.) The language, the phraseology, have in the Pseudo-Isaian portions a peculiarity which the genuine Isaiah knows not. (8.) The use of the later Hebrew or Chaldaic idioms, demonstrates a later age. (9.) If prophecies under the name of such a distinguished prophet as Isaiah, had been in existence in the days of Jeremiah, who suffered abuse and persecution, because he predicted a captivity which no one believed, he would have appealed, without doubt, to such a distinguished predecessor, as his defenders did, in his justification, to an altogether indefinite prediction of Micah. Kleinert S. viii. — xxi.

These we may well suppose contain the weight of the objections to Isaiah. It is easy to detect the *πρῶτον ἁεὶδος*, the first and fundamental error whence all proceeds. It is the principle that the mind of men cannot be made to possess a distinct and definite perception of future things. This springs first out of an unconverted, unbelieving heart; out of an ill-concealed infidelity; out of the very pyrrhonism which characterized Tindal, Thomas Paine, Hobbes, Bolingbroke, and Spinoza. The work of grace is unknown in the heart, and every thing supernatural and miraculous is denied. The principle itself has before been asserted by Voltaire: "We cannot know future events," says he, "because we cannot know what is not." If these prophets were really inspired, and if God revealed unto them the future, especially if the mode of revelation was by vision, in which future things were made present realities to the

mind, the very supposition implies that the allusions of the prophet should be taken from that future, in which his mind in these moments of high inspiration lived and acted. These things not only became present realities, but are described as such; and from that future, in which he thus seemed to himself to be, the prophet, under the divine illumination, could look forth into a remoter future, and discover there visions of glory, and be filled with joyful hope and anticipations of what is in store for the people of God. And it is plain that while his physical being, his breathing body might exist in the present moment, his ideal existence might shift from point to point as he was borne along *φερομενος* by the Holy Ghost. It is plainly as easy for Him who sees the end from the beginning, to reveal events with historic definiteness to the mind of the prophet, as in vague generalities. It is an astonishing misapprehension, if it be not a wilful blindness, to regard prophecy as vague and of uncertain application. And it costs much wresting of the Scriptures, and great displacing of dates, the manufacturing indeed of a chronology for the nonce, as it respects these writings, to carry out this view with the slightest show of plausibility. "Not the usage of the Hebrew prophets to prophecy so individually and specially!" And yet Josiah was predicted by name, and what he should do to Jeroboam's altar, specifically mentioned, three centuries and a half before Josiah lived to fulfil the prediction. We would quote too the entire prophecies of Isaiah, Chap. xiii., xiv., xxi., had not these also, as if for the sole purpose of removing them out of the way, been assigned to a period after the exile. Yet the prophetic writings are full of equally minute predictions of prostrate empires and ruined cities. Not one of these has history disproved. Jerome was embarrassed in commenting in the 4th century, on Ezek. xxvi: 14, where the prophet, apostrophizing Tyre, the Liverpool of the ancient world, twenty-four centuries ago, says, "Thou shalt be built no more." He was embarrassed because that mart of the nations, was then apparently reviving. All-devouring time has swept on, and written his indelible and truthful comments on Ezekiel's prophecy, more full and able than Jerome could. Tyre is indeed become like "the top of a rock"—"a place to spread nets upon,"—her granite pillar and marble columns lie broken beneath

the waves—her stones, her timber, and her dust, have they laid in the midst of the water. Out of the book of Psalms, and this *Pseudo*? Isaiah, you may read the life and atoning death, the burial, resurrection, and mediatorial reign of Christ our Saviour, his pierced hands and feet, the bitter potion he drank on the cross, his raiment parted by lot, his agonizing cry, his burial in the sepulchre of the rich, all written, as even these critics must allow, from five to ten centuries before his birth. As to style, it is well known that it varies with the age and circumstances of the author: That forms of expression which have been favorite at one period of life, are displaced by other forms of expression at another. Other scenes, other society, other trains of thought, contact with other minds, other states of body, all affect the language in which one expresses his ideas. Professor Alexander has applied these principles of the higher criticism, so much vaunted by the German critics, to the Satires, and *Ars Poetica* of Horace. He shows that the *απαξ λεγόμενα* in the latter are sufficiently numerous, if we apply the same test, by which portion after portion has been removed from Isaiah, to establish the spuriousness of that. In the same way, Prof. Lee shows that we might with equal propriety maintain, from the difference of style between the oration against Cataline and the offices of Cicero, and between the *Æneid* and *Bucolics* of Virgil, that they could not have emanated from the same author. That the man who wrote *Lady Macbeth*, could not have written “*Much Ado about Nothing*.” He who wrote *Paradise Lost*, could not have written the little poem termed *L'Allegro*. So that it might be shown by numerous deductions, that there must be a *Pseudo-Cicero*, *Virgil*, *Shakspeare*, *Milton*;—and he affirms that with little trouble it might be shown, “that there are pseudo-authors under any name, not excepting those of *Bertholt*, *Rosenmüller*, and *Gesenius*.” The alleged *Aramæan* words, or rather words used in an *Aramæan* or *Chaldee* sense, Prof. Lee, with much positiveness, denies to have any such sense beyond what occurs in the portions of *Isaiah* acknowledged genuine.* And even if they did, we ask, was not *Palestine* surrounded on every side by na-

* *Sermons and Dissertations on the Scriptures*, by the Rev. S. Lee, B. D., &c. &c. &c., Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge London, 1830.

tions speaking these dialects, so closely allied with the Hebrew? Are not the words or idioms of sister dialects continually creeping into each other's territories? Did not Dr. Johnson grieve lest Englishmen should come at length to babble a dialect of France? Might we not expect *a priori* their partial prevalence in all the periods of Jewish literature—and are they not in fact found in the oldest and the latest Hebrew writings,—in Moses, in Solomon, as well as in Ezekiel and Ezra. And might there not from some special reason, now indiscernable, be an influx of them at the particular time Isaiah wrote.

These theories devour one another. That which is defended as genuine by one man, is rejected as spurious by the scholar that comes after him. The judgment, founded on such data, must be fluctuating and uncertain. The idea of a prophetic anthology, collected after the exile, is a pure fiction. The presumption is entirely against it. The external and internal arguments are alike against it. The fact that the other prophetic writings, as those of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and those of the minor prophets, contain only the writings of those whose names they bear, is against it. Josephus, and every Jewish authority from him down, are against it. The apocryphal writings of the Jews are against it,—and although there is an answer to each of the arguments quoted above, as it were at the point of our pen, we have probably spent time enough already to show that the theory is a cunningly devised fable.

Our remarks are becoming so extended, that we must pass over briefly what we had intended further to say.

We have in common with the Jewish and with most Christian interpreters, since Vitringa, supposed that the arrangement of Isaiah's prophecies is not always in the exact order of their delivery. And especially, that chapter vi. contains an account of Isaiah's call and inauguration to his prophetic office. Others indeed regard it, and Prof. Alexander among them, as designed to prepare him for a discouraging and painful revelation which was to follow. Others, that it was designed to encourage and reassure him when he was about giving up his prophetic commission. And others still, that he first prophesied as a candidate for that office, to which he is now more solemnly ordained. These suppositions may in some one or other of their forms

be true. For it does not vary from the experience of faithful ministers of the word at the present day, that they should have their call to the holy office, as it were renewed, especially when they are cast down at their ill-success, or have some new convictions of the exaltation, majesty, holiness, and pardoning love of "the Lord," as they see him "sitting upon his throne." But in favour of the view now common, though our author and Hengstenberg, both advocate that to which we have just alluded, is the fact that similar visions occurred at the call of Ezekiel and Jeremiah to the prophetic office, and to John also, when there were vouchsafed to him visions of God in the isle of Patmos, and he was made the prophet of the new covenant. There is something analogous too in every real call to the ministry now, — there is, in like manner, a vision of the Lord, especially of Christ, in his glory and awful holiness, a deep conviction of our undone condition and present unworthiness, — a sense of pardon, and of sin and guilt purged away and removed by the application of atoning blood, symbolized by the live coal from the altar of sacrifice applied by the seraph to the lips of the prophet. It is then that we hear moving the silent depths of our soul, the voice of the Lord Jehovah, "Whom shall I send and who will go for us?" and it is then that we reply, "Here Lord am I," "Send me."

To allow for this supposition, it is not necessary to have recourse to the declaration of the Talmudists, that these prophecies were arranged by the men of Hezekiah, or to introduce the hypothesis of a later compiler. Isaiah may have collected and arranged his own predictions, and adopted, for some reason not now wholly discoverable, some other than the chronological order.

In mentioning the causes which have led to this speculative, daring, and unsatisfactory criticism, which has torn this prophetic book into fragments and distributed the *disjecta membra* among so many imaginary authors of various later periods, and has, as in the case of Lowth, led to arbitrary alterations of the text, Prof. Alexander enumerates the influence of the critical processes of the school of Bentley, as transferred to the Scriptures, the extravagant application to the Arabic and other cognate languages, to explain the Hebrew idioms; the general imitation of the methods of

interpretation which had been adopted in the classics; the exaggeration of the poetic element in the prophetic writings undesignedly promoted by Lowth's Prelections on Hebrew Poetry, and more especially by his commentary on Isaiah, which gave countenance to the efforts of the earlier neologists of Germany, "to blot out the distinction between poetry and prophecy,—between the ideal inspiration of the Muses and the real inspiration of the Holy Ghost." Add to these the prevalence of the maxim, that "there can be no distinctive prophetic foresight of the distant future." These elements combined in an unscriptural, unsanctified mind, are doubtless the fruitful causes of the havoc which has been made with all that is truly sacred in the prophetic style and character, or which must be admitted to exist in writings which claim from us an implicit submission, as our only rule of faith and practice. We were not however wholly prepared to agree with him, in his censure of the mode of printing the prophetic writings, which was introduced by Lowth, and has been so extensively copied. While we would not have this method introduced, as it has been to some extent, in editions of the Scriptures designed for the general reader, the poetic element has been so much overlooked in past ages, that we see no objection to it but the contrary, in illustrative works, as those of Gesenius and Henderson, addressed to the eye and understanding of those who are already sufficiently acquainted with the poetic idiom of the Hebrew, not to misapprehend it. We are well aware how this poetic theory of parallelism, strophes, stichoi, has been exaggerated and abused, so that as in Is. 7: 8, a prosaic passage occurring in a poetic parallelism, is removed by Gesenius and others, as an interpolation, not merely because of its chronological difficulties, but influenced *von aesthetischem Gefühl*, by his sense of what belongs to good taste. But we are persuaded that the "*numerous prose*" of Isaiah, is something quite different from the balanced periods of "Seneca, Augustine, Larochevoucauld, Pascal, Johnson and Macauley." Although there is a frequent descending to the plain straight-forwardness of prose, there is also a most perceptible resumption of the parallelism of thought, which creates at once a corresponding rhythm in the style. And it is this passing and repassing from the one to the other species of composition, which •

constitutes no small part of those interesting surprises which give such life and spirit to the prophetic composition. Much of Milton's incomparable *Paradise Lost*, more of Wadsworth, and still more of the most measured parts of Shakspeare, would lose their poetic rythm in the estimation of most readers, if printed as plain prose. There are reasons of an hermeneutical, and reasons of an apologetic nature, for having the poetical character of these books truly understood. Paine characterized the style of Isaiah as prose run mad. We should throw around it all the dignity which really belongs to it.

The volume containing the Later Prophecies of Isaiah, is prefaced by an able and instructive introduction. The author begins by pointing out the two main particulars in which the Jewish people had perverted the true design of the divine arrangements in relation to themselves. They had come to ascribe an inherent efficacy to the rites of the ceremonial law, and to imagine their preëminence to arise from some ground within themselves. They forgot that they were set for the salvation of the world, or rather of that chosen people which was to be gathered from all nations, and of which they were the representative and symbol. Till Christ came, his elect people were represented by this chosen nation. This nation again were represented by the Levitical tribe, and in a still more concentrated form, by the priestly family, until the representation was finally concentrated in a single person in the family, who was himself also a type of the head, Jesus Christ. Of this relation, which they sustained to other nations, the arrangement for the reception of proselytes ought to have reminded them. For forgetting these great principles—for departing from God, and relying upon an arm of flesh—for their abominable idolatries, and their heartless hypocritical worship, the carnal Israel, Isaiah taught them, would be rejected, while the true Israel would be gathered out of all kindreds, languages and tongues. In the midst of these, their living Head, the Servant of Jehovah, the Messiah, stands,—who is sometimes spoken of in his own personal character, at others, as including within his mystic body more than himself, those even who are united with him,—he stands as “a colossal figure between the church of the Old and that of the New Testament, as

a Mediator, an interpreter, a bond of union, and a common head."

In common with most of the later interpreters, Professor Alexander regards these prophecies as constituting one continuous but desultory discourse, in which, though there is a sensible progress of thought, it is interrupted by retrocessions and resummptions, so as to baffle all attempts at a strict logical analysis. He does not believe the great subject of these prophecies to be the restoration from Babylon, which is not more frequently mentioned than the Exodus from Egypt, but rather the true destiny of the people of God in all after ages. It has given dissatisfaction to some persons, that Professor Alexander finds in the closing chapters no allusion to the restoration of the Jews to Palestine. Those passages which J. D. Michalis and Henderson so understand, he applies to the future ingathering of the heathen nations, not excluding the Jews, into the Kingdom of God. This he has done without committing himself as to the question whether their return may not be predicted elsewhere.

It remains that we should speak of the general character of these volumes. The first impression we obtain from them is, that of laborious industry, extensive reading, and real learning on the part of the author. All that is truly valuable on this prophet he seems to have carefully consulted. The commentaries of Chrysostom and Jerome were made use of, especially in the earlier chapters—those of Jarchi, Aben Ezra, Kimchi, among the Rabbins; Luther and Calvin, and occasionally others among the Reformers; Junius and Tremellius, Cocceius, Grotius, Vitringa, J. H. Michaelis, Gill, Lowth, J. D. Michaelis, Eichorn, Gesenius, De Wette, Maurer, Hitzig, Hendewerk, Barnes, Henderson, Ewald, Umbreit, Knobel, Koppe, Augusti, Bertholdt, Hävernick, Drechsler, Clericus, Hengstenberg, and many other authors among the moderns; and the ancient versions seem also to have been carefully consulted, and are continually quoted, especially in the first volume. Nor do grammatical and lexical researches appear to have been omitted. And while all the means which a judicious scholar would use, seem to have been employed in ascertaining the sense, there is no appearance of leaning upon mere authority. Less apparent use is made of the cognate languages, than

is usual among modern European scholars, especially of Germany, and less care is used to illustrate the manners and customs to which allusion is made by the prophet. This has perhaps resulted in part from the conviction that too much has been made of these sources of illustration by others. The work is peculiarly valuable, as giving a history of the more modern labours of European scholars upon these prophecies, and still more, from its polemic aspect towards the German rationalism in all its forms, and its just antagonism to the false principles of criticism, which have made such havoc with the sacred text.

No work is perfect, and we notice, as defects, in this, that the number of opinions enumerated, and the brevity which it was necessary to use, sometimes leaves the reader at a loss which the author designed to approve, the translation given at the commencement of the comment is the only thing to which we can resort to decide the question, and this sometimes fails us. The author occasionally, too, though rarely, seems to leave a difficult point without wholly deciding it in his own mind. When this occurs, we are always disappointed. An instance of this may be found on page 121 of the Earlier Prophecies. There is sometimes, too, an authoritative decision as to the meaning of a word or passage, when we would have been better pleased to have had the reason of the decision likewise given. But notwithstanding this, and though there are some points on which we feel disposed as yet to differ from the learned author, we are compelled to speak of his commentary on Isaiah in terms of the highest praise.

The book itself is got up by the enterprising publishers, in the best style of American typography, and in our judgment is the most important original work in explanation of the Hebrew Scriptures that has yet emanated from the American press—a work of which, when compared with those of the best European scholars, our country has no reason to be ashamed. We shall look with interest for further efforts from the same pen, and trust the day is not far distant when our American Presbyterian Church will contribute her full share to this department of sacred learning. Most devoutly do we wish that this work may be the means of arousing our Presbyterian ministry to a more diligent study of the Old Testament, in the original tongue.

How slight is our claim to be interpreters of God's word, who, as soon as we enter the ministry lay our Hebrew Bibles upon our shelves, and forget, with a hasty and regretless oblivion, that noble and heart-stirring language in which God spake from Sinai in the voice of words, in which the church for three thousand years chaunted the praises of Jehovah, in which the Holy Spirit moved such a noble train of rapt prophets to speak of the advent of the Son of David, and of the ever increasing glories of his Kingdom. While we commend it to the more earnest study of candidates for the ministry, we commend it also to ministers themselves. We should be worthier sons of our worthy sires, if we should revive what we once knew of this sacred tongue, and continue, as we are happy to know some do now, in the daily reading of the Hebrew Scriptures.

ARTICLE VI.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Suggestions on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes in the Southern States; together with an Appendix, containing Forms of Church Registers, Form of a Constitution, and Plans of different Denominations of Christians.* By CHARLES COLCOCK JONES, D. D. Philadelphia. 1847.

The great length to which this Number of the Review has already extended, prevents us from noticing this valuable pamphlet of Dr. Jones' as its importance demands. It is such a practical view of the entire work of the Religious Instruction of our Coloured Population, as we would expect from the wisdom, large

experience, and piety of the author. It will furnish many profitable hints to our brethren in the ministry, and to all who are anxious to promote the best interests of the servants committed to our care. The following are the closing words of the pamphlet: "The bearing which the religious instruction of the negroes has upon the peace, the order, the purity, the happiness, and the prosperity of our Southern country is not understood, nor appreciated as it should be. But I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord, that the subject and the duty are both now fairly before the Southern Church, and particularly that branch of it to which I am attached. Whatever else concerning this people, may be in doubt or in dispute, or whatever may be their condition in times present or in times to come, there can be no doubt and no dispute *on the duty of affording them the Gospel of the grace of God.* Here, then, is firm ground to stand upon; and ground upon which the Lord's servants may stand *firmly*, for it is their own. Ministers, churches, and owners are the almoners of mercy to this dependent people. Let them not delay action, but while the door is open, and God moves them to it, let them enter the field; let them piously, prayerfully, and energetically "arise and build," and seek from Heaven that patience and perseverance which shall know no exhaustion and no defeat. I would recommend to the friends of religious instruction not to mix it up with questions touching the civil condition of the negroes: 1 Tim. vi. 1-8; nor turn aside from the main work to combat incidental evils. Time is wasted, the great cause is retarded and prejudiced. Believe in God—in his Providence—in the power of his truth and grace—and go forward! We are to lead this people unto life eternal, through the knowledge of Jesus Christ our Lord. This is the will of God—this is our duty—the great duty of the Southern Church. Grant us wisdom, and power, and grace, O Lord, our God and our Redeemer, to discharge it."

2. *A Grammar of the Mpongwe Language, with Vocabularies.*
By the MISSIONARIES OF THE A. B. C. F. M. *Gaboon Mission,*
Western Africa. New York. 1847.

This little book, though modestly ascribed as to its authorship to the Missionaries of the American Board, we presume is the production chiefly, if not wholly, of our beloved brother the Rev. J. L. Wilson. It was our wish to have spoken more fully of that portion of his labours, which has been employed in reducing to writing the Grebo and Mpongwe languages of Africa, with the view of giving to those nations and to Africa the word of life, and eventually a Christian literature. We can at present barely chronicle the publication of this little grammar. The surprising regularity and flexibility of the language it describes, we have not space nor time to exhibit. We perceive that the Ethnographical Societies of New York and Boston, are taking great interest in these labours of Mr. Wilson; and that those who have turned their attention to these studies, are expressing their gratification at the facts which his publications have brought before them. By these labours of our missionaries, necessarily undertaken as a means of disseminating the truth of the Gospel, great incidental advantages in the way of extending the boundaries of knowledge and civilization accrue,—not only to nations involved in the night of barbarism, but in some important respects, to those more favored lands from which these missionaries go forth. The writings of Adelung, Hervas, and Balbi, are greatly indebted to the labours of Christian missionaries for the materials which are found in them, and without which they could not have been written. It is to the zeal of Catholic and Protestant missionaries, says Balbi, “that Ethnography owes in our day the knowledge of so many languages of India, and other countries of Asia, of America and Oceanica, as well as the translation of the whole or parts of the Bible into more than a hundred different tongues.”

3. *The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.* By J. H. M'ILVAINE. M. W. Dodd: New York. pp. 244.

Here is a book in many respects after our own heart,—modest, but independent,—speculative, yet full of faith,—somewhat poetical, and somewhat philosophical,—and on the whole scriptural and orthodox. It takes a wide range, and glances on some of the topmost heights of theology;—its subject is the creation and fall of man, and the idea on which it is founded, and which is developed by the author is, that the facts recorded in the Bible in connection with these events, are both historical facts and symbols of spiritual truth, which have a universal application to the human race. It is really the doctrine of the federal character of Adam, illustrated in the spirit and style of the modern philosophy, with the design of relieving the Scripture history and the orthodox doctrine of the difficulties and objections they present to many minds. We are not prepared to concur in some of the author's views, and from others we positively dissent; but these we do not consider important, and we commend his book to our readers, as original, instructive, and highly interesting. Some of the most holy and healthful truths which the carnal wisdom of the world has rejected, are here once again presented for its acceptance; and though they fall unheeded on the ear of an infidel generation and a sensual philosophy, there are every where hearts of faith and love which will receive them. The main point presented is, “that the wisdom of man, as a criterion of distinction between good and evil, is foolishness; and that the wisdom of God alone is true wisdom”—a truth fundamental in Revelation, discovered also in the deeps of the true philosophy of human nature, and of prime practical importance in all human life; but one over which a godless, self-sufficient world is rushing blind to its own perdition. The author is, we believe, pastor of an Old School Presbyterian Church, in Utica, N. Y. But he tells us nothing about himself, and this we like. From our heart we bless the writer who is willing to stand on his own merits, or to fall in his own weakness. If we honor him for nothing else, we will honor him for *that*.

4. *The Four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, in Greek, with English Notes, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical; Maps, Indexes, etc. Together with the Epistles and Apocalypse. The whole forming the complete text of the New Testament, for the use of Schools, Colleges, and Theological Seminaries.* By REV. J. A. SPENCER, A. M., Author of "*The Christian Instructed*," "*History of the English Reformation*," etc. Harper & Brothers: New York. 1847.

This volume originated, as the editor informs us, from a desire of supplying our colleges and higher seminaries of learning, with the means of giving instruction in the language and general criticism of the New Testament. He desired to counteract the tendency to neglect the study of the Greek Testament, as a part of a liberal course of education, under the conviction that this neglect was a great wrong done to the cause of public morals. The volume before us, contains the entire Greek text, according to the edition of Dr. Mill, as printed at Oxford in 1831, under the care of Dr. Burton, Regius Professor of Divinity. The explanatory notes extend no further than through the book of Acts. The author hopes to extend them in a future volume through the Epistles and Apocalypse. The Greek text is in a fair and open type. But the notes do not appear to us to add any thing either new or profound to other illustrative works already in existence. They may, and doubtless will be useful to learners in our schools and colleges, but do not meet the wants of students in our schools of theology. We know not to what class of Episcopal divines the author may belong, but the stress which he puts upon baptism in the note upon Mark 16; 16, and John 3: 5, make us hesitate as to the scripturalness of his faith. "Shall be saved," says he—"that is, shall be placed in a state of salvation, (which implies, of course, forgiveness of sin and reconciliation to God,) and shall be finally saved, if he continue in the same faith and covenant. How any can undervalue baptism, when the Saviour has made it of such importance, may well excite astonishment." "Except one be thus born anew *by the Almighty energy of the Holy Spirit*

in the use of water, that apt symbol of purification wrought in the soul by his gracious influences, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God, so as to enjoy its unspeakably precious privileges." Is baptism then the means of regeneration, and the necessary antecedent of salvation? And is it possible that he who is in that state of salvation which implies forgiveness of sin and reconciliation with God, shall finally perish?

5. *The Glory of Woman is the Fear of the Lord: A Sermon.* By the REV. CHAS. COLCOCK JONES, D. D. Philadelphia. 1847.

Another little book from the pen of Dr. Jones. It consists of a Sermon, preached at Richmond during the meeting of the General Assembly, and which was requested by some who heard it, for publication. It comes home to the business, heart, and hearth of woman. It is spiritual, practical, appropriate, wise;—suggesting to the minds of those to whom it is addressed, important things which too often escape their notice. We commend it to the perusal of sisters, daughters, wives, and mothers.