

THE

✓
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW:

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, S. C.

VOLUME V.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED BY A. S. JOHNSTON.

1851-2.

CONTENTS.

NO. I.

Article.	Page.
I. DOMESTIC LITERATURE,-----	1
Tallulah and other Poems. By HENRY R. JACKSON, Savannah, Ga. Jno. M. Cooper, publisher. 1850.	
II. VALIDITY OF POPISH BAPTISM,-----	12
III. THE MILLENNIUM,-----	52
IV. THE CREDIBILITY AND PLENARY INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES,-----	73
V. THE HARMONY OF REVELATION AND NATURAL SCIENCE, WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO GEOLOGY.—NUMBER I.	93
VI. FOOT-PRINTS OF THE CREATOR, OR THE ASTEROLEPIS OF STROMNESS. By HUGH MILLER, author of the Old Red Sandstone, &c. 1 vol. 8vo. pp. 337.-----	111
VII. CRITICAL NOTICES,-----	144
1. Report of a General Plan for the Promotion of Public and Per- sonal Health, devised, prepared and recommended by the Commissioners appointed under a resolve of the Legislature of Massachusetts, relating to a Sanitary Survey of the State. Presented April 25th, 1850. Boston: Dutton and Went- worth. pp. 544, 8vo.	
2. Lectures on Theology, by the late Rev. JOHN DICK, D. D. Published under the superintendence of his son. With a Preface, Memoir, &c., by the American Editor. Two vol- umes in one, 8vo. Robt. Carter & Brothers, N. York, 1851.	
3. Crumbs from the Land of Cakes. By JOHN KNOX. 12mo. pp. 192. Gould & Lincoln, Boston, 1851.	
4. The Authority of God: or, the True Barrier against Romish and Infidel Aggression. Four discourses by the Rev. J. H. MARLE D'AUBIGNE, D. D. 12mo. pp. 305. Robert Carter & Brothers, New York, 1851.	
5. Midnight Harmonics: or, Thoughts for the Season of Soli- tude and Sorrow. By OCTAVIUS WINSLOW, M. A. 12mo. pp. 249. Robert Carter & Brothers, New York, 1851.	

6. Expository Discourses on the First Epistle of the Apostle Peter. By JOHN BROWN, D. D., Senior Minister of the United Presbyterian Congregation, Broughton Place, Edinburgh, and Professor of Exegetical Theology to the United Presbyterian Church. Complete in one volume. N. York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1851. pp. 801, 8vo:
7. Lecture before the Young Men's Library Association of Augusta, Georgia; shewing African Slavery to be consistent with the moral and physical progress of a nation. By C. G. MEMMINGER, of Charleston, S. C. Published by request of the Association. Augusta: W. S. Jones. 1851. pp. 25.
8. Christ's Second Coming: Will it be Pre-Millennial? By the Rev. DAVID BROWN, A. M., St. James' Free Church, Glasgow. New York: Carter, 1851. pp. 499, 12mo.
9. The Life and Times of John Calvin, the Great Reformer. Translated from the German of Paul Henry, D. D., Minister and Seminary Inspector in Berlin. By HENRY STEBBING, D. D., F. R. S. In two volumes. Vol. 1. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 8vo.
10. Truth and Error; or Letters to a Friend, on some of the controversies of the day. By the Rev. HORATIUS BONAR. New York: Carters. 1851. pp. 282, 18mo.
11. Lays of the Kirk and Covenant. By Mrs. A. STUART MONTEATH. New York: Carters. 1851. pp. 245, 16mo.
12. The Broken Bud; or Reminiscences of a Bereaved Mother. New York: Carters. 1851. pp. 325, 16mo.
13. Letters to my Pupils; with Biographical Sketches. By Mrs. L. H. SIGOURNEY, New York: Carters. 1851. pp. 341.
14. The Believer's Daily Remembrancer; Green Pastures for the Lord's Flock. By the Rev. JAMES SMITH. From the Thirty-eighth London Edition. Robert Carter & Brothers: New York. pp. 380.
15. Addresses of Rev. S. L. Graham, D. D., and of Rev. F. S. Sampson, D. D., at their inauguration, July 11, 1850.
16. The Committing of our Cause to God: a Sermon by Rev'd. FERDINAND JACOBS, Charleston.
17. Fugitive Slave Law: a Sermon by ICHABOD S. SPENCER, D. D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
18. A Discourse preached in the Second Presbyterian Church, Newburyport, by Rev. W. W. EELLS.
19. The Citizen and the Commonwealth: a Sermon delivered in the First Congregational Church, Holliston, Massachusetts, on the day of the Annual State Fast, April 10, 1851, by J. T. TUCKER, Pastor.

Article.	Page.
VI. THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE,-----	572
By Rev, THOS. SMITH, D. D. N. York : Geo. P. Putnam. 1850.	
The Unity of the Human Race. By JOHN BACHMAN, D. D. Charleston, S. C.: C. Canning. 1850.	
Natural History of the Varieties of Man. By ROBERT GORDAN LATHAM, M. D. F. R. S. London : 1850.	
VII. CRITICAL NOTICES,-----	601
1. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thos. Chalmers, D. D., LL. D. By his son-in-law, the Rev. WM. HANNA, LL. D. Vol. 3d., pp. 531, 12mo. Harper & Brothers : N. York. 1851.	
2. The Variations of Popery. By SAMUEL EDGAR, D. D. pp. 606, octavo. Robt. Carter & Brothers : New York. 1850.	
3. Bible Dictionary, for the use of Bible Classes, Schools and Families. Prepared for the Presbyterian Board of Publica- tion. pp. 476, 12mo. Pres. Board of Publication, Phila.	
4. A Series of Tracts on the Doctrines, Order and Polity of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America—em- bracing several on Practical Subjects. Vol. 6. Presbyterian Board of Publication.	
5. The Canon of the Old and New Testaments ascertained, or the Bible complete, without the Apocrypha and unwritten traditions. By ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER, D. D. 12mo. pp. 359. Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia.	
6. Moriah, or Sketches of the Sacred Rites of Ancient Israel. By Rev. ROBERT W. FRASER, M. A. pp. 309, 12mo. Presby- terian Board of Publication.	
7. Ears of the Spiritual Harvest. pp. 180. Presbyterian Board of Publication.	
8. Life of a Vagrant, or the Testimony of an Outcast to the Value and Truth of the Gospel. pp. 165. Carter & Bro- thers, New York.	
9. Roger Miller, or Heroism in Humble Life. A Variation. By GEORGE ORME. pp. 185. Carter & Brothers, New York.	
10. The Life of Col. James Gardiner. By P. DODDRIDGE, D. D. pp. 228. Presbyterian Board of Publication.	
11. Charity and its Fruits ; or Christian Love, as manifested in the Heart and Life. By JONATHAN EDWARDS. pp. 530, 18mo. Robert Carter & Brothers, New York.	
12. The Christian Philosopher triumphing over Death. A Narra- tive of the Closing Scenes of the late Wm. Gordon, M. D., F. L. S. By NEWMAN HALL, B. A. pp. 250, 12mo. Pres- byterian Board of Publication.	

Rev. S. J. G. an

6. Expository Discourses on the First Epistle of the Apostle Peter. By JOHN BROWN, D. D., Senior Minister of the United Presbyterian Congregation, Broughton Place, Edinburgh, and Professor of Exegetical Theology to the United Presbyterian Church. Complete in one volume. N. York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1851. pp. 801, 8vo:
7. Lecture before the Young Men's Library Association of Augusta, Georgia; shewing African Slavery to be consistent with the moral and physical progress of a nation. By C. G. MEMMINGER, of Charleston, S. C. Published by request of the Association. Augusta: W. S. Jones. 1851. pp. 25.
8. Christ's Second Coming: Will it be Pre-Millennial? By the Rev. DAVID BROWN, A. M., St. James' Free Church, Glasgow. New York: Carter, 1851. pp. 499, 12mo.
9. The Life and Times of John Calvin, the Great Reformer. Translated from the German of Paul Henry, D. D., Minister and Seminary Inspector in Berlin. By HENRY STEBBING, D. D., F. R. S. In two volumes. Vol. 1. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 8vo.
10. Truth and Error; or Letters to a Friend, on some of the controversies of the day. By the Rev. HORATIUS BONAR. New York: Carters. 1851. pp. 282, 18mo.
11. Lays of the Kirk and Covenant. By Mrs. A. STUART MONTEATH. New York: Carters. 1851. pp. 245, 16mo.
12. The Broken Bud; or Reminiscences of a Bereaved Mother. New York: Carters. 1851. pp. 325, 16mo.
13. Letters to my Pupils; with Biographical Sketches. By Mrs. L. H. SIGOURNEY, New York: Carters. 1851. pp. 341.
14. The Believer's Daily Remembrancer; Green Pastures for the Lord's Flock. By the Rev. JAMES SMITH. From the Thirty-eighth London Edition. Robert Carter & Brothers: New York. pp. 380.
15. Addresses of Rev. S. L. Graham, D. D., and of Rev. F. S. Sampson, D. D., at their inauguration, July 11, 1850.
16. The Committing of our Cause to God: a Sermon by Rev'd. FERDINAND JACOBS, Charleston.
17. Fugitive Slave Law: a Sermon by ICHABOD S. SPENCER, D. D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
18. A Discourse preached in the Second Presbyterian Church, Newburyport, by Rev. W. W. EELLS.
19. The Citizen and the Commonwealth: a Sermon delivered in the First Congregational Church, Holliston, Massachusetts, on the day of the Annual State Fast, April 10, 1851, by J. T. TUCKER, Pastor.

Contents.

v

20. A Plea for the Old against the New in Education : an Address delivered at the close of the Annual Examination of the Presbyterian High Schools at Greenwood, Abbeville District, by Rev. A. A. PORTER.
21. Religion in Schools Vindicated : an Address by Rev'd. JAMES HOYT, delivered in the Presbyterian Collegiate Institute, at Taladega, Alabama, March 28, 1851.
22. A Tribute of Filial Affection : a Sermon occasioned by the death of Mrs. JANE KIRKPATRICK, preached in the first Reformed Dutch Church of New Brunswick, N. J., by SAMUEL B. HOW, D. D.
23. Retribution Provided for in the Laws of Nature : a Discourse delivered in the Baptist Church at Selma, Ala., April 6, 1851, by W. T. HAMILTON, of Mobile.

NO. II.

Article.	Page.
I. VALIDITY OF POPISH BAPTISM,-----	177
II. CHIVALRY AND CIVILIZATION,-----	207
III. LIFE OF THOMAS PAINE,-----	228
Author of "Common Sense," "Rights of Man," "The Age of Reason," &c. By G. VALE. New York: 1849.	
IV. THE MORAL, SOCIAL AND PROFESSIONAL DUTIES OF ATTORNEYS AND SOLICITORS,-----	249
By SAMUEL WARREN, Esq., F. R. S. of the Inner Temple, Barrister at Law. New York. Harper & Brothers: 1849.	
The Importance of Religion to the Legal Profession, with some remarks on the character of the late Charles Chauncey, Esq. A Discourse. By H. A. BOARDMAN, D. D. Philadelphia. Published by Wm. S. Martin: 1849.	
The Obligations of Legislative Science to the Bible. By GARDNER SPRING, D. D. New York. Taylor & Dodd: 1839.	
V. SCRIPTURALISM AND RATIONALISM,-----	271
VI. THE HARMONY OF REVELATION AND NATURAL SCIENCE, WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO GEOLOGY.—NUMBER II.	284
VII. CORRESPONDENCE,-----	315
1. Extract from Minutes of the Proceedings of the Palmetto Regiment, at their meeting in Columbia, S. C., on the 20th August, 1851.	

Article.	Page.
2. To the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review.	
3. Dr. Curtis to Ex-Governor Johnson.	
4. Governor Johnson to Dr. Curtis.	
VIII. CRITICAL NOTICES,-----	318
1. The British Squadron on the Coast of Africa. By Rev'd. J. L. WILSON, American Missionary at the Gaboon, Africa.	

NO. III.

I. VALIDITY OF POPISH BAPTISM,-----	321
II. ARMINIANISM RESTRICTIVE OF DIVINE FREE AGENCY,--	366
III. REPORT ON SLAVERY,-----	380 ✓
IV. SERMONS OF THE LATE REV. BENJAMIN F. STANTON,---	390
New York: Printed and published for the proprietor, by D. Fanshaw, 575 Broadway. pp. 311, 12mo. 1848.	
V. EVIDENCE OF THE DEGRADATION OF ANIMALS,-----	417
1. The Foot-Prints of the Creator, or the Asterolepis of Stromness. By HUGH MILLER, Author of the Old Red Sandstone, &c. Boston: 1850.	
2. The Epoch of Creation. The Scripture Doctrine contrasted with the Geological Theory. By ELEAZOR LORD. With an Introduction. By R. W. Dickinson, D. D. New York: 1851. 1 vol. 8vo. pp. 311.	
3. Course of Creation. By J. ANDERSON, D. D., of Newburgh Manse. Cincinnati: 1851. pp. 384.	
4. Indications of the Creator; or Natural Evidences of Final Cause. By GEORGE TAYLOR. New York: 1851. 1 vol. 8vo. pp. 282.	
5. The Ancient World; or Picturesque Sketches of Creation. By O. T. ANSTED, M. A., F. R. S., F. G. S. London: 1847. 1 vol. 8vo. pp. 408.	
VI. CRITICAL NOTICES,-----	444
1. Living or Dead? A series of home truths. By the Rev. J. C. RYLE, B. A., Rector of Helmingham, Suffolk. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1851. pp. 360, 12mo.	
2. The Life and Times of John Calvin, the great Reformer. Translated from the German of PAUL HENRY, D. D., Minister	

- and Seminary Inspector in Berlin. By HENRY STEEBING, D. D., F. R. S. Vol. the 2d. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1851. pp. 454, 8vo.
3. The Typology of Scripture. By Rev'd. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, Salton. Edinburgh: 1847. Philadelphia: Daniels & Smith. 1851. 2 vols. 12mo.
 4. A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus, expository and practical, with critical notes. By the Rev'd. ANDREW A. BONAR, Collace. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1851. pp. 513, 8vo.
 5. Memoir of the Rev. W. H. Hewitson, late Minister of the Free Church of Scotland, at Dirleton. By the Rev. JOHN BAILLIE, Linlithgow. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers. 1851. 12mo. pp. 374.
 6. Earnest Words to Young Men, in a series of Discourses. By E. P. ROGERS, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Augusta, Ga. Charleston: Walker & James. 1851. pp. 288, 12mo.
 7. The Dead of the Synod of Alabama: A discourse by ROBERT NALL, Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Mobile. With an Appendix. Published by order of the Synod. Mobile. 1851. pp. 52.
 8. Man his brother's Keeper: An Address delivered in the Chapel of the Presbyterian Female Institute, at Talladega, Alabama, at the close of the Annual Examination, August 22d, 1851, by Rev. SAMUEL K. TALMAGE, D. D., President of Oglethorpe University, Ga. Published by request of the Board of Directors. Philadelphia: 1851.
 9. The Responsibilities of American Youth! An Address delivered at Orrville Institute, June 26, 1851, by Rev. W. T. HAMILTON, D. D., of Mobile, Alabama. Mobile: 1851.
 10. The Necessity of Continued Self-Education. An Address to the Graduating Class of S. C. College, at Commencement, on the first of December, MDCCCLI. By FRANCIS LIEBER, of the French Institute. Printed by order of the Governor. Columbia, S. C.: Steam-Power Press of A. S. Johnston. 1851.
 11. Smithsonian Reports. Notices of Public Libraries in the United States of America. By CHARLES C. JEWITT, Librarian of the Smithsonian Institute. Printed by order of Congress. Washington, D. C.: 1851. pp. 207.
 12. Minutes of the Presbytery of Harmony. Charleston, S. Carolina: 1851.
 13. Minutes of the Presbytery of South Carolina. Fall Session. Anderson, S. C.: 1851.

14. Guicciardini and the Popes. An Address delivered before the Adelpian Society of the Furman Institute, at the Commencement, on Monday, June 16, 1851. Greenville, S. C.: 1851.
15. The Claims of Science. An Address delivered before the Euphemian and Philomathean Societies of Erskine College, S. C. By WILLIAM C. RICHARDS, A. M. Charleston, S. C.: 1851.
16. Inaugural Address of Rev. E. F. ROCKWELL, Professor of Natural Science, before the Board of Trustees of Davidson College, N. C., August 13, 1851. Salisbury, N. C.
17. Hints on Female Education. By ELIAS MARKS, M. D., of Barhamville, S. C. Columbia, S. C.: 1851.
18. A Commentary on Ecclesiastes. By MOSES STUART, lately Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass. New York: George P. Putman. 1851.
19. The Royal Preacher. Lectures on Ecclesiastes. By JAMES HAMILTON, D. D., F. L. S., Author of "Life in Earnest," &c. pp. 353, 12mo. Robert Carter & Brothers, New York. 1851.
20. Daily Bible Illustrations. By JOHN KITTO, D. D., F. S. A. Solomon and the Kings. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1851.
21. Geology of the Bass Rock. By HUGH MILLER. With its civil and ecclesiastic history and notices of some of its martyrs, by Dr. McCrie and others. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1851.

NO. IV.

Article.	Page.
I. THE HARMONY OF REVELATION AND NATURAL SCIENCE. NUMBER III.—THE FINAL CONFLAGRATION.....	461
II. PRONUNCIATION OF GREEK,..... History of the Greek Alphabet, with remarks on Greek Orthography and Pronunciation. By E. A. SOPHOCLES. Cambridge: 1848. pp. 136.	495
III. THE CHARACTER OF MOSES,.....	504
IV. REMARKS UPON THE WILL, WITH SOME STRICTURES UPON THE OPINIONS OF McCOSH,.....	535
V. ANALOGY OF THE SOUTHERN LANGUAGE OF EUROPE WITH THE LATIN.—BY V. H. MANGET.....	551

Article.	Page.
VI. THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE,-----	572
By Rev, THOS. SMITH, D. D. N. York: Geo. P. Putnam. 1850.	
The Unity of the Human Race. By JOHN BACHMAN, D. D. Charleston, S. C.: C. Canning. 1850.	
Natural History of the Varieties of Man. By ROBERT GORDAN LATHAM, M. D. F. R. S. London: 1850.	
VII. CRITICAL NOTICES,-----	601
1. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thos. Chalmers, D. D., LL. D. By his son-in-law, the Rev. WM. HANNA, LL. D. Vol. 3d., pp. 531, 12mo. Harper & Brothers: N. York. 1851.	
2. The Variations of Popery. By SAMUEL EDGAR, D. D. pp. 606, octavo. Robt. Carter & Brothers: New York. 1850.	
3. Bible Dictionary, for the use of Bible Classes, Schools and Families. Prepared for the Presbyterian Board of Publica- tion. pp. 476, 12mo. Pres. Board of Publication, Phila.	
4. A Series of Tracts on the Doctrines, Order and Polity of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America—em- bracing several on Practical Subjects. Vol. 6. Presbyterian Board of Publication.	
5. The Canon of the Old and New Testaments ascertained, or the Bible complete, without the Apocrypha and unwritten traditions. By ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER, D. D. 12mo. pp. 359. Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia.	
6. Moriah, or Sketches of the Sacred Rites of Ancient Israel. By Rev. ROBERT W. FRASER, M. A. pp. 309, 12mo. Presby- terian Board of Publication.	
7. Ears of the Spiritual Harvest. pp. 180. Presbyterian Board of Publication.	
8. Life of a Vagrant, or the Testimony of an Outcast to the Value and Truth of the Gospel. pp. 165. Carter & Bro- thers, New York.	
9. Roger Miller, or Heroism in Humble Life. A Variation. By GEORGE ORME. pp. 185. Carter & Brothers, New York.	
10. The Life of Col. James Gardiner. By P. DODDRIDGE, D. D. pp. 228. Presbyterian Board of Publication.	
11. Charity and its Fruits; or Christian Love, as manifested in the Heart and Life. By JONATHAN EDWARDS. pp. 530, 18mo. Robert Carter & Brothers, New York.	
12. The Christian Philosopher triumphing over Death. A Narra- tive of the Closing Scenes of the late Wm. Gordon, M. D., F. L. S. By NEWMAN HALL, B. A. pp. 250, 12mo. Pres- byterian Board of Publication.	

Rev. S. J. G. an

Contents.

13. Songs in the House of my Pilgrimage. Selected and arranged by a Lady. pp. 315, 18mo. Robert Carter & Brothers, New York.
14. Green Pastures, or Daily Food for the Lord's Flock. By Rev. JAMES SMITH. pp. 188, 32mo. Gilt: Presbyterian Board of Publication.
15. Still Waters, or Refreshment for the Savior's Flock, at Eventide. By Rev. JAMES SMITH. pp. 188, 32mo. Gilt: Presbyterian Board of Publication.
16. Sacramental Meditations and Advices. By the Rev'd. JOHN WILLISON. pp. 376, 18mo. Robert Carter & Brothers, N. York.
17. The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax. By RICHARD SIBBES, D. D. pp. 291, 18mo. Presbyterian Board of Publication.
18. Lessons of Life and Death; a memorial of Sarah Ball. pp. 144, 32mo. 19. Memoir of Mrs. Agnes Andrew, of Paisley. 18mo. pp. 101. 20. The Cripple. 21. Still Happy. 22. The Ragged Scholars. 23. Visit to the Holy Land. 24. The Laborer's Daughter.
25. Man: his Religion and his World. pp. 238, 18mo. Carter & Brothers, New York.
26. My Father's God; a testimony for religion. pp. 96, 18mo. Presbyterian Board of Publication.
27. Three Last Things; or Death, Judgment and Eternity. By Rev. JOHN HAMBLETON. pp. 117, 18mo. Presby. Board of Publication.
28. Light of the Dark Valley. 29. Address to Brothers. By Rev. DANIEL BAKER, D. D. Pres. Board of Publication.
30. Decision; or Religion must be all or is nothing. By GRACE KENNEDY. 31. The Converted Unitarian. A short memoir of E—E. 32. Universal False and Unscriptural. An Essay.
33. Confessions of a Convert from Baptism in Water, to Baptism with Water. From the 2d English edition.
34. It is I: or the voice of Jesus in the Storm. By NEWMAN HALL, B. A. 35. Come to Jesus. By NEWMAN HALL, B. A.
36. Considerations for Days of Adversity. 37. The Brazen Serpent, or faith in Christ illustrated. By J. H. JONES, D. D.
38. Sermons to Young Children. 39. My Own Book: or select narratives for youth. 40. The Child's Poetical Keepsake.
41. Alphabet of Birds—Illustrated. 42. The works of Creation—Illustrated—from the English edition.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER I.

JULY, 1851.

ARTICLE I.

DOMESTIC LITERATURE.

Tallulah and other Poems. By HENRY R. JACKSON.
Savannah, Ga. Jno. M. Cooper, Publisher, 1850.

POETRY is both the beginning and the climax of a nation's literature. It not only reduces the jargon of a half-formed language to harmony, but, when thus harmonized, adduces from it its highest and most perfect combinations. As the same spirit of God that arranged and beautified the primal chaos—separated also, from its unintelligent order, its last and highest work, man—so the genius of the poet not only combines, into a harmonious language, the rude accents of a semi-barbarous people, but exalts, so to speak, upon that language, when formed, its noblest and highest monument—the drama, or the epic.

The historical facts that prove this proposition are curious and interesting. The oldest literature in the world is the Jewish. Of that literature, Moses was (instrumentally) the father. But Moses was not only a poet, but the very prince of poets. The Song of Miriam at the Red Sea, and his Farewell to Israel on the plains of Moab, have never been surpassed. But he is the author, either by origin or translation, of the book of Job. The style, age, general character, and especially its incorporation into the Holy Scriptures, all indicate Moses as its author,

And what a poem! Carlyle considers it the greatest poetical production in existence. Thus did a Divine law-giver, and a finished scholar, of olden times, cast the charms of poetry over the most venerable literature of the world.

The records of Grecian and Roman literature are even more to our purpose. The fabulous legends of Mercury, Apollo and Orpheus, all indicate that the rude language of Greece was harmonized by bards that even preceded the great Homer. However this may be, the latter carried that language to a perfection, in his immortal *Iliad*, that it never surpassed afterwards. The earliest writers, too, in the stately Latin, were the poets Ennius, Plautus and Terence. These formed that beautiful vehicle of thought which was afterwards to be carried to its highest perfection, by the genius of Lucan and Virgil. Nor are similar facts less noticeable in the origin and progress of modern languages. According to Talvi, one of the first, if not the very first literary production in the Russian language, was Igor's expedition against the Polovtzi, an epic poem of the twelfth century. It is a well known fact that, in Provence and Normandy, the Troubadours and Trouveurs, wandering bards, celebrating either the adventures of lovers or the feats of heroes, were among the first to elicit from barbaric confusion the elements of that beautiful tongue, the French. In Spain, too, the *Life of Cid Ruy Diaz*, an irregular, but spirited poem, was the first literary star that shed light upon the soft dialect of the afterwards haughty Dons of Castile and Arragon. Ciallo d'Alcamo, Guinizelli, Arrezzo and Cavalcante preceded, in Italian literature, even the more illustrious names of Dante and Petrarch. It was these last, however, that harmonized, elevated and almost canonized the modern language of this classic peninsula. In English, William Langland and Chaucer were the first architects in that splendid temple, which the genius of Milton and Shakespeare has consecrated forever.

Thus is it historically true, that poetry is at once the beginning and the climax of a nation's literature. The spirit of literature seeks this as its earliest form, and, even after passing through various changes, consecrates itself forever in poetic imagery, as its highest and holiest dwel-

ling
cau
His
loso
rela
dev
of
fact
mat
ent
con
of
are
com
ther
T
rian
has
wri
and
pre
mar
Th
from
set
and
alre
not
rud
the
no
as
Th
fice
nes
nat
alre
the
our
It
lite
gin

And what a poem! Carlyle considers it the greatest poetical production in existence. Thus did a Divine law-giver, and a finished scholar, of olden times, cast the charms of poetry over the most venerable literature of the world.

The records of Grecian and Roman literature are even more to our purpose. The fabulous legends of Mercury, Apollo and Orpheus, all indicate that the rude language of Greece was harmonized by bards that even preceded the great Homer. However this may be, the latter carried that language to a perfection, in his immortal *Iliad*, that it never surpassed afterwards. The earliest writers, too, in the stately Latin, were the poets Ennius, Plautus and Terence. These formed that beautiful vehicle of thought which was afterwards to be carried to its highest perfection, by the genius of Lucan and Virgil. Nor are similar facts less noticeable in the origin and progress of modern languages. According to Talvi, one of the first, if not the very first literary production in the Russian language, was Igor's expedition against the Polovtzi, an epic poem of the twelfth century. It is a well known fact that, in Provence and Normandy, the Troubadours and Trouveurs, wandering bards, celebrating either the adventures of lovers or the feats of heroes, were among the first to elicit from barbaric confusion the elements of that beautiful tongue, the French. In Spain, too, the *Life of Cid Ruy Diaz*, an irregular, but spirited poem, was the first literary star that shed light upon the soft dialect of the afterwards haughty Dons of Castile and Arragon. Ciallo d'Alcamo, Guinizelli, Arrezzo and Cavalcante preceded, in Italian literature, even the more illustrious names of Dante and Petrarch. It was these last, however, that harmonized, elevated and almost canonized the modern language of this classic peninsula. In English, William Langland and Chaucer were the first architects in that splendid temple, which the genius of Milton and Shakespeare has consecrated forever.

Thus is it historically true, that poetry is at once the beginning and the climax of a nation's literature. The spirit of literature seeks this as its earliest form, and, even after passing through various changes, consecrates itself forever in poetic imagery, as its highest and holiest dwel-

ling-place. Should any be disposed to inquire into the cause of this phenomenon, the matter is perfectly plain. History, which is the record of national events; and philosophy, which is a careful inquiry into the causes and relations of things, must necessarily be slower in their developement than poetry. It is only by a long succession of national changes, and a careful collection of difficult facts, that the historian and philosopher can obtain the materials on which to proceed. The case is widely different with the poet. The settlement of new countries, the conflict of leaders, the feats of the daring, the gallantry of lovers, and, above all, nature—infinite nature—these are all materials at hand, and the imagination has only to combine and arrange them into tales or narratives, to give them thrilling and irresistible effect.

The history of American literature is somewhat at variance with the facts stated above. In our country, poetry has been neither the pioneer, nor the perfection of our writing. Theology, philosophy, eloquence, jurisprudence, and even metaphysics, have gone before it; and, even at present, it may be placed in the rear of history and romance. This fact is curious and may need an explanation. The colonists of this country differed in many respects from the early settlers of other lands. They were not a set of semi-barbarians with a rude language, but polished and refined Englishmen, bringing with them a language already in a state of the highest cultivation. Their's was not an origination, but a transference of society. The rudeness, in this case, was all in nature; and they applied the appropriate remedy, the axe and the plough. Probably no nation that has ever existed has accomplished so much as the American people in the same length of time. They have dispossessed a race of barbarians of a magnificent soil; they have converted that soil from a wilderness into a land of fields and gardens; they have originated a great and splendid government; and they have already, from being an infant nation, rushed forward to the very head of political influence and power. Surely our's has been a land of giants and of gigantic enterprizes. It was natural, under these circumstances, that a practical literature should have preceded that which is chiefly imaginative and entertaining. And such has been the case;

and, even to the present day, America is anticipating the advent of her poet—the appearance, yet future, of some illustrious bard she does not now possess.

Let us, however, not despise the poets that we have. Homer, Dante, Shakespeare and Milton, those suns of the poetic firmament, all had their morning stars; and, at the present time, there is in America quite a galaxy of poetic luminaries. Bryant, Longfellow, Emerson, Poe, Willis and Lowell are certainly names not to be despised. Nor should we overlook the fame of Mrs. Sigourney, Miss Gould, and other like minstrels of the gentler sex. And these are all things around us. They are the tickings of time's watch-wheel at the present moment—they are the manifestation of the spirit that we ourselves breathe—they indicate, certainly, a change passing over us, from the purely practical to the divinely meditative—from axe and hammer-sounds to the *Æolian* breathings of the lyre and the lute.

Possibly it would be well, just here, to note an imperfection, certainly a marked feature, in our forming poetry. By whatever cause, Boston has become the Parnassus of America. There the muses congregate—there poetry is published and appreciated. And we are happy to learn, too, that the firm of Ticknor, Reed and Fields, recently so acrimoniously satirized in the *Emporium*, by the author of "*Parnassus in Pillory*," is not in the habit of meeting the advancing bard with the copper-lip reply—"It won't sell, sir—it won't sell, sir." They have ascertained that poetry—yes, poetry—is a marketable article even in America. And the patronage which these liberal publishers have given to home genius, has encouraged and enabled a number of aspiring minds, around that city, to cultivate the friendship of the muses. Hence there is a literary halo around that pilgrim metropolis that no other city in our country enjoys. Now, the evil to which we allude is just this—that in no spot on our continent is there so strong a German influence as at and around Boston. Transcendentalism, in spirit, and latitudinarianism, in form, are manifest in the poems and literary writings of their best authors. The design of the poet should be to indicate feelings and emotions that are natural to man. And, as both good and bad men may be in extreme conditions, he may describe such emotions as swelling into storms, or

abating into the greatest imaginable composure. But, when he goes beyond these bounds and forces us across the limit of humanity—when he desires us to put off our natural impulses, and to put on a sort of spirit-robe to understand him—we confess that, like Paul, we begin to doubt whether either he or ourselves be in or out of the body! We are suspended in mid heaven by a sort of magical cobweb, and we are ready almost to question personal identity. But, for a work of this sort, you must *make* a language. Words that have been employed for ages, to express such feelings and emotions as are common to man, will not answer to convey proper ideas when you wish to express (if it be possible) feelings and emotions that are absolutely superhuman. Here, you must rear a Babel—you must roll Pelion on Ossa, or you utterly fail. And, really, it is mortifying to see how our mother English, the sainted language of Milton and Shakespeare, of Addison and Pope, is made to assume a thousand grotesque and even ridiculous aspects in the hands of such overstrained philosophical writers. Poor Carlyle—our Saxon ancestors will certainly have a hard settlement with him, for letting so many Germans into the pure temple of their classic and elegant language!

But it is time to turn to a poet of entirely different character. Henry R. Jackson, whose name stands at the head of this article, is a Georgian by birth, a native of Athens, and the son of Dr. Henry Jackson, former Professor in the University; by profession he is a lawyer, and he now fills the office of Judge in the Eastern Circuit of Georgia. During the Mexican campaign he held the post of Colonel in the Georgia regiment. The mournful exit of many of the members of that regiment, has called forth one of his most beautiful and touching pieces. So much for the author; as to the work, no one we think can read it, without being impressed with the fact, that he is under the spell of one of nature's genuine minstrels. His harp is evidently not stolen, nor does he hold it by hire; it has been neither Germanized nor Babelized, but rings to the clear tones of the human soul as a bell does to an elastic atmosphere. There is no discord, none whatever. The feeling is conceived—deeply conceived—and is beautifully and naturally expressed. We see here no such phrases

as "cloud-barks with bellying sails," and "every-dayness of this work-day world," disfiguring the simple transparency of a genuinely classic style. The Tallulah, which is the longest of the poems, is a work of very high merit. The bard has placed himself on the awful precipice that overhangs that frightful cataract; he inhales, as far as nature will allow, the spirit of terrible grandeur around him; he associates the past and the future with the objects of his present meditation. Under these circumstances he attempts to describe the awful chasm and roar beneath him, and to give its solemn lessons to the world. He launches at once into the sublime, and never lowers the elevation of the strain, until he sounds the last note. It may be seriously questioned whether even the best poets of our age have succeeded as well in the uniform maintenance of a succession of grand and glowing ideas. This piece alone is enough to wreath the brow of our young Judge with the laurel of permanent poetic fame. It will never cease to be admired, we are sure, while taste and genius can be appreciated. Nor does our author lose spirit, when he condescends to walk over "the red old hills of Georgia," to listen to the plaintive notes of the "whip-poor-will;" to sit down under the "dog-wood tree," or to stand in the desolation of a "deserted homestead." Every where, whether bowing at the feet of a venerated sire—soothing the sorrows of a widowed mother—standing at the grave of a loved sister—looking up into the abbey-like vault of Bonaventure—or eating his crust and ham with the hardy settler of New Georgia—every where he is heart and hand with all around him—full of sympathy—full of pathos—full of *human nature*. All that such a bard requires to be extensively popular is, *a hearing*. And yet we suspect, if the truth were known, that there are thousands of Georgians who scarcely know that such a poet has been, and is among them! Yea more, we suspect, that on the book-counter the fair hand often passes over "Tallulah and other poems," to fix itself upon the "yellow cover" of some work of Alexander Dumas, George Sand, or other like novelist!

Having thus introduced our author, and his unpretending little work to public notice, we now proceed to the main design of this article, Domestic Literature. What-

ever may be the cause or causes, the fact is undeniable, that the South, a tract of country almost as large as half of Europe, inhabited by an intelligent and high-minded people, possessed of wealth and means, the South has not as yet produced what may be called a literature! If we possessed at this moment only the books that are strictly indigenous, what would they amount to? Probably, too, at least two-thirds of what may pass for Southern literature has been produced by *adopted* citizens! Our almost absolute destitution on this subject may be gained from a few simple questions: for the millions of children and youth around us, have we produced a Spelling-book? have we furnished for them a Reader? a Geography? a Grammar? a History? Is there now in all the schools from Baltimore to Texas, a solitary book that the South has produced? Is there in all the colleges in the same extent of country, a solitary text-book written by a Southerner? If our history is told, the Yankees must tell it! If our pronunciation and spelling are fixed, the Yankees must fix them! If even the price of a bale of cotton is decided upon, we must go to Davies to learn that its value is \$430! Thus do we live, and move, and have our literary and educational existence, in Northern thinking and Northern writing! It is enough to make the very blood boil at the heart, to have to record these facts. We are ashamed of them, and would hide them from human gaze, did we not believe that the best interests of the South require their exposure.

But let us come to other facts, for if the South has never made a school book, she has possibly done some thing better. Let us ask then, what has Virginia, the oldest State in the Republic—a patriotic—a great State—what has she done to create a literature? She has furnished a few histories of herself recently, and some very good biographies. What has South Carolina done? She has produced a very creditable history, a few theological works of some pretension, and a few works of fiction. These States are probably considerably ahead in authorship of any others in the Southern sisterhood. We may, too, have done them injustice in the above answers. But we approach a State in which our information is more accurate. What has Georgia done? The following is about the

amount of our self-produced literature: a History of the State in two volumes by McCall; a respectable Work of Fiction by Judge Clayton; the Life and Madness of Tasso by R. H. Wilde; a small fragment of poetry by the same; the Statistics of Georgia, recently published by Rev. R. White; these Poems of Judge Jackson; and various compilations and digests of State laws! It is possible that Georgia may also lay claim to the writings of her most distinguished daughter in the literary world, Miss McIntosh. Though in the great metropolis, she is yet a native of our soil; and at least a part of her glory should be shed on us. This is about the sum total of our literature! We have besides this, a good many published sermons, reports, speeches, &c. &c. Now is this an adequate literature, for a State passing into the middle part of her second century, inhabited by a thrifty and intelligent population, possessed of a great number of excellent academies, maintaining five flourishing colleges, and exhibiting in *every other respect* the signs of rapid and powerful progression? To this question there is and can be but one answer—It is not. Nor have we in our State a solitary Review, Magazine, or any thing of the sort. There is also a strange reluctance to aid our neighbors, who are attempting something of this sort, to furnish able and well prepared articles, for even those Reviews that are open to us, and which are inviting our co-operation!

We have been a good deal entertained lately, in running a parallel between ancient Sparta and our Southern country. The Spartans were fine agriculturists, fixed patriots and invincible soldiers; but they have not left, we believe, a solitary luminary in the literature of Greece. Athens, close by, had a galaxy of poets, orators and philosophers. But Sparta wholly employed herself in carrying out her present selfish interests, under the laws of Lycurgus. Is not this too striking a picture of our boasted South at present? We are an agricultural—a patriotic, a brave people—we have raised great generals and great statesmen; but where are our poets and philosophers, our historians and writers?

The cause of this state of things cannot be found in the influence of slavery. Athens and Rome, at the very acme of literary fame, were surrounded by an almost infinite

multitude of slaves. Indeed, there is much in the independence, the leisure, the spirit usually associated with the possession of slaves, to encourage and expedite literary enterprize. Enter the country mansion of one of our wealthy farmers—you see books, reviews, papers and sometimes paintings and sculpture—you see an intelligent mind poring over the literature of the day—well informed on all national subjects—possessing both leisure and wealth. What facilities are here for the cultivation of history, philosophy, poetry, &c. ? Nor can the cause of this state of things be found in any general mental torpor peculiar to the South. The Southern is an energetic, active, stirring mind ; on all political subjects what restless and ceaseless activity do we exhibit ? Nor are we apathetic in religion, but a fervent and earnest people. Nor are we indifferent in trade, internal improvement, or the establishment and extension of schools. It is almost exclusively on *this one subject* that we slumber, showing evidently, that it has either been entirely overlooked, or that it has some peculiar difficulties.

There is much force in both of these suppositions. We have no idea that the South has at all appreciated the full value of a domestic and flourishing literature. There is often an outcry against the number of new publications—a spirit to thrust off the influx of the foreign literature, that is poured upon us by Northern publishers—a prejudice even against book-making altogether. We have not fully entered into a right conception of what would and must be our condition, did we possess active authors, publishers, and readers. A native and flourishing literature would be “life from the dead” throughout the entire structure of our whole society ; it would quicken genius, diffuse knowledge, encourage effort, counteract vice and consecrate many an idle hour to noble and good ends. Its effects upon our young men would be most happy. Instead of plunging them, as soon as they get a diploma, and even earlier, into the whirlpool of politics, we should then take them to the Arcadian groves and Castilian fountains of a more retired and peaceful life. But we have not appreciated all this as we ought ; our thoughts have been appropriated too exclusively to Government on the one hand, and cotton on the other. We have not begun as yet to lay

our literary schemes—to make our literary estimates—to appropriate our literary outlay. We leave this great interest to chance and the future. In the mean time, our Yankee brethren, seeing our neglect, are anticipating our action, or even suppressing it, by an ample supply of all sorts and kinds of books, pamphlets and magazines.

We sincerely hope that this subject, distinctively and pre-eminently—as an interest in which the whole South is concerned—will receive from public men and public bodies, the attention which it deserves. It seems to us that our country, divided as it is into separate State sovereignties, has peculiar advantages for literary enterprise. Why may not a State Legislature foster this, as it does all other local interests? It establishes colleges, encourages academies, adopts plans for common school education, co-operates with various companies in creating banks, manufactories and railroads. Why may it not go a step farther, and cast its wing of protection in some way over native authors? Shall it be left to tyrants and despots alone to encourage literary men, while republican Governments—that above all others demand a literature peculiar to their character—pass them by in cold neglect? It is becoming quite a common opinion among some British reviewers, that if we are not careful, as a nation, foreign literature will poison the very spirit of republicanism that now exists among us! What is the remedy then—what, but the creation throughout our vast republic of an American literature of the highest order?

But literary enterprise at the South is encompassed with very many disadvantages; one of the greatest is, the non-existence from Baltimore to New Orleans, of a solitary publishing firm. An author must contract, if he can, with a New York, or Boston, or Philadelphia house. There are very many chances, that he will meet with no favorable conditions; he must publish at his own expense, and necessarily suffer a great loss. Who will publish on such terms? Why, many a man would sooner throw his manuscripts into the fire, than have them go to the world with the sure prospect of encumbering his estate. But cannot the whole South—the wealthy South—support at least one publishing house? The motive to this, apart from authorship, is immensely strong. We declare it as

our solemn conviction, that such houses as Harper & Brothers, Appleton & Co., &c., exert a stronger influence upon the tastes, manners, habits and character of our people, than even their local institutions. We have sometimes had our hair almost to stand on end, when considering the mammoth power of a single New York publisher. And ought not that power to be distributed? Ought not the South, so peculiar in the structure of her society—so much the apple of discord in the Union—ought not the South to possess a portion of that power?

It has been intimated, sometimes, that New York, or some such place, is the natural market for books; and that, unless published there, they cannot get into circulation. There is some force in this statement at present, we will admit. But if we had a southern book-market, as we have a cotton-market, there could be no force in the remark whatever. Were there a solitary house of respectable means and patronage at the South—and were these authors to furnish such house with good and useful books—the book-trade would issue from such establishment in all possible directions. Buyers must go where an article is to be had; it being in all cases the production which creates the market. We get flour from Baltimore or New York. Why? Because it is there produced. They obtain tobacco from Richmond, cotton from Charleston and Savannah, and sugar from New Orleans. Why? Because these articles are produced in these various localities. Now if the South produced authors—and if she had a publishing firm of standing—would we not at once have a book-market? London is the great literary market of Great Britain: but is there not a very lucrative trade of this sort carried on in Edinburgh and other large towns? And as to the re-publication of foreign literature, why may not that be done in the South as well as elsewhere? Can nobody select foreign literature for us but Harper and Brothers, the Carters, or some such like firm in New York? But we have said enough—possibly too much—on this subject. Some, perhaps, will consider us as croaking—some as visionary—some as sectional. We wish to be neither. We have looked over this subject for years—we have revolved it in our mind, in the light of the past and the future—we have associated it with all the great movements of the age.


And we declare it as our solemn and fixed conviction, that the South can never be respected abroad—prosperous at home—and truly great—without a literature of her own. She must have not only her own schools and colleges, but her own books and authors—not simply her own newspapers, but her own reviews—not *a* literature, but *her own* literature. This will make her nobly independent—this will cast around her a defence better than fortresses—more powerful than armies. This will give her the consciousness of importance—will create genuine self-respect—and will make her to stand an equal among equals in the family of nations.

ARTICLE II.

VALIDITY OF POPISH BAPTISM.

[This article, which will be followed by others, in consecutive numbers of the Review, is a re-publication of a series of articles which appeared, in 1846, in the columns of the *Watchman and Observer*. They are now collected and re-published, not with a design to revive the controversy which occasioned them, but at the desire of many who are anxious to see them before the public in a more permanent and accessible form.—EDS. S. P. R.]

The remarks which appeared in the *Princeton Review*, the July number of the past year, [1845,] upon the decision of the Assembly, in regard to the validity of Romish baptism, deserve a more elaborate reply than they have yet received. The distinguished reputation of the scholar to whom they are ascribed, and the evident ability with which they are written—for, whatever may be said of the *soundness* of the argument, the *ingenuity* and *skill* with which it is put cannot be denied—entitle them to special consideration. And as the presumption is, that they embody the *strongest* objections which *can* be proposed to the decision in question, a refutation of them is likely to be a complete and triumphant defence of the action of the Assembly. Under ordinary circumstances, it might be



attributed to arrogance, in ordinary men, to enter the lists with Princeton; but truth always carries such fearful odds in its favor, that the advocate of a just cause need not dread, with far inferior ability, to encounter those whom he may regard in some degree the patrons of error.

As in the General Assembly it was maintained by those who denied the validity of Popish Baptism, that the ordinance itself was so corrupted in its constituent elements—its matter and its form—that it could not be treated as the institution of Christ—and that the Papal communion, as an organized body, being destitute of some of the indispensable marks of a true church, could not be recognized in that character—the strictures of the reviewer have been shaped with a reference to this two-fold argument. In opposition to the Assembly, he asserts that the essential elements of baptism *are* found in the Romish ceremony, and the essential elements of a church in the Papal communion; and, what is still more remarkable, he insists that, even upon the supposition that the Romish sect is not a church of the Lord Jesus Christ, it by no means follows that its baptism is not valid. The consent of the Protestant world, for ages and generations past, to the opinion which he has espoused, without being adduced as a separate and distinct argument, is repeatedly introduced as an offset to whatever weight the overwhelming vote of the Assembly might carry with it. Such is a general view of the Princeton remarks.

Now, I propose to show that their distinguished author has failed to prove any one of these positions, either that the essential elements of baptism *are* found in the Popish ordinance, or that, without being a church, it can have the sacraments of Christ, or that the testimony of Protestant Christendom is more clearly in his favor than it is against him. These are the points upon which issue is joined.

To the question, what constitutes the validity of baptism, the reply obviously is, the conformity of any rite with the definition of baptism, which may be collected from the Scriptures, and justified by them. Whatever ordinance possesses all the elements which belong to Christian baptism, *is* Christian baptism, and should be recognized as valid by all who bear the Christian name. The

validity of a sacrament does not depend upon any *effects* which it produces, either mysterious or common—but upon its *nature*: the question is, not what it *does*, but what it *is*; and, whatever coincides with the appointment of Christ, so as to be essentially the same ordinance which he instituted, must be received as bearing his sanction. When the Assembly, therefore, decided that Popish baptism is not valid, it intended to assert, that what in that corrupt communion is administered under the name of baptism, is really a different institution from the ordinance of Christ. Rome's ceremony does not answer to a just definition of the Christian sacrament.

In enumerating the elements of baptism, the reviewer seems to have fallen into two mistakes—one wholly unimportant—the other, materially affecting the question in dispute. *Intention* is treated as something distinct from the *form* of baptism,—and *matter*, form, and intention are represented as constituting the *essence* of the ordinance. Now, in the language of the schools, *form* and *essence* are equivalent expressions. The *form* of a thing is that which makes it what it is, which distinguishes it from all other beings, and limits and defines our conceptions of its properties.* According to Aristotle, it is the *forms* impressed upon the first matter, which enable us to discriminate betwixt different substances. As intention, according to the statement of the reviewer, is a part of the *essence* of baptism, it is consequently an error of arrangement to make it different from the form. The whole idea of baptism may be embraced under two heads. The reviewer, no doubt, had his eye upon the peripatetic division of causes; but the *intention* of which he speaks cannot be the *final* cause of Aristotle, because that was not an ingredient of the essence. The *use* of a table, or the pur-

* τὸ ὡς τὸ εἶδος; τὸ τὴν εἶναι. Arist. Met. L. 7. c. 4. "Form is that," says Stanly, quoting this passage, "which the thing itself is said to be *per se*—the being of a thing what it was—the whole common nature and essence of a thing answerable to the definition." Philos. part 4th, chap. 3d. "Now that accident," says Hobbes, "for which we give a certain name to any body, or the accident which denominates its subject, is commonly called the *essence* thereof—and the same essence, inasmuch as it is generated, is called the *FORM*." Philosophy. "Ens a forma habet," says Wolfius, "ut sit hujus generis vel speciei atque ab aliis distinguatur. Hinc scholastici aiunt, *formam dare esse rei, dare distinguere*. Ontologia, part 2, sec. 3. c. 2. § 945.

pose of a mechanic in making it, is no part of the *nature* of the table. But the *intention* in baptism is indispensable to the existence of the ordinance—it is a necessary element of a just definition, and, therefore, belongs appropriately to the form. The true final cause exists in the mind of God. In the case of baptism, a definition which should set forth the matter and form fully and completely, would coincide exactly with the logical rule which resolves a definition into the nearest genus and the specific difference. The matter, *water*, is a generic term, and suggests every other kind of ablution besides that of baptism—while the form distinguishes this particular form of washing from every other mode of using this element.

As this mistake in arrangement, however, is a mere question of words and names, I pass to a more important error, the omission of one of the elements, which, according to the great majority of Protestant confessions, enters into the essence of Baptism. The *form* does not consist alone in washing with water, with solemn invocation of the name of the Trinity, and with the professed purpose of complying with the command of Christ. There must be some one to make the invocation, and to apply the water. These are acts which require an agent—services which demand a servant. Not *any* application of water, in the name of the Trinity, with the ostensible design of signing and sealing the blessings of the new and everlasting covenant, constitutes baptism—the water must be applied by one who is lawfully commissioned to dispense the mysteries of Christ. There must be an *instrumental*, as well as a *material* and formal cause. This fact the reviewer seems neither prepared to deny nor assert; and, though he takes no notice of it in his formal definition of baptism, he is yet willing to concede it for the sake of argument. The question, then, is, do these four things enter into the baptisms administered by the authority of the Romish church? Do her priests wash with *water*, in the *name of the Trinity*, with the *professed design of complying with the command of Christ*, and are *they themselves* to be regarded as *lawful ministers of the word*? The Princeton Review has undertaken, in all these instances, to prove the affirmative; and it is my purpose to show that it has signally failed—that, according to

their scriptural import, not one of these particulars is found in the Popish ordinance.

I. The reviewer expresses great surprise,* at the statement made on the floor of the Assembly, that Romanists were accustomed to corrupt the water, which they used in baptism, with a mixture of oil. It is rather a matter of astonishment that he himself should not have been aware of so notorious a fact. It is true that their church formularies make natural water the only thing *essential* to the *matter* of the ordinance; but it is equally indisputable that *such water* is only *used* in cases of urgent and extreme necessity. Whenever the rite is administered with solemn ceremonies—and these can never be omitted except upon a plea which is equally valid to dispense with the services of a priest—the water, instead of being applied in its natural state, in conformity with the command of Christ, is previously consecrated, or rather profaned, by the infusion of *Chrism*—a holy compound of balsam and oil. Innovations upon the simplicity of the sacraments began with the spirit of superstition in the Christian church, and grew, and strengthened, until they reached their consummation in the magical liturgy of Rome. The precise period at which this specific mode of consecrating the water was first introduced, I am unable to determine; but there is an evident reference to it in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, which goes under the name of Dionysius. “Immediately after the unction,” says Bingham,† “the minister proceeded to consecrate the water; or the bishop, if he were present, consecrated it, while the priests were finishing the unction; for so the author, under the name of Dionysius, represents it. “While the priests,” says he, “are finishing the unction, the bishop comes to the mother of adoption (so he calls the font), and, by invocation, sanctifies the water in it; *thrice pouring in some of the holy Chrism, in a manner representing the sign of the cross.*”

The Catechism of the Council of Trent not only insists upon this mixture, whenever baptism is performed with

* “We were, therefore, greatly surprised to see, that it was stated on the floor of the Assembly, that Romanists did not baptise with water, but with water mixed with oil.” Princeton Review, July 1845, p. 449.

† Origines Sacræ. Lib. xi. cap. x. § 1.

solemn ceremonies, but states distinctly that it *has always been observed* in the Catholic church, and traces its origin to apostolical tradition. “*Illud vero animadvertendum est, quamvis aqua simplex, quæ nihil aliud admixtum habet, materia apta sit ad hoc sacramentum conficiendum, quoties scilicet baptismi ministrandi necessitas incidat, tamen ex Apostolorum traditione semper in Catholica Ecclesia observatum esse, ut cum solemnibus ceremoniis baptismus conficitur, sacrum etiam Chrisma addatur, quo baptismi effectum magis declarari perspicuum est.*”

This same catechism divides the ceremonies of baptism, as is usual among the Romish writers upon the subject, into three classes—the first embracing those which precede; the second, those which accompany; and the third, those which follow the administration of the ordinance. “*In primis*”—it begins the explanation of the first head—“*igitur aqua paranda est, qua ad baptismum uti oportet. Consecratur, enim, baptismi fons, addito mysticæ unctionis oleo, neque id omni tempore fieri permissum est; sed more majorum, festi quidam dies, qui omnium celeberrimi et sanctissimi optimo jure, habendi sunt, expectantur; in quorum vigiliis sacræ ablutionis aqua conficitur,*” &c. “*In the first place, the water to be used in baptism must be prepared. The font is consecrated by adding the oil of the mystic unction. Nor can this be done at any time; but, in conformity with ancient usage, is delayed until the vigils of the most celebrated and holy festivals.*” Part ii. § 60, Catechis. Conc. Trident.*

Durand enumerates *four* kinds of blessed water, among which he includes the water of baptism, and gives a full and particular account of the mode of sanctifying it. “*Postremo sit admixtio Chrismatis in aqua, sicut dictum est. Unde dicitur in Burcardo, lib. iii. “benedicimus fontes baptismatis oleo unctionis;” et Augustinus eisdem verbis utens subjecit quod hoc magis tacite sive sine scriptura hac mystica ratione introductum est quam per aliquam Scripturam. Per hujusmodi ergo admixtionem unio Christi et ecclesiæ significatur. Nam Chrisma est Christus, aqua populus dicitur. Sanctificetur fons iste—ex quibus verbis*

* Pars II. Cap. 2, § 11.

ad quid fiat admixtio satis datur intelligi.* To the same purport is the testimony of Alcuin, the famous preceptor of Charlemagne. "Quibus finitis ante fontes et facto silentio, stante sacerdote, sequitur benedictio fontis. *Omnipotens, sempiterne Deus, &c.* "Sequitur consecratio fontis; in modum præfationis decantanda: *Aeterne Deus, qui invisibili potentia sacramentorum tuorum.* Ad invocationem vero Spiritus sancti, quem sacerdos celsa voce proclamatur, id est, alto mentis affectu, deponitur cereus benedictus in aquam sive illi, qui ab eo illuminati sunt, ad demonstrandam scilicet Spiritus Sancti presentiam, sacerdote jam dicente; *Descendat in hanc plenitudinem fontis. Fonte benedicto, accipit Pontifex chrisma cum oleo mixto in vase ab Archidiacono et aspergit per medium fontis in modum crucis.*"†

These passages, from Durand and Alcuin, are extracted from their accounts of the solemnities of the GREAT SABBATH—the Saturday preceding Easter. This festival and Pentecost were the solemn seasons to which, in the times of Leo, the administration of baptism was confined, except in cases of necessity—and hence it is, in the description of these festivals, that we are to look for a detailed exhibition of the ceremonies connected with its due celebration. In the first book of Martene de Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus, may be seen the forms, taken from various liturgies, of consecrating the font, and the *infusion of the Chrism* is,

* De Divinis Officiis, Lib. vi. p. 140. Lyons Edition, 1518. "In the last place, the water is mixed with chrism—as we have previously mentioned. Whence it is said in Burcard, lib. iii. *We bless the fonts of baptism with the oil of unction.* And Augustin, using the same words, subjoins that it is done more from a mystical reason than from any authority of Scripture. By a mixture of this sort, the union of Christ with the Church is signified; the chrism representing Christ, and the water the people."

† De Divinis Officiis, cap. xix. De Sabbato Sanctæ vigil. Paschæ. "These things having been completed before the fonts, and silence instituted, the priest standing, the benediction of the font follows: *Omnipotent, Eternal God, &c.* Then succeeds the consecration of the font, to be chanted, as in the preface to the mass. *Eternal God, who by the invisible power of thy sacraments.* At the invocation of the Holy Spirit, whom the priest proclaims with a lofty voice, that is, with deep affection of mind, the blessed candle is deposited in the water, or those which had been lighted, to show the presence of the Spirit, the priest now saying: *May he descend in this fulness of the font. The font, being blessed, the Pontiff receives from the Arch-deacon, the chrism with oil mixed in a vase, and sprinkles it in the midst of the font in the form of a cross.*"

invariably, a part of the process.* Hurd, in his interesting work on religious rites and ceremonies, mentions among the solemnities of Easter-eve the consecration of the waters of baptism. "The officiating priest perfumes the font thrice with frankincense, after which, he takes some of the oil used in baptism, and pours it on the holy water crossways, mixed with Chrism, and this is reserved to baptize all the catechumens, or children, who shall be brought to the church."†

These authorities, I trust, are sufficient to diminish the Reviewer's surprise at the statement made on the floor of the Assembly, and to put it beyond doubt, that the *matter* of Romish baptism is *not simple, natural water*, but *water artificially corrupted*. Whether this corruption vitiates the sacrament to such an extent as seriously to affect its validity, is not so trivial a question as the reviewer supposes. As baptism is a species of ablution, whatever unfits the water for the purpose of cleansing, unfits it for the Christian ordinance. Such mixtures as are found in nature, in springs, pools, rivers and seas, so long as they do not affect the liquidity of the fluid, do not affect its adaptation to any of the ordinary purposes of life. Men still *wash* with it. But a water which cannot be used in *washing*, is not suitable matter for baptism; and, as *oil* evidently impairs its cleansing properties, it destroys that

* The following specimens may be taken:—1. Ex Missali Gothico-Gallicano. After a prayer for blessing the fonts, and the exorcism of the water, the rubric directs that the water shall be blown upon three times, and the chrism infused into it in the form of a cross.

Deinde insufflas aquam per tres vices, et mittis chrisma in modum crucis, et dici—Infusio chrismæ salutaris Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ut fiat fons aquæ salientis cunctis descenditibus in eo, in vitam æternam. Amen. Lib. 1. Art. 18. ordo i.

2. Ex veteri missali Gallicano.

After the prayers for blessing the fonts, the rubric directs, that *three crosses should be made upon the water with chrism*. "*Postea facis tres cruces super aquam de chrismo et dicis, &c.—Ibid. Ordo ii.*

3. From an old Paris Ritual, the form of administering baptism on the great Sabbath, the Saturday preceeding Easter, is extracted. *Ibid. Ordo x.* Among the other ceremonies enumerated, the infusion of the chrism is expressly mentioned. "*Inde,*" is the rubric for that purpose, "*inde accipiens vas aureum cum chrismate, fundit chrisma in fonte in modum crucis, et expandit aquam cum manu sua, tunc baptizantur infantes, primum masculi, deinde feminæ.*"

† Hurd's History of the Rites, Ceremonies and Customs (Religious) of the whole world, p. 218.

very quality in water, in consequence of which it is capable of representing the purifying influence of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. No more incongruous substances can be found than water and oil, and, to wash in such a mixture, is not to *cleanse*, but *defile*. The *significancy* of the rite is affected; it is not made to consist in simply washing with water, but in washing with a water duly consecrated with *oil*. In the present case, attention is called to the mixture: great importance is attached to it, and it is in *consequence* of the chrism that the mixed substance is used in preference to the pure, simple, natural element. It is not because it is *water*, but because it is *sanctified by oil*, that the priests employ it in baptism. This is, certainly, not making the significancy of the rite depend upon washing with water; it makes it equally depend upon the oil of the mystic unction. The very purpose of the mixture is to increase the significancy of the rite; to declare more fully the nature and effect of the baptism. The oil is, consequently, made a prominent element in the compound, and it is precisely that which, in ordinary cases, *fits* the water for its use. In other cases, the foreign element is left entirely out of view, and the adulterated substance is used *as* water and nothing but water. But here it is not, *notwithstanding* the mixture, but *because* of the mixture, that the corrupted water is employed. It is not used *as* water and nothing but water, but as water invested with new properties, in consequence of the oil. The presence of the foreign matter is an improvement, when canonically introduced, upon the original appointment of the Saviour; and so much importance is attached to it, that Rome permits simple water to be used only on the plea which may also dispense with the services of the priest, the plea of stern necessity. Water, without the chrism, may be employed in that class of cases in which Jews, infidels and Turks are authorized to baptize. Through the pressure of necessity, *God may* sanctify it without the oil; but, in ordinary cases, the charm lies in the mystic unction.

These two circumstances seem to me to distinguish the mixture in question, from all the combinations which are found in nature. 1. That the *oil* destroys the *fitness* of water for the purpose of ablution, and so affects the sig-

nificancy of the rite ; and 2d, that the mixture is not used *as* water, but that peculiar stress is laid upon the foreign element. It *enters into* the baptism as a very important ingredient. He who baptizes with rain or cistern water, or water impregnated with saline mixtures, *overlooks* the foreign matter, and attaches value *only* to the water. He uses the mixture simply *as* water. But Rome makes the *corruption* of the water a part of her solemn ceremonies—the chrism works wonders in the font, and imparts to it an efficacy which, only in rare cases, it would otherwise possess. The mixture of the chrism with the water is, according to Durand, a sign of the union between Christ and the Church—and as an evidence of the value attached to the chrism, he adds that *it* represents Christ, while the water represents the people ; and the Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches that additional significancy is given to the water by the holy chrism. We may concede to the Reviewer, “that water with oil thrown on it is still water ;” that is, it may be heated and used, notwithstanding the mixture, *as* water—that wine adulterated with water continues to be wine, or may be used as such, provided the mixture is not made a matter of prominent observation. But when the foreign elements are dignified into importance, and made to play a part in the offices performed, then the water is no longer simple water, but water and oil, the wine is no longer simple wine, but wine and water. If in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper we were professedly to adulterate the wine, in order to give superior efficacy to it, and to use the compound not simply *as* wine, but as wine invested with *new* properties, *in consequence* of the mixture, the matter of the sacrament would be evidently vitiated, and that not because it *was a mixture*, but because it was *used as a mixture*. If the same wine were used *as wine, notwithstanding* the mixture, there would be no impropriety ; but when it is used *in consequence* of the mixture, the case is manifestly different.

It is not a little remarkable, that the Romanists themselves condemn a practice which seems to be fully as justifiable as their own. “Sed neque probandi sunt illi,” says Martene, “de quibus Eghertus Eboracensis archiepiscopus in Excerptis. cap. 42. (Sunt quidam, inquit, qui miscent vinum cum aqua baptismatis, non recto ; quia Christus non

jussit baptizari vino, sed aqua.)* And yet, in the very next section, this writer insists on the importance of using *consecrated* water, and not profane, whenever the ordinance is administered, and refers, among other authorities, to the passage from Dionysius, already quoted, which shews that the consecration embraced the infusion of chrism, in the form of a cross. It is difficult to see how a mixture with *wine vitiates* the sacrament, while a mixture with *oil improves* it. The command of Christ, which is very properly pleaded against wine, applies as conclusively to chrism. But whatever may be said of this self-condemnation on the part of Rome, I think it cannot be denied that, in that idolatrous communion, the *matter* of baptism is corrupted, and that the Reviewer has consequently failed in making out his first point, that papal baptism is a washing with water, and that this is the sole matter of the sacrament. But what, then, it may be asked, did baptism become extinct when this innovation was first introduced, among the churches that adopted it? My reply is, that I know of no sacredness in baptism, which should entitle it to be preserved in its integrity, when the ordinance of the Lord's Supper has been confessedly abolished in the Latin Church. Why should baptism be perpetuated entire, and the Supper transmitted with grievous mutilations? Or will it be maintained that the essence of the Supper was still retained when the cup was denied to the laity? Is it more incredible that an outward ordinance should be invalidated, than that the precious truths which it was designed to represent, should be lost? Is the shell more important than the substance? And shall we admit that the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel have been damnably corrupted in the Church of Rome, and yet be afraid to declare that the signs and seals of the covenant have shared the same fate? If Rome is corrupt in doctrine, I see not why she may not be equally corrupt in ordinances, and if she has lost one sacrament, I see not why she may not have lost the other, and, as the foundations of her apostacy were laid in the ages immediately succeeding the

* De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus, Lib. 1. cap. 1. art. 14. "But neither are they to be approved, of whom Egbert, Archbishop of York, says, (Excerpt. cap. 42.) *There are some who mix wine with the water of baptism. Not rightly, because Christ did not command to be baptized with wine, but with water.*

time of the Apostles, I cannot understand why the loss of the *real* sacrament of baptism may not have been an early symptom of degeneracy and decay.

But our business is with truth and not with consequences. We should not be deterred from admitting a scriptural conclusion, because it removes, with a desolating lesom, the structures of antiquity. We are not to say, *a priori*, that the Church in the fifth or sixth centuries, *must* have had the true sacrament of baptism, and then infer that such and such corruptions do not invalidate the ordinance. But we are first to ascertain from the Scriptures what the true sacrament of baptism is, and then judge the practice of the Church in every age by this standard. If its customs have at any time departed from the law and the testimony, let them be condemned; if they have been something essentially different from what God had enjoined, let them be denounced as spurious. The unbroken transmission of a visible Church in any line of succession is a figment of papists and prelatists. Conformity with the Scriptures, and not ecclesiastical genealogy, is the true touch-stone of a sound Church-State; and if our fathers were without the ordinances, and fed upon ashes for bread, let us only be the more thankful for the greater privileges vouchsafed to ourselves.

II. The *form* of baptism, or that which distinguishes this species of ablution from every other washing with water, consists in the relations which, according to the appointment of Christ, it sustains to the covenant of grace. The solemn invocation of the names of the Trinity,* though a circumstance attending the actual application of the element, and, perhaps, an indispensable circumstance, does not constitute the *whole* essence of the ordinance. A Socinian may undoubtedly employ the same formulary as ourselves. And yet, according to repeated admissions of the Reviewer himself,† his want of faith in the personal distinctions of the Godhead, would be sufficient to render void the pretended sacrament. To baptize in the name of Father, Son and Spirit, is not to pronounce these words as an idle form, or a mystical charm, but to acknowledge

* "Is it then correct as to the form? Is it administered in the name of the Trinity?" Princeton Review, July 1845, p. 450.

† p. (448) p. (446).

that solemn compact in which these glorious agents entered, from eternity, for the redemption of the Church. It is the *faith* of the Trinity, much more than the *names* of its separate persons, that belongs to the essence of baptism; and where this *faith* existed, some of the ancient fathers contended—how justly I shall not undertake to decide—that the ordinance was validly administered, even though done without the explicit mention of *all* the persons of the Godhead. “He that is blessed in Christ,” says Ambrose,* “is blessed in the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost; because the name is one, and the power one. The Ethiopian Eunuch, who was baptized in Christ, had the sacrament complete. If a man names only a single person expressly in words, either Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, so long as he does not deny in his faith either Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, the sacrament of faith is complete; as, on the other hand, if a man in words express all the three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but in his faith diminishes the power either of the Father, or Son, or Holy Ghost, the sacrament of faith is void.” Whatever objection may lie against the first part of this statement—that the explicit mention of all the persons of the Trinity is not indispensable to the due administration of baptism,—none can decently deny, that to name them without believing in them, is not to celebrate but to profane the ordinance.

As, therefore, the invocation of the Trinity may take place in ablutions which it is impossible to recognise as the baptism instituted by Christ, it cannot constitute the *whole* form of the sacrament. In this there is no real difference between the Reviewer and myself. He only uses the word *form* in a different sense from that in which I have been accustomed to employ it; but, by no means, confines the *essence* of the sacrament to what he denominates its *form*. On the contrary, he makes the *design* or *intention*† an essential part of the ordinance, and means

* Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, Book xi. chap. 3, § 3.

† “There is, however, a third particular included in this definition of baptism; it must be with the design to “signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagements to be the Lord’s.” No washing with water, even if in the name of the Trinity, is Christian baptism, unless administered with the ostensible design of signifying, sealing and applying the benefits of the covenant of grace.” *Princeton Review*, July 1845, p. (448.)

by it precisely what I would be understood to convey, when I resolve the form of a sacrament into the relations which its material elements, according to the appointment of Christ, sustain to the covenant of grace. To eat bread and to drink wine is not necessarily to celebrate the sacrament of the Lord's Supper — to be immersed or sprinkled, — a formal invocation of the names of the Trinity accompanying the deed, is not necessarily to be baptized. There must be a reference to the economy of grace, a distinct recognition of that precious scheme of redemption, in its essential features and fundamental doctrines, without which ordinances are worthless, and duties are bondage. That which determines a specific ablution to be Christian baptism, which impresses upon the matter what may be styled the *sacramental form*, and which, consequently, constitutes its essence as a sacrament, is the relation which it bears to the covenant of God's unchanging mercy. To deny that relation, though all the outward appearances may be retained, is to abolish the sacrament. To tamper with the essence of an ordinance, is to tamper with its life. As the constitution of this relation, whatever it may be, depends exclusively upon the authority of Christ, it is competent to Him alone to define the circumstances under which it may be justly conceived to exist, to specify the conditions upon which its actual institution depends. For aught we know, He might have rendered every circumstance of personal ablution, or of eating and drinking, on the part of believers, a sacramental act. But He has chosen to restrain the sacramental relations within certain limits; and when his own prescriptions are not observed, no power of man, no intention of ministers, can impress the sacramental form upon material elements. The purpose of a family to convert its ordinary meals into memorials of the Saviour's passion, coupled with the fact that they are despatched with the usual solemnities of the eucharistic feast, is not sufficient to make them, in truth, the supper of the Lord. The emblems of His broken body and shed blood, are not made thus common and profane. If, to be more specific, the authority to administer the sacraments is entrusted exclusively to the ministers of the word, the same matter employed, in the same way, by

others, would be evidently destitute of the sacramental form. The *relation* to the covenant of grace, which depends upon the institution of Christ, could not be justly apprehended as subsisting, and the promises attached to the due celebration of the ordinance could not be legitimately expected to take effect.

He, therefore, that would undertake to prove that the Romish ceremony possesses the *form* or the *essential elements* of Christian baptism, must not content himself with shewing that Rome baptizes in the name of the Trinity. He must prove, besides, that she inculcates just views concerning the *nature* of the relationship which the outward washing sustains to the covenant of grace; that her conceptions of the covenant itself, that to which the ablution has reference, are substantially correct, and that she employs the outward elements in conformity with the conditions prescribed by the author of the sacrament. If she is fundamentally unsound upon any of these points, she abolishes the *essence* of the ordinance, she destroys its *form*. She may, for instance, be as orthodox as Princeton represents her to be, in regard to the personal and official relations of the Trinity,* she may teach the truth in regard to the scheme of redemption; and yet if her baptism bears a *different kind* of relationship to the covenant of grace from that instituted by the Redeemer, it is evident that it must be a *different* thing. If, on the other hand, she is sound as to the *nature* of the relationship, and yet corrupt as to the *object* to which the sacrament refers,† her baptism is only *analogous* to Christian baptism, and, therefore, cannot be the same. The relations are similar, but the things related are different. If again, she holds to the truth, both as it respects the relationship itself and the things related, and yet does not administer her ordinance according to the conditions on which the sacramental form may be expected to take place, she washes indeed, but not sacramentally;

* "There is not a church on earth, which teaches the doctrine of the Trinity more accurately, thoroughly or minutely, according to the orthodoxy of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, than the church of Rome. The personal and official relations of the adorable Trinity are also preserved." Princeton Review, July 1845, p. 450.

† "There can be no baptism where the essence of Christianity is not preserved." Burnet, xxxix articles, art. xix.

the authority of Christ is wanting. She administers no *baptism*. If to be unsound in any *one* of these points makes void a sacrament, what shall be said when there is unsoundness in *all*? Such an ordinance is trebly void. And that this is the case with Romish baptism, I think will be made to appear when the arguments of the Reviewer, the strongest, perhaps, that can be presented, to shew that it possesses the form or retains the essence of the Christian institute, shall have been duly weighed.

1. First, then, does Rome teach the truth in regard to the *nature* of the relationship involved in a sacrament? The answer to this question will depend upon the answer to the previous question, what the nature of the relationship is. How much soever they have differed upon other points, Protestant divines have generally agreed, that one prime office assigned to the sacraments is to *represent* to the eye, as preaching unfolds to the ear, Christ as the substance of the new covenant. They are *signs* which teach by analogy. As water cleanses the body, so the blood of the Redeemer purges the conscience, and the spirit of the Redeemer purifies the heart. As bread and wine constitute important articles of food, and administer strength to our feeble frame, so the atonement of Christ is the food of the spiritual man, and the source of all his activity and vigour!* This *analogy* is what Augustin meant when he said, "If sacraments had not a certain *likeness* and *representation* of the things whereof they be sacraments, then indeed they were no sacraments."† The *things themselves* unquestionably are not similar. There is no likeness between the water and the spirit, between bread and wine and the death of Jesus, but there is a resemblance in their *relations*. Water performs a similar office for the flesh, which the blood of Christ performs for the soul. Bread and wine sustain a similar relation to our natural growth which faith in Christ bears to our spiritual health. It is

* "The signification and substance is to show us how we are fed with the body of Christ; that is, that like as material bread feedeth our body, so the body of Christ, nailed on the cross, embraced and eaten by faith, feedeth the soul. The like representation is also made in the sacrament of baptism; that as our body is washed clean with water, so our soul is washed clean with Christ's blood." Jewell, Defence of the Apology.

† Quoted in the above mentioned treatise of Jewell.

obvious, that regarded simply as *signs* instituted by the authority of Christ, the sacraments are happily adapted to confirm our faith in the truth and reality of the divine promises. They place before us in a different form, and under a different aspect, in a form and aspect adapted to our animal and corporeal nature, the same grounds and object of faith which the word presents to the understanding. They do not render the promises of the covenant, in themselves considered, more sure or credible, but they help us, by images addressed to the senses, in apprehending what might otherwise be too refined for our gross perceptions.* They are a double preaching of the same Gospel; and confirm the word just as an additional witness establishes a fact. They are in short *visible promises*, which we cannot contemplate in their true character, without an increased conviction of the truth and faithfulness of God. But in addition to this, God may be regarded as declaring through them to worthy recipients, that just as certainly as water purifies the body, or as bread and wine sustain it, just so certainly shall their consciences be purged from dead works, and their spiritual strength renewed through the blood of the Redeemer. The certainty of the material phenomena, which is a matter of daily experience, is made the pledge of an equal certainty in the analogous spiritual things. It is in this way, I conceive, that the sacraments are seals of the covenant. They not only *represent* its blessings, are not only an authorized proclamation of its promises, addressed to the eye, but contain, at the same time, a solemn assurance that to those who rightly apprehend the signs, the spiritual good shall be as certain as the natural consequences by which it is illustrated; that the connection between faith and salvation is

* Hence Calvin very justly observes: "And as we are corporeal, always creeping on the ground, cleaving to terrestrial and carnal objects and incapable of understanding or conceiving of any thing of a spiritual nature, our merciful Lord, in his infinite indulgence, accommodates himself to our capacity, condescending to lead us to Himself even by these earthly elements, and in the flesh itself to present to us a mirror of spiritual blessings. "For if we were incorporeal," as Chrysostom says, "he would have given us these things pure and incorporeal. Now because we have souls enclosed in bodies, he gives us spiritual things under visible emblems; not because there are such qualities in the nature of the things presented to us in the sacraments, but because they have been designated by God to this signification." Institutes, Book iv. chap. 14, §3.

as indissoluble as between washing and external purity, eating and physical strength.

Is this the doctrine of the church of Rome? Does she regard her sacraments as instituted *signs* of spiritual things, or as visible *pledges* of the faithfulness of God in the new and everlasting covenant? If so, she has been most grievously slandered by the most distinguished Protestant divines, and the Princeton Review is the only work, so far as I know, of any merit, which has ventured to assert that her doctrine on this subject is precisely the same with that of the Reformed church. It is, indeed, admitted that there is a difference between Papists and Protestants as to the *mode** in which the design of baptism is accomplished. But did it not occur to the Reviewer that there could be *no* difference upon this point, if there were a perfect agreement as to the nature of that *relation* which baptism sustains to the covenant of grace? If Rome looked upon the sacraments in the same light with ourselves, as only *signs* and *seals*, and nothing more than signs and seals, though she might have disputed whether the benefits which they represent are, in every instance in which no serious obstruction exists, actually conveyed, the question as to *their inherent efficacy* never *could* have been raised. She would have taught their recipients, as we do, to look beyond the visible symbols to the personal agency of the Holy Ghost to render them effectual. As well might she have expected her children to become men in understanding by reading books in an unknown tongue, as have directed them to seek for grace in signs and seals, without any reference to the things represented. As it is the ideas which words suggest that constitute knowledge, so it is Christ's words and his benefits that constitute the value of the sacraments; and they cannot be used with any just conception of their *real nature* without leading the soul directly to him. Any theory of their office which even proposes the temptation to stop at themselves is utterly destructive of their true design. The questions which

* "The great difference between Protestants and Romanists relates not to the design of the ordinance, but to the mode and certainty with which that design is accomplished, and the conditions attached to it. In other words, the difference relates to the efficacy and not to the design of the ordinance."
—*Princeton Review*, July, 1845, p. 451.

have been agitated with so much zeal among the Popish Theologians, whether the consecration of a Priest imparts a mystic power to the external symbols, enabling them to produce effects which, independently of his benediction, they could not accomplish—whether his intention to bestow this magical virtue is absolutely essential to its actual communication, whether the appropriate results of the ordinances are secured *ex opere operantis* or *ex opere operato*, or by both conjointly—questions of this sort, which have been the fruitful themes of so much discussion among the sainted Doctors of Rome, are too obviously absurd to be asked upon the Protestant hypothesis. And yet Princeton tells us that Rome and ourselves are precisely agreed upon the *nature* of the sacraments;* that she, as we do, makes them signs and seals of the new covenant, and consequently fixes the hopes of her children *not upon them*, but upon the glorious object whom they represent. So thought not Calvin† when he inveighs so eloquently against the “*pestilent and fatal nature of the opinion*,” which he attributes to the Sophistical schools, and declares, in his celebrated Tract concerning the necessity of reforming the church, to have been universal before the Reformation,‡ “that the sacraments of the New Law, or

* “Then as to the essential part of the ordinance, the design, in this also their (Romish) baptism agrees with that of Protestants. According to our standards, the design of the sacrament is to signify, seal and apply to believers the benefits of the new covenant. This is the precise doctrine of the Romanists, so far as this.”—*Princeton Review*, July, 1845, p. 450.

† Institutes, book iv., chapter xiv., § 14. Vol. 2, p. 464–5, Bd’s Edition.

‡ “Besides, the consecration both of baptism and of the mass differs in no respect whatever from magical incantation. For by breathings and whispering and unintelligible sounds, they think they work mysteries, xx. The first thing we complain of here is, that the people are entertained with showy ceremonies, while not a word is said of their significancy and truth. For there is no use in the sacraments unless the thing which the sign visibly represents is explained in accordance with the word of God. Therefore when the people are presented with nothing but empty figures with which to feed the eye, while they hear no doctrine which might direct them to the proper end, they look no farther than the external act. Hence that most pestilential superstition under which, as if the sacraments alone were sufficient for salvation, without feeling any solicitude about faith, or repentance, or even Christ himself, they fasten upon the sign instead of the thing signified by it. And indeed not only among the rude vulgar, but in the schools also, the impious dogma every where obtained, the sacraments were effectual themselves, are not obstructed in their operation by mortal sin; as if the sacraments had been given for any other end or use than to lead us by the hand to Christ.” (Calvin’s Tracts, vol. 1, pp. 138–9, as published by Calvin Translation Society. See also pp. 166 and 194.)

those now used in the Christian Church, justify and confer grace, provided we do not obstruct their operation by any mortal sin." So thought not Turretin,* who evidently treats it as the doctrine of the Papists, that the sacraments are *not* signs and seals of the everlasting covenant, but *true, proper, physical causes* of the grace they are said to represent. This error, concerning the inherent efficacy of the sacraments, Pictet† also declares to be *contrary to their nature*. Owen‡ felt that there was a vital controversy betwixt us and Rome on this point when he renounced Popish baptism as a *species of idolatry*. It is impossible to read the Reformed confessions and the apologies which the Reformers made for them, without being impressed with the fact that their authors labored under a deep conviction, that the minds of the people were seduced, by the teachings of Rome, with dangerous and fatal error on the very *essence* of the sacraments, the nature of their relation to the covenant of grace, the precise office they discharge under the dispensation of the Gospel. This was, in fact, a standing topic of controversy between the two parties. Rome represented the new doctrines concerning gratuitous justification and the work of the spirit, as derogatory to the dignity and value of the sacraments, and artfully turned the tide of prejudice, growing out of the old associations of mystery and awe with which the people had been accustomed to look upon the consecrated symbols, against the restorers of the church. The cry everlastingly was, "you have robbed the sacraments of their glory. You have degraded them into *empty shows*.§ You have introduced your new fangled doctrines of faith and the Spirit in their place." These and similar accusations were continually alleged against the Reformers by the Papists, shewing that there was a radical difference between them as to the design of the sacraments. Rome felt that one of her strongest holds upon the people was their attachment to these mysteries of her faith, and hence she was anxious, as much as possible, to make the sacraments the seat of the

* Turretin, Instit., Theo., Vol. 3, p. 404.

† Pictet Theol. Chret., book xv., chapter 4.

‡ Owen's Works, vol. xvi., p. 95.

§ "You make Christ's sacraments," said Harding against Jewell, "to be only shows." (Richmond's British Reformers, vol. 7, p. 693.)

war. While the Papists charged the Reformers with prostituting these solemn and august ceremonies into *worthless signs*, the Protestants retorted upon Rome that she had converted them into *charms*, and had invested creatures of dust and earth, the beggarly elements of this world, with the high prerogatives of God. The question was not so much about the *mode* of operation, as Princeton insinuates, but about the *agent* that operated; it was a question whether the *sacraments themselves* conferred grace, or whether God the Holy Spirit conferred it, employing them simply as *means* which had no *intrinsic* power to do the work. It was a question whether the sacraments were really *signs* or *efficient agents*; and if this be not a question concerning their *nature*, it would be hard to raise one that is. If the impression of the Reformers was right, that Rome exalted the sacraments into true and proper *causes* of grace, there can be no doubt that whatever she may have professed in words, she did in fact deny them to be *signs*, and consequently changed their relations to the covenant of grace, and made them *essentially* different things from what Christ had appointed. It is a matter of no sort of consequence that the Reformers themselves failed to deduce this inference. The full application of a principle is not always perceived at once, and the soundness of a conclusion depends upon the truth of the premises and the rigour of the reasoning, and not upon human authority. If the essence of the sacraments is determined by their relation to the covenant of grace, and that relation consists in their being signs and seals of its blessings, then whoever denies the reality of the signs, or teaches doctrines inconsistent with it, evidently destroys the very being of the sacraments, and what he presents under their names, whether charms or magic or physical causes of grace, are an impious and blasphemous substitution. This is precisely what Rome does. While she retains the ancient definitions, and uses the expressions, signs and seals, she vacates their meaning by giving such a view of the actual offices they discharge in the economy of redemption, as to make signs no more signs, seals no more seals. They cease to be, in the ordinary sense of the phrase, *means* of grace, and become *laws* of grace. She teaches a *mechanical theory* of salvation, calculated at once to exalt her Priests and to degrade

God, and fritters down the personality of the ever glorious Spirit into the mere nexus which connects a cause with its effect, a law with its results. She teaches men accordingly to rely upon the *sacraments* and not upon *Christ*, to stop at the external act, as if water, bread and wine were our Saviours, instead of looking to him in whom all the truths of the gospel centre and terminate; an error which could not be committed if she held the sacraments to be real signs. These statements I shall endeavor to make good.

It is universally admitted in the Church of Rome, that the sacraments confer the grace which they signify *ex opere operato*.* If it should be conceded, for the sake of argument, that Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and Zuingle, mistook the meaning of this anomalous phrase, and that the cautious definitions of Bellarmine and Dens contain the true explanation of the subject, still the conclusion will seem to be inevitable, that the sacraments produce their spiritual effects, either in the way of physical causes, or of mechanical instruments. Both hypotheses are inconsistent with the theory of *signs*. It would be obviously absurd to say, that fire was a symbol of heat, or that the combined forces which keep the planets in their paths are *signs* of the elliptical orbits they describe, or that the screw, the lever, and the wedge, represent the effects they respectively produce. The relation of a cause to its effect, or of a machine to the phenomena of motion, is widely different from that of a sign to the thing it denotes. According to Bellarmine,† to confer grace *ex opere operato* is

* Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novæ legis Sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem divinæ promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere, anathema sit. Trident. conc. Sessio Septima, cap. (8)

† Igitur ut intelligamus, quid sit opus operatum, notandum est, in justificatione, quam recipit aliquis, dum percipit Sacramenta, multa concurrere; nimirum, ex parte Dei, voluntatem utendi illa re sensibili; ex parte Christi, passionem ejus; ex parte ministri, potestatem, voluntatem, probitatem; ex parte suscipientis, voluntatem, fidem et pœnitentiam; denique ex parte Sacramenti, ipsam actionem externam, quæ consurgit ex debita applicatione formæ et materiæ. Ceterum ex his omnibus id, quod active, et proxime, atque instrumentaliter efficit gratiam justificationis, est sola actio illa externa, quæ Sacramentum dicitur, et hæc vocatur opus operatum, accipiendo passive (operatum) ita ut idem sit Sacramentum conferre gratiam ex opere operato, quod conferre gratiam ex vi ipsius actionis Sacramentalis a Deo ad hoc institutæ, non ex merito agentis, vel suscipientis: quod S. Augustinus lib. 4, de Baptismo, ca. 24 expressit illis verbis: Ipsum Per Seipsum Sacramentum multum valet. Nam voluntas Dei, quæ sacramento utitur, concurret quidem active,

to confer grace by virtue of the sacramental action itself, instituted of God for this very purpose. The effect of the ordinance does not depend either upon the merit of him who receives, or of him who dispenses it, but upon the fact of its due administration. Though the authority of God which institutes the rite—the death of Christ which is the ultimate meritorious ground of grace—the intention of the minister which consecrates the elements, and the dispositions of the recipient, which remove obstacles from his mind, all concur in the production of the result; yet, that which immediately and actively secures the justification of the sinner, is the *external action*, which constitutes the sacrament. This, and this alone, however other things may be subsidiary, is according to the appointment of God, the immediate instrument in effecting, when not prevented by obstacles or hindrances, the grace which is signified. *How* this is done, is said to be an open question in the Church of Rome;* but the different opinions which have divided her divines, and distracted her schoolmen, may be

sed causa est principalis. Passio Christi concurrit, sed est causa meritoria, non autem effectiva, cum non sit actu, sed praterierit, licet moneat objective in mente Dei. Potestas, et voluntas ministri concurrunt necessario, sed sunt causæ remotæ; requiruntur enim ad efficiendam ipsam actionem Sacramentalem, quæ postea immediate operatur. Probitas ministri requiritur, ut ipse minister non peccet Sacramenta ministrando, non tamen ipsa est causa gratiæ in suscipiente, nec juvat suscipientem per modum Sacramenti, sed solum per modum impetrationis et exempli. Voluntas, fides, et paenitentia in suscipiente adulto necessario requiruntur, ut dispositiones ex parte subjecti, non ut causæ activæ: non enim fides et paenitentia efficiunt gratiam Sacramentalem, neque dant efficaciam Sacramentis, sed solum tollunt obstacula, quæ impedirent ne Sacramenta suam efficaciam exercere possent; unde in pueris, ubi non requiritur dispositio, sine his rebus sit justificatio. Exemplum esse potest in re naturali. Si ad ligna comburenda, primum exsiccarentur ligna, deinde excuteretur ignis ex silice, tum applicaretur ignis ligno, et sic tandem fieret combustio; nemo diceret, causam immediatam combustionis esse siccitatem, aut excussionem ignis ex silice, aut applicationem ignis ad ligna, sed solum ignem, ut causam primum, et solum calorem, seu calefactionem, ut causam instrumentalem. Bellarmine, De sacramentis, Lib 2 cap 1.

* Secundo notandum, non esse controversiam de modo quo Sacramenta sint causæ, id est, an physice attingendo effectum, an moraliter tantum; et rursum si physice, an per aliquam qualitatem inhaerentem, an per solam Dei motionem; ista enim ad questionem fidei non pertinent: sed solum generatim, an Sacramenta sint veræ et propriæ causæ instrumentales justificationis, ut vere ex eo quod quis baptizatur, sequatur, ut justificetur. Nam in hoc conveniunt omnes Catholici, ut Lutherus ipse fatetur, in lib. de captiv. Babyl. cap. de Baptismo: Arbitrati, inquit, Sunt quam plurimi esse aliquam virtutem occultam spiritualem in verbo. et aqua, quæ operetur in anima re-

embraced under the general theories of moral power, and physical causation.* The patrons of the former, slow to comprehend how material elements can achieve a spiritual result, ascribe the efficiency not to the sacraments themselves, but to the agency of God. They suppose that He has pledged His omnipotence, in every instance of their due administration, to impart the benefits which the matter represents. He has inseparably connected the effectual working of His own power with the external action. Grace always accompanies the rite, their union is fixed by divine appointment, cemented by divine energy, and as indissoluble in the experience of the faithful, as they are in the purpose of the Almighty. This theory, though not so gross and palpably absurd as the other, reduces the sacraments, in their relations to us, to the category of machines, machines in the kingdom of God, to which spiritual phenomena may be ascribed, just as truly as the wheel, the pulley, and the wedge, are mechanical contrivances for bending nature to our wills. In their relations to God, they would seem to be somewhat analogous to *laws*, since they are described as *stated modes* of divine operation, and may evidently be regarded as compendious expressions for a class of facts, which take place with unvarying uniformity. In the schools of philosophy, no more inherent efficacy is attributed to natural laws, than the Romanists, who support the theory of moral power, are accustomed to bestow on the operation of the sacraments. It is God in each case, who acts, and the law simply declares the regularity and order of His conduct. But, however this may be, to resolve the connection between

cipientis gratiam Dei. His alii contradicentes statuunt, nihil esse virtutis in Sacramentis, sed gratiam a Solo Deo dari, quia assistit ex pacto Sacramentis a se institutis: omnes tamen in hoc concedunt, Sacramenta esse efficacia signa gratiae. Bellarmine. Ibid.

Salva autem fide, inter Catholicos disputatur, an Sacramenta novae legis conferant suos effectus physice, an tantum moraliter. Dens vol. 5 p. 90.

* Quidam tenent causalitatem physicam, et sese explicant, quod Sacramenta, tanquam Divinae Omnipotentiae instrumenta, vere et realiter concurrant ad productionem effectuum in anima, per virtutem supernaturalem a principali agente sibi communicatam, et per modum actionis transeuntis sibi unitam. Qui vero adstruunt causalitatem moralem tantum, dicunt quidem Sacramenta non esse nuda quaedam signa, nec mere talia, quibus positis, Deus gratiam infundat, sed esse velut chirographa et authentica monumenta pacti, quo Deus se quodammodo obstrinxit, ut ad praesentiam signorum Sacramentalium gratiam conferret debite suscipientibus.—Dens vol. 5. p. 90.

outward ordinances and spiritual benefits, into the fixed uniformity of a law, is to make the external action, in reference to men, a species of machine. As motion, in the last analysis, must be attributed to God, those mechanical instruments which are adapted to its laws, are only contrivances for availing ourselves of His power, to compass ends which our own strength is inadequate to reach. Experience, by giving us the laws of nature, acquaints us with the methods of the divine administration. And mechanism consists in a skilful disposition of materials, with reference to these laws, so as to make them subsidiary to the purpose which we propose to achieve. If, accordingly, there be a fixed connection between the due dispensation of the sacraments, and the reception of grace, we can avail ourselves of them to secure spiritual good, with as much certainty, and as little piety, as we can depend upon the wheel, the pulley, or the lever, to raise enormous weights; rely upon the wedge to break the stoutest cohesion, or trust to the screw for an immense compression. The external action is adapted to the law of sacramental union, as the ordinary mechanical powers are instruments adjusted to the laws of motion. Hence regeneration is effected, in flat contradiction to the scriptures, by the will of man, and justification is as much our own work, as the erection of a building, or the destruction of a monument. We can use the instrument which secures it.

The other theory of the operation of the sacraments represents them as *causes*. Its advocates seem to have believed, in opposition to the prevailing conclusions of modern philosophy, that what, in material phenomena, are dignified with this appellation, are possessed of a latent power to accomplish their effects. Regarding the invisible nexus which binds events in this relationship together, as something more than the established order of sequences given by experience, they were led to ascribe mysterious efficacy to the cause by which it not only preceded the effect with unvarying uniformity, but actually gave it existence. They attributed to physical facts that potency, according to their measure, which our instinctive belief of causation leads us to recognize somewhere; and sound philosophy centres in God. The sacraments, accordingly, are represented, by the advocates of their physical efficacy,

as invested with a virtue, force or power, in consequence of which they produce the grace they are said to signify. This theory is not only the most common in the Church of Rome, but seems to me to be the only one strictly accordant with the views of Trent. The sixth canon of the seventh session of that council pronounces its usual malediction upon those who shall deny that the sacraments of the gospel *contain* the grace which they signify, or that they *confer* that grace upon those who place no obstacles in the way.* But whatever may be said of the decrees of the council, its catechism seems to be clear and unambiguous. Having spoken of signs which are only significant and monitory, it proceeds to observe,† that “God has instituted others which have the power, not only of signifying, *but of effecting*, and in this class must evidently be reckoned the sacraments of the new law. They are signs, divinely prescribed, not invented by men, which, we certainly believe, contain in themselves the *power of effecting the sacred thing* (the grace) which they declare.” A sacrament is defined to be a “thing subjected to the senses, which, in consequence of the appointment of God, possesses the power, not only of signifying, but also of *effecting*, holiness and righteousness.” They are said to have been instituted as “remedies and medicines, for restoring and defending the health of the soul,” and are commended as pipes which convey the merit of the Saviour’s passion to the consciences of men.§ What language can be stronger,

* Si quis dixerit, Sacramenta novae legis non continere gratiam, quam significant, aut gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicem non conferre, quasi signa tantum externa sint acceptae per fidem gratiae vel justitiae, et notae quaedam Christianae professionis, quibus apud homines discernuntur fideles ab infidelibus; anathema sit. Trident. con. Sess. 7. can. 6.

† Alia vero Deus instituit, quae non significandi modo sed efficiendi etiam vim haberent, atque in hoc posteriori signorum genere sacramenta novae legis numeranda esse liquido apparet: signa enim sunt divinitus tradita, non ab hominibus inventa, quae rei cujuscumque sacrae, quam declarant, efficientiam in se continere certe credimus. Trident, Catechism, p. 158. Lyons edition.

‡ Quare, ut explicatius quid sacramentum sit declaretur, docendum erit rem esse sensibus subjectam, quae ex Dei institutione sanctitatis, et justitiae tum significandae, tum efficiendae vim habet. Trident Catechism, p. 159.

§ Tertia: Tertia causa fuit, ut illi tanquam remedia, ut scribit sanctus Ambrosius, (3) atque Evangelici Samaritani medicamenta ad animarum sanitatem, vel recuperandam, vel tuendam praesto essent: Virtutem enim, quae ex passione Christi manat, hoc est, gratiam quam ille nobis in ara crucis meruit, per sacramenta, quasi per alveum quemdam, in nos ipsos derivari oportet, aliter vero nemini ulla salutis spes reliqua esse poterit, Ibid p. 162.

than that which the authors of the Catechism have employed, in treating of the first effects of the sacraments.* "We know," say they, "by the light of faith," and all true papists must respond amen, "that the power of the omnipotent God exists in the sacraments, and they can, consequently, effect that which natural things, by their own energy, cannot achieve."

In the comparison which is instituted between the sacraments of the *new*, and those of the *old* dispensation, the pre-eminence is given to the former, in consequence of possessing what the others did not possess, the ability of effecting that which their matter represents.† The latter availed to the cleaning of the flesh, the former reach the impurities of the soul; the latter were instituted simply as signs of blessings to be afterwards conferred by the ministry of the gospel, but the "former flowing from the side of Christ, who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot unto God, purge our consciences from dead works to serve the living God, and so work, through the power of Christ's blood, that grace which they signify." The general current of this phraseology seems to be incompatible with any hypothesis but that of physical causation; the same sort of relationship is attributed to the outward matter and the inward grace which subsists between impulse and motion, fire and heat.

This view of the subject is confirmed by the prevailing tone which the Popish theologians adopt in discussing the doctrine of the sacraments. "Grace," says Bellarmine,‡ "is the effect of the sacrament, and hence is con-

* At fidei lumine cognoscimus, omnipotentis Dei virtutem in sacramentis inesse, qua id efficiant, quod sua vi res ipsae naturales praestare non possunt. Ibid. p. 173.

† Ex iis igitur quae de priori sacramentorum] effectu, gratia scilicet justificante, demonstrata sunt, illud etiam plane constat, excellentiorem, et praestantior vim (2) sacramentis novae legis inesse, quam olim veteris legis sacramenta habuerunt: quae cum (3) infirma essent, egenaeque elementa, (4) inquinatos sanctificabant ad emundationem carnis, non animae: quare, ut signa tantum earum rerum quae ministeriis nostris efficiendae essent, instituta sunt. At vero sacramenta novae legis ex Christi latere manantia, (5) qui per Spiritum Sanctum semetipsum obtulit immaculatum Deo, emundant conscientiam nostram ab operibus mortuis, ad serviendum Deo viventi, atque ita eam gratiam, quam significant, Christi sanguinis virtute operantur, Ibid. p. 174.

‡ Gratia enim effectus est sacramenti, proinde in sacramento continetur, ut quilibet alius effectus in sua causa. Bellarmine, De Sacramentis, Lib. 1, cap. 4.

tained in the sacrament, as every other effect is contained in its own cause. That which is chiefly and essentially signified,"* he observes again, "by the sacraments of the new law, is only justifying grace. For, as we shall subsequently see, the sacraments of the new law effect that which they signify. They do not, however, effect the passion of Christ, nor future blessedness. They pre-suppose, on the contrary, his passion, and promise future blessedness; but they do, properly, import justification." In discussing the question whether a sacrament can be logically defined, he announces a truth which seems to be fatal to those who, like the Reviewer, would inculcate the identity of Popish and Protestant views in regard to the nature of the sacraments. "A sacrament, as such," says he,† "not only signifies, it also sanctifies. But to signify and to sanctify belong to different categories, the one being embraced under that of relation, the other under that of action." "It is more proper," he states, in another connection,‡ "to a sacrament to *sanctify* than it is to signify." In rebutting Calvin's account of the nature of the sacraments, he does not scruple to assert,§ that "they are efficacious causes of grace, when no obstacles interpose." His critique of the great Reformer's definition, so strikingly illustrates the fundamental difference between Protestants and Romanists on this whole subject, that I hope the reader will excuse me for extracting the part which relates to the sign. Calvin says that a sacrament is "an outward sign, by which the Lord seals in our consciences the promises of his good will towards us, to support the weakness of our faith: and we, on our part, testify our piety towards him, in His presence and that of angels, as well

* Est autem hoc loco notandum, id quod praecipue et essentialiter significatur per sacramentum novae legis, esse solam gratiam justificantem. Nam ut infra dicemus, sacramenta novae legis efficiunt, quod significant; at non efficiunt passionem Christi, nec vitam beatam sed solam justificationem: passionem enim praesupponunt, et vitam beatam promittunt; justificationem autem proprie adferunt. Ibid. cap. 9.

† Secundo, sacramentum, ut sacramentum, non solum significat, sed etiam sanctificat, ut Catholici omnes docent de sacramentis novae legis. Ibid, cap, 16.

‡ Prima propositio: Ad rationem sacramenti in genere non satis est, ut significet, sed requiritur etiam, ut efficiat sanctitatem seu sanctificationem: immo magis proprium est sacramenti sanctificare, quam significare. Ibid, cap. 12.

§ Sacramenta esse causas gratiae efficaces, nisi ponatur obex. Ibid, cap. 16.

as before men." "This whole definition," says Bellarmine,* "is vitious, as will evidently appear from a close examination of it word by word. The first expression is *an outward sign*. This, indeed, is absolutely true, but not in the sense in which Calvin intends it. He means a naked sign, a symbol which signifies only, but effects nothing. For, throughout his whole definition, he contemplates no other effects of the sacraments than to seal the promises of God and to testify our own piety. It is no objection to this statement that he asserts, in his antidote to the Council of Trent, (Sess. 7, can. 5,) that the *sacraments are instruments of justification*, for he calls them instruments, because they excite and strengthen faith, and that not efficiently, but only objectively. Beza has very clearly expressed the same idea in his book de Summa rei Sacramentariæ, question 2, where he says—"Whence is the efficacy of the sacraments? It depends entirely upon the operation of the Holy Spirit, and not upon the signs, except so far as the outward objects may excite inward perceptions." Thus Beza. For the same reason, the signs which hang on the doors of inns might be called instruments of eating, since they suggest the idea of a table within. The Scriptures, however, everywhere teach that the sacraments are *operative*, inasmuch as they cleanse, wash, sanctify, justify, regenerate. John, 3 chap.

* His explicatis refellenda est hæc definitio: tota enim est vitiosa, ut perspicuum erit, si percurramus singula verba. Primum verbum est; *Symbolum externum*: quod quidem verum est absolute, non tamen in eo sensu, quo accipitur a Calvino. Ille enim intelligit esse nudum symbolum, id est, symbolum quod solum significet, non autem operetur aliquid: nam in tota definitione non ponit alios effectus hujus symboli, nisi obsignare promissiones, et testificari pietatem nostram: neque obstat, quod Calvinus dicat in antidoto Concilii Tridentini, Sess. 7, can. 5. Sacramenta esse instrumenta justificationis; nam intelligit esse instrumenta, quia excitant, vel alunt fidem; idque non per aliquam efficientiam, sed mere objective. Id quod explicat clarissime Theodorus Beza, in lib de summa rei sacramentariæ, quest. 2, cum sic ait: Unde efficacia illa sacramentorum? A Spiritu sancti operatione in solidum, non autem a signis, nisi quatenus externis illis objectis interiores sensus moventur. Hæc ille. Qua ratione certe signa etiam, quæ in foribus publicorum hospitiorum pendent, instrumenta dici possunt caenationis, quia movent hominem, ut cogitet in ea domo paratam esse mensam, &c.

At Scripturæ passim docent, sacramenta esse res quasdam operantes, nimirum quæ mudent, lavent, sanctificent, justifcent, regenerent. Joan 3. I. Cor. 6, Eph. 5, ad Tit. 3, Actor 22, Immo nusquam Scripturæ dicunt, sacramenta esse testimonia promissionum Dei et nostræ pietatis, aut certe non tam expresse hoc dicunt, ut id quod nos asserimus, nimirum quod sint causæ justificationis. Ibid, cap. 16.

1 Cor. 6 Ephes. 5, Tit. 3, Acts 22. Never do they assert that the sacraments are testimonies of God's promises and of our piety, or, at least, they do not certainly teach this with as much directness as they inculcate the doctrine which we have asserted, that the sacraments are causes of justification." The point most offensive to the mind of Bellarmine, in the doctrine of Protestants, was, evidently, that in which they represent the effect of the sacraments as depending upon the Holy Spirit, and the truths and promises which they address to faith. He regarded the external action as the secret of their power. When duly administered, they just as truly, according to him, confer grace, as impulse communicates motion, or fire communicates heat. They were causes containing their effects, not figuratively, but really and properly, instruments producing their results by immediate and direct efficiency. Precisely to the same purport is the doctrine of Dens. "In the fourth place," says he,* "a sacrament is a sign, efficacious and practical, effecting that which it signifies." The recipient is said to be passive under its power,† and the sacraments are represented as truly and properly the causes of grace to those who do not interpose obstacles,‡ "they contain the grace causally and instrumentally, and that not simply as they are signs of it, which was the case with the sacraments of the old law, but as instrumental causes from which it might be extracted.§ Harding, the Jesuit, in his celebrated controversy with Jewell,|| says: "There be seven sacraments, which do not only signify a holy thing, but also do sanctify and make holy those to whom they be exhibited, being such as, by institution of Christ, contain grace in them and power to sanctify." "The sacraments of the new law," he teaches again,¶ "work the thing itself that they signify,

* Quarto, est signum "efficax et practicum," scilicet efficiens id, quod significat.—Dens, vol. 5, p. 68.

† Quia subjectum non concurrit active, sed tantum passive. Ibid, p. 70.

‡ I. An sacramenta novæ legis causent Gratiam?

Responsio Fidei contra sectarios est, ea vere et proprie causare Gratiam non ponentibus obicem, non tanquam causas principales, (hoc enim solius Dei est), sed tanquam instrumentales. Ibid. p. 89.

§ Sed quod Gratiam contineant causaliter et instrumentaliter, vel, ut dicit Steyaert, quatenus non sunt tantum signa Gratiæ, ut illa veteris Legis, sed et causæ instrumentales, de quibus eam depromere liceat. Ibid. p. 90.

|| Richmond's British Reformers, vol. 7, p. 685.

¶ Ibid. p. 690.

through virtue given unto them by God's ordinance to special effects of grace. Sacraments contain grace, after such manner of speaking, as we say, potions and drinks contain health."*

The theory of causation is kept up even in the doctrine of obstacles. There is a striking analogy betwixt the resistance which is offered by material hindrances to the action of physical causes, and that of the obstacles which, according to the Romish doctors, defeat the operation of the sacraments. What is technically called an obstacle—I allude not to those essential ones arising from perverseness of will, or from gross hypocrisy, which render void the sacrament, but to those accidental ones, which do not invalidate, but only impede the efficacy of the ordinance: what is technically called an obstacle of this sort is, either some disposition directly repugnant to the sanctifying tendency of the sacrament, or the want of such a state of mind as is suited to its action. There must be some congruity, as in material phenomena, between the tendencies of the cause and that upon which they are expended. Fire has a tendency to burn, but then the fuel must be dry. Motion once begun has a tendency to continue, but then friction and resistance must be removed; and so the sacraments are fitted to sanctify, but then the subject must be adapted to their action.†

Whatever may be the mode in which the sacraments operate, whether mechanical or efficient, the relation in which they are conceived to stand to the covenant of

* Ibid. p. 686

† Est carentia, says Dens, defining an obstacle, dispositionis necessaria ad recipiendum sacramenti effectum; sive est defectus alicujus non impediens valorem sacramenti, sed ejus effectum seu collationem Gratiae ob indispositionem susipientis; ut si quis in affectu peccati mortalis, vel cum ignorantia necesariorum necessitate medii, suscipit aliquod sacramentum, præter Pœnitentiam.

Quotupliciter continget, poni obicem accidentalem?

R. Dupliciter: scilicet per obicem sacramenti positivum seu contrarium, et per obicem negativum seu privativum.

Obex positivus seu contrarius sacramenti consistit in indispositione actuali repugnante infusioni Gratiae sanctificantis.

Talis est quodcumque peccatum actuale mortale, sive cujus actus vel effectus in suscipiente sacramentum adhuc moraliter dici potest perseverare; sive quod in ipsa sacramenti cujuscumque susceptione committitur.

Obex negativus consistit in carentia dispositionis necessariae ad effectum sacramenti ex ignorantia vel inadvertentia nullo modo, vel saltem non graviter culpabili: v. g. ignorantia inculpabilis necesariorum necessitate medii. Dens, vol. 5, p. 107.

grace is essentially different from the representations of the Scriptures. Instead of being signs and seals of the benefits of redemption, conducting the mind beyond themselves to Jesus, the author and finisher of faith, they usurp the office of the Holy Ghost, and undertake to accomplish what he alone is pledged to effect. It cannot be doubted that the only Holy Spirit, whom Rome practically recognizes, is what she denominates her sacraments. Her whole theory of grace is grossly mechanical. The Tridentine Catechism runs the parallel between natural and spiritual life, and shows that the sacraments are to the latter, what birth, growth, nutriment and medicine are to the former.* The sinner is renewed by baptism, strengthened by confirmation, nurtured by the eucharist, restored to health by penance, and dismissed into eternity, prepared for its awful solemnities by extreme unction. Baptism is the birth, confirmation the growth, the eucharist the food, penance the medicine, and extreme unction the consummation of the spiritual man: call them causes,

* Catholicae igitur Ecclesiae sacramenta, quemadmodum ex Scripturis probatur, et Patrum traditione ad nos pervenit, et (1) conciliorum testatur auctoritas, septenario numero definita sunt. Cur autem neque plura neque pauciora numerentur, ex iis etiam rebus, quæ per similitudinem a naturali vita ad spiritualem transferuntur, probabili quadam ratione ostendi poterit. Homini enim ad vivendum, vitamque conservandam, et ex sua reique publicae utilitate traducendam, hæc septem necessaria videntur: ut scilicet in lucem edatar, augeatur, alatur; si in morbum incidat, sanetur; imbecilitas virium reficiatur; deinde, quod ad rempublicam attinet, ut magistratus nunquam desint, quorum auctoritate, et imperio regatur; ac postremo, legitima sobolis propagatione seipsum et humanum genus conservet. Quæ omnia quoniam vitæ illi, qua anima Deo vivit, respondere satis apparet, ex iis facile sacramentorum numerus colligetur.

Baptismus—Primus enim est baptismus, veluti ceterorum janua, quo Christo renascimur.

Confirmatio—Deinde confirmatio, cujus virtute fit ut divina gratia augeamur, et robaremur. Baptizatis enim jam apostolis, ut Divus Augustinus testatur, inquit Dominus: Sedete in civitate, donec induamini virtute ex alto.

Eucharistia.—Tum Eucharistia, qua, tanquam cibo vere cælesti, spiritus noster alitur, et sustinetur. De ea enim dictum est a Salvatore: "Caro mea vere est cibus, et sanguis meus vere est potus."

Pœnitentia—Sequitur quarto loco pœnitentia, cujus ope sanitas amissa restituitur, postquam peccati vulnera accepimus.

Extrema-unctio—Postea vero Extrema-Uncio, qua peccatorum reliquiæ tolluntur, et animi virtutes recreantur, siquidem D. Jacobus, cum de hoc sacramento loqueretur, ita testatus est: Et si in peccatis sit, remittentur ei. p. 166.

or call them machines, no matter how they act, while it is conceded that the sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato*, their relation to the economy of salvation is substantially that which the Eternal word assigns to the third person of the Trinity.

Lying vanities, as they are, according to the teaching of the mother of harlots, they are yet the Saviours to which the millions of her deluded children cling for acceptance before God. They are accustomed to use nothing higher in the scale of excellence than the empty pageantry of ceremonial pomp, or to dream of nothing better in the way of felicity than the solemn farce of sacerdotal benediction; their hopes are falsehood and their food is dust. Strangers to the true concision of the heart, which they have experienced who worship God in the Spirit, rejoice in Christ Jesus and have no confidence in the flesh, the miserable votaries of Rome confound the emotions of mysterious awe, produced by the solemnities of a sensual worship, with reverence for God and the impressions of grace. Doomed to grope among the beggarly elements of earth, they regale the eye, the fancy and the ear; but the heart withers; imagination riots on imposing festivals and magnificent processions, symbols and ceremonies, libations and sacrifices; the successive stages of worship are like scenes of enchantment; but the gorgeous splendors of the liturgy, which famish the soul, while they delight the sense, are sad memorials of religion "lying in state surrounded with the silent pomp of death." The Holy Ghost has been supplanted by charms, and physical causes have usurped the province of supernatural grace.

As to the point, whether the sacraments are seals, it deserves to be remarked, that there is a discrepancy between some of the most distinguished Popish theologians, and the Catechism of Trent. The latter teaches,* that, "as God in the Old Testament was accustomed to attest the certainty of his promises by signs—so also in

* Quemadmodum igitur in veteri Testamento Deus fecerat, ut magni alicujus promissi constantiam signis testificaretur; ita etiam in nova lege Christus Salvator noster cum nobis peccatorum veniam, cælestem gratiam, Spiritus Sancti communicationem pollicitus est, quædam signa oculis et sensibus subjecta instituit; quibus eum quasi pignoribus obligatum habemus, atque ita fidelem in promissis futurum dubitare nunquam possemus. p. 162.

the New Law our Saviour Christ, having promised us the pardon of our sins—heavenly grace, the communication of the Spirit—has instituted signs, subjected to the eyes and senses, which serve as pledges of his truth, so that we cannot doubt but that he will be faithful to his promises.” And yet of the same doctrine, as announced by Luther, Bellarmine remarks,* “that it is so absurd, that nothing can be conceived more so. Signs and prodigies,” he continues, “may justly be employed for confirming the message of a preacher, since they are known and striking of themselves; and depend not at all upon the message. But the sacraments have no power of themselves; they cannot be even apprehended as sacraments, except as confirmed by the testimony of the Word. Those who see the sick suddenly healed, demons expelled at a word, the blind restored to sight, and the dead raised from their graves by a preacher of the Divine Word, are so struck and prostrated by the intrinsic power and splendor of the

* Sed hæc sententia tam est absurda—ut nihil fere cogitari possit absurdius. Nam signa atque prodigia ad confirmandam prædicationem merito adhibentur, cum sint ex se nota et illustria neque a prædicatione ulla ratione dependant: contra autem sacramenta nullum ex se vim habent, ac ne sacramenta quidem esse intelliguntur, nisi testimonio verbi confirmentur. Itaque qui a prædicatore divini verbi, vel morbos repente curari, vel Dæmones verbo pelli, vel cæcos illuminari, vel ab inferis mortuos revocari conspiciunt, ipsa miraculi vi tanquam fulgore quodam ita percelluntur, ac prosternuntur, ut vel inviti verbis tanti viri fidem habere cogantur. Qui vero aquis hominem ablui, quod in baptismo facimus; vident, nihil mirantur, neque facile credunt in ea lotionem aliquid sublimius latere, nisi verbo Dei ante crediderint. Quod si non ante sacramenta suspicere incipimus, quam verbo Dei fidem habeamus; quo pacto, quæso, fieri potest, ut sacramentis divina eloquia confirmentur? An non ridiculus esset, qui ethnico diceret; “ut credas vera esse quæ dico, amphoram istam aquæ super caput tuum effundam?” Egregia sane probatio; nisi enim ex Dei verbo disceremus lotionem illam unctionem ad purgandos animos valere, quis crederet? quis id non rideret? neque enim id habet aquæ natura, ut morbos animi curet, et cordis maculas eluat; sed quidquid in hoc genere potest, ex institutione divina potest, divinam autem institutionem divina eloquia patrefaciunt.

Porro comparatio illa, qua verbum diplomati, sacramentum sigillo ab adversariis, passim confertur, tam est inepta, ut nihil ineptius fingi queat; multoque rectius verbum Dei sigillum sacramenti, quam sacramentum verbi Dei sigillum dici possit. Nam ut sigillum, etiam sine diplomate, vim suam habet atque agnoscitur et honoratur; diploma sine sigillo non agnoscitur esse diploma, nec vim ullam habet; sic etiam verbum Dei, sine testimonio sacramenti, suam, eamque summam habet auctoritatem; sacramentum vero sine verbi testimonio, nullam. Non igitur sacramentum, ut illi volunt, sigillum verbi, sed verbum, sigillum sacramenti nominari debuisset. Bellarmine, præface to vol. 3 De Sacrament.

miracle, that, even against their wills, they are compelled to credit his message. Those, however, who perceive a man washed with water—which is what we do in baptism—see nothing wonderful, and are slow to believe that anything of unusual sublimity lies hid in the act, unless they shall have previously credited the Word of God. If we do not begin to honor the sacraments until we have faith in the Divine Word, how, I pray, is it possible that the sacraments should confirm that word? Would he not be ridiculous who should say to a heathen—in order that you may believe what I say, I will pour this pitcher of water upon your head? An admirable proof, truly! Unless taught by the word of God, that that washing, and that unction, avail to purify the soul, who would believe it? Who would not laugh at the thought? There is nothing in the nature of water to cure diseases of the mind, or to cleanse the stains of the heart. Whatever virtue of this sort it possesses is derived from Divine institution, and that institution is made known by the word of God. Besides, the comparison, so common among our adversaries, of the word to a charter, and the sacrament to its seal, is so inapt, that nothing can be conceived more so. With much more propriety can the word be called the seal of the sacrament, than the sacrament of the word. For as the seal, even without the charter, has its own power, and is acknowledged and honored—while the charter, without the seal, is not recognized as such, and has no force—so also the word of God, without the testimony of the sacrament, has its own, and that the highest authority, while the sacrament, without the testimony of the word, has none. The sacrament, therefore, should not be called the seal of the word, but the word the seal of the sacrament.” Many other passages, of the same nature, might be extracted from this writer, in which the doctrine of sacramental seals is repudiated, scouted, scorned. Can it then be regarded as an authoritative dogma of Rome? Her leading theologians despise it—make it a spurn and trample in their controversies with Protestants—pronounce it the very height of absurdity—the perfection of inaptitude. The Decrees of Trent nowhere allude to it—and the only place in which it seems to be remotely favored is a single short paragraph, in the Tridentine Catechism,

occurring in the midst of a long, elaborate dissertation on the sacraments. The *emphasis*, most clearly, in the Church of Rome, is laid upon the power of the sacraments to sanctify. This is their distinguishing feature—this, according to Bellarmine, their *differentia*.^{*} Their *essence* lies here, and whoever denies to them their power, destroys their reality.

I cannot, therefore, disguise my astonishment, that Princeton should have represented that the views of Rome and of *ourselves*, in regard to the nature of the sacraments, are precisely the same. She teaches that they are *causes* of grace, and we that they are *signs*. She teaches that they dispense the blessings of salvation by their own power; we, that they are nothing without the Holy Ghost. According to her, they justify, regenerate and sanctify. According to us, they point to Him who, of God, is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. According to Rome, they work infallibly, where material dispositions exist. According to us, they are lifeless and unmeaning, when estranged from faith. We insist that they are seals of the everlasting covenant, and Rome, if she speaks at all, upon this point, mutters the confused gabble of Babel. Rome's sacraments and our's belong essentially to different categories. They are as wide apart as action and passion. Her's is a species of deity, and our's are content to be elements of earth. When she baptizes, her water penetrates the soul, purges the conscience, and purifies the heart. When we baptize, we wash only the flesh, while our faith contemplates the covenant of God, and His unchanging faithfulness. *Our* baptism *represents* what the blood of the Redeemer, applied by the Eternal Spirit, performs upon the souls of believers. Rome's does the work itself. Our's is vain without the Holy Ghost. Rome's is all the Holy Ghost she needs.

From the foregoing discussion it will be seen, that Rome vitiates the *form* of the sacraments, by inculcating the dogma, that they produce their effects *ex opere operato*.—It is this principle which changes them from *means* into laws or causes of grace, and converts them into a species of machinery, by the use of which, men become the ar-

^{*} Proinde signum, est veluti genus; sanctificans, veluti differentia. Bellarmine De Sacramentis, Lib. 1, cap. 10.

chitects of their spiritual fortunes. The argument, therefore, as urged against Rome, does not apply with equal force to the strictly Lutheran and the English Churches, unless it can be shown that these communions embrace the principle, that the sacraments confer, *ex opere operato*, the grace which they signify. The churches of the East I have no disposition to ridicule. There is sad reason to apprehend, that the gospel has long since departed from their sanctuaries. But the great Protestant communions of England and Germany, glorious from the strife of other days, I cannot contemplate, with all their defects, without veneration and love, and it will require something more than the unsupported word of the Reviewer, to convince my mind, that they symbolize with Rome in one of her deadliest errors.* The English reformers have expressed themselves with great clearness upon the subject of the sacraments—this having been one of the hottest points of controversy in England—and their Catechisms, Letters, Protestations, and Creeds, are free from any tinge of error. The articles, adopted in London in 1552, and published by the King, Edward VI. in 1553, are as explicitly Protestant as words can make them. The 26th treats of the sacraments, in which it is said that “in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect and operation, and yet not that of the work wrought (*ex opere operato*) as some men speak; which word, as it is strange and unknown to holy Scripture, so it engendereth no godly, but a very superstitious sense.”† The Catechism adopted by the same Convention, and published at the same time, is almost as bald in its definition or description, as Zuingli himself could have desired.‡ The articles as now exist-

* “Besides, if baptism is null and void when administered by those who hold the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, what shall we say to the baptism in the Church of England, in the strict Lutheran churches, and in all the churches of the East? On this plan, we shall have to unchurch almost the whole Christian world; and Presbyterians, instead of being the most catholic of churches, and admitting the being of a church, wherever we see the fruits of the spirit, would become one of the narrowest and most bigoted of sects.” Princeton Rev. July 1845, p. 452.

† Richmond's British Reformers, p. 334.

‡ Master.—Tell me, what thou callest earliest sacraments?

Scholar.—They are certain customary reverent doings and ceremonies, ordained by Christ, that by them he might put us in remembrance of his benefits; and we might declare our profession, that we be of the number of

ing, have undergone considerable changes since the reign of the good King Edward; the clause condemning the *opus operatum* doctrine of Rome, is no longer retained, but the opposite truth is most clearly expressed. What there is in the Lutheran symbols to subject them to the just imputation of the Romish error, I am unable to discover. Luther himself, says Bellarmine,* has defined a sacrament "to be nothing else than a divine testimony, instituted for exciting and increasing faith, which, like a miracle, confirms, and like a seal, ratifies the promise of grace." "A ceremony in the New Testament without faith," says the Augsburg Confession,† "merits nothing either for the agent or others. It is a dead work, according to the saying of Christ, the true worshippers shall worship the Father, in spirit and in truth. The whole eleventh chapter of Hebrews proves the same. By faith, Abel offered a better sacrifice; without faith it is impossible to please God. Therefore, the Mass does not merit remission of guilt or punishment *ex opere operato*. This reason clearly refutes the merit which they term *ex opere operato*." If there be any one principle of the gospel which Luther saw in a steady light, and held with a firm grasp, that principle was justification by faith, a principle as utterly opposed to the sacramental grace of Rome as to the ceremonial righteousness of the Jews; and it is grossly improbable that Luther, who understood so fully, appreciated so highly, and labored so severely, for the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, should have been entangled with the galling yoke of ceremonial bondage. How could he, the business of whose life it was to unfold the blessedness of faith, have taught in the same breath in which he proclaimed the

them, which are partakers of the same benefits, and which fasten all their affiance in him; that we are not ashamed of the name of Christ, or to be termed Christ's scholars. Ibid. p. 369.

* Princeps Lutherus, cum in Babylone, tum in assertionibus articulorum, nihil aliud sacramentum esse voluit nisi divinum testimonium ad excitandam, vel nutriendam fidem institutum, quod instar miraculi confirmet, et instar sigilli obsignet promissionem gratiæ. Quocirca Sacramenta fere conferre solet cum vellere Gideonis, cum signo, quod Isaias obtulit regi Achaz, cum aliis ejusmodi miraculis, atque prodigiis, quibus ad faciendam fidem Prophetæ, et Apostoli utebantur. Bellarmine Præfatio to vol. 3. De Sacramentis.

† Augsburg Confession, De Missa; compare also article 13 which is very strong.

glories of the cross, that we are justified by any external work, however sacred? Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon! It is true that he did teach, what the Liturgy of England is supposed to sanction, that infants are regenerated at the time of baptism. But he was far from teaching the mortal heresy of Rome, that baptism itself renewed them. He treated the sacrament as only a sign and seal, but he supposed that God wrought in their hearts by the power of his Holy Spirit that faith upon which the grace of the sacrament depended. The sacrament, in other words, profited them precisely as it does all other believers. It was a symbol and a seal in every case, whether of infants or adults, addressed to faith. "Perhaps," says he in the *Babylonian Captivity*,* after having explained the necessity of faith to the efficacy of baptism, "perhaps the baptism of little children may be objected to what I say as to the necessity of faith. But as the word of God is mighty to change the heart of an ungodly person, who is not less deaf nor helpless than an infant, so the prayer of the church, to which all things are possible, changes the little child, by the operation of the faith, which God pours into his soul, and thus purifies and renews it." "The Anabaptists," he says again,† "greatly err in preventing infants from being baptized. For though little children, at another time, want the judgment of reason, yet when they are baptized, God so operates upon their minds, that they hear His word, and know and love Him, as formerly the holy John, in the womb of his mother, perceived the presence of Christ, and leaped for joy." If other evidence were wanting, that he was far from embracing the *opus operatum* fiction of Rome, I might refer to his sermon on Baptism, in which he denounces this heresy of schools, and while he admits that the master of the sentences, and his followers, have treated well of the dead matter of the sacraments, he asserts that "their spirit, life, and use, which consist in the verity of

* Quoted in D'Aubigne's *Hist. Ref.* vol. 2, p. iii, Carter's Edition.

† Potius graviter errant Anabaptistæ, homines fanatici ac furiosi, dum infantes baptizari prohibent. Nam etsi parvuli alio tempore iudicio rationis carent, tamen dum baptizantur, sic in eorum mentibus operatur Deus, ut et verbum Dei audiant, et Deum etiam agnoscant, ac diligant; quemadmodum olim sanctus Joannes in utero matris Christi præsentiam sensit, et præ gaudio exultavit. Bellarmine *Præf.* as above.

the divine promise, and our own faith, have been left wholly untouched ;”* and nothing more is needed to vindicate the Lutheran Church, than Melancthon’s defence in his Apology, of the passage already extracted from the Augsburg Confession.† “Here we condemn,” says he, “the whole rabble of scholastic doctors, who teach that the sacraments confer grace upon him who interposes no obstacle, *ex opere operato*, without any good motion on the part of the recipient. This opinion is pure Judaism, to suppose that we can be justified by a ceremony, without a good motion of the heart—that is, without faith—and yet this impious and superstitious opinion, is taught with great authority in the whole kingdom of the Pope.” Such proofs might be indefinitely multiplied.‡ The Reviewer, I think, must have been misled by the ambiguity of the phrase, baptismal regeneration. It may mean regeneration produced by the ordinance itself, *ex opere operato*, or as Bellarmine expresses it, the external action, which is the doctrine of Rome ; or it may mean, regeneration effected by the spirit of God, at the time of baptism, which was unquestionably the opinion of Luther, and perhaps of the compilers of the English Ritual. The first destroys the *nature* of the sacrament as a sign and seal, the other does not impair it ; and hence the argument, so fatal to Rome, leaves untouched the English and Lutheran communions.

To obviate a difficulty which may suggest itself to the minds of some, it may be well to remark, that the errors

* Esto contemptor Magistri Sententiarum cum omnibus suis sribentibus, qui tantum de materia, et forma sacramentorum scribunt, dum optime scribunt, id est, mortuam, et occidentem literam Sacramentorum tractant ; cæterum spiritum, vitam, et usum, id est, promissionis divinæ veritatem, et nostram fidem prorsus intacta relinquunt. Bellarmine, De Sac. Lib. 1 cap. 2.

† Hic damnamus totum populum scholasticorum Doctorum, qui docent, quod Sacramenta non ponenti obicem conferent gratiam *ex opere operato*, sine bono motu utentis. Hæc simpliciter Judaica opinio est, sentire, quod per ceremoniam justificemur, sine bono motu cordis, hoc est, sine fide : et tamen hæc impia, et superstitiosa opinio magna auctoritate docetur in tota regno Pontificis. Ibid, cap. 3.

‡ This matter is discussed pretty fully in the third volume of Bellarmine’s “Disputationum de Controversiis” Ingolstadt Edition, 1601, which is the edition constantly referred to in these articles. The Arch-Jesuit quotes passages from Luther which seem to insinuate the papal doctrine, but which, he proves conclusively, were not intended to teach it. Bellarmine contends that it was absolutely impossible for him to teach it, as long as he held the doctrine of justification by faith.

of an individual minister, do not invalidate the ordinances dispensed by him, so long as the church, with which he is connected, teaches in her symbols, and retains as a body, just conceptions of their nature. He is guilty of aggravated sin in trifling with the mysteries of Christ. But his public and official acts must be measured, not by his private opinions, since it is not man's prerogative to search the heart, but by the standards of the society to which he belongs, and by whose immediate authority he acts. Those who, in Christian simplicity, receive the sacraments at his hands, will receive them with profit to their souls. He, indeed, is a heretic, but his church is sound; and the ordinances which he dispenses are those received by the church, and not the inventions of his own mind. Hence, baptism administered in the Church of England, by an Arian or a Puseyite, though the one denies the Trinity, and the other the essence of the sacrament, is unquestionably valid, because the church itself is sound upon both. And so there may be, perhaps are, priests in the Papal communion, who hold the true, Protestant, scriptural doctrines of the sacraments; and yet, as they act under covenanted articles, and are consequently presumed to do what the church intends, the ordinances dispensed by them cannot be regarded as valid. The *creed* of the church, not the intentions of individuals, must be our standard of judgment. Here we have what the Reviewer calls "the professed, ostensible design;" and Rome's baptism I feel solemnly bound to reject, because her design is not the design of Christ. She professes to do a different thing from what the Saviour instituted.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

ARTICLE III.

THE MILLENNIUM.

Much has been written on the subject of the Millennium, and the second coming and kingdom of Christ. It was agitated in the days of Paul, 2. Thess. II: 2. It seems,

too, to have been discussed not a little by the Christian fathers, for several hundred years. There was much controversy on the subject, then, as well as in modern times. And probably, at no period in the history of the church, has the attention of the people of God been more turned to those passages of Holy Scripture, that speak of the glory of Christ's kingdom on earth, and the general prevalence of true religion in it, than at this time, the middle of the nineteenth century.

And at no previous time, probably, have the opinions of great and good men been more at variance, on many points connected with that expected season of peace and prosperity to the church. It is natural that this subject should awaken a deeper interest in the hearts and minds of Christians, as the time seems to draw nigh, and the signs appear. And there are many things that seem to indicate, that the world is on the eve of some great events; that it is ripe for some radical change.

The waves of the great sea cannot settle into a calm. The world is a vast laboratory, in which God, The Great Chemist, has been performing a series of long and complicated experiments; and has brought out often to the gaze of an admiring universe, wonderful results, both in the natural and moral world; and has compelled men to exclaim in astonishment, "what hath God wrought!"

It would seem as though He had purposely given to every heresy its day, an open field, and by a fair experiment, had made it work out its own refutation. It would appear that He had permitted Satan to run the length of his chain, to devise and promulgate every system of false doctrine, possible for the "father of lies" to invent. And that the world had gone round and round in the same course of error, until there was nothing more to be brought forward, of which it could be said "see, this is new." That every form of oppressive government had exalted itself, as a "Throne of iniquity," against the "Throne of God," but had met with an overthrow. Hardly any new weapon can be formed against the city of the "Great King." Vice and iniquity can hardly assume any new shape. Hypocrisy and will-worship have done their best. Blasphemy and impiety have set their mouths against the heavens, and with tongues set on fire of hell, have long

enough "run upon the thick bosses of Jehovah's buckler."

Infidelity, among all its ten thousand Protean forms, is perhaps now putting on its last disguise, in which to give the church a stab, under the appearance of great zeal for benevolence and philanthropy, above all that the church can shew; imitating the conduct and character of its great prototype, who "had the bag, and bare what was put therein;" and also was so zealous for "the poor," above all the other disciples; when *supreme selfishness ruled him, even to the selling of his master*. And it may be, that in the progress of events, this is about to be re enacted on a large scale. And it is to be hoped that the Lady in Scarlet, and her beast covered with names of blasphemy, are almost old enough to die with very age; or, that their allotted time in the Book of God, is nearly at an end.

But whatever conjectures we may form, as to the secret things of God* yet to transpire, it is certain that the space between this time and A. D. 2000, or the next 150 years, will be filled with most important events, unless the most judicious interpreters of prophecy have been found, or made, so mad by the study, as to fail entirely in their calculations. Rev. Robert Fleming, who wrote on this subject, about 1701, and who then from the scroll of the ancient seer almost exactly described the scenes of the French Revolution of 1793-4, so that he appeared like "one of the old prophets risen again from the dead," says, that the conclusion of the sixth vial of the Apocalypse, and the beginning of the seventh, will occupy most of the time between 1848 and 2000 A. D. And he conjectures, the last one will require no more than about 30 years of this period.†

Now, though we do not boast of uncommon sagacity, or ability to understand the writings of the prophets, yet we think that we have noticed some things concerning those coming events so darkly foreshadowed, that have not been attended to by any writer; and that is, that there is a parallelism between the beginning and the end of the period we commonly call the Millennium. That there are two great series of events, standing over against each other,

* Prov. xxv. 2. "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing."

† Discourse on the Rise and Fall of the Papacy, 1701.

one series at its introduction, and the other at its close. And that these are so similar to one another, and the former in a certain sense the types of the latter, that both are described in the same terms, and portrayed by the same imagery. And naturally, the first event to be noticed in illustration of this idea, is the coming of Christ, as many other things seem to depend on this. A matter about which at the present day, there is much discussion, whether it is to occur at the first or last end of the Millennium. But in the sense explained above, He will come at both times, but in different senses: the first being typical and prophetic of the other, just as was that at the destruction of Jerusalem, John xxi. 22., Mat. xvi. 27, 28. xxiv. 34, when the power and greatness of the Savior were manifest, but not his person; though he says that those then living *should see him coming in his kingdom*. So, as we shall see, a coming is spoken of, in connection with events that must come to pass at the beginning of the Millennium; as at the destruction of anti-Christ, 2 Thess. II. 8., Rev. xix; at the conversion of the Jewish nation, Rom. xi. 26. He comes as the Great God; and in other places his Millennial coming is alluded to. But there is to be a personal appearance of Christ at the close of that long day of triumph to the church, Rev. I. 7. 2 Thess. I. 7, 1 Thess. iv. 16., 1. Cor. xv. 23., 1 John iii. 2., Mat. xxv. 31, 46.

As this, however, is more or less involved in some things that follow, and we shall recur to it again hereafter, we shall not dwell upon it so much here; but dismiss it for the present, and proceed in the next place to mention another set of these parallel and double events, which is, that of a judgment, at the commencement and at the termination of the thousand years. And, as to the former, there are, in our view, several passages that speak of such a judgment, agreeing in point of time. A judgment that is to precede the great Sabbath of the church on earth; which is to be a great crisis in the affairs of the world, and which is to sweep away some of the greatest obstacles to the spread of evangelical truth, and to the universal diffusion of the gospel.

An event of so great importance, and of so varied an aspect, as we may well suppose would be the case, is represented under a great variety of imagery. For though it

is the same in time, yet as there are so many enemies of the church, the judgment, and the victory of the saints over each class, may be separately given; and also, the same identical thing may be spoken of in different places, and in different ways. Thus the overthrow of Papal anti-Christ, is given in Rev. ch. xiv. and xix., under the emblem of the harvest, vintage, and treading of the wine press; in which, "the word of God," "the Son of man," "the King of Kings, and "Lord of Lords," representing the person trampling on the grapes to spread their juice, treads down the slain, and stains his garments red with blood. Compare especially, xiv. 18, 19 and xix. 15, and the circumstances of both passages will be found to be similar; they are in the same place in *the order of events*, following or attending the downfall of Babylon; and preceding the binding of the Dragon, and the ushering in of the Millennium.

Here, in both places, is fearful vengeance inflicted on the enemies of the church, and the victory given to the saints. What more terrible, than the slaughter of so many men, that their blood flows like a river rising to the bridles of the horses for the space of two hundred miles? This is, too, the same event as that mentioned in ch. xi. when "the kingdoms of the world became the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." When the Elders gave Him thanks that he had taken to himself his GREAT POWER, and had reigned; vs. 18. "And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead that they should be judged; and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants, the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldst destroy them that destroy the earth."

This does not refer to the final judgment; nor does "the dead," mean literal dead, but those spiritually in that condition; or if not, it is spoken of those who had been put to death as martyrs of Jesus; and then, to judge them is to give judgment in their favor, as when it is said "God shall judge his people," and avenge them, as is explained more fully in what follows, "and that thou shouldst give," &c.

These three instances of a judgment in the Book of Revelation, appear to stand in the same connection, and to

mark the same time as the one in the seventh chapter of Daniel, where thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit; and the kingdoms of the world were given to Christ, and all dominions served and obeyed him. And this also is parallel with the time in the second chapter, when "the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." These prophecies of the more ancient seer can no more refer to the final and general judgment, than those already cited from the visions of the beloved disciple; for the saints with Christ here on earth have "the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven;" and all dominions serve Christ according to Ps. lxxii. 11, where, "All things shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him."

This time, too, is doubtless the same as that when the dispersion of the Jews will end, and their holy city no longer be trodden down by the Gentiles. An event on which other important transactions are made to depend. For Rom. xi. 25, "Blindness in part hath happened to Israel, till the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved,"* which implies that that blindness will continue only till the great mass of the Gentiles is converted. See also Luke xxi. 24, Rom. xi. 2, Dan. xi. 6, 7, Ezek. ch. xxxvi. and xxxvii.

There are, then, several events that nearly or quite synchronize, in connection with which, the Great Head of the church will appear in some way, to favor his own cause, and to put his foes, and those of his people, to flight in a

* We know that some, as the author of the *Ordo Sæclorum*, p. 671, understand *πληρωμα* here, not in the sense of "fulness," but as in Matt. ix. 16., "that which is inserted to fill up a rent or void;" and here "the filling in of the place of the rejected branches of the olive tree with an election of the Gentiles." But 1. This would amount to the same thing, for before the church was composed almost entirely of Jews, with very few converts from among the Gentiles; and now the place made vacant by their rejection, is to be filled up in a corresponding proportion with Gentiles, and very few Jewish converts, till a certain period.

2. The ordinary interpretation accords with facts thus found in the history of the Jews. The words of Paul ii. Cor. iii. 14, 15, are still true, that "a veil is upon their hearts;" and this to all appearance will remain, till the Gentiles have in a body crowded into Zion, and filled out the branches of the olive tree, broken off so long ago.

3 The interpretation mentioned above is different from that of almost all the learned commentators.

powerful manner. And this is to judge both his friends and foes.

And in this is probably pointed at the overthrow of Popery, Paganism, Mohammedanism, and all other opposing powers, by the judgments of God; at which time the days of the church's mourning will be ended. It will here be seen that we have briefly touched upon some points, the full discussion of which would occupy much time and space; but it is inconsistent with our present object to dwell upon them.

It is evident that there is to be at least *one great marked transaction here on earth*, in which the Saviour has the chief hand, both punishing his enemies and rewarding his people; and that this must be before that period to which the anxious gaze of the church has so long been directed; and that it is called a judgment. Rev. xiv. 7.

But it is only a type, and a prelude, a warning, and a foreshadowing to the world, of another judgment still to come after that, having some features similar, and answering to it in many points. Perhaps described in similar language because seen in the same range of view by the prophet. Just as is the case with the destruction of Jerusalem, foretold in Mat. xxiv. in words whose full meaning would embrace the general judgment; but which were to have a fulfilment in that generation. Just as is the case with the downfall of the old Roman Empire, and the reign of idolatry, at the time of the accession of Constantine to the throne of the world, foretold, Rev. vi. 12-17. The imagery and costume of one judgment and end of the world, is borrowed from the other. The author of "The Decline and Fall," says, "the ruin of the Pagan religion is described by the sophists as a dreadful and amazing prodigy, which covered the earth with darkness, and restored the reign of chaos and of night."*

Sir Isaac Newton remarks that "Great earthquakes, and the shaking of the heavens and earth, so as to distract and overthrow them; the creating of a new heaven and earth, and the passing away of an old one, or the beginning and end of a world, are put for the rise and ruin of a body politic signified thereby."† So, as Bacon says, prophecies

* Vol. III., p. 129.

† Obs. on Proph., part I. ch. 2.

may "have a springing and germinant accomplishment through many ages, though the height or fullness of them may refer to some one age."* That in which all such prophecies have their final and complete fulfilment, is the great judgment at the end of the Millennium, and of time. Rev. xx. 12, "When the dead, small and great, stand before God"—"and the sea gave up the dead that were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead that were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." There is now time no longer. He that is now found holy, is holy still; he that is filthy remains confirmed in that character forever.

And here, as immediately connected with that judgment, we may introduce and compare the two resurrections spoken of in different places in the Bible. Most especially in Rev. xx. 5, 6, the "first resurrection" is found, and is at the beginning of the Millennium. This is figurative. As Mr. Guise remarks, "There is mention made in this prophecy of *two sorts of dead* persons: those who were slain for the witness of Jesus, and those who were slain by the sword of him that sat on the horse. The former were raised to life, and lived and reigned with Christ one thousand years: but the others lived not again till the thousand years were finished—they had no successors of the same wicked and persecuting spirit till the devil was let loose after the Millennium."† This resurrection probably synchronizes with Rom. xi. 15, where the "receiving of the Jews will be as life from the dead;" and with Ezek. xxxvii. 12, 13, when God would open their graves, and cause them to come up out of their graves, and place them in their own land.

But the general resurrection, Rev. xx. 12, 13, Dan. xii. 2, Matt. xxv. 32, &c., is at the end of the world, when the

* Quoted by Newton on Proph. Int.

† This is undoubtedly the view of the great majority of interpreters, and of intelligent Christians. Dr. Hammond, Dr. Scott, Dr. Whitby, Bogue. Witsius, Lowman, Hopkins, Fuller, Boothroyd, &c. follow it. And the fallacy of Bp. Newton, (on Proph., London Edition, 1832, p. 587,) "If the martyrs rise only in a spiritual sense, then the rest of the dead rise only in a spiritual sense," will appear, if we change the word "spiritual" into "*figurative*:" Rest applies in a figurative sense to martyrs: so it does to the rest of the dead: the former had successors—the latter not till end of Millennium.

dead, small and great, stand before God; when the sea, death and hell delivered up the dead that was in them; and some are raised unto eternal life, and some unto shame and everlasting contempt.

But we proceed to mention another point of parallelism connected with those already mentioned, and that is, a great battle to be fought in each case. This is implied in the passages quoted above in reference to the judgment. Particularly, the first battle, connected with the first judgment, Rev. xix. 19—21, when "the beast, and the kings of the earth, and *their armies*, were gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army." When the beast and the false prophet were taken and cast alive into a lake of fire, and the remnant of their army was slain. This appears coincident with the battle of Gog and Magog in Ezek. xxxviii., &c. And if not absolutely the same, yet connected in time. The battle of Gog and Magog in Ezekiel we take to be a literal conflict with some people and their king. It precedes and is connected with the restoration of the Jews to their own land, and arises out of a resistance to God's fulfilment of his promises to them. There is an extensive combination of their enemies, who come like a cloud out of the north parts, a mighty host against the mountains of Israel. Just as in Revelations, the beast and false prophet unite with the kings of the earth. But, as in the latter case, the enemies of Christ met with a signal defeat, so in the former. And if they were not cast into a lake of fire they fell by the judgments of God, who "pleaded against them with pestilence and with blood; and rained upon them and their bands, and upon the many people with them, an overflowing rain, and great hail-stones, fire and brimstone."—Ezek. xxxviii. 22. This is followed by a variety of occurrences here in this world. Now there is another battle of Gog and Magog, that stands over against this, and corresponding to it, at the close of the Millennium, Rev. xx. 8. It is called by this name only in a figurative sense, and because similar to the one in Ezekiel one thousand years before. Nor can it be necessary here to go into an induction of particulars to shew that these two battles, bearing the same name, are not identical; and that the one in the more ancient prophet more nearly agrees with

that recorded in Rev. xix. than in Rev. xx. This will be perfectly obvious to one who will observe the time, the connection, the subject matter of the descriptions, or the cause of the battles in each case.

We proceed, then, to mention an additional point of resemblance between the beginning of the season of prosperity enjoyed by the church on earth, and the commencement of the heavenly state: and that is, that in each case there is a new heaven and earth. And the remark of Sir Isaac Newton, quoted above, applies especially here. An important political change; a revolution in an organized government, of great extent; one in which the whole world is interested, is figuratively a change in the material universe. Now in Isaiah lxv. 17, we read of a new heaven and a new earth, in comparison with which the former was not worthy to be remembered. But we see in what follows that this refers to great changes in this present world. The language is figurative—not literal. The change is moral, not physical. And we see, by the last three verses of the Book, that it is introduced by the destruction of wicked men, which will bring it into the very place in our series of events where we have put it. "And they (the worshippers of God, in verse 24,) shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me," &c. It would appear, then, that this great change would be introduced by the slaughter of the enemies of God, who opposed him in a particular case, and whose carcasses would be left to putrify unburied, as a monument of divine justice. And this is undoubtedly the same as the judgment and battle mentioned above, occurring in the same order and connection, and followed, as here, by the peace and happiness of the saints, under him who makes all things new.

But the new heavens and earth parallel to this in Rev. xxi. 1, was after "the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea." They were immediately antecedent to the heavenly state of the righteous; when the former things had passed away. It is not a figurative but a real change that is portended: and is the same as that mentioned by the apostle Peter—2 Peter, iii. 10—13, when "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned

up ;"—and there are to succeed "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." And this is certainly in connection with the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men : when the final state of men is fixed and settled.

The next point of correspondence is between the building of a new city and temple, and the new Jerusalem. In the prophecy of Ezekiel, chapter xl. to xlvii. we read of a city and temple to be constructed, the latter of which is described with great minuteness. And it is a singular fact, that we have not seen particularly noticed, that the *temple is not in the city*, nor connected with it. But in the centre of the land of Israel is laid out a square of 25,000 reeds on a side. From the north part of this is taken a portion, reaching across its whole length from east to west, and in width 10,000 reeds. In the midst of this parallelogram is located the sanctuary. (Ch. xlviii. 10.)

On the south side of this, and adjoining it, is laid off another portion of the same length and width, leaving between this and the south side of the square a lot of the same length, but of only half the width ; and in the centre of this is the city, a square of as many reeds on a side (including the suburbs) as the lot is wide—viz., 5,000 reeds. (Ch. xlviii. 15—17.) So that the temple is to be at least 15,000 reeds from the north side of the city, which is named Jehovah Shammah—"The Lord is there."*

And it would seem as though great permanency was intended by a structure of so much magnificence as the temple ; an object apparently of much greater importance than the city, of which little is said.

And with regard to this part of the Book of Ezekiel, there can be, perhaps, but three opinions :

1. That it is all to be understood in an allegorical and spiritual sense, and finds its fulfilment in the Christian Dispensation.

2. That it is to be considered in the light of a promise made to the Jews of great privileges, and of a permanent settlement in their own land ; but being conditioned on their good conduct, has failed, and will never be fulfilled, on account of their disobedience.

* The separation of the sanctuary and city signifies, perhaps, a separation of Church and State, totally different from the old Theocracy.

3. That it is now hereafter to be literally fulfilled, *or something answerable to it*, in the same connection in which it stands in prophecy; according to which, it would appear as if the Jews were to be brought into the Christian Church, and restored to their own land.

On this latter point we know that there is a great diversity of opinion among those who have written on the subject. And while it is not our intention fully to discuss the matter here, we may just remark, that when we see so many prophecies accomplished, and now fulfilling, met to the very letter; when in so many cases we see the event predicted, it may be, thousands of years beforehand, coming up to the last iota of what fell from the lips of the inspired seer; there is every reason to expect that the same will be the case in regard to those which have not passed from prophecy to history. Especially when they are as pointed and clearly expressed as those that relate to the resettlement of the ancient people of God in their own land; and the building of the city and temple mentioned by Ezekiel. We would refer to such passages as Hosea iii. 4, 5, Ezek. xxxvii. 21, 25, xxxix. 28, 29, Jer. xxxi. 38—40, Romans xi. 25.

The predictions of Ezekiel could not refer to their return from the captivity in Babylon, but must refer to a restoration from a more general dispersion, such as they are now in; and it was to be “in the latter days.” And what God hath spoken he is able to bring to pass—however, from present appearances, it may seem improbable or impossible to us.

There is here one circumstance that may be worth mentioning, which we do not remember to have seen noticed by any one: the encampments of the Israelites in the wilderness (Numb. ii.) were, by divine direction, in regular military order,* and always on the same plan. Now if any one will take the pains to draw that plan, and then the ground-plot of the temple described by Ezekiel, ch. xl. &c., he will see a striking resemblance. And we remember that the *city* and the *temple* have no immediate connection with one another. Now can we find these any

* Sometimes compared with the camps of the Roman Army. Adams Ant. p. 314.

where else? If we turn to Rev. xx. 9, we very probably see them referred to. There is the camp of the saints, τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν ἁγίων, the very term employed by the Septuagint to signify the encampment of the Israelites in Lev. iv. 12, 21, xvi. 27, and which Paul uses in the same way, in Heb. xiii. 11. This, then, may stand for the temple and its out-buildings, and "The Beloved City" represents the one in Ezekiel xlviii. 35, called Jehovah Shammah, "The Lord is there:" the same as that around which the armies of the last Gog and Magog "were poured numberless" as the sand of the sea; led up by Satan upon the breadth of the land, when was his "last hour and the power of darkness;" when the arch-enemy of God and man made his last assault on the church, and met with so signal a discomfiture.

But parrallel to this is the New Jerusalem, in Rev. xxii., that is not built with hands; and of which the temple and tabernacle were only patterns and figures. (Heb. ix., 23, 24.) This city descends from God, out of Heaven. It is introduced at the end of the one thousand years; and when the former things had passed away. It is at the commencement of the permanent state of heavenly bliss, when sorrow, sin and pain shall forever flee away.*

So also, in this connection, we may mention that, in Ezek. ch. xlvii., we find living, healing waters, flowing out from under the east gate of the temple, and increasing in depth to an impassible river, bordered with evergreen trees, whose leaves were medicinal, and whose fruit was plucked and reproduced each lunar change. The counterpart of this is found in Rev. xxii. But there the river flows out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. It is where there is no more sea: and these things are here found within the Holy City, that descended from God out of Heaven, and in which was no temple. They are not, as in the former case, of the earth, earthy. These two sets of descriptions cannot both refer to the same thing and the same time; but the first is emblematical of the last. They both represent what is to occur, in some sense, but at the distance of a thousand years apart; and this,

* Mr. David N. Lord says that this city cannot signify heaven, because it descends from heaven.

whether the language be understood literally or figuratively. The latter river is, probably, what the Psalmist meant by "the river of the pleasures of God," (xxxvi. 8.)

Again, there is some reason to believe that, if not in the church as a whole, in the Jewish part of it, restored to the land of promise, there will be a head or prince. In support of this opinion, we may refer to such passages as Rom. xi. 26—"There shall come out of Zion the deliverer." And in Ezekiel xxxvii. 22-25, they are to have one king and one shepherd; "David, my servant, shall be king over them:" in ch. xlv. called "the Prince."

To this corresponds the headship of Christ over the whole church, when his kingdom or body is completely filled out.

We will add but one point more here to illustrate the matter in hand; and that is, the binding of Satan, Rev. xx. 2. He is restrained, or shut out from the world for the space of one thousand years; at the end of this period, he appears again on the stage of the world for a short time, to act his last part in the great drama, before his final exit. And, because he knows that his time is short, he is in a great rage. But, after his final rout, he and his followers are cast into the lake of fire: not for that period which is with the Lord as one day, but to be confined, and to be tormented day and night forever and ever. Without enumerating any more particulars of this kind, we will exhibit, in a tabular form, a brief view of some of those events yet to be, and which have so great a correspondence with each other, while standing one thousand years apart in time.

Parallelism between the commencement and the close of the long expected Millennium:

The coming of Christ, figurative.—
2 Thess. ii. 8; Rom. xi. 26.

The coming of Christ, personal.—
Rev. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Thess. iv. 16.

A battle and a judgment.—Rev. xi. 17, 18, xix. 11-21; Dan. vii. 9-14, 21-27; Zech. ch. xiv.

A battle and the general judgment.—
Rev. xx. 7-15.

The battle of Gog and Magog.—
Ezek. xxxviii.

The battle of Gog and Magog.—
Rev. xx.

The first resurrection.—Rev. xx. 5, 6; Rom. xi. 15; Ezek. xxxviii. 12, 13.

The general resurrection.—Rev. xx. 12, 13; Dan. xii. 2.

Saints reign with Christ on earth.—
Rev. xx. 4—v. 10.

A new heaven and earth.—Isa. lxxv.
17-25—lxxvi. 22-24.

A new city and temple.—Ezek. xl.
—xlviii.; Rev. xx. 9.

River flowing from the gate of the
temple.—Ezek. xlvii.; Zech. xiv. 8.*

A vicegerent prince.—Ezek. xxxvii.
24, 25—xliv. 3.

The beast and false prophet cast
into the lake of fire.—Rev. xix. 20.

Satan bound one thousand years.—
Rev. xx. 2.

Great happiness on earth.—Isa. ii.
2-4, lxxv. 4-9.

The mystical presence of Christ.
Perhaps something like the shechi-
nah.—Isa. lx. 19, 20; Ezek. xlviii. 2-7.

Saints reign with Christ, in heaven.
—Rev. iii. 21; 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; 2
Tim. ii. 12.

New heavens and earth.—Rev.
xxi. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 13.

New Jerusalem and no temple.—
Rev. xxi. 2-27.

River of Life from the throne of
God.—Rev. xxii. 1.

The direct government of Christ.—
Rev. xxii. 3-5.

Death and hell cast into lake of
fire.—Rev. xx. 14, 15.

Satan confined forever in hell.—
Rev. xx. 10.

The bliss of heaven.

The personal presence of Christ.—
Rev. xxi. 22, 23—xxii. 3-5.

If these passages, and many others, be referred to, a general correspondence will be found running through many particulars; and this, of itself, is a strong argument in favor of the theory.

If, then, these prophecies, yet to be fulfilled, have been rightly arranged, some other important truths may be inferred; and,

1. We shall see that there need be no alarm with regard to the end of the world, as if the general resurrection and the general judgment were just at our doors. Pretenders to inspiration, or to great knowledge of prophecy, have often laid hold of this to create a panic:† some, too, have honestly mistaken the language of the Bible. The same was true in early times: 2 Thess. ii. 3. The words of Christ, (Mat. xxiv. 34,) taken in their connection, might mislead some, especially if they followed the chronology of the Septuagint, which, in the early ages of the church, was implicitly followed; but which makes the world much older than the Hebrew text. And it seems that the disciples misunderstood the words of Christ, in John xxi. 22, 23, with regard to his second coming.

* This, from the *temple*, and not from the *city*, would indicate *spiritual* blessing: the New Jerusalemis *all temple*.

† In the tenth century, it was believed that the world would end one thousand years from the birth of Christ. Mosh. Ch. Hist. Cent. 10, b. iii. ch. 3.

But the words of Paul still stand good, that we need not be soon shaken in mind, or troubled by any one that pretends to show that the day of Christ is at hand. For that part of eternity that is cut off and cast below the skies; that great parenthesis between eternity past and eternity to come, called *time*, reaches on many hundreds of years beyond the present. There may be wars and rumors of wars—there will doubtless be, before long, great convulsions and revolutions in the kingdoms of this world before the Desire of all nations shall come, either personally or potentially. But many prophecies, that imply and require long periods of time, are yet waiting on record to be fulfilled in their time, on the present earth, before the final conflagration. Those events that have passed from the future, by that ever shifting point, the present, into the past, and have become matter of record, no less by the pen of the historian than by that of the prophet, are not found to fail in the least iota in coming up to the words taught by the Holy Ghost. And we may as certainly expect, as to the rest, that God will, in His own time, manifest that he saw the end from the beginning. The conversion of the great body of the Jews, and their ingathering from their wide dispersions, and the probable re-building of their city and temple,* or some events answering to this; the conversion of the Gentile world; the removal of all the opposition to Christ and his cause that arises from Popery, Mohammedanism, Paganism, and Infidelity; all this must require some length of time before even the victory can be given to the saints of the Most High: and Christ shall take unto himself his great power, and reign their king. And, after that, time stretches on a thousand years to the restitution of all things.

2. We may see how so many men have fallen into so great an error as to suppose the resurrection of the dead, the personal appearance of Christ, and the general judgment, were just at hand; or to adopt other views similar to those of which there have been a great variety given to the world, while those momentous events are afar off. It has arisen from wrongly locating the fulfilment of cer-

* There seems to be reason to believe that some idea of sacredness was attached to this land from the earliest times, and that the same will continue. Gen. xii. 7, xiv. 18, xxii. 2; Ex. xv. 17; Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14; 1 Chron. xxi. 24, 25; Jer. iii. 17; Rob. Calmet, pp. 559, 560.

tain prophecies *in time*. They have doubtless, in many cases, at least, applied the first series of unfulfilled prophecies to the same events as the second, confounding one with the other. Because the expressions are often just the same, and seem to speak of events identically the same, they have too readily concluded that both sets are literal, coincide, and that they are to be brought about at the same time; and, with regard to the latter series, in some cases, one thousand years too soon—making one end of the world equal to the other. To those who are, in any slight degree even, conversant with the subject of prophecy, it is evident that certain well defined periods, that God has fixed in the great scheme of things, are drawing to a close, and that some things that the prophets have spoken are ready to be verified. And, as there are other things still farther off, bearing the same name, and perhaps seen, in the prophetic view, in the same range, like two ridges of distant mountains appearing in close connection, though separated by a wide valley, so some interpreters of prophecy have mistaken those farthest off for those nearest the observer. They have transferred the closing scenes of the Millennium to its introduction.

3. We can also see how men have been led into the opposite error, of expanding the one thousand years of that happy period into 360,000, for which there is scarcely a shadow of authority in the word of God: as before, they have confounded types and antitypes—heaven and earth. And, because there are expressions declarative of the prolonged and uninterrupted prosperity of the church on earth, as in Isa. ch. lx., &c., and because of the fact that the reign of the saints with Christ is never to end, as in Dan. vii. 14, 18, 27, they have been led to place what follows the Millennium before its close; and to crowd what belongs to the eternal, heavenly state, into a temporal period. If they bring in the “new heavens and the new earth” of Rev. xxi. 1, at the commencement of the Millennium, and co-incident with that which prefigures it, as it is after the first earth had passed away and there is nothing to measure time by, and there cannot be on our supposition, as there is not any terminating limit in the other direction, they are compelled to expand their Millennium indefinitely, or to make out a long definite period. But they forget

that the peace and happiness of the church, after judgment is given in her favor, and she is vindicated from the many foul aspersions cast upon her, and as much exalted as now depressed—raised from a state of servitude to one of kingly and priestly honor, are never to end, though the world ends. And that, when the last *great sabbatism* of *time* is reached, that is but the prelude to that eternal rest that is laid up for the saints in light; that Sabbath whose sun will never go down; and that the former is but one step from the latter. The earth will then be but the outer court of heaven. The final conflict of the hosts of Satan with Christ will not interrupt this happiness; for, in the moment of danger, and when those foes seem most confident of success, they are taken away without hand, and devoured by fire from God, before whom, on His great white throne, all the living and dead, small and great, immediately appear.

4. It will be seen that the view of the Millennium presented above militates against the Millennarian hypothesis—at least on many points, though we are aware that there is, among those that bear that name, a great diversity of views. But they may be divided into two great classes, those who hold that Christ will reign in person on earth, with no subjects but those who are raised from the grave, or transformed while living; and those who expect that, while the dead saints sojourn on earth, the generations of the living will go on as now—joining the earthly and heavenly in one.

But, in the first case, we cannot see how that great battle of Gog and Magog can be fought after the Millennium. Where are the combatants to come from? And, in the other case, it looks too absurd to suppose the raised saints to live during the present order of things; and, evidently, it would not add to their present happiness in heaven, but must detract from it. We suppose that the first coming of Christ, in our tabular view, to be not personal or miraculous, but figurative, potential, and by the immediate agency of his providence; but, in a high degree, foreshadowing that time when He will appear in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

* Dr. Gill makes them the wicked raised from the dead and the devils.—*Sermon on the Glory of the Church, preached in London, 1752.*

Now most, if not all, Christians believe that there is to be a personal coming of the Saviour, and *but one*. And the great point in dispute is, whether it is to be at the beginning of that prosperous period for which the church is looking, or at its close.

That it is to be at the close of the Millennium, is favored by the fact that it is connected with the resurrection of the body, and that is assigned to the end of the world, when, of course, the Millennium will terminate. See 1 Cor. xv. 22-24; Phil. iii. 20, 21; 1 Thess. iii. 13, iv. 14-17, v. 23. We find that coming connected, too, with the last judgment. Mat. xxv. 31-46; 2 Thess. i. 6-9; and, in Heb. ix. 26-28, we read that Christ "appeared once to put away sin;" but, when He appears the second time, it will be in the character of the Great Judge who is to judge the world. This passage seems to decide the whole question; and we have not seen that stress laid upon it that it deserves. In many other cases, that coming is associated, as there, with the final and complete happiness of the saints: 1 John iii. 2; 2 Pet. iii. 12-14, &c.; Acts iii. 21.

If, then, that second coming be connected, as we believe it is throughout, with the second series in our tabular view, and not with the first, then whatever expressions of this kind may be found where this coming seems to be spoken of in a different connection, these must be understood as figurative, as belonging to our first series, where Christ makes known His great power, but does not manifest His glorious person to the view of men. This is sustained, too, by the fact that one or two such appearances have occurred according to the predictions of Scripture: in which cases he was not openly seen—notwithstanding the strength of the language: Comp. Mat. xxiv. 31 with 34, and John xxi. 23; Rev. vi. 16, 17.

5. It is apparent that the most glorious part of the history of the church is yet unwritten, except by the prophets. That history is increasing in interest every hour. There have been, it is true, in times past, great displays of the power and grace of God in her favor.

When we look back, at least, to the time of the Saviour's sojourn on earth, and at what he accomplished in person; and not only in his life, but at his death; and, much more, by the shedding forth of the gift of the Holy Ghost on the

day of Pentecost ;—when we see the Gospel, like leaven, diffusing itself abroad in the world, and working great changes, till it entered the palace, and, at length, sat on the throne of the Cæsars, we are constrained to say “God hath wrought great deliverances for Jacob !” And, when again we cast a glance at the Great Reformation, and at its results—at the progress of true religion since the present century began—we are ready to exclaim, “He hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad !” We can thank him for the past, and take courage for the future. But what are the brightest pages of her history compared with what is yet to be written, “in the latter days :” when “the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established on the tops of the mountains, and all nations shall flow into it”—when all the enemies of Zion shall bow before her. One little incident in the life of Christ and the apostles, may stand as the emblem of a great part of the past history of the Christian church. That small band of disciples, in a little boat on that confined lake, the sea of Gallilee, tossed with the waves, and the wind contrary ; but Jesus, walking on those waves, saying to his fearful family, “Be of good cheer. It is I—be not afraid.”*

But the future condition and prospects of that same family, of which Christ continues the head, may be represented under the figure of a vast fleet, on the wide ocean, with wind and tide in its favor—its whitening canvass covering the whole sea—and, in full sail, the countless hosts of the redeemed entering the haven of eternal rest, with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads. It almost makes us wish that we had lived later, in time to witness the glorious things spoken of Zion, the city of our God. (Isa. lx.)

6. How desperate the malignity and depravity of the human heart ! Light, knowledge, privileges enjoyed to any amount without the converting grace of God, only make men more blind to their true interest, and more hardened in sin. What kind of a sinner will he be who continues such during the Millennium, (Isa. lxxv. 20,) when the light of the moon will be as the light of the sun,

* “One interesting object greeted our eyes—a little boat, with a white sail, gliding over the waters : the only one, as we afterwards found, upon all the lake.”—John vi. 16–22. Rob. Res. in Pal., &c., vol. iii. p. 253.

and the light of the sun as the light of seven days collected into one? How fully, under the power of Satan, are those armies of Gog and Magog, who, after a hundred-fold greater display of the power, the justice, the wisdom, and the goodness of God, than we have ever seen, will yet fight against them, and seek to cut off his people from the earth! This is, indeed, rushing upon the thick bosses of Jehovah's buckler. This is provoking that very doom that already awaited them.

7. We have as great reason to expect a great change from the present state of the world, at the introduction of the Millennium, as the Jews had to look for what occurred at the advent of Christ. They were disappointed in all their expectations. They were looking for certain things according to their own views, when, lo, it appeared in the issue that they had wholly misunderstood their own prophets, whom they had heard every Sabbath day.

They had no idea that things would take the turn that they did. They did not look for so great a change as that, from Judaism to Christianity. Nor do we see well how they could well have anticipated from the prophecies all that was done, though they ought to have known vastly more than they did. We can now see that the change was indicated in the old text; but, if we had lived then, we might have been as blind as the Jews: in fact there are, in the New Testament, some interpretations of the prophecies that no uninspired man could make. So it may be that, in many things, when the Millennium actually comes, prophecies will be fulfilled, as wide of the calculations of many as was the case with the Jews. The object of prophecy is not to make us prophets, but to confirm our faith by the event; and, if it tarry, we must wait for it. (Heb. ii. 3.)

We cannot tell what will come to pass in every case answerable to a prophecy; and, when we look for a literal fulfilment, as the Jews did concerning Elias, that particular prophecy may be, as was true then, accomplishing before our eyes, in a different form, so that we do not recognise it. We ought, then, to watch and pray, and wait for the coming of our Lord, well assured that He will permit none of his own words to fail, nor any of those

which were penned by men full of His spirit. And, if He bring about some sudden changes, and great revolutions in church or state—if he shake nations and kingdoms, and even the solid earth itself, to make way for his new heaven and earth, let us be ready to receive him—to fall in with his great movement, recognizing him as the leader in it, and as coming to restore the kingdom to Israel. And, in this point of view, the study of prophecy is most profitable, that we may not be taken unawares. A blessing is pronounced on those that read *and understand* the prophecies, “and keep those things which are written therein.” (Rev. i. 3.)

“None of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand.” “Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the thousand three hundred five and thirty days.” Dan. xii. 10, 12.

ARTICLE IV.

THE CREDIBILITY AND PLENARY INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

No sentiment is more generally entertained, and more amply confirmed, than that the Scriptures profess to be divinely inspired. This opinion is not founded on education and prejudice merely, but is doubtless derived, in many instances, from an impartial and a diligent perusal of their interesting pages. But, notwithstanding the number of lucid expressions in which they distinctly affirm their claim to inspiration, many have refused to admit its validity, and reject, with unmingled contempt, the doctrine which it involves. The generation of Deists and sceptics is not yet entirely extinct. There are Dodwells, Tolands and Priestleys at the present day. Did we adopt the theory of transmigration of souls, we should be disposed to believe that the departed spirits of those gentlemen had returned to earth and taken possession of Morell, Scherer, Nott and others, whose names we might mention. The labors of such men as these have produced in some

munities, the lamentable effect of weakening and setting aside the authority of Scripture. They have certainly tended to embolden sceptics in their profane and wayward course, to render the impenitent more unconcerned about their moral condition and future destiny, and to perplex with doubts the minds of those who, though hopefully pious, are nevertheless too liable to be unduly influenced by the authority of great names, and to be tossed by every gale that blows. Results of this nature might have been confidently anticipated; for it is a fact, abundantly attested by the history of the church and of individuals, so soon as men persuade themselves that the Bible is destitute of inspiration and authority, they feel and act as if they were absolved, by Divine and special enactment, from all obligations to repent of sin and lead a holy life. If we take away inspiration from the Bible, it is to us no Bible at all. Although we might cheerfully acknowledge that its books are both genuine and authentic, yet, if they are not divinely inspired also, they are not more obligatory on us as a rule of faith and practice, than the Odes of Horace or the Commentaries of Cæsar. Every promise would be a blank, and each threatening a dead letter. The joys of heaven, described in graphic language by the Saviour, prophets and apostles, would be only admired as a beautiful sketch of an excited imagination, and the torments of the bottomless pit disbelieved and rejected as a ridiculous story of the nursery or school. Almost every moral restraint would be speedily removed, and the world would soon be ripe for a second deluge, from whose desolating effects but few could expect to escape.

It is also true, that as soon as we think we discover mistakes, even of small importance, in the statement of a witness, we begin to lose confidence in his general testimony. If we deny the inspiration of any part of the Scriptures, we may, for the same reason, and with the same authority, deny the inspiration of every other part. If we presume to maintain that the historical books are filled with false statements and inaccurate calculations, may we not, on similar grounds, reject the doctrinal and preceptive books also? The open denial of Moses and the prophets, prepares the way for a contemptuous and fatal rejection of Jesus and the gospel of his grace. The same species of in-

fidelity which leads men to affirm that the *words of Scripture* are not given by inspiration, actively and strongly tempts them to contend that its *ideas also* are not inspired by the Holy Ghost. Pursuing this method of tampering with the sacred text, and advancing from one degree of bold impiety to another, they would soon convince themselves that it is a question of no moment at all whether they believe the Bible or not.

Every lover of truth and the souls of men ardently desires to see the advancing waves of scepticism rolled back. A firm conviction of the security of his own position does not repress his anxiety to remove others from the vicinity of that vortex which, increasing in rapidity at every revolution of its eddying tide, is prepared to engulph and destroy them forever.

We shall endeavour to present a few arguments in behalf of the credibility and plenary inspiration of the sacred Scriptures. We hope to prove that the books which profess to belong to the sacred canon are *really inspired*, and to such a degree that the writers were, by divine influence, infallibly secured from committing mistakes and errors in regard to their *ideas* and *words*, while they were discharging the duties of their office. In prosecuting this design it will be proper and necessary to show what books belong to the canon of Scripture, and briefly to exhibit the historical grounds on which they have been received.

I. The holy Scriptures consist of two principal parts: the sacred national books of the Israelites, or the Old Testament, written in Hebrew,* and the sacred books of the Christians, or the New Testament, written in the Greek language. When the Jews returned from captivity and re-established divine worship, they collected into a library all the sacred books which they still possessed. It is probable that the autograph of Moses, which was originally deposited in the most sacred part of the sanctuary, perished with the ark in the destruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar. The tradition was prevalent among the Jews that the sacred Scriptures were utterly lost in the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. But there must have been

* A part of Daniel, a verse in Jeremiah, and a part of Ezra are written in Chaldee.

authentic copies of them among the people; for Josephus relates that every tribe, by the command of Moses, was furnished with a copy of the Pentateuch. The collection of these scattered books and the establishment of the Old Testament canon is generally attributed to Ezra. It is admitted that he made additions and corrections in several parts of these writings, where anything of the kind appeared necessary for illustrating, connecting and completing the work. He added the last chapter of Deuteronomy, in which he gives an account of the death and burial of Moses, and of the succession of Joshua. He changed the names of several places that had fallen into disuse, and instead he put their new names, by which they were then called. The place to which Abraham pursued the kings who carried Lot away captive, was called Laish in the time of Moses. After his death the Danites took possession of it, and called it Dan. When Ezra came to revise the account of this transaction, he placed in the text the name Dan instead of Laish, because the former was the common name at that time. According to Jewish writers, Ezra was assisted in his work by a great synagogue, consisting of a hundred and twenty men, including Daniel and his three friends and Haggai, Zechariah, and Simon the Just. But it is improbable that all these men lived at one time, since, from the period of Daniel to that of Simon the Just, no less than two hundred and fifty years must have intervened. The only thing probable in regard to this subject is, that the persons said to belong to the great synagogue did not live in one age, but *successively* until the time of Simon the Just, who was inducted into the office of high priest about twenty-five years after the death of Alexander the Great. Malachi seems to have lived after the time of Ezra. Nehemiah mentions the high priest Jaddua and also Darius Codomanus, both of whom lived after Ezra. The genealogy of the sons of Zerubbabel is carried down, in the first book of Chronicles, to the time of Alexander the Great. This book, therefore, could not have been placed in the canon by Ezra, nor much earlier than the time of Simon the Just. The book of Esther was probably added during this interval. The conclusion at which we arrive is, that Ezra commenced the work and collected and arranged all the sacred books that belonged to the

canon before his time, and that a succession of pious and learned men continued to pay attention to the canon until the whole was completed, about the time of Simon the Just. After this period no other books were added to the Old Testament scriptures. Let us now see what books were contained in this canon thus completed and established. The Jews divided their Scriptures into three parts: the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. The first embraced only the five books of Moses: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. The second contained Joshua, Judges, with Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, with his Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, the twelve minor prophets, and Job, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Chronicles. The third part embraced Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon.

The Septuagint was executed at Alexandria two hundred and eighty-two years before the Christian era, and it contains the books enumerated in the Jewish canon. The son of Sirach, author of the book of Ecclesiasticus, who lived two hundred and thirty-two years before Christ, makes evident references to the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and mentions these prophets by name. He speaks of the twelve minor prophets also. The prologue to the book, written by the translator, informs us that the Law, the Prophets, and other ancient books were studied by his grandfather. About forty years before Christ were written the Targums of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, and of Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Prophets, according to the Jewish classification; which are evidences that those books were not only in existence at that time, but also recognized as belonging to the Jewish canon. Jesus Christ mentions the Law and the Prophets in one place, and in another the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms. An inspection of the quotations in the New Testament from the Old will furnish abundant proofs that the Jewish canon contained the same books which now constitute the Old Testament. All these are sometimes designated by the term *law*. They are also called sacred writings, holy writings, and simply the writing or Scripture. Josephus, who was contemporary with Paul, Peter and John, bears the following important testimony in his treatise against Apion: "We have not thousands of books, discordant and

contradicting each other ; but we have only twenty-two, (answering to the number of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet,) which comprehend the history of all former ages, and are justly regarded as divine. Five of them proceed from Moses ; they include as well the laws as the account of the creation of man, extending to the time of his death. This period comprehends nearly three thousand years. From the death of Moses to that of Artaxerxes, who was king of Persia after Xerxes, the prophets who succeeded Moses committed to writing, in thirteen books, what was done in their days. The remaining four books contain hymns to God and instructions of life for the use of men." From this testimony it appears that the Jews did not recognize in the time of Josephus any books as belonging to the sacred canon, but those which are now found in the Old Testament. They permitted none but the prophets to write their national history, and none but priests to transcribe it. They admitted to the canon no productions unless they bore evident marks of genuineness, authenticity and inspiration. They rejected several works, of which mention is made in the sacred history ; the book of Samuel the seer, the book of Nathan the prophet, the book of Gad the seer, the book of Jasher, and the book of the wars of the Lord. The simple mention of a book, or a mere citation of a sentence from it, by no means gives it a place in the canon. The language, style, and the whole mode of representation of the Old Testament, are in the spirit of the times in which it professes to have been written. The accounts which the writers of its books give of the history, polity, customs and institutions of the oldest nations, precisely agree with those which we obtain from other sources. They are full of allusions to each other ; events and authors, mentioned in the earlier writings, being often cited in the later. David is mentioned in the second book of Chronicles, Moses in the book of Joshua, and Jeremiah in the book of Daniel. The plagues of Egypt, the passage through the Red Sea, and the rebellions of Israel in the days of Moses are mentioned in the book of Psalms. The deliverances of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, from Sisera, from the Philistines and from the king of Moab, are spoken of by Samuel in his solemn address at Gilgal. The written records of the

Jewish nation were deposited in the temple, and preserved from the earliest times with great care. This is particularly true of the law of Moses and other public documents, to which they wished to give a solemn sanction. Josephus describes these documents "as deposited in the temple." The Grecian Jews concurred with those of Judea in the opinion that they were authentic and genuine productions. The testimony of Philo and of the Jewish rabbins, cited in the Talmud, may be adduced to prove the same fact. Melito, bishop of Sardis, who flourished about a hundred years after Josephus, travelled into Palestine for the express purpose of satisfying his mind about the canon of the Old Testament. He left behind him a catalogue, preserved by Eusebius, from which it appears the same books were in his day received into the sacred canon as are now found in the Hebrew Bibles. This is also true of the catalogues furnished by Origen, Athanasius, Cyril, Augustine, Jerome, Rufin, the council of Carthage and that of Laodicea.

The canon of the Old Testament is settled on the clearest historical grounds. Though various readings may be found, on comparing different manuscripts and translations; though alterations of letters and vowel-points may have been made; and though some interpolations and errors, in consequence of the ignorance and carelessness of transcribers, or of their too scrupulous regard to calligraphy, may have been perpetrated; yet it is the decisive opinion of the most judicious, that the worst manuscript extant would not pervert a single article of faith, weaken the force of one moral precept, nor impair the credibility of any history, prophecy or miracle which these books record. The manner in which they have always been preserved, the estimation in which they have been held, the care that has constantly been exercised in regard to the sacred text, and various other circumstances, have all conspired, under the providence of God, to defend and secure their original integrity and purity.

The books of the New Testament contain nothing to awaken a reasonable suspicion that they were written in another age, and by other authors than are commonly supposed. The dialect in which they are composed, evinces that they were the productions of native Jews of the first century. All the Jewish authors of that century, who

made use of the Greek language, employed that Hebraistic Greek in which the New Testament is written. After the second century, this peculiar dialect fell into disuse, and Christian writers wrote in a different manner. These books could not have been forged, therefore, during the second or any subsequent century. The autographs of these writings, like those of Moses and the prophets, have met the fate of many ancient records. They have been lost, and will probably never be recovered. No one can produce the autographs of any books as old as the New Testament, unless they have been preserved in extraordinary manner, as in the case of the manuscripts of Herculaneum. It cannot be reasonably supposed, that in the midst of such vicissitudes, revolutions and persecutions as the church has endured, the original manuscripts could have been secured and preserved by any thing short of a miracle. An overruling and a wise Providence may have permitted them to be lost, lest in process of time they should be idolized, or lest posterity should venerate the mere parchment and ink, the letters and form employed by an apostle, more than the doctrines which he taught, and the admonitions which he addressed to them. The Lord knew that these books could and would be transmitted with sufficient accuracy, by means of apographs, to the most distant generations; and the history of their transmission affords abundant proofs of His superintending care. They were extensively circulated at an early period, and publicly read in many churches. They were so highly prized, that many copies were taken, though there was then no speedier method of producing them than by forming every letter with a pen. These copies were doubtless accurate, since the persons employed in transcribing possessed great reverence for the books, and since errors, discovered in the transcripts, would have either prevented their sale or greatly reduced the price. The first Christians had been in the habit of using, to a greater or less extent, the collection of the sacred books of the Jews; and it was natural they should feel induced to form a similar collection of their own. Many spurious writings, which were ascribed to the apostles, were circulated and even read and used in the churches. During the life of the apostles productions of this character were

palmed on the people by impostors. To prevent these impositions, and promote the edification of Christian posterity as well as their own, the followers of Christ commenced a collection of their books. It was a rule with them to admit only such books into the canon as could be proved to be the writings of the apostles, and their first assistants in office. Those alone were allowed to be ἐνδιάθηκοι, which had credible testimony in their favor from the earliest period. The epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, the gospels of Peter and Thomas, and several other works, were rejected on this principle. Another rule was to reject every book that did not agree with the doctrines which the apostles taught, and the regulations which they established. The collection which the first Christians thus formed, was divided into two parts, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and τὸ ἀποστολικόν. It is highly probable that the apostle John was acquainted with the first three gospels, sanctioned them by his authority, and that he completed the history which they contain by his own gospel. He omits to mention, or at least briefly notices, some important events which are more fully described by the other evangelists; and, on the other hand, he relates many things which they omit. He enlarges on the incidents and discourses that preceded and followed the Eucharist, the passion, the resurrection of Christ, and other events. But there is no evidence that John either made the collection of the other books (ἀποστολικόν) or sanctioned them by his authority. Had this been the fact, doubts could not have arisen concerning his second and third epistles, his Apocalypse and some other productions.* His decision would have at once and forever settled the question. It appears that the collection of these books, like those of the Old Testament, was not finished immediately, but was commenced a considerable time before it was completed. The first regular catalogue of the books of the New Testament which we find on record, is by Origen, who lived about one hundred years after the death of John. He was a man of extensive biblical learning, and was eminently qualified to judge correctly in this case. This catalogue includes all the

* The genuineness of 1 John v. 7, 8, has been very much controverted. The arguments on both sides are fully stated in Horne's Introduction, vol. 2, pp. 366, et seq.

books now found in the New Testament, except the epistles of James and Jude. These were not omitted, however, by design; for, in other parts of his writings, he expressly acknowledges them as part of the canon. Eusebius may be regarded as giving his testimony, about a hundred years after Origen. In his catalogue he enumerates every book we have now in the New Testament, and no others. Athanasius in his Festal epistle and Synopsis of Scripture, has left a catalogue of these books which perfectly agrees with the canon now in use. The same is true of the catalogues furnished by Epiphanius, Jerome, Rufin, Augustine, and by the unknown author who goes under the name of Dionysius, the Areopagite. Forty-four bishops were present at the council of Carthage, which gave a catalogue that exactly coincides with the present canon. Cyril mentions all the books except Revelation. The same is true of the council of Laodicea, which convened after the middle of the fourth century. For a brief period, the apocalypse fell into considerable discredit among the other churches. It was thought to support the extravagant doctrines of the Chiliasts, who were regarded as errorists. Its contents are of a deeply mysterious nature, and on this account also it was permitted to lie in obscurity for a season. It is not found in a number of ancient catalogues.

But notwithstanding this fact, the evidence in its favor is of a high character. Hermas and Papias were acquainted with it. Justin Martyr makes mention of it. Quotations were made from it by Theophilus of Antioch, and Irenæus. The latter speaks of "the exact and ancient copies of this book, which were confirmed by the concurrent testimony of those who had seen John." A monument of Hippolytus, of the third century, dug up in Rome in 1551, contains a catalogue of all his works, among which there is "one on the gospel of John and the Revelation." It was received as canonical by Cyprian, Lactantius, Victorinus, Athanasius and Augustine. Origen called John both an evangelist and an apostle, and also a prophet.

The Gnostics, who were the heretics of the first period of the Christian church, never questioned the credibility of these books. Celsus and Porphyry, Lucian and Julian and other heathen writers confirm their genuineness.

They were translated as early as the second century, into Syriac and Latin, and during the third and fourth centuries into Ethiopic and Gothic. The testimony of Christian writers of the first three centuries is decidedly in their favor. They were quoted as sacred Scripture by all the fathers, living in parts of the world the most remote from each other. They were cited as authority in Asia, Africa and Europe. When controversies arose they did not appeal to any other books. It is evident, therefore, that they knew no other books, originally written in the Greek language, which claimed to be canonical, or if they did, they did not esteem them of equal authority with those which they cited. They were received as genuine and authentic, because they were recognised and esteemed as such, by those who lived nearest the period when they were written, and by the ages following, in a continued series. They were quoted so frequently by the fathers, that had the New Testament been destroyed, the greater part of it could have been recovered and collected from their writings. The evidence in their favor is so strong, that if it were counteracted and set aside, we should behold a miracle more stupendous than any found in the books themselves. But, as has been already observed, many are willing to admit that the writings of the Old Testament and the New are both genuine and authentic, and yet strenuously deny that they are also divinely inspired. A history may be accurately true, and may be composed by its professed author, and still it does not follow that it was given to man by inspiration. Hume's history of England and Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, have been regarded as authentic and genuine; but none will contend that they are therefore inspired. It has been conceded that the doctrines taught in the Scriptures are of divine origin, and yet those who make the admission, virtually deny that the Scriptures themselves are inspired documents. They tell us that the doctrines, promises and precepts of revelation are frequently contained in religious books, sermons and tracts, but no one can prove by that fact simply that these *works themselves* are of divine origin. It is true that the divinity of the Christian religion *need* not be considered as depending on the divinity of the Scriptures. These two things were distinguished from

each other as early as the time of Melancthon, and the distinction may still be properly observed. The truths and doctrines which are contained in the Scriptures, are certainly of divine origin; but that fact does not prove that the Scriptures themselves are inspired throughout and in every part. We feel bound, therefore, not only to show that the books of Scripture are genuine and authentic, and contain doctrines of a heavenly origin; but that they themselves, the holy Scriptures, as they originally came from the hands of prophets and apostles, are really and fully inspired. This proposition has been so ably and so frequently discussed, that we would not attempt to establish it in a brief article, but for the fact, that many have been led to believe that, though the Bible contains true history and sound precepts of morality, it is at the same time destitute of plenary inspiration, and may be believed without profit, and rejected without detriment, according to the fancy and taste of the reader. We have somewhere met with an account of a certain warrior, who, having murdered his predecessor, and usurped his throne, was afterwards requested to permit him to be numbered among the gods, and he replied: let him be a god, provided he be not living. A number of persons, who profess a veneration and love for the Scriptures, appear to reverse the order of the warrior's words, and say: let them be genuine and authentic, but only provided they be not divine nor obligatory as a rule of faith and morals. That we may oppose, and aid in exterminating, this insidious and dangerous form of infidelity, we shall shew that the Scriptures contain nothing but what God intended to communicate by them to the children of men; that the persons whom He employed for this purpose, were, by a high divine influence, instructed what and how to speak and write, while engaged in the duties of their office. Those who admit the omnipotence of God, cannot consistently maintain that it is absolutely impossible for any person to be inspired. He who formed the souls of men, and is himself a spirit, surely has access to their minds. He rules and governs all moral beings, and yet their free agency and the full exercise of their powers is not in the least degree superseded. Individuals have been, and are now employed, in executing his vast and glorious designs, and still

their own consciousness as well as His word, testify that they possess all the liberty that can possibly belong to man in the present life. The same is true of those on whose minds the Almighty Spirit chose to exert an influence, enabling them to reveal his will, and preserving them from error. They were under his infallible guidance, and yet their acquired knowledge, habits, and characteristic dispositions were not superseded. We shall proceed to prove that the sacred writers were thus inspired.

II. If we have succeeded in establishing the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament, we must believe the divinity of Jesus Christ. He confidently and unreservedly appealed to his innocence, even in presence of his enemies; and challenged them to convict him, if they were able, of a single act of dishonesty. He practised none of the arts of deception. His character, conduct and works were such, as to free him from the imputation of being either an honest enthusiast or a crafty impostor. He declared that he taught his religion by the express command of God.* In confirmation of his claims, he performed miraculous works. He healed the sick and gave speech to the mute, opened the eyes of the blind and raised the dead from the grave. After dying on the cross, he rose by his own power from the tomb. Forty days after his resurrection, he ascended to heaven and sat on the right hand of the Father. He amply proved himself a divine personage. Now if he is God, all his promises as well as his threatenings, have been or will be, fulfilled. When Peter confessed that Jesus Christ was the son of the living God, He responded: I will give 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. Since Peter evidently spoke in the name of the other apostles as well his own, the answer which Jesus made was addressed to them, as well as to him. If it be allowed that this absolute promise was given exclusively to the apostles, how could they exercise the power of binding or loosing (of forbidding or permitting) especially after their decease, except by their doctrine? And where must the church or

* Matt. xxvi. 63. John v. 43. John xvi. 27, 8.

the world look for that doctrine, if not in their writings? Should we suppose that the exercise of this authority was confined to the short period of their continuance on earth, the visible church has ever since been destitute of rules for censures and absolutions of a declarative nature, and also of all criteria for the discrimination of true Christians from other men, either for the purpose of self-examination, or for the regulation of conduct towards the household of faith and the world around us. "But if this promise was not made exclusively to the apostles, the consequence must be, either that there are in every age ministers of religion possessed of this absolute power of binding and loosing, or the words of Christ have not received their full accomplishment. As it does not accord with the prevailing sentiments of those who love the simplicity of the gospel, nor with the admonitions and precepts of Jesus Christ, to invest any ministers, however pious and learned, with such infallible and decisive authority; we may be justified in drawing the conclusion, that the promise, which we are now considering, was made exclusively to the apostles, and was signally fulfilled when they were inspired by the Holy Spirit to deliver that doctrine to the church, by which the state of all persons with respect to divine acceptance or condemnation is and will be finally decided." If this be admitted, it will inevitably follow that the express testimony of Jesus Christ proves the writings of the apostles to be a part of divine revelation; for in them they delivered to the visible church what they received from Him; and these writings have been, and will be, to all succeeding generations, the doctrine of Christ himself. He explicitly and solemnly promised to his apostles peculiar divine influence and assistance, whenever they should be called on to teach, confirm or defend his religion. He addressed to them a promise of this character on four different occasions. Matthew mentions one of the occasions. When Christ first sent the apostles forth, he told them of the dangers that would surround them, and encouraged them if they should be brought before governors, not to take thought *how* or *what* they should say, for it should be given them the same hour what they should speak.* He gave them

* Matt. 10: 19, 20.

the same promise when he commissioned them to publish his religion,* when he predicted the destruction of Jerusalem,† and when he made to them his parting and last address.‡

Now if the apostles were assisted in their oral discourses, which were of temporary and limited advantage, how much more should they be assisted in their written instructions, which were destined to exert a more lasting and extended influence? The words λαλέιν and παρακαλεῖν are applied with equal propriety to speaking and writing. Whether the apostles spoke or wrote, or whatever they did in the discharge of their duties—they were assisted by the constant and uninterrupted influence of the Holy Spirit, their paraclete, their counsellor and their guide. He should convince the world through them, by their writing as well as speaking. He should reveal to them many things of which Christ had not spoken. That they might be secured from mistakes, or a perfidious memory, He should *remind* them of what Christ had taught them, and *instruct* them in everything necessary to the discharge of their duties.§ The Holy Spirit should reveal to them future events, endow them with miraculous powers, correct their mistakes, and impart new instructions whenever they were called for. Whatever the apostles taught, may be regarded as coming from God himself. The apostles and evangelists themselves ascribe the same authority to their writings as to their oral instructions.|| The testimony of Jesus Christ is the foundation of the doctrine of the inspiration of the New Testament. He promised this influence to the apostles. This promise was certainly fulfilled. The apostles claimed to be inspired, and wrought miracles in confirmation of their claim. The gospels of Mark and Luke and the Acts, though not written by the apostles, were penned by their attendants and under their immediate inspection, and, consequently, were equally authenticated by them, as if they had themselves written them. We have before stated that it is extremely probable the first three gospels were sanctioned by the apostle John. In regard to the apostle Paul, it will suffice to remark, that there is

* Luke xii. 11, 12. † Mark xii. 11; Luke xxi. 14. ‡ John xiv. 16.

§ John xiv. 26. || John xx. 31; 1 John i. 1-4; 2 Thess. ii. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 1-ii. 13; Eph. ii. 13; Acts xv. 23.

no alternative between denying all the facts recorded concerning him and allowing his apostolic authority in its fullest extent. Peter places the epistles of his beloved brother Paul, on a level with the other Scriptures.*

The only portion of Scripture of which Jesus himself can properly be called the author, is that which contains the epistles to the seven churches of Asia, which He dictated to the apostle John as his amanuensis.

The Jews regarded the Old Testament, in all its parts, as divine. Josephus and Philo always mention the books with the greatest veneration, and frequently call them *θειαὶ γραφαί, ἱερὰ γράμματα*. The former expressly ascribes divine inspiration (*ἐπινοία θεοῦ*) to the prophets. Now the question arises, what opinion did Christ and his apostles express concerning the books of the Old Testament?

They assented to the opinion of the Jews on this subject. Though they labored to subvert the Jewish dispensation and establish a more perfect one in its stead, they still regarded the Mosaic doctrine, institute and writings as divine. They had imperfections, it is true, but these were inevitable to the ancient economy, which was designed for the world while yet in infancy and incapable of a higher instruction. Every part of the Jewish Scriptures were, in every form, recognised as the word of God, as infallible, incapable of being broken, more certain of accomplishment than heaven and earth of continuance, by our Lord and his apostles. The writers of the several books claimed to be messengers of God; they authenticated that claim (with few, if any exceptions,) by miracles or prophecy. They taught the truth—truth, as far above that contained in uninspired writings, as the heavens are above the earth; and the predictions which they contain, scattered over the whole volume, given in detached parts and at long intervals, and all concentrating in one great system, have been fulfilled, and are still fulfilling. The apostles Peter and Paul endorse the Old Testament as inspired.† The passage from Peter proves the inspiration only of the prophetic part of the Old Testament; but, from the two passages together, it is obvious that the apostles believed

* 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

† 2 Tim. iii. 14-17; 2 Pet. i. 19, 20.

the Old Testament, as a whole, to be inspired. Christ called it Scripture, the Sriptures, the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. Taking a view of the Bible as an entire book, we see indisputable evidences of its divine origin. Its sublime and godlike ideas, the spirituality and elevation of its design, the majesty and simplicity of its style, the candor, disinterestedness and uprightness of the writers, the harmonious agreement of its parts, its wonderful efficacy on the consciences and souls of men, the fulfilment of its prophecies, and its astonishing preservation, are all incontestible proofs of its being inspired. Moreover, if the writers had not been inspired, they could not have written so accurately about past events. A great number of the first disciples were very illiterate. They knew nothing comparatively of the beauties of style and splendor of diction. They were plain, but honest and honorable men. And yet they wrote their accounts with judgment, and without any essential discrepancies. They described a perfect character, which was never performed before, nor has it been done since by the most gifted novelist. Though the genealogies of kings and priests, under the Old Testament dispensation, were doubtless taken from other records, yet the writers were superintended and instructed by the Spirit of God, while they were engaged in the work; and, if any alterations in the arrangement of the books, or any other changes were made, they were made by Ezra, who was inspired.

It might appear from one passage of Paul's writings, that he was not inspired. He says, I think I have the Spirit of the Lord. The word, for think, in the original, means, and is frequently used to denote, a full conviction of mind. The apostle intended, therefore, to say that he was well convinced that he was giving advice which accorded with the mind of the Spirit. The apostles and prophets could not have prophesied, nor given correct accounts of past events without the directing and superintending influence of the spirit.

We say, therefore, that the Holy Scriptures are inspired. The writers of them have given us nothing but what God intended to communicate by them to mankind.

III. We believe that this inspiration was plenary—extending not merely to one part of the Scriptures, but to all

its parts—not only to the ideas, but also to the words, as they came originally from the hands of the prophets and apostles. He who attends to the operations of his own mind is fully satisfied that he cannot *think* without the intervention and use of language. When he is carrying out a course of argument without speaking or writing it, he must even then employ words. They are the scaffolding of thought. The one cannot easily be constructed, nor be of profitable use, without the other. It is sometimes very difficult to select the proper words to express our ideas. The historian, or author of any grade, must consult his own taste and that of his expected readers, and must study to find out and set in order acceptable words. Now if the ideas contained in the Scriptures are inspired, and if it is almost impossible for an uninspired person always to select the most appropriate and expressive language, we must admit that the words of the Scripture were also dictated by the Holy Spirit. It was very important that the facts and observations, which God intended for the instruction of mankind in all ages, should be properly expressed; and there was danger that errors would be committed by such persons as the penmen of the Scriptures, the greater part of whom were illiterate and ignorant of the art of composition. Jesus Christ promised to his disciples that, when they were brought before kings and governors for his sake, it should be given them in that hour what they should speak; and the apostle Paul affirms that he and the other apostles used not the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the *Holy Ghost* taught. We cannot suppose, therefore, that when these writers were most at liberty, they were, in no degree, directed by a secret influence (without taking away free agency) in the selection of their words and phrases. When they announced heavenly mysteries and new doctrines, of which they could have had no conception; and when they delivered predictions which they did not understand, it is plain that the words must have been presented to their minds. They were much in the same situation with a person who sets down a passage in an unknown tongue, at the dictation of another. That they did not understand all their own prophecies is obvious from the words of Peter, who represents them as studying them and trying to discover their meaning.

In regard to the histories, moral reflections, and devotional pieces of the Scriptures, it is not necessary to contend for the inspiration of the language in the same sense. The writers of these parts were doubtless permitted to exercise their own faculties to a certain extent, and to express themselves in their natural manner; but they were still guided and superintended by the Holy Spirit, and infallibly secured from committing mistakes. It is very probable that God accommodated himself, in his communications, to the character and genius of the persons employed; and, on this ground, the diversity of style may be explained. The terms suggestion, elevation and superintendence, do not fully express the ideas which they are intended to convey. Though it may appear that there are different degrees of inspiration, yet we are inclined to believe that all parts of the Scripture are so far inspired that they contain no more and no less than what God designed to reveal by them to mankind. When the great object was *accuracy* in history or calculation, He gave the necessary assistance. When the object was to foretell future events, He arranged for that end, and bestowed on proper persons the requisite qualifications. When the design was to render praise, to discuss doctrines, or to comfort the people of God, He was with them, and taught them how and what they should speak and write. We have succeeded (we trust) in our attempt to shew that the books which profess to belong to the sacred canon are really and fully inspired. We may derive from this fact three or four important inferences.

1. The first is, that the books, commonly called the Apocrypha, are not the word of God, and should not be bound up with the other books. They were not recognized by Christ and his apostles as part of the word of God. They are never quoted as of authority, never referred to as Scripture or as the words of the Spirit, in the New Testament. They were not recognized as inspired by Christians of the first four centuries. They are not included in the catalogues given by Melito, Origen, Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril, Epiphanius, Gregory, Nazianzen, Rufin, and the council of Laodicea.* The authors of these books do not claim to be

*The Arguments of Romanists discussed and refuted. By Rev. Dr. THORNWELL. 10th letter.

inspired, but on the contrary disclaim any such authority, or speak in terms incompatible with it. They are just such books as uninspired men under their circumstances might be expected to write. There is nothing in any of them which might not be expected from Jews living either in Palestine or Egypt, whose opinions had been more or less modified by a knowledge of the Oriental or Grecian systems of philosophy. They often contradict the books of the Old Testament or are at variance with themselves. They contain false doctrines or false principles of morals, or in many cases absurd stories. They formed no part of the Jewish canon.

2. If all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction and instruction in righteousness; we have a sufficient rule of faith and practice without consulting the wishes of the church, the bulls of Popes, and the decrees of councils. If we desire to know what are true doctrines, let us go to the *Scriptures*, which are able to make us wise unto salvation through faith in the Redeemer. Do we wish to settle any religious controversies? Let us appeal to the *Scriptures*, for they are infallible and cannot be broken. Are we harassed with doubts and fears? Let us take the *Scriptures*, and prayerfully and patiently examine them; and we shall soon discover the path of wisdom and duty, and receive strength to follow it through life.

3. If the Scriptures are really and fully inspired, ministers of religion and interpreters of the text should possess such a regard and reverence for them as would restrain them from handling them deceitfully, or with presumption and lightness. They should be stimulated to due diligence and care and dependence on God, in eliciting the true meaning of the words and phrases. All men should cheerfully submit to the authoritative teachings of Scripture; but especially they whose duty it is to explain it, and illustrate its moral power by a holy example. They ought not to be contented with meagre information, but should strive to attain the qualifications which are requisite to the faithful minister and fully accomplished interpreter of the *Scriptures*.

ARTICLE V.

THE HARMONY OF REVELATION, AND NATURAL SCIENCE; WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO GEOLOGY.—NUMBER I.

The spirit of Infidelity is not the spirit of true Philosophy—intellectual, physical or moral. Doubt is to the mind what hunger is to the body—the stimulus which Nature, or the God of Nature, has provided to incite and prepare us for the enjoyment of healthy nutriment—but it is not that very nutriment itself. *Habitual skepticism* is intellectual disease—the *atrophy* of mind, the ordinary cause, the invariable symptom of mental inanition, or ill-digested knowledge—and bears the same relation to that calm love of truth and scrutiny of evidence, which characterizes all large and healthy understandings, that the insane and insatiable craving of some dyspeptic patient, after stimulants and trash, bears to the discriminating relish and healthy appetite which belong to every vigorous and well-developed human frame. To doubt may be “the beginning of Philosophy;” but devout and assured faith in God and Nature—this is its glorious and triumphant consummation. Hence, of all those mighty men who have stood foremost in every department of enquiry—have enlarged the boundaries of knowledge—have fathomed the depths of the human understanding—unveiled the mysteries of Nature—penetrated the infinitudes of space, or mastering the whole wide domain of matter and of mind, have given new laws to guide our investigations in either—your Bacon, your Locke, your Newton, Leibnitz, Des Cartes, Euler, Kepler, Tycho Brache—of all those mighty men of old, who tower before us, there, upon the page of history, in their colossal grandeur and gigantic strength, high above all their fellows, the luminaries of their own age, and of all succeeding generations—*scarce one* has been *an unbeliever*. “I had rather believe all the fables of the Legend, the Shaster and the Koran,” exclaims Lord Bacon, “than that this universal frame is without a mind.” And, in his “Advancement of Learning,” “A little or superficial knowledge of Philosophy may incline a man’s mind

to Atheism; but depth in Philosophy bringeth men's minds about to Religion."

On the contrary, there is a sympathy deep, intense, all-pervading—a harmony profound, stupendous, universal, between the revelations of the Bible and the discoveries of modern science, in the broadest range and the boldest grasp of its largest and most comprehensive generalization—in the whole spirit, tone and temper of its legitimate inquiries—in that attitude of devout humility and conscious ignorance, yet of erect and fearless, of hopeful and even confident attention, with which she stands in the great temple of Nature, and traces each "foot-print" of the Almighty, whether amidst the infinitude of space or amidst the depths of a past eternity—the chronicles of extinct races, or the wreck of departed worlds.

If the Creator of the Universe be, indeed, an intelligent and moral agent—infinite in wisdom and goodness, as boundless in his power—then, besides the physical universe around us, there is *another*, of rational and moral beings, of correspondent extent, variety and grandeur.

Now let any one appropriate, if he can, at a single glance of thought, all that our modern astronomy hath discovered—the universe of greatness above us, which the telescope hath revealed, and the descending universe of littleness, which the microscope has made known—let him accept her boldest assertions as indubitable truths, and follow onward in her most adventurous speculations, till the fevered brain grows dizzy, and the strained intellect bewildered, as whirling by suns and systems, as they rise, in rapid and dazzling succession, in ever enlarging magnitude and increasing splendour around, he strives to picture to his imagination that lapse of ages and those intervals of space for which arithmetic has no formula, and language no expression, and the mind of man, in its boldest efforts, *no approximate conception*. Then let him turn to the Bible, and in the revelations there will he find the parallel and exact counterpart of all which, in the grandeur of the material creation, has most awed and subdued, most enlarged and exalted, his conceptions. Will he not find here, too, the march and the movement of a high moral administration—the progressive evolution of one stupendous system, coeval with all ages, and coextensive with

all worlds—the omnipresent majesty of one supreme and all-pervading legislation, binding together, as in one bond of sympathy, the remotest parts of this great moral universe—system after system of intelligent existences—angels and archangels, and cherubim and seraphim rising one above another, in ever-ascending progression, indefinitely high, until at last the eye of inspiration is dimmed with excessive radiance, and the telescope of revelation rests upon those upper intelligences—those mysterious and nameless “*powers in heavenly places*,” for which earth presents no analogies, and language has no titles—yet unto them “*is made known through Christ the manifold wisdom of God?*”

And now, when he learns that the whole family in heaven look with intensest sympathy upon our fallen race; that the Great Father of *all* has so loved the world that he sent his own Son upon an errand of infinite compassion to redeem it—that he who was mighty to save, “travailed in *the greatness of his strength*,” and all the attributes of the Godhead were summoned and concentrated here, as for some high achievement, while he contemplates with adoring wonder this amazing condescension, will he not find an analogy, at least, if not an adequate illustration, in the ways of him who, though he has garnished the heavens by his power, and calleth forth the stars by number, hath given to Saturn his girdle of light, and to the sun his diadem of fire—yet hath stooped to gild the insect’s wing, and to pencil the hues of the lowliest floweret of the valley; nay, hath not disdained to lavish *all* the resources of his infinite wisdom, his boundless benevolence, and Almighty power, in moulding the minutest portion of the minutest member of one of those invisible animalculæ, whose teeming myriads live and revel and die *unseen*, amidst the sweets and fragrance of a single flower. Doth God care for the flower of the field?—and will he not care for you, oh ye of little faith?

Did it become him thus to concentrate all the attributes of the Godhead, and lavish all the resources of omnipotence on such as these, and is it inconsistent with the dignity of his exalted nature that he should stoop to redeem a whole lost world of immortal spirits?

Again, long centuries before Herschell handled a teles-

cope, or Newton had studied the laws of the planetary motions, or Cuvier had touched a fossil bone, or Hume had reasoned upon the permanency of a course of nature; while all those astounding facts of the cognate sciences, Astronomy and Geology, which have thrown such startling light upon the history of our own, and perhaps all other globes, lay buried deep beneath the huge strata, where they had been chronicled for ages, or lost amidst the unfathomed depths of space; a Galilean fisherman has furnished us with a broad outline of modern science; distinctly stated the fundamental sophism of that atheistic metaphysic, which constitutes the basis of all the infidelity of modern times, and given to it the very refutation which is offered by the most distinguished geologists of our day. In the last days, according to the apostle, 2 Pet. 3 chap., shall arise a new form of infidelity. The objector shall take his stand upon the invariable operation of nature's laws, and invariable succession of nature's phenomena: "In the last days shall come scoffers, saying, where is the promise of his coming, for since the fathers fell asleep, all things *remain* as they *were* from the beginning of the creation?" To this the apostle answers, in language precisely corresponding with that of our scientific geologist, and capable, with a very slight and legitimate modification, of including all his most important principles: "The present condition of our globe is not the first, and shall not be its final state. Our present continents were once submerged beneath the ocean, from which 'ἐξ ὕδατος' they at length arose, were then swept by a terrific deluge, and having thus passed through successive catastrophes, are yet reserved for another and more fearful visitation,—"*reserved unto fire.*" But think not that this destruction spoken of will be *annihilation*; it will be *purification rather*. The former condition of our globe adapted it for the abode of irrational animals only; the last great crisis in its history, prepared it for the higher order of rational and moral agents. The next will be another step in the ascending series of God's providential arrangements, and instead of a habitation for imperfect fallen beings, it will be the theatre of a glorious moral manifestation, the blissful abode of holy, happy beings. "Nevertheless, *we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.*"

Indeed, the whole tone and tendency of our modern Geology, *when rightly understood*, is intensely and profoundly Christian. It furnishes by far the most conclusive of all arguments for the existence of a God ; explodes the atheistic theory of an infinite series of beings ; and thus dispels the last remaining doubt that might otherwise have thrown its shadow over the soul of man. It refutes the only plausible objection that has ever been devised against the miraculous evidence of the Gospel History (Hume's celebrated argument against miracles ;) for it *lives amidst the innumerable miracles* of ages past, and reads and *acknowledges* their record, engraven indelibly upon the everlasting rocks. Its spirit, rightly understood, is the spirit of awe and reverence. It places us at once, amidst the infinitude of ages and the immensity of space ; it tells of catastrophes long since past, and of other catastrophes yet to come ; of stupendous powers, even now at work all around us, far surpassing our conception, which have left the traces of their agency deep on the whole face of nature ; in the huge mountains they have heaped up, the valleys they have hollowed out ; in the masses of dislocated strata, torn from their native beds and dashed together in wild confusion ; or twisted and bent in all directions from their horizontal position, as if held fast by some Titanic hand, and writhing amidst the agonies of some terrible convulsion.

Amidst the wild play of all these terrific powers, the mighty succession of these incalculable ages, she traces the steady march of *one vast and comprehensive plan* ; and the direct interposition, often repeated and distinctly visible, of the same almighty power, which originated the whole design at first, and still presides over every movement of the complicated machinery. *The Theology of natural science*, then, is in perfect harmony with *the Theology of the Bible*. She starts with *one instinctive principle, one intuitive conviction*, of the invariable connection between a CAUSE and its *appropriate effect* ; and by the light of this single principle, she decyphers the hieroglyphics of dynasties long entombed, and penetrates the mysteries of the celestial motions, and rises, step by step, with irresistible demonstration, to *a first great cause*, that can exist, without absorbing all subordinate causes into his

own mysterious being, and operate without merging all inferior agency in his own inscrutable omnipotence. But she bears along with her another principle, alike immediate, universal, irresistible, coeval with the origin of the race, co-extensive with the globe, inseparable from the constitution of our nature—the intuitive conviction of the *relation between right and wrong*, that there is a moral element in man, and a moral law in the universe, that the *highest power and the highest right are one, and both are enthroned, supreme over all worlds.*

And now that almighty power and infinite holiness are enthroned together, let natural science accumulate her facts and multiply her demonstrations. Let Astronomy enlarge each world into a system, and each system to a universe of suns, pouring their blazing radiance over our midnight skies, with their attendant planets, sweeping over orbits of illimitable extent. Let Geology transform each individual of its extinct races, into a separate species; and each species into the representative of an era; and expand each era over incalculable ages. Let the eye of man be kindled up with seraphic vision, and the intellect of man be moulded to the stature of tall arch-angels, that he may stand upon some high eminence in the upper skies, and looking abroad over the immensity around him, may discover new systems of worlds, which no telescope, as yet, has brought within the scope of human vision; and from that new and untrodden field of observation, gather fresh evidences of the existence of a God, and fresh illustrations of all his attributes; yet would the Christian welcome joyfully, and appropriate each successive revelation. For at each step, in the onward progress of this high argument, as fact was piled on fact, and illustration on illustration, and this ethereal intelligence, kindling with the grandeur of his theme, bore every understanding and every will along upon the rapid tide of a resistless and overwhelming demonstration, still, as the earth faded from our view, and nought but immensity and eternity was there around us, would not the reverence, and solemnity, and breathless awe of eternity rest upon our spirits? Nay, could that audacious dream of ancient and modern impiety be realized, and the mystery, that ever from of old, has shrouded the invisible and eternal one from human

gaze, be *all laid bare*, and we be introduced into the presence chamber of the Most High, and stand face to face with God; would we not find *there too*, enthroned above all worlds, eternal justice, and almighty power? and beneath the broad blaze of that omniscient eye, and with all our sins upon us, would not the language of nature be the echo of that voice, which startled the patriarch of old, when in visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, "a Spirit passed before his face, and the hair of his head stood up," and a voice was heard amidst the stillness of the midnight, "Shall *mortal man* be just with God? *A man with his maker!*" And the awestruck patriarch exclaimed, "*How shall man be just with God?* For *he is not a man* as I am, that I should enter into judgment with him; neither is there a days man betwixt us, that he might lay his hand upon us both." Such, then, is the Theology of natural science. Such the utmost goal of her most magnificent discoveries, and proudest demonstrations. They "shut us up" absolutely to the "faith." They serve as a schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, in whom alone, "God can be just, and justify the ungodly."

We have thus presented a brief and rapid view of that mutual harmony, which prevails between the discoveries of science and the revelations of the Bible, in their broad outline, their general tone and spirit, their tendency and ultimate results.

That amidst this general harmony, there should nevertheless arise apparent discrepancies, and real difficulties, difficulties more easy to be discovered than to be solved, lies *manifestly* in the nature of the case, and will surprise no one, who remembers those strange and inexplicable anomalies that present themselves in the phenomena of nature; those irregularities in the movements of the universe, that seem to threaten its destruction; those perturbations from unseen causes, in the orbits of our planets; those huge chasms in the order of the creation, where its progress seems to be suddenly arrested, its harmony interrupted, its best established analogies *all defied*; yet that, in every instance, unwavering confidence in the very harmony thus apparently violated, has suggested the *true solution*; and the solution when attained, has confirmed the harmony; thus, by progressive approximation, establish-

ing *the scientific assurance* that *each apparent* anomaly will hereafter be merged in some higher law, and the difficulties which our ignorance has suggested, will be removed, *as heretofore*, by our advancing knowledge. It is manifestly impossible, that *any human* theory should be able to embrace and harmonize all the phenomena of the physical or moral universe, for the human mind is finite; and the scheme of the universe, devised by an infinite intelligence, if not absolutely infinite, like its author, is yet vast, beyond all our powers of conception, including all worlds and all systems, with their myriad inhabitants, and their manifold relations, stretching over the whole infinitude of space, and eternity of duration. Hence, the very advance in science which solves one difficulty, often discovers many more to be solved, for our ignorance and our knowledge seem to be inseparable correlatives; the opposite poles of the same mysterious potency; and every enlargement of the *boundaries of the known*, is a correspondent extension of the *vast and limitless unknown*. Let him, therefore, declaim against apparent difficulties in the Bible, whose theory can comprehend and explain all the mysteries in the phenomena of nature, and in the existence and character of the God of nature! For, let it not be forgotten, that if the Bible be from God, then, there is not only a probability, but a certainty, that it will be liable to *the same objections*, and from *the same causes*, which are urged against his existence, and his character,—his natural government and his moral legislation. That mysterious and incomprehensible eternity of God, without a beginning and without an end, present through all time, yet without relation to time! That omnipresence of God, pervading all space, yet bearing no relation to it,—intensely present *in the totality* of his attributes in the most distant portions of his universe, at once, at every moment in time, and every point in space! That invisible and fearful moral government of his, the unchangeable enemy of sin, encompassing us on every side, with its terrible instances of moral retribution here, and premonitions of still more fearful punishments hereafter! That absolute sovereignty in the distribution of his favors amongst men, guided by infinite wisdom doubtless, yet according to a law which baffles our scrutiny, and heeds not our mur-

murs ! Let any man consider for a moment, what are the ordinary objections against divine revelation, and he will find that they are principally aimed at the being, or character, or government of God, as revealed in the works of nature,—and amount to this, that the Bible *is the book of God*, the transcript of his wisdom, holiness and justice, imbued with his spirit, and overshadowed by the awful majesty of his mysterious being. The most fearful tendency of scientific skepticism, metaphysical and physical, in modern times, *has been and is*, to deny the existence of a personal God, and by necessary consequence, the reality of all moral distinctions, and all moral obligation. The transcendental pantheist does not aim his blows at Christianity exclusively or mainly, but at the existence of a Deity, distinct from the universe, which he has made ; and of a moral government, distinct from the blind agency of natural law. He, *even*, patronizes Christianity, and honors Christ as the “*divine man*,” the latest and most wonderful manifestation of the infinite in the finite. The school of Lamarck, Oken, and other advocates of the developement hypothesis, only touch Christianity as they may be supposed to sap our faith in the existence of God, or the natural immortality of the soul of man. The celebrated argument of Hume against the miracles of the Bible, is equally conclusive against the miracles of creation, and all the miracles of Geology ; and its fundamental principle is accordingly applied (in his treatise on the natural history of religion) to annihilate our belief in the existence of a God. And what is still more to our purpose here, it will be found in the course of our discussion, that the most serious Geological objection against the truth of the Bible is based upon a similar assumption. Indeed, we feel assured that *all* objections against the Bible, theoretical or practical, whether *uttered* by Philosophy or indistinctly *felt* in common life, are based upon the vague, almost unconscious impression, that “*there is no God ;*” and could we produce upon the minds of men the profound and abiding conviction of *His existence* and *His presence*, of the awful majesty that overshadows us, the omniscient eye that rests upon us, the infinite holiness that encompasses us on every side, all the illusions of skepticism would spontaneously vanish. Hence, the great difficulty

in practical life is not to lead men to believe the miracles of the gospel, but that still more stupendous miracle, which by day and night is around us everywhere, of an omnipresent creator, and an invisible and fearful moral Government ; *and in Philosophy*, to disenchant mankind of that fond imagination of *a law* without an *intelligent legislator*, and A COURSE OF NATURE independent of an AUTHOR OF NATURE.

The multitude of objections against Christianity—the variety of the sources from which they are derived—the earnestness, ingenuity and confidence with which they have been urged—the learning, eloquence and genius by which they have been sustained, have led many to conclude, without the labor of investigation, that a book, against which so many objections had been urged, is one of suspicious and objectionable character, and of *doubtful authority* at best. As well might it be contended that the granite ramparts of some rock-bound coast, which, for eighteen successive centuries, have hurled back the billows that dashed in impotent fury at their feet, are of *doubtful durability and strength*. Far from being legitimate occasion of alarm to the Christian, or idle exultation to the unbeliever, they really constitute an independent and most powerful argument for its divine original. For, if the Bible be from God, then it is divine and perfect truth, and cannot possibly harmonize with erroneous or defective views on any subjects which it treats ; and *must, therefore*, from the very necessity of the case, meet new objections from each new phase of human science, in all its revolutions, necessarily imperfect still. Now Christianity comes forth before the world with high pretensions. She presents a broad front to every assailant. As a theory of God and man, of time and eternity, and of the Universe itself, it sweeps a stupendous circle of thought—stretches over the whole wide field of human knowledge—touches upon all the varied phenomena of the intellectual, moral and physical creation—embraces, in historical narrative and prophetic delineation, the whole history of *the world as God's world*, and of the *human race as one in origin and destiny*, through a period of more than three thousand years, from the earliest patriarchal ages to the Roman emperors, and thence to the end of time—thus presenting

an *almost infinitude* of points, where it can be confronted with the matured results of human investigation, in every department of inquiry. *With all this*, she comes before the world, and demands universal belief and universal obedience. She courts investigation—she invites scrutiny—she challenges discussion—she throws down her gauntlet of defiance to every antagonist—and, *in every age*, a thousand foes have leaped forward to mingle in the assault. They come from every quarter, and of every character—each hoary superstition, each beardless science. They wield every weapon of refined or barbarous warfare, drawn from the domain of history or fiction, of imagination or of fact. They dig into the bowels of the earth, and hew the granite mountain—they explore the unfathomed depths of space—search the sepulchres of buried nations—decypher hieroglyphical inscriptions in temples, pyramids and tombs—study the fabulous geneologies, and fabulous astronomies of races whose sublime progenitors, according to their own account, must have been cotemporaries of the Saurian tribes of an earlier world.

There is not a false religion upon earth that could bear the test of such a scrutiny, for a single year—that would not vanish instantaneously, before the light of a single science. *The telescope and microscope* alone would suffice to overthrow all the ancient religions of farther Asia. That the sacred Scriptures should have come forth not only unharmed, but victorious, from all the conflicts of eighteen centuries; that not one of their fifty writers has ever uttered or suggested an opinion contrary to any of those facts which the lapse of twenty-three hundred years has revealed; that each new discovery in science—each fact drawn forth from pyramid or pillar, from sepulchre or coin, from mutilated monument or half-defaced inscription, should only serve to throw new light upon their meaning, and add new evidence to their credibility, is, perhaps, the completest specimen which the whole range of human learning has yet afforded of the truth of a theory established by millions of independent harmonies; and mounting up, in their combined and multiple result, to billions of probabilities in its favor, with absolutely nothing to the contrary. The history of these objections against Christianity would be, indeed, her proudest vindication. Geo-

logy herself, in all her cycles, does not present more curious specimens of extinct species, than these successive infidel objections, long buried and forgotten beneath the huge masses of argument and learning, with which consecrated genius has overwhelmed and preserved them—at once their monument and sepulchre.

First, it was objected, against the genuineness of the sacred records—"That we have not the very works of the evangelists and apostles themselves." Sacred learning has distinctly proven that these identical writings existed, and were read in public assemblies throughout the civilized world, during the first century—were quoted by numerous writers, their immediate successors, during the three succeeding centuries, in such profusion, that the whole New Testament, in every essential fact and doctrine, might be reconstructed from the quotations by these various authors; thus presenting a larger amount of testimony, to this single book, in the course of three centuries, than could be gathered, *from all the writers, of all centuries*, in behalf of the Greek and Roman classics, *all combined*. It was then objected, against their "*uncorrupted preservation*," "That they had been transmitted, through many centuries, by means of various manuscripts, written by different hands; and that Mill, and other critics, had discovered a corresponding number of various readings, casting thus a serious doubt over the integrity and authority of the received text." The most profound investigations of modern times have proven that all these doubtful readings are really of slight importance; and, even were each admitted, or the passages in which they occur all stricken from the Bible, not one essential doctrine of our faith would be, in the slightest degree, affected; and the great fabric of sacred truth would remain as complete in its proportions, its symmetry and strength, as some vast cathedral, from whose strong foundation, or lofty dome, the hand of folly, or the lapse of time, had crumbled the minutest portion of the cement, which served to unite, but did not constitute, the massive marble of which the building was composed.

Driven by successive defeats from the sure *terra firma* of historical testimony, Infidelity took refuge amidst the hieroglyphics of Egypt and the astronomy of the Hindoos. Bailly proved, to his own satisfaction, from the

record of eclipses amongst the Hindoos, that the existence of man upon earth was many thousand years earlier than the Mosaic history would allow; and this whimsical vagary of a visionary man, though hooted out of France by the wit of Voltaire and the science of D'Alembert, was long an established article of faith amongst the enlightened Infidels of England, Scotland and America. Mathematical demonstration and historic testimony have since combined to show that these eclipses were calculated *clumsily*, backwards, for ages that were past, and cannot be dated so early as the commencement of the Christian era. Some French savans, attached to Napoleon's army, during the expedition into Egypt, discovered mysterious zodiacs, at Denderah and Esneh. Though unable to decypher the hieroglyphics with certainty, one thing was indisputable—that the zodiacs were constructed at the lowest, 17,000, probably 18,000, years ago; and the writer well remembers how his boyish faith was shaken by the bold assertions and contemptuous sneers of the Edinburgh Review, against all who hesitated to receive their oracular utterance, founded, as they said, upon Mathematical demonstration. Champollion and his collaborators have read the inscription, and find that it belongs to the age of Tiberius Cæsar. Comparative anatomy, mean time, had become, through the genius of Cuvier, an important field of investigation, and presented many striking examples of analogical resemblance between the structure of man and that of other animated beings. Professor Oken, descending, one day, the Hartz mountains, beheld the "beautiful blanchèd skull of a bird. I picked it up—regarded it intensely," says he—"the thing was done." "Since that time, the skull has been regarded as a vertebral column." Rapidly, over all Europe, and throughout all scientific circles, spread the bold hypothesis that the skull is but a developement of the spine; part of that other more comprehensive theory of developement which represents man—intellectual, moral, immortal man—as the developement of the brute—itself the developement of some monad, or mollusc, which has been smitten into life by the action of electricity upon a gelatinous monad. This vertebral portion of a brutal theory, sprung from the skull of a beast, long since emptied of its brains, had

passed, "like a flood of lightning," through his *disorganized brain*; and he, very naturally, concluded that *all human intelligence* is the result of an electric spark passed through an unorganized gelatinous monad. It has been well remarked, by an able writer, that the strongest argument in favor of this theory is, that any human being should ever have been found willing to adopt, much more to assert with eagerness, this high near relationship to the ourang-outang and ape. Congeniality of sympathies and may prove community of origin.

"A fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind."

Hooted from the earth, the developement hypothesis took refuge amidst the distant nebulæ of the further heavens. Driven thence by Lord Rosse's telescope, it returned again to the earth; and the last sad record of its tragic fate assures us that, hemmed and jammed in, at last, between granite pyramids and huge masses of old red sandstone, it was shivered to atoms by a blow from the stone hammer of a Caledonian quarrier: and, of all its prodigious "*creations*," now, no "*vestiges*" remain.

It will now be perceived how intimate is the relation of these general remarks to that particular discussion which it is our design, hereafter, to prosecute. Christianity does not present herself to-day before the scientific world to seek its patronage or propitiate its favour. She stands not before us as a discredited witness, to bolster up a doubtful reputation; but as a witness whose evidence has been tested, for eighteen centuries, in a thousand ways—that has been followed, scrutinized, confronted at every point—subjected to every torture which power could inflict, or ingenious cross-examination could devise: yet *always vindicated*, and, in proportion to the severity of that ordeal through which she has passed, and the multitude of the tests previously endured, is the antecedent probability in her favor. She comes *not* as a trembling culprit, on trial for her life; but as a queen, with the long train of her attendant evidences,—prophetical, historical, miraculous—and the hosts of her conquered and captive foes, to vindicate her fair fame, establish her title to the crown, and claim universal dominion. The question is not, then, at the present day, when any single science is arrayed

against Christianity, whether, *with our existing knowledge of the facts of this solitary science*, there be not an equipoise of evidence, or even a preponderance of argument, against that view which harmonizes with the Bible history. But, whether there be such an overwhelming preponderance in favor of the opposite opinion as will neutralize that whole long array of cumulative evidences, external and internal, historical, miraculous, prophetic, upon which the credibility of the Gospel is established?

And here it would be an easy, and, perhaps, in a purely polemical discussion, a legitimate procedure, to plead to the jurisdiction of these sciences—to deny their authority as judges—their competency as witnesses—*because of their immature age and discordant testimony*. We might say to these discordant sciences, “Settle your own disputes;” to these juvenile sciences, “Tarry at Jericho till your beards be grown.” We might array system against system, and theory against theory, which have arisen in the geologic world in rapid and brilliant succession, each as arrogant, as impious, and as transient as its predecessors; and shew that the same changes are in progress *now*; that, upon many questions of fundamental importance in this discussion, the ablest geologists are arrayed against each other. That each new decade of the last half century has produced its new facts, and the corresponding modification of existing theories, until the same writer is found, not only in opposition to other, but, both as to facts and theory, in contradiction with himself; and, having thus thrown suspicion upon the science itself, conclude that the objections which it offers are to be treated with indifference, as irrelevant or premature. But such is not our method. Of Mosaical cosmogonies, and Fairholme geologies, and aspects of the universe, with their pre-Adamic Adams, we know little. To what particular geologic formation they belong, would be, perhaps, a curious question to a serious thinker. Perhaps they might be considered as examples and illustrations of that peculiar order of “progressive degradation,” which Hugh Miller has recently described, with that keen wit of his, and keener logic—all whose features are twisted awry, as by some strange dislocation, with one great *central* eye, fixed intensely upon some ancient commentary; another *lateral*, and turned asquint

towards geology. We are willing to receive truth from whatever quarter. Amidst much doubtful and audacious speculation, there are, in geology, many ascertained and indubitable facts. Amongst these, we are ready to acknowledge a pre-existing condition of our globe, as evidenced by successive species of animated beings, whose remains are found imbedded in successive strata, beneath the surface of the earth. And yet, even a candid inquirer may surely ask, in a discussion such as this, where many disputed questions are connected, directly or remotely, with our subject—Amidst this conflict of opinions, what shall I believe? You seek to take my feet from off the rock of ages, and now, while the ground shifts perpetually beneath me, as with the quiverings of an earthquake, or the heavings of internal fires, where shall I stand? When doctors disagree, whom shall I follow? Shall I follow Buckland, in his "*Reliquiæ Diluviæ*," supported by Cuvier, DeLuc, Dolomien, and other distinguished geologists, when he supposes that he has discovered indubitable traces of the historic, Mosaical deluge; or Buckland, in his "*Bridgewater Treatise*," where he seems, at least, to modify his views? Shall I follow Hugh Miller, when, in his "*Old Red Sandstone*," he discovers "that the ichthyolites of the *lower* old red sandstone were of comparatively small size, while those of the upper Old Red were of great bulk;" that the "system began with an age of dwarfs, and ended with an age of giants?" Or shall I follow him in his "*Foot-Prints*," where, at the very base of the system, he "*discovers one of the most colossal of its giants*;" and, instead of an ascending order of progressive development, asserts a descending order of progressive degradation? Shall I follow the "*Catastrophists*," or the "*Uniformitarians*"—those who see, everywhere, the evidence of terrible convulsions, that shook and rent the earth, and ages of tempests that heaved the ancient ocean; or those who deny all great catastrophes, and assert the absolute uniformity of the course of nature, through all geological cycles? In regard to the change of climate, apparent on our globe, shall I adopt the astronomic, or geologic theory? Concerning the origin of our vast mountain ranges, shall I adopt the ordinary theory of scientific geologists, of a *sudden* upheaval by some great

paroxysm of nature? Or that asserted by Mr. Lyell, of slow and gradual elevation, through centuries of comparative repose? In regard to the *central heat* of the earth, now no longer disputed, or disputable, shall I adopt the theory of La Place and Herschell, and all the bolder theorists, concerning a great ocean of internal fire, not many miles below the surface, and deepening in intensity as you approach the centre? Or the chemical theory of Lyell and Sir Humphrey Davy, which attributes all to the combination and decomposition of various elements, beneath the influence of some great subterranean current of electricity, the earth itself being as one vast voltaic pile? Shall I agree with those who consider geology and astronomy as *part of one great comprehensive science*, each the necessary complement of the other, and both under the guidance of wide-extending cosmical laws, which operate, if not similarly, at least analogously, throughout the visible universe? Or shall I, with Mr. Lyell, divorce these cognate sciences, and build up geology upon the basis of its own peculiar and independent phenomena? Or, lastly, shall I follow Mr. Lyell, when he asserts the *absolute uniformity of the course of nature*;—or when he *denies this uniformity*, and acknowledges, in the creation of man, the direct interposition of an extraordinary power, superior to all the agencies either before or since existing in nature, and really divine? Or, finally, shall I follow him into that logical catastrophe into which he plunges, through horror of the physical; when, startled by the absurdity of a *uniformity which is not uniform*, he seeks to relieve the difficulty by asserting, with laudable impartiality, an *extraordinary agency which is not extraordinary*; and then, with true grammatical precision, deducing from this double negative, a single affirmative—in attempting to reconcile the two, annihilates both?

But however great the diversity of sentiment upon these and other questions bearing directly and indirectly upon the Christian argument, on one point, at least, ALL MEN ARE AGREED: *there is not a geological theory extant which would not be overthrown, and the whole science revolutionized, by the discovery of a single new and extraordinary fact.*

This is not the language of a foe, but of its wisest, most judicious, and most competent defenders. Witness the last utterance from the geologic oracle (Miller's "Foot-Prints," page 313): "It (Geology) furnishes us with no clue by which to unravel the unapproachable mysteries of creation; these mysteries belong to the wondrous Creator, and to him only. We attempt to theorize upon them, and to reduce them to law, and all nature rises up against us in our presumptuous rebellion. A stray splinter of cone-bearing wood—a fish's skull or tooth—the vertebra of a reptile—the humerus of a bird—the jaw of a quadruped—all—any of these things, weak and insignificant as they may seem, become in such a quarrel too strong for us and our theory—the puny fragment in the grasp of truth forms as irresistible a weapon as the dry bone did in that of Samson of old; and our slaughtered sophisms lie, piled up, 'heaps upon heaps,' before it." Is it possible, then, that such a theory, which would thus be annihilated by a single fact, within the limits of its own appropriate domain—which would be brained by the humerus of a sparrow, or the tooth of a fish—shall be allowed to exercise so despotic a control beyond it as to annihilate the whole array of evidence in favour of the Bible, *within us* and *without*—to erase the mighty footsteps of the gospel, as she has gone abroad over the world, to sanctify and to bless—to hush the voice of conscience—to stifle the sense of guilt—to quench the hopes of immortality? Should such a theory seek to contradict our consciousness—to reverse the principles of morals—deny the great facts of civil and sacred history, and overthrow the foundations of our faith—without the slightest hesitation, we would reject the theory, and hold to the fact; clasp the Bible to our hearts, and reject Geology! Such *would be* our conclusion, on the broadest principles of the inductive philosophy—which ever prefers the well-known, familiar, indubitable fact, whether of outward observation or inward consciousness, and the direct, immediate, intuitive convictions of the mind, before all the plausibilities of ingenious hypotheses, based upon remote or doubtful or complicated facts, and subtle ratiocinations. But we do not believe that the *ascertained facts* or *received principles* of Geology do thus contradict

the Bible ; on the contrary, we are convinced that they have done important service to the cause of Theology, both natural and revealed ; and furnished to each some of its most conclusive arguments and sublimest illustrations.

[NOTE.—We shall return to the subject in a following number.]

ARTICLE VI.

Foot-Prints of the Creator, or the Asterolepis of Stromness. By HUGH MILLER, author of the *Old Red Sandstone, &c.* 1 vol. 8vo. pp. 337.

In our last number we gave a brief notice of this volume. We propose now, by examining it more critically, to show that it merits a deliberate perusal by all classes of readers, Christians especially.

The author is certainly one of the most remarkable men of the age. He is a living illustration of the truth, that some men, despite the most untoward circumstances of birth and fortune, are destined to accomplish some high civil, moral, or religious purpose. About the time of his birth, infidels triumphed in the hope of soon discrediting the Bible, by discoveries in physical science, especially geology, then in its period of bold, reckless youth, with the amiable, learned, and eloquent, though infidel Scotch professor, Playfair, among its most zealous cultivators. Like our own Franklin, Mr. Miller has raised himself from the toils of a laborious and humble profession, by great industry, superior genius, pure morality, and active piety, to a commanding and useful position in the social scale.

Physical science should not be content with advancing civilization, by multiplying the comforts of life, increasing the refinement of human feeling, adding facilities for the general enjoyment of high intelligence, and diminishing the miseries of superstition. It should aspire to do much more ;—not merely to raise man's thoughts from nature up to nature's God, by educing proofs of divine wisdom, de-

sign, and benevolence from each of the endlessly varied objects of the material world, but to persuade man to believe God's word, by demonstrating the reality of a beautiful harmony between scientific and revealed truth. "Remembering that the revelations of natural science cannot, in any way, injure the revelation of eternal truth, but, on the contrary, aid to establish, in the minds of the doubting, a firm conviction of its divine origin, and of man's high position, we need never fear that we are proceeding too far with any inquiry, so long as we are cautious to examine the conditions of our own minds, that they may not be made the dupe of our senses."* We shall show, in the sequel, that, in this spirit, Mr. Miller studied science;—that to this noble use he has applied his varied attainments;—that while ascertaining, by patient observation and abstruse processes of reasoning and generalization, the exact position, character, and function of a scale, a tooth, or a skull of an extinct fish, (the *Asterolepis*,) he was preparing to employ his knowledge in refutation of infidel error, believing "that of all men, the geologist stands most in need of the Bible."

That the reader may the more readily appreciate the merits of this work, we think it advisable to preface our examination of it with a brief sketch of the author's life, and with an enumeration of his other literary and scientific labors. We begin with an extract from Sir D. Brewster's full and very interesting memoir :

"Mr. Miller was born at Cromarty, of humble but respectable parents, whose history would have possessed no inconsiderable interest, even if it had not derived one of a higher kind from the genius and fortunes of their child. By the paternal side he was descended from a race of sea-faring people, whose family burying-ground, if we judge from the past, seems to be the sea. Under its green waves his father sleeps; his grandfather, his two grand-uncles, one of whom sailed round the world with Anson, lie also there; and the same extensive cemetery contains the relics of several of his more distant relatives. His father was but an infant of scarcely a year old at the death of our author's grandfather, and had to commence life as a poor ship-boy; but such was the energy of his mind, that, when little turned of thirty, he had become master and owner of a fine, large sloop, and had

* Hunt's Poetry of Science, p. 309.

built himself a good house, which entitled his son to the franchise on the passing of the Reform Bill. Having unfortunately lost his sloop in a storm, he had to begin the world anew, and he soon became master and owner of another, and would have thriven, had he lived; but the hereditary fate was too strong for him, and when our author was a little boy of five summers, his father's fine new sloop foundered at sea, in a terrible tempest, and he and his crew were never more heard of.

Mr. Miller had two sisters younger than himself, both of whom died ere they attained to womanhood.

His mother experienced the usual difficulties which a widow has to encounter in the decent education of her family; but she struggled honestly and successfully, and ultimately found her reward in the character and fame of her son. It is from this excellent woman that Mr. Miller has inherited those sentiments and feelings which have given energy to his talents as the defender of revealed truth, and the champion of the Church of his fathers. She was the great grand-daughter of a venerable man, still well known to tradition in the north of Scotland as Donald Roy of Nigg—a sort of northern Peden, who is described in the history of our church as the single individual who, at the age of eighty, when the presbytery of the district had assembled in the empty church for the purpose of inducting an obnoxious presentee, had the courage to protest against the intrusion, and to declare 'that the blood of the people of Nigg would be required at their hands, if they settled a man to the walls of that church.' Tradition has represented him as a seer of visions and a prophet of prophecies; but whatever credit may be given to stories of this kind, which have been told also of Knox, Welsh and Rutherford, this ancient champion of Non-Intrusion was a man of genuine piety, and the savor of his ennobling beliefs and his strict morals have survived in his family for generations. If the child of such parents did not receive the best education which his native town could afford, it was not their fault, nor that of his teacher. The fetters of a gymnasium are not easily worn by the adventurous youth, who has sought and found his pleasures among the hills and on the waters. They chafe the young and active limb, that has grown vigorous under the blue sky, and never known repose but at midnight. The young philosopher of Cromarty was a member of this restless community; and he had been the hero of adventures and accidents among rocks and woods which are still remembered in his native town. The parish school was, therefore, not the scene of his enjoyments; and while he was a truant, and, with reverence be it spoken, a dunce,

while under its jurisdiction, he was busy in the fields and on the sea-shore, collecting those stores of knowledge, which he was born to dispense among his fellow men. He escaped, however, from school, with the knowledge of reading, writing, and a little arithmetic, and with the credit of uniting a great memory with a little scholarship. Unlike his illustrious predecessor, Cuvier, he had studied Natural History in the fields and among the mountains, ere he had sought for it in books; while the French philosopher had become a learned naturalist before he had even looked upon the world of Nature. This singular contrast it is not difficult to explain. With a sickly constitution and a delicate frame, the youthful Cuvier wanted that physical activity which the observation of Nature demands. Our Scottish geologist, on the contrary, in vigorous health, and with an iron frame, rushed to the rocks and the sea-shore in search of the instruction, which was not provided for him at school, and which he could find no books to supply."

In 1821, he set out, as he informs us, "a slim, loose-jointed boy," to engage in an occupation, that of a stonemason, "in which men toil every day, that they may be enabled to eat, and eat every day, that they may be enabled to toil." In the first chapter of the "Old Red Sandstone," the reader will find brief and beautiful descriptions of the scenes in which his labors began, and of the objects that arrested his attention. On slabs of sandstone he found, after the novel and exciting process of blasting with gunpowder had split the rock asunder, abundant evidence of ancient ripple-marks,—“the resemblance was no half resemblance—it was perfect,”—and wondered what had become of the waves that left their impress on the solid rock. In superincumbent beds of diluvial clay he observed stones, different both from the sandstone below and from one another, all rounded and water-worn, “as if they had been tossed in the sea for hundreds of years.” In one noble section, “a sort of chance dissection in the earth’s crust,” he perceived veins of granite, dizzy precipices of gneiss, and huge, irregular masses of hornblende, in one part; the “little known, but highly interesting” fossils of the Old Red Sandstone, in another part; and the beautifully preserved shells and lignites of the Lias, in another. He laid open with his hammer nodular masses of bluish Lias limestone; and, “wonderful to relate,” found in one a beautiful finished sculpture, (an ammonite,) “like one of the flu-

ted volutes of an Ionic capital ;" in another, scales of fish ; and, in another, a piece of decayed wood. Of all nature's riddles, these seemed to him, then, most difficult to expound ; but being naturally a philosophical inquirer and close observer, he "treasured them carefully up,"—thus early manifesting the highest attribute of genius—minute attention to every thing presented to the senses.

His curiosity having been thus thoroughly aroused, in his first few days of labor, he was informed by a companion, to whom he exhibited his collection of curious things, that, at the distance of two miles, were curiously-shaped stones, called *thunderbolts*, and like the heads of boarding-pikes, which, in the days of his father, people regarded as remedies for "bewitched cattle." Taking advantage of an afternoon holiday, (which most young men would have wasted in idleness or vice,) he visited the designated spot, and found in it a richer scene of wonders than he could have "fancied even in his dreams."

His attention was soon arrested by a group of rocks, wholly different in color and organic contents from both the primary granites and the sandstone cliffs, and consisting of thin strata of limestone, with thick beds of bituminous shale. "The layers into which the beds readily separate are hardly an eighth of an inch thick, and yet on every layer there are tens of thousands of the various fossils peculiar to the Lias. We may turn over these wonderful leaves, one after another, like leaves of a herbarium, and find the pictorial records of a former creation in every page. Scallops and gryphites, ammonites of almost every variety peculiar to the formation, and eight or ten varieties of belemnite ; twigs of wood, leaves of plants, cones of an extinct species of pine ; bits of charcoal and scales of fishes ; and, as if to render their pictorial representation more striking, though the leaves of this interesting rocky volume are of a deep black, most of the impressions are of a chalky whiteness. I was lost in admiration and astonishment.

. . . . I passed from ledge to ledge, like the traveller in the tale, through the city of statues, and at length found one of the supposed thunderbolts. . . . I learned, in time, to call this stone a belemnite, and became acquainted with enough of its history to know that it once formed a part of a variety of cuttle-fish, long since extinct."

"In short, the young geologist, had he all Europe before him, could hardly choose for himself a better field.

I had, however, no one to tell me so at the time, for geology had not yet traveled so far north; and so, without guide or vocabulary, I had to grope my way as I best might, and find out all its wonders for myself. But so slow was the process, and so much was I a seeker in the dark, that the facts contained in these few sentences were the patient gatherings of years."

We close this account of our author's early toils and studies in the words of Sir D. Brewster:

"After having spent nearly fifteen years in the profession of a stone mason, Mr. Miller was promoted to a position more suited to his genius. When a bank was established in his native town of Cromarty, he received the appointment of accountant, and he was thus employed for five years in keeping ledgers and discounting bills. When the contest in the Church of Scotland had come to a close, by the decision of the House of Lords in the Auchterarder Case, Mr. Miller's celebrated letter to Lord Brougham attracted the particular attention of the party which was about to leave the Establishment, and he was selected as the most competent person to conduct the *Witness* newspaper, the principal metropolitan organ of the Free Church. The great success which this journal has met with is owing, doubtless, to the fine articles, political, ecclesiastical, and geological, which Mr. Miller has written for it. In the few leisure hours which so engrossing an occupation has allowed him to enjoy, he has devoted himself to the ardent prosecution of scientific inquiries."

The reader must not infer, from what has been said, that Hugh Miller's studies were confined exclusively to geology. Far from it. His writings all attest that as he was, in his boyhood, "a reader of curious books, when he could get them—a gleaner of traditionary stories," so his exuberant fancy and ardent thirst for knowledge did not permit him, in toilsome manhood, to neglect to store well his mind with rich treasures of poetic, historical, and even legal lore. The frequency, skill, and taste, with which he enriches his most profoundly learned pages, with apt illustrations from history, poetry, art and science, evince the avidity with which he sought knowledge from all the high and pure sources of it, and also the retentiveness and readiness of his memory.

Hence, he has shown himself competent to the discussion of a variety of unconnected subjects. In the "Traditional

History of Cromarty" he displayed a familiar acquaintance with Scottish scenery, history, and legends. In his "Letter from one of the Scotch people to Lord Brougham, on the opinions expressed in the Auchterarder Case," he showed an intimate knowledge of the history, tenets, and legal rights of the Church of Scotland. His "Whiggism of the Old School, as exemplified in the past History and present Position of the Church of Scotland," is a work of much historical and theological merit. And his "First Impressions of England and its People," published in '47, "is full of knowledge and of anecdote, and is written in that attractive style which commands the attention even of the most incurious reader." "This delightful work, though only in one volume, is equal to three of the ordinary type, and cannot fail to be perused with high gratification by all classes of readers. It treats of every subject which is presented to the notice of an accomplished traveller, while he visits the great cities and romantic localities of merry England. We know of no tour in England, written by a native, in which so much pleasant reading and substantial instruction are combined; though we are occasionally stopped, in a very delightful locality, by a precipice of the Old Red Sandstone, or frightened by a disinterred skeleton, or sobered by the burial service over Paleozoic graves, we soon recover our equanimity, and again enter on the sunny path to which our author never fails to restore us."*

In this long digression from the work before us, we have had in view a definite purpose. Our object has been, not so much to write a biography of the author, as to convince the reader, that Mr. Miller's calm temperament, superior intellect, aptitude for correct observation, habits of patient investigation, high attainments in general science, refined taste, experience in controversial writing, profound knowledge of geology, and sincere belief, from early education and mature reflection, in the Calvinistic interpretation of Revelation;—that this extraordinary combination of qualities fitted him, if any man can be qualified, to view calmly and understand fully the connection between science and the Bible. Having labored, as mason and geologist, ham-

* Sir D. Brewster's Memoir.

mer in hand, nearly twenty years, in numerous quarries, in different geological formations, in a country in which the geological series of rocks, from the oldest to the most recent, is nearly complete and magnificently developed, he cannot surely be charged with ignorance or prejudice, nor regarded as liable to the errors of a closet geologist. What he describes, he has seen, and often disinterred. Hence, Agassiz says, justly, "his generalizations have nothing of the vagueness which too often characterizes the writings of those authors, who have attempted to make the results of science subservient to the cause of religion." And far from believing all that is promulgated as scientific truth, our author cautions his readers against the scientific credulity of this age. "There is," he says, truly, "a species of superstition, which inclines men to take on trust whatever assumes the name of science, and which seems to be a reaction on the old superstition, that had faith in witches, but none in Sir Isaac Newton, and believed in ghosts, but failed to credit the Gregorian Calendar." Indeed, his inquisitive, astute mind, long strictly trained in the severe school of induction, is neither bewildered by words nor convinced by merely specious arguments. Thoroughly imbued with the true spirit of the Baconian philosophy, he coolly collects and cautiously collates facts, from which conclusions necessarily follow, to be employed in future generalizations. Hence, he yields assent to none of the scientific humbugs of the day, from the juggles of mesmerism and the buffoonery of phrenology, to those more subtle, more dangerous doctrines, which threaten "to strike down all the old landmarks, ethical and religious."

The volume before us is the last published work of the author. It had passed rapidly through three London editions, when it was republished, last year, by Gould & Co., Boston, with a memoir by Sir D. Brewster, and critical notes by Agassiz.

Its first title, "Foot-Prints of the Creator," was suggested by Dr. Hetherington, the well-known historian of the Church of Scotland. For several reasons, we regard this title as an unfortunate one. Besides the questionable propriety of investing Deity, in any human production, with such organs as feet, it savors of imitating such titles as "Medals of Creation," "Vestiges of Creation," &c.; es-

pecially as the "Asterolepis of Stromness" indicates both the leading object of the scientific portion of the work, and the highly important use made of that extinct ichthyic monster in demolishing one hypothesis, and in establishing another on its ruins.

Were we disposed, we could easily institute a few verbal criticisms; for we find, in the "Asterolepis of Stromness," words and phrases quite as objectionable as "in our midst," "reliable," "in this connection," "doctor" for physician, so learnedly animadverted on as defects in "Everett's Oration and Speeches," in seven compact pages of a recent review of that collection. Our object, at present, is not, however, the exercise of critical acumen, of which we profess to have very little; yet we must assure the reader that Mr. Miller possesses, in as great a degree as any living writer, the combination of those qualities of style,—“clear, vivid and powerful, ranging at will, and without effort, from the most natural and graceful simplicity, through the playful, the graphic, and the vigorous, to the impressive eloquence of great thoughts, greatly expressed,”—which enables him to make the most abstruse scientific descriptions and discussions both intelligible and interesting to the general, even unscientific reader.

In the composition of the work, the author had mainly in view a threefold design: 1st, the publication of new, important and interesting scientific discoveries, chiefly in the ichthyic branch of palæontology, and made by himself in one of the oldest systems of the fossiliferous rocks, the Old Red Sandstone; 2d, the refutation of the development hypothesis of DeMaillet, Lamarck, Oken, and the "Vestiges of Creation;" and, 3d, the exposition of a new and strangely interesting theory, the *Progress of Degradation*.

What is the development hypothesis? We will let Oken and Lamarck answer the question.

"There are," says Oken, "two kinds of generation in the world: the creation proper and the propagation that is consequent thereon, or the *generatio originaria* and *secundaria*. Consequently, no organism has been created of larger size than an infusorial point. No organism is, nor ever has one been created, which is not microscopic. Whatever is larger has not been created, but developed; man has not been created, but developed." Lamarck held

"that inert matter was endowed with life; until, in the course of ages, sensation was superadded to mere vitality. Sight, hearing and the other senses were afterwards acquired; then instinct and the mental faculties; until, finally, by virtue of the tendency of things to *progressive improvement*, the irrational was developed into the rational."

But, it was asked, if the process of *development by law* has been in progress, during the long periods of time which geology proves to have elapsed since creation began,—that indefinitely remote period denoted by the words, "In the beginning,"—why are there still such multitudes of distinct species of conferva, algæ, infusoria and corals? Why has this been the case in all geological eras? Why have not all been developed into trees and animals high in organization?

In answer to this objection, Lamarck replied, by another hypothesis, "that nature is not an intelligence, nor the Deity, but a delegated power, a mere instrument, a piece of mechanism acting by necessity, an order of things constituted by the Supreme Being, and subject to laws which are the expressions of his will. This nature is obliged to proceed gradually in all her operations. She cannot produce animals and plants of all classes at once, but must always begin by the formation of the most simple kinds, and, out of them, elaborate the more compound, adding to them, successively, different systems of organs, and multiplying, more and more, their number and energy." "She is always beginning anew, day by day, the work of creation, by forming monads, or 'rough draughts,' (ebauches,) which are the only living things she gives birth to *directly*."* And Oken is more explicit. He says, "Plants and animals can only be metamorphoses of infusoria. This being granted, so also must all organizations *consist* of infusoria, and, during their destruction, dissolve into the same. Every plant, every animal, is converted by maceration into a mucus mass: this putrefies, and the moisture is stocked with infusoria. Death is no annihilation, but only a change. One individual merges out of another. Death is only a transition to another life—not into death. This

* Lyell's Prin. of Geol. 1 vol. 8vo. p. 552.

transition from one life to another takes place through the primary condition of the organic or the mucus."

True, Lamarck admits the creation, at first, of primary rudiments of plants and animals, and, probably, of the great divisions of each. A profound philosopher, and learned naturalist, he perceived that the uncontrolled exertion of the *tendency to progressive development* ought, during the long periods of geologic time, to have left, registered in the rocks, clear proofs, (and this nearly all geologists denied,) of a gradual transition from the simplest to the most complex structures,—from a mere rudiment of an organ in one age, to its full development in another,—from the humblest to the most exalted intelligence. To explain why such a complete, unbroken chain of evidence is not found in the rocks, he ascribed great influence to another principle, the modifying *agency of external circumstances*,—climate, food, the relations of animals to plants as each spread from different localities—the fluctuating nature of localities, now sinking below the sea, now rising above its level.

Some of our readers may think such an hypothesis too absurd to demand a refutation. If so, they forget the proneness of man to believe any form of infidelity, and underestimate the ingenuity, talent and learning arrayed in its defence by many writers, and especially by Lamarck in his *Philosophic Zoology*, and the Introduction to his great work on the invertebrate animals; by the German professor, Oken, in his "*Phisio-Philosophy*;" and by the author of the "*Vestiges of Creation*" and the "*Sequel*." These authors sought their arguments from astronomy, botany, zoology and geology. They ingeniously distorted the nebular hypothesis of Herschell, that nebulae may pass into comets, comets into incandescent suns, and these, by radiation, into habitable worlds like our earth. They appealed to the changes effected in plants and animals by cultivation and domestication. Above all, they dwelt with delight and confidence on the supposed evidence furnished by geology of progress from less complex and less perfect tribes of animals and plants, in the first fossiliferous period, to more and more perfect and complex forms, in each succeeding period, till man appeared an improved ourang-outang.

The telescope of Lord Rosse drove them from the astronomical argument, by resolving most of the nebulae into fixed stars inconceivably remote and numerous. Botanists and zoologists, finding no evidence, (except in a few doubtful cases of hybridity in plants and the lower animals, which can be most satisfactorily explained on other principles,) of transmutation of one species into another, though they had examined more than 100,000 species of existing plants, 120,000 insects, 10,000 mollusca, 8,000 fishes, 8,000 birds, 1,300 mammalia, and many thousands of other animals, amounting, altogether, to near two millions of living species,* decided "that species have a real existence in nature, and that each was endowed, at the time of its creation, with the attributes and organization by which it is now distinguished."†

We admit, said these theorists, the apparent stability of species, if we limit our investigations to the narrow period of the human era; but "there has been," says St. Hilaire, "an uninterrupted succession in the animal kingdom, effected by means of generation, from the earliest ages of the world up to the present day, and the ancient animals, whose remains have been preserved in the strata, however different, may, nevertheless, have been the ancestors of those now in being."

This perversion of geology by naturalists, who were ignorant of that noble science, naturally enough caused it to be regarded, for a time, as hostile to revelation. Hence, too, many theological writers, though aware that the first chapter of Genesis can be literally so interpreted as to admit the high antiquity of the earth, not as the habitation of man, but as a planet of the solar system; and that the weight of theological evidence was in favor of this interpretation, before geological phenomena were known, adopted the opposite interpretation, and clung long, but vainly, to the opinion, that "the heavens and the earth," the sun and moon, and "the stars also," were created out of nothing, when man, with existing plants and animals, was brought into being, only about six thousand years ago.

The geologists were thus placed between hostile parties, the advocates of the development hypothesis, on one side,

* *Am. Jour. Sci.*, vol. 1, second series, p. 132.

† *Lyell's Prin. Geology*, 1 vol. 8vo. p. 589.

and mistaken, but learned and pious, defenders of the Scriptures, on the other. They were exposed to the assaults of both. Had they abandoned their investigations, who can estimate the injury that would have been done, both to science and the inspired volume? Fortunately, the leading English geologists, Murchison, Sedgwick, Buckland, Smith and Harris, were also learned, and, we believe, pious divines; and sustained by an ardent love of truth, physical and revealed, and believing that no real discrepancy between them can ever be proved, they fearlessly prosecuted their investigations, collected an immense mass of facts, and studied carefully the 20,000 species of fossil plants and animals, that had been ascertained and described. Applying to these the rules employed by botanists and zoologists, and even adopting the "laws of evidence, promulgated by Hume in his argument on miracles, and La Place in his doctrine of probabilities," they proved that the plan of creation has been the same, in all past periods; that it has been gradually unfolded and expanded, in successive distinct periods of creation; that, in all those periods, "species have had a real existence in nature;" and that the longer those periods can be proved to have been, the more fatal is palæontological evidence to the Lamarckian hypothesis, "as a mere feverish dream, incoherent in its parts, and baseless in its fabric." "Give, we ask, but one well-attested instance of transmutation, from the algæ to even the lower forms of terrestrial vegetation common on our sea-coasts, and we will keep the question open in expectation of more." It will not do to tell us, as Cuvier was told, when he appealed to the fact determined by the mummy birds and reptiles of Egypt, of the fixity of species in all, even the slightest particulars, for at least three thousand years,— "that immensely extended periods of time are necessary to effect specific changes, and that human observation has not been spread over a period sufficiently ample to furnish the required data regarding them." Can you have longer periods than those, whose history we read in geology? "The apology is simply a confession that, in these ages of severe inductive philosophy, you have been dreaming your dream, cut off, as if by the state of sleep, from all the tangibilities of the real waking-day

world, and that you have not a vestige of testimony with which to support your ingenious vagaries."

Driven, thus, from the domains of astronomy, botany and zoology, and from the thoroughly studied, more recent portions of the fossiliferous strata, the Lamarckians retreated to those oldest and deepest deposits, the Old Red Sandstone system, and the Upper and Lower Silurian systems, in which the first traces of organic life are found, all below being granite, gneiss, and other non-fossiliferous, crystalline rocks. These, they contended, especially those near the bottom, contained nothing but sea-weeds, zoophytes, brachiopods, trilobites, and a few little fishes, some of them even microscopic; and these they honored as the progenitors, by development and transmutation, of all endogenous and exogenous plants, and of all animals, whether *radiate*, *articulate*, *molluscous* or *vertebrate*.

Here, among "the ambiguities of the Paleozoic formations," says Sir D. Brewster, "the hypothesis might have lingered with the appearance of life; but Mr. Miller has, with an ingenuity and patience worthy of a better subject, stripped it even of its semblance of truth, and restored to the Creator, as governor of the universe, that power and those functions which he was supposed to have resigned at its birth."

Before we proceed to show, by giving a very brief outline of his remarkable discoveries, skilful anatomical processes of reasoning, and clear, comprehensive conclusions and generalizations, how Mr. Miller drove this hypothesis from even the deep recesses of the earth,—hitting other questionable theories of even Owen and Agassiz staggering blows as he passed them by the way,—we must inform the reader of the light in which he viewed its consequences. Having shown it to be incompatible with a belief in the immortality of the soul, and of man's accountability to God as the final judge,—practical Atheism,—though consistent with a belief in the existence of a God,—he says:

"Nor does the purely Christian objection to the development hypothesis seem less, but even more insuperable than that derived from the province of natural theology. The belief which is, perhaps, of all others, most fundamentally essential to the revealed scheme of salvation, is the belief that 'God created man upright,' and that man, instead of proceeding onward and upward,

from this high and fair beginning, to a yet higher and fairer standing in the scale of creation, sank, and became morally degraded. And hence the necessity for that second dispensation of recovery and restoration, which forms the entire burden of God's revealed message to man. If, according to the development theory, the progress of 'the first Adam' was an upward progress, the existence of the 'second Adam' is simply a meaningless anomaly."

Let us imagine Mr. Miller, a profound geologist, who had labored and studied nearly twenty years, in the Paleozoic formations, (the last retreat of the active, struggling Lamarckians,) and who had examined more of their organisms than any living savan, Agassiz and Murchison not excepted, meditating on the consequences "of a form of error, at once exceedingly plausible and consummately dangerous, and which is telling so widely on society, both in Europe and America, that one can scarce travel by railway or in a steamboat, or encounter a group of intelligent mechanics, without finding decided traces of its ravages."

He thus soliloquises,—“What, in order to establish its truth, or even to render it in some degree probable, ought to be the geological evidence regarding it? The reply seems obvious. In the first place, the earlier fossils ought to be very *small* in size; in the second, very low in organization. In cutting into the stony womb of nature, in order to determine what it contained, mayhap millions of ages ago, we must expect, if the development theory be true, to look upon mere embryos and fœtuses. And, if we find, instead, the full grown and the mature, then must we hold that the testimony of geology is not only not in accordance with the theory, but in positive opposition to it. Such, palpably, is the principle on which, in this matter, we ought to decide. What are the facts?”

To find what the facts are, he undertook an exploratory ramble into the Orkney Islands, and remained some time in the vicinity of Stromness. This busy sea-port town is situated on the island of Pomona, “a special centre,” whence the Old Red Sandstone (Devonian) system may be most accurately studied. The system is a marine deposit, 10,000 feet thick, and divisible into three distinct

formations. The axis of the principle island of the Orkney group, Pomona, is a long granitic ridge. On this granite rests the highly-inclined conglomeritic base of the oldest of the three formations of the system. This conglomerate is made up, chiefly, of fragments of the basal granite, a rock which all geologists recognize as the type of the rocks that formed the crust of the infant globe, long anterior to vegetable and animal creations; for, on all hypotheses,—none, not even the Lamarckians, contending that there was no “beginning,”—there must have been a period when a marine, fossiliferous deposit commenced. This granite must have been one of the surface rocks, much exposed to disintegrating influences, near a vast, primary oceanic basin—a palæozoic Hudson’s or Baffin’s Bay,—into which the older conglomerate was “swept by numerous streams, rapid and headlong, and charged with the broken debris of the inhospitable regions which they drained.” These, then, are the actual base of the fossiliferous rocks of that part of the globe. They were formed at the very bottom of the palæozoic sea of what is now Scotland. Other oceans, in which were formed the Silurian strata, had previously existed, in other regions, but not in that. We shall visit their beds anon, with our author, to see what was the character of their inhabitants.

Let us now confine our attention to the first deposit in this palæozoic ocean, in which, if anywhere, we might expect to find evidence of the existence of points of vitality—our monad progenitors, according to the Lamarckian hypothesis, having begun their career of development. And what, asks the reader, did Mr. Miller find there? He tells us there are, in the lowest of the three Old Red Sandstone formations alone, “more remains of fish than in every other geologic system in England, Scotland and Wales, from the coal measures to the chalk inclusive. Orkney is, to the geologist, emphatically, the land of fish.” Were the fishes small in size, “mere minnows and sprats,” near the bottom? He says:—

“I traced the formation upwards along the edges of the upturned strata, from where the great conglomerate leans against the granite, till where it merges into the ichthyolitic flagstones; and then pursued these, from older and lower, to newer and higher layers, desirous of ascertaining at what distance over the base of the system its more ancient organisms first appear, and

what their character and kind. And, embedded in a grayish-colored layer of hard flag, somewhat less than a hundred yards over the granite, and about a hundred and sixty feet over the upper stratum of the conglomerate, (which is non-fossiliferous,) I found what I sought—a well marked bone—in all probability the oldest vertebrate remain yet discovered in Orkney.”

A figure of this remarkable bone, in shape resembling a large roofing-nail, is given in the first chapter of the Foot-Prints. It was ascertained to be the hyoid plate bone of a fish. The length of the entire specimen was, in this instance, though the corresponding bone in ordinary fishes is, of course, small, “five seven-eighths inches, the transverse breadth of the head two inches and a quarter, and the thickness of the stem three-tenths of an inch.” Judging from the place in which it was found, it must have been the remain of one of the first fishes of this ancient sea; and, as placoid, not *ganoid* fishes are characteristic of the Silurian strata, which lie, geologically, below the Old Red Sandstone, it was important to determine the order of fishes to which it belonged.

It is necessary to remind the reader that fishes, the lowest class of animals with bones, (*vertebrata*), are arranged by Agassiz in four orders, on characters derived chiefly from the scales. 1. Placoids, as the shark, saw-fish and ray, that have fixed gills, an internal *cartilaginous* skeleton, and a dermal covering of curious scales, which are points, plates or spines of enamelled bone, (called shagreen,) “not planted on the skin, but elevated over it on an osseous stem, or foot-stalk, as a mushroom is elevated over the sward on its stem,” and, of course, these scales do not overlap. 2. Ganoids, as the sturgeon, that have free gills protected by gill-covers, a cartilaginous skeleton, and angular, shining, enamelled, osseous scales, often very large, planted on the body, and sometimes arranged side by side, sometimes overlapping slightly, and sometimes each overlapping at least two-thirds of the one next below it, forming a slate-roof-like bony envelope of the skinless animal from snout to tail. 3. Ctenoids, as the perch, those having a bony skeleton, and jagged, horny scales. 4. Cycloids, as the herring, those having bones within, and covered with overlapping, circular, smooth, horny scales.

So far as is yet known, all the Silurian fishes were Placoids. The Ganoids made their appearance in the Old Red Sandstone period, during the whole of which, "the age of fishes," and all the other long periods anterior to the chalk, these two orders were the sole representatives of their class. They then retrograded, but did not wholly disappear. Their reign ended, and ctenoids and cycloids swarmed in oceans' depths.

We now return to the curious bone found by the author. Fragments of similar bones had been found in the same formation in Russia, and examined by several naturalists, and, finally, by Agassiz, who made shrewd conjectures concerning its structure and the family to which it belonged, but, even to him, "the dermal bones were mere fragments of a puzzle, the key of which seemed lost." Fortunately, in addition to the hyoid bone found by Mr. Miller near Stromness, and which fixed conclusively the exact geological position of the animal,—the remote time when it certainly had begun to exist,—he was supplied with a rich collection of bones of the same species, *Asterolepis*, from another locality, Thurso, by Mr. Robert Dick, a tradesman and amateur geologist, "one of those working men of Scotland, of active curiosity and well-developed intellect, who give character and standing to the rest."

Our limits do not permit us to detail the comparisons of the scales of allied families of fishes, recent and extinct, in the latter part of the third chapter of the work, in order to determine the true character of the *asterolepis*. Having ascertained it to be a Ganoid fish, he traced it to the *Coelacanth* (*hollow spine*) family,—“all squat, robust, strongly-built,”—“remarkable for the strength and weight of their bony armor,” from which “a bullet would rebound flattened,”—“the head covered by strong, bony plates, roughened by tubercles,”—and “the jaws thickly set with an outer range of *true* fish teeth, and more thinly with an inner range of what seem *reptile teeth*, that stood up, tall and bulky, behind the others, like officers on horseback, seen over the heads of their foot-soldiers, in front;” “and the double fins must have borne, externally, somewhat the form of the sweeping paddles of the *ichthyosauria*,” (a huge, voracious reptilian,) “genus.” “And such was that ancient *Coelacanth* family, of which the oldest of our

Scotch ganoids, the *Asterolepis* of Stromness, formed one of the number, and which, for untold ages, has had no living representative."

Could this family of Coelacanth be the developed descendants of the placoids of the more ancient silurian seas? To ascertain the probability of this, let us fix our attention for a moment on the scales. We can imagine the foot-stalks and points of the placoid shagreen becoming less and less elevated, more and more extended, till the broad, bony scales of the Coelacanth armour would result, and until scales, at first merely in contact, would gradually so overlap, that two-thirds of each would be covered as in a slate-roof. Now, different families of ganoids, Acanths, Diptereans, Palaeonisci and Coelacanth, do approximate, in different degrees, to the shagreen scales of the placoids. But all the Coelacanth, including the *Asterolepis*,—"that first, hugest ganoid,"—differ most widely from the silurian placoids in their scales. And, as it will furnish an apt illustration of Mr. Miller's skill and acuteness in reading the characters and relations of extinct fishes, in their bony and entombed relics, we cite the paragraph in which he sums up the results of his examination of the scales:—

"The scaly cover of the Coelacanth was a cover on the slate-roof principle. There was, in some of their genera, about one third more of the scale covered than exposed. It was *farthest* removed, in character, from shagreen, as that of their contemporaries, the Acanths, approximated to it most nearly: they were, in this respect, the two extremes of their order. And, did we find the Coelacanth in but the later geological formations, while the Acanths were restricted to the earlier, it might be argued by the asserters of the development hypothesis, that the amply imbricated, slate-like scale of the Coelacanth had been developed, in the lapse of ages, from the shagreen tubercle, by passing, in its downward course—broadening and expanding as it descended—through the minute, scarcely imbricated disks of the Acanths, and the more tile-like rhombs of Dipterians and Palaeonisci, until it had reached its full extent of imbrication, in the familiar modern type exemplified in both the Coelacanth and the ordinary fishes. But such is not the order which nature has observed. The two extremes of the Ganoid scale appear together in the same early formation. Both become extinct in a period geologically remote; and the scales of the existing state of things, which most nearly

resemble those of ancient time, are scales formed on the intermediate or tile-roof principle."

If those readers, who are not familiar with details of ichthyic palæontology, will now accompany us through a few dry paragraphs, we will endeavor to give them some idea of the acumen, talent for observation, and skill in comparative anatomy, with which the author lays the broad, deep, and immovable foundation, on which he bases his conclusions with regard to the high organization in the class of fishes, and the extraordinary size of the *Asterolepis*.

We know not how it may have affected others, but we read no part of the work with such intense interest as the new, striking, wonderfully conclusive processes of anatomical analysis and comparison, by which, with the aid of distinct and beautiful cuts, the author refutes Oken's theory of the development, by light, of nerves in pairs; and, by these nerves, the supposed four cranial vertebræ, even in man's head, corresponding to the four senses seated in the head;—shows why the perishable, internal, cartilaginous, cerebral box of Placoid and Ganoid fishes are not found in the oldest rocks;—points out its structure, studded *externally*, under shagreen skin, with star-like bony points, destitute of sutures, and perforated with holes for the passage of nerves, while the *proper vertebræ* of the same animal have the bone internal and the cartilage external;—proves that the well-preserved bony buckler, which formed an external skinless shield around the cartilaginous brain-box of the Ganoids, *Cælacanth*s especially, corresponds to the internal skin-covered bony brain-box of the cod, taken as the best type of existing fishes;—demonstrates a most manifest correspondence in number, position and form, between the internal cranial bones of the cod and the external ones of the *Coccosteus*, *Osteolepis*, *Asterolepis*, and other ganoids;—finds in the under jaws "strongly-marked bones in at least all the *Dipterian* and *Coelacanth* genera,"—a true union of the external with the internal skeleton, and the first indications of teeth in bony sockets;—traces in the under jaw of one a striking resemblance to that of a quadruped, with a mode of articulation that probably admitted the lateral motion exemplified by man himself;—and triumphantly exhibits, in a section of the cranium of another, "the two very important cranial cavities, the brain

pan proper, and the passage through which the spinal cord passed into the brain, the most ancient brain pan on which human eye has ever yet looked, and the type of cell in which, myriads of ages ago, in at least one genus, that mysterious substance was lodged, on whose place and development so very much in the scheme of creation was destined to depend."

Having given a restoration of the head of a Dipterian Ganoid, nearly allied to the *Asterolepis*, he says:

"This profile, the result not of a chance-drawn outline arbitrarily filled up, but produced by the careful arrangement in their proper places of actual plates, serves to show how perfectly the dermo-skeletal parts of the creature were developed. Some of the animals with which we are best acquainted, if represented by but their cuticular skeleton, would appear simply as sets of hoofs and horns. Even the tortoise or pengolin would present about the head and limbs their missing portions, but the dermo-skeleton of the *Osteolepis*, composed of solid bone, and burnished with enamel, exhibited the outline of the fish entire, and, with the exception of the eye, the filling up of all its external parts. Presenting outside, in its original state, no fragment of skin or membrane, and with even its most flexible organs sheathed in enamelled bone, it must have very much resembled a fish carved in ivory; and, though so effectually covered, it would have appeared, from the circumstance, that it wore almost all its bone outside, as naked as the human teeth."

Finding no trace of those cerebral vertebræ, of which a skull is regarded by Oken and his disciples as developments, the principle is successfully sought, which rendered it necessary, that the geologically earliest divisions of it, found in the dermal skulls of the first Ganoids, (as the *Asterolepis*,) should correspond with the divisions, not merely of the internal osseous skulls of existing fishes, but with those also of other higher animals, man not excepted. Of the solid parts of the ichthyic head, some plates afford protection to the brain; and being, therefore, passive, are firmly united, as in the cranial buckler of all Ganoids;—while others, contributing to such functions as mastication and respiration, and therefore requiring active motion, are separate and susceptible each of independent motion, like the lower jaw of *Dipterus* or the hyoid plate of *Asterolepis*. In these parts of an osseous wall, for the

protection of the chief animal organ in a cavity, means of adjustment to any required dimensions or form of that cavity, if, as Harris contends, in his Pre-Adamite Earth, a manifestation of Divine All-Sufficiency was a ruling motive, must have been provided. This provision we find in all the Ganoid skulls. Hence, the greatest living naturalist, Professor Owen, of London, says :

"The recognition of an ideal exemplar" in the Ganoid fishes and in other Paleozoic vertebrata, "for the vertebrated animals, proves that the knowledge of such a being as man existed before man appeared; for the Divine mind, which planned the archetype, also foreknew all its modifications. The archetypal idea was manifested in the flesh, under divers modifications, upon this planet, long prior to the existence of those animal species that actually exemplify it."

The high cerebral organization of the Coelacanth, the family of fishes to which the *Asterolepis* belonged, being thus established, the author enters on the consideration of that animal, in order to ascertain its structure, bulk and aspect.

Its remains, subjected to a most rigid examination, yield to the philosopher many secrets, that have been, countless ages, locked up in the rocky volume of its own and of the history of its cotemporaries. The large scales—enamelled plates of bone—which completely shielded the creature's body, each covered with star-like tubercles, resembling little hillocks; and the ponderous cranial buckler, "large enough to have covered the skull of an elephant," and yet strengthened, within and without, by three longitudinal ridges, converging from the base to a point near the snout, and between the eyes, and by a transverse cross-beam,—so that the head of the largest living crocodile is defended by an armature greatly less strong,—indicate that it must have had, in those ancient seas, still more powerful assailants to resist, but whose remains have not yet been found. The cranium, dissected and examined, exhibits, like other fishes, "the same bones, though much subdivided, that exist in the skulls of other vertebrata;" and, in each piece, channeled markings between the osseous fibres radiate from a centre of ossification, as "in the cerebral bones of the human fœtus." The under jaws,—consisting of two pieces joined in front, as in placoid fishes, and also in quadrupeds,—

studded all round near the edge of the bony lip with thickly-set ichthyic teeth, "like iron spikes in the upper edge of a gate," and within these, on an interior platform, a thinly-set row of huge, striated, pointed, double-edged, reptilian teeth,—symbolize the coming reptile—show us the crocodile entrenched behind the fish. They prove, also, that the animal was carnivorous. The hip-bone is constructed on the same type as that of the higher fishes, and even of quadrupeds and monkeys. The coprolites contain scales of Dipterians, and teach us that the *Asterolepis* devoured smaller, but formidable, carnivorous, buckler-headed cotemporaries;—yea, more, that the intestine contained, in perfection, "the winding, cork-screw, spiral" contrivance, found in some animals, "as the amphibious quadruped, called sea-fox," to which Paley refers, in his chapter on compensating contrivances, and of which he says, "here the shortness of the gut is *compensated* by the obliquity of the perforation." The nail-like hyoid bone, found at Stromness, and others much larger, subsequently obtained, complete the chain of evidence necessary for ascertaining the rule of measure—"module, as the architect might say—by which the proportions of the rest of the creature were regulated." And what was its size? The rule of measurement admits of variations; and hence, we are informed, that the individual that left the largest bones yet discovered, "if built in the shorter proportions, must have been eighteen, and, if in the longer, twenty-three feet in length."

"Thus, in the not unimportant circumstance of size, the most ancient Ganoids yet known, instead of taking their places, agreeably to the demands of the development hypothesis, among the sprats, sticklebacks, and minnows of their class, took their place among its huge, basking sharks, gigantic sturgeons, and bulky sword-fishes. They were giants, not dwarfs."

"Instead of being, as the development hypothesis would require, a fish low in its organization, it seems to have ranged on the level of the highest ichthyic reptilian families ever called into existence. Had an intelligent being, ignorant of what was going on upon earth during the week of creation, visited Eden on the morning of the sixth day, he would have found in it many of the inferior animals, but no trace of man. Had he returned again in the evening, he would have seen, installed in the office of keep-

ers of the garden, and ruling with no tyrant sway, as the humble monarchs of its brute inhabitants, two mature human creatures, perfect in their organization, and arrived at the full stature of their race. The entire evidence regarding them, in the absence of all such information as that imparted to Adam by Milton's angel, would amount simply to this, that in the morning man was not, and in the evening he was. There, of course, could not exist, in the circumstances, a single appearance to sanction the belief that the two human creatures, whom he saw walking together among the trees at sunset, had been "developed from infusorial points," not created mature. The evidence would, on the contrary, lie all the other way. And in no degree does the geological testimony respecting the earliest Ganoids differ from what, in the supposed case, would be the testimony of Eden regarding the earliest men. Up to a certain point in the geological scale, we find that the Ganoids are not; and when they at length make their appearance upon the stage, they enter large in their stature, and high in their organization."

And what must have been the aspect of this "oldest of Scottish fishes," much more bulky than "a large porpoise," the author leaves us to imagine. Let the reader, who may have seen a large shark, saw-fish or sword-fish of existing seas, contrast it mentally with an *Asterolepis*, twenty feet in length, shielded in its brilliant enamelled coat of mail—(more elaborately carved than that of Charles V., though manufactured in the age of Cellini)—with its large, prominent eyes, far forward in its broad bony-bucklered head, which must have had the sinister aspect of a reptile watching its prey. Let him fancy it darting near the surface and glittering in the sun's rays, with its enormous mouth, fenced all around and within with rows of spike-like teeth, ready to seize a Dipterian fish, and crush with a crashing sound its bony carapace, and he may form some conception of its aspect.

Our classic readers will remember the notion "of the philosophers of antiquity, with whom it was a received maxim, that created things were always most perfect, when they came first from the hands of their Maker; and that there was a tendency to progressive deterioration in sublunary things, when left to themselves;

" — Omnia fatis
In pejus ruere, ac retro sublapsa referri. "

This beautiful passage, in Lyell's masterly examination and rejection of the Lamarckian hypothesis, in three long chapters of the *Principles of Geology*, occurred to us, when we had concluded Mr. Miller's description of the *Asterolepis*; for Lyell, after stating the opinions and arguments of Lamarck and his followers, says, "the tables were completely turned on the philosophers of antiquity." We felt that the tables had been completely turned again on the "mystic" Oken, the "dreaming" Lamarck, and the "ingenious" author of the "*Vestiges*."

The reader's attention has been confined to the *Asterolepis*. It did not exist alone. Its Ganoid order embraced numerous other genera, some of which are very little inferior to it in size or organization. Though found in all subsequent times, the ganoids must have swarmed in the oceans of the Old Red Sandstone period; for our author says, if the trade were once fairly opened up, the Orkneys alone could furnish tons and ship-loads of their remains for the museums of the world; and the period must have been sufficiently protracted for the deposition of rocks of various kinds, thicker than the loftiest Scotch mountains; for of those rocks the mountains mainly consist. The *Asterolepis*, however, bore to its order the relation of superiority, which the lion bears to that of Carnaria; the elephant to *Pachydermata*; and the orang-outang to *Quadrumana*. Other animals—radiate, molluscos, and articulate—existed in countless numbers, forming classes, orders, families, and genera, some of which still exist, and the species of which were marked by characters quite as distinctive as those of the human era. Truly, to the very bottom of the oldest system of rocks, save one, the Lamarckians can find no foundation on which to rest their hypothesis, and claim for it the support of geologists. The geologist discovers in the rocks evidences of *degradation*,—confirmation of the opinion of the ancient philosophers; for the Ganoids have certainly retrograded slowly in all later periods, and have their analogues, now, in the sturgeon. Through the various formations and subdivisions of that oldest system, the Silurian, the dawn of organic existence, we now propose to proceed to the very bottom, if the reader will accompany us, confining our attention to the ichthyic class.

The Silurian are marine strata ten thousand feet in thickness ; and all geologists admit that their deposition, from abraded fragments of pre-existing rocks, required the long periods of time, demanded by the author of the "Vestiges." As but a few traces of fish had, ten years ago, been found in the upper series, and none in the lower divisions or formations, though remains of corals, mollusca, and articulata (*trilobites*) constitute mountain masses in England, Russia, the United States, and many other countries, where "there were many hands and eyes busy" in search of them, the author of the *Vestiges*, in his volume of "Explanations," founding his argument on the presumed fact of their total absence, boldly said, "*I fix my opponents down to the consideration of this fact, the earliest formations contain no fish.*" Fortunately, great advance has since been made in this branch of palaeontology. The author gives a minute history of the progress of discovery, referring to Murchison, Sedgwick, Agassiz, Phillips, and the New York geologists. The results are briefly given in the subjoined table, to which we add the metamorphic, non-fossiliferous rocks :

Upper Silurian Rocks.	Upper Ludlow.	1	Fish, 1838. (Murchison.)	Plynlimmon Group.	8	None yet.
	Aymestry Limestone.	2	Fish, 1842. (Phillips.)			
	Lower Ludlow.	3	None yet.			
	Wenlock Limestone.	4	Fish, 1845. (Sedgwick.) Fish, 1846. (N. Y. Geologists.)		9	Fish, 1847, (Geologists of English Government Survey.
	Wenlock Shale.	5	Fish, 1847. (Phillips.)		10	Fucoids.
Lower Silurian.	Caradoc Sandstone.	6	None yet.	Gneiss, &c. Mica Slate.		No fossils of any kind.
	Llandeilo Flags.	7	Fish, 1847. (Sedgwick.)			

Thus, the bold challenge of the latest and most ingenious defender of the law of development has been met, successfully, by the conclusive proof of the actual occurrence of the remains of fish, at the very bottom of the fossiliferous series. The first question is *not*, were they

numerous? For though, from those found in one bed, Agassiz formed six *genera*, and though the cartilaginous nature of their internal skeletons, and the minuteness of the shagreen points or plates on their skins, forbid the hope of finding their remains abundant in rocks deposited, perhaps, myriads of ages before the period of the Old Red Sandstone began, the occurrence of one bone, unequivocally that of a fish, in solid rock, like that of the Bala Limestone, establishes the existence of the *class* at that time, as clearly as a thousand. The question is, were they minute, mere ichthyic fœtuses and embryos?

The scales, teeth, jaws, and spines of Silurian fish hitherto discovered, have been referred by ichthyologists, with entire unanimity, to the Placoid order of Agassiz. And by a careful comparison of some of these, especially the fossil defensive spines, that formed the anterior mast-like supports of their fins, with those of living fishes, Agassiz discovered "an affinity to the genera *Cestracion*, *Centrina* and *Spinax*." By instituting a comparison of the defensive spines from the first and ninth,—the highest and lowest Silurian formations,—Upper Ludlow and Bala Limestone, (see preceding table,) with those of *Spinax Acanthias* (dog fish) and *Cestracion Phillipsii* (Port Jackson Shark,) he finds the fossil spines more than twice as long and thick as those of the existing animals. The same is true of fossil spines found in the Onondaga limestone, New York. These fishes are, therefore, inferred to have doubled in size the Port Jackson Shark of our times. The assertors of the development hypothesis appealed to geological evidence, expecting that, should fishes be discovered in the lowest Silurian strata, they would be microscopic; "and straightway witnesses enter court. But lo! among the expected dwarfs, there appear individuals of more than the average bulk and stature." Never were a set of theorists more effectually driven to the wall: and the author's apology for "tedious minuteness of descriptions, and a too prolix amplitude of statement," was, though in keeping with the modesty gracefully exhibited on every page, wholly unnecessary; for his wonderfully graphic descriptions of objects, and lucid statements of facts, impart a charm to the work, which holds the reader spell-bound, even in the perusal of its most abstruse portions.

Having established the large size of some, at least, of the first fossil fishes, the question remains, and it is the principal one, "did these ancient Placoid fishes stand high or low in the scale?" of being,—“were they high in intelligence and organization?” Must they be placed in these respects, though not in size, above the Ganoids?

Professor Sedgwick had previously maintained, that if we regard “the brain, and the whole nervous, circulating and generative systems, they stand at the highest point of a natural ascending scale, the very highest types of their class.” By a learned process of investigation, requiring a profound knowledge of all the systems of classification, Linneus’s, Cuvier’s, Muller’s, Owen’s and Agassiz’s, and of the principles on which they depend, the author strips the whole subject of “the entanglement and perplexity,” in which the Lamarckians attempted to involve it, in order to show that, as many *cartilaginous* fishes stand low in the scale; so, of the general inferiority of all, there can be no doubt. The true question is, not as to the *cartilaginous* fishes,—a mere subterfuge of the “Vestiges,”—but “the *Placoid* fishes of the Silurian Rocks.” More important principles in classification than an internal cartilaginous skeleton, induced Linneus to place the Placoids “above fishes altogether, by erecting them into an order of reptiles,—*Amphibia Nantes*.” The system of Muller, modified by Owen,—“now regarded as most natural,”—places the cartilaginous ichthyic worms in the first and lowest order, and most of the Placoids—“ichthyic reptiles”—in the eleventh and highest order of fishes, the Plagiostomi. The Placoid and Ganoid orders of Agassiz, “stamped in the mint of nature,” are real; and if the questionable Ctenoids and Cycloids were thrown into one—the horn-covered—the three orders would correspond, in the order of their appearance, to the three great geologic periods,—Palaeozoic, Secondary and Tertiary,—and to the order of their arrangement in “Cuvier’s Animal Kingdom,”—the highest in the scale appearing first in geologic time.*

* And the great “defect” in Agassiz’s system is, not in the principle of classification, but in the arrangement of fishes. When the absence of scales left him without a guide, he resorted to the principle of Cuvier,—his great teacher—the presence or absence of a cartilaginous, internal skeleton, forgetting that the Placoids have an osseous external covering, while the lower

In accordance, then, with all principles of classification, the Silurian Placoids *rank high in the scale of organization.*

And what was the rank in intelligence of the Placoids of the Silurian seas? To determine this point, we must ascertain with what organ or combination of organs, instinct and intelligence are most intimately connected. If rank depended on solidity of bone, all birds, all carnivorous, and many herbivorous quadrupeds, would take precedence of man. Development of brain, not solidity of bone, is the correct principle on which animal rank depends. In the lowest, *Acrite*, division, nervous matter is wholly absent; and as we ascend in the scale of being, the nervous ganglia increase, till we reach the highest; and examination of the four classes of vertebrata shows, that in fishes, the brain bears to the spinal cord the average proportion of 2 to 1; in reptiles, $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 1; in birds, 3 to 1; and in mammals, 4 to 1; while in man, it is 23 to 1! And of this the author of the "*Vestiges*" was sensible; for though, when it suited his purposes, in reasoning concerning the fishes, he made an internal bony skeleton the criterion of rank; yet, when he traced man's origin through monkeys to the dolphins, (whose bones, according to Owen, are but little removed from cartilage) he appeals, in support of man's affiliation to his marine progenitors, to "the great development in the brain of the dolphin family." The Placoids, as we have seen, possess a compound internal skeleton,—in the head, cartilaginous within and osseous without, and, in the vertebræ, bony within and cartilaginous without.

Is the cerebral mass of existing Placoids largely developed? In reply to this question, our author says, that having examined the brains of all the fishes on the Scotch coast, he found invariably the largest brain, in proportion to the size of the body, in the dog-fish, rays and other placoid fishes. And to this superior relative magnitude of brain, all fishermen attest that they possess a corresponding superiority of instinct and "shrewd caution," "both in

cartilaginous fishes have no bone at all, and a *soft slimy skin* like worms, being, indeed, far below several of that class, not merely in the brain, nerves and organs of circulation and generation, but in effective means of offence and defence.

watching their prey, and in avoiding the fisherman's hook and the meshes of his net."

In their reproductive organs, they rank with chelonians and reptiles. Among the rays, individual attachments are formed between male and female. Their eggs, like those of the tortoise and crocodile, are of considerable size. Their young pass through no such metamorphoses as those of even the salmon, the toad, and the amphibia generally. And some, the dog-fish especially, to which Agassiz found the Silurian placoids nearly related, are ovoviviparous, and bring forth their young alive and fully formed.

But, say the Lamarchians, "is not embryonic progress the key to the classification of animals," and is not the cartilaginous structure of the placoid skeleton analogous not merely to the embryonic skeleton of the bony fishes, but of vertebrated animals in general? Not at all. The placoid skeleton, we have seen, has true bone external in the head and on the skin, and internal in the vertebræ; and, moreover, the so-called cartilage of the placoids is chemically different, as a simple experiment demonstrates, from that of embryonic bony fishes, birds and mammals; for the former is insoluble in boiling water, while the latter is completely soluble.

And what, say you, asks the author of the "Vestiges" to the one-sided, heterocercal tails of the placoids? Is it not a characteristic of the embryos of the bony fishes—of the young salmon just burst from the egg? If we admit that a one-sided tail is a sign of immaturity in the young of one set of animals; is it a proof of inferior organization in the adults of another? The young *Balanus* has two eyes, which it loses at maturity, and then passes its days in darkness. The immature *Lepas* swims freely, but the mature animal, fixed to a rock or log, is no longer able to swim. The negro infant is nearly white, but as it advances in age its color gradually deepens into jet black. Are eyes, organs of motion, and a white skin mere embryonic peculiarities,—evidences of a low and not of a high standing? If not, on what principle can the heterocercal tail of the placoids, counteract all evidence derived from brain, instinct, organs of generation, individual attachments, viviparous production of fully formed young, and a bony skeleton covered with a substance which,

though apparently cartilaginous in physical characters, is wholly different in chemical properties? Is the heterocercal or one-sided tail of the placoids not an evidence of superior rank? In the osseous fishes, the vertebral column terminates abruptly, and expands into a broad fin of osseous rays enveloped in soluble cartilage. This surely is a sign of *degradation*; for when the one-sided tail of a recent placoid, (*Spinax Acanthias*) was boiled and burned, it lost much of its ichthyic character, and acquired, instead, a striking resemblance to the pointed bony column in the tail of the Saurian animals.

The author of the "Vestiges" ridicules the mouths of most of the recent placoid fishes, which open under the head, as a marked embryonic feature. To this it would be a sufficient reply, that the *lowest* fishes, the *Suctorii*, have the mouth at the anterior termination of the muzzle; and that some *bony* fishes, as the distorted asymmetrical *Platessa*, (a genus in no way superior to its bony neighbors,) have the mouth in the upper side of the snout, which gives them "an expression of unmistakeable stupidity." But the objection is susceptible of a much more conclusive reply. Egerton, Agassiz, Sedgwick and Forbes trace the Silurian fishes to the Cestraciont family of the placoids, and the *Cestracion Philipsii*, or Port Jackson shark, (the sole surviving species of the oldest vertebrate family of Creation,) has its mouth (according to Wilson, in the "Encyclopedia Britannica,") "at the extremity of the pointed muzzle." And in Agassiz's "Tabular View of the Genealogy of Fishes" "the Cestracionts, and they only, sweep across the entire geologic scale." This first family, having passed in various generic and specific forms, but in gradually decreasing numbers, through all geological periods, has one living species left; and of its mouth Miller said, after he had examined a fine specimen in the collection of Prof. Fleming:—

"The mouth, instead of opening, as in the ordinary sharks, under the middle of the head, to expose them to the suspicion of being creatures of low and embryonic character, opened in a broad, honest-looking muzzle, very much resembling that of the hog. The mouths of the most ancient placoids of which we know anything, *did not*, I reiterate, *open under their heads*."

Thus, having clearly shown that embryonic develop-

ment is not the key to the theory of development, *but of foetal development*; that embryonic progress is foetal development, and nothing more; and that gestation is not creation, Mr. Miller says:

"It is one of the difficulties incident to the task of replying to any dogmatic statement of error, that every mere annunciation of a false fact or false principle must be met by elaborate counter-statement or carefully constructed argument, and that prolixity is thus unavoidably entailed on the controversialist, who labors to set right what his antagonist has set wrong. The promulgator of error may be lively and entertaining, whereas his pains-taking confutator runs no small risk of being tedious and dull. May I, however, solicit the forbearance of the reader, if I spend a little time more in indicating what I deem the proper ground, on which the standing of the earlier vertebrata should be decided. To the test of *brain* I have already referred, as all-important in the question: I would now refer to the test of what may be termed *homological symmetry of organization*."

In the discussion of this test the author unfolds and sustains, with an irresistible array of facts and arguments, his striking and strangely interesting theory of *Degradation*. It was our intention, when we began this article, to give the reader an outline of this theory; but our limits forbid it at present. We will, perhaps, resume the subject at this point in the next number.

This is a scientific age, and we cannot close this article without inviting the special attention of those, who have control of the course of education in our Colleges, and in Theological Seminaries especially, to the subjoined paragraph:—

"It is always perilous to under estimate the strength of an enemy; and the danger from the development hypothesis to an ingenious order of minds, smitten with the novel fascinations of physical science, has been under estimated very considerably indeed. Save by a few studious men, who, to the cultivation of geology and the cognate branches, add some acquaintance with metaphysical science, the general correspondence of the line of assault taken up by this new school of infidelity, with that occupied by the old, and the consequent ability of the assailants to bring, not only the recently forged, but also the previously employed artillery into full play along its front, has not only not been marked, but even not so much as suspected. And yet, in order to show that there actually is such a correspondence, it

can be but necessary to state, that the great antagonist points in the array of the opposite lines, are simply the law of development versus the miracle of creation."

"But, ere the churches can be prepared competently to deal with it, or with the other objections of a similar class, which the infidelity of an age so largely engaged as the present in physical pursuits will be from time to time originating, they must greatly extend their educational walks into the field of physical science. The mighty change which has taken place during the present century, in the direction in which the minds of the first order are operating, though indicated on the face of the country in characters which cannot be mistaken, seems to have too much escaped the notice of our theologians.

"Speculative theology and the metaphysics are cognate branches of the same science; and when, as in the last and the preceding ages, the higher philosophy of the world was metaphysical, the churches took ready cognizance of the fact, and, in due accordance with the requirements of the time, the battle of the evidences was fought on metaphysical ground. But, judging from the preparations made in their colleges and halls, they do not now seem sufficiently aware,—though the low thunder of every railway, and the snort of every steam-engine, and the whistle of the wind amid the wires of every electric telegraph, serve to publish the fact,—that it is in the departments of physics, not of metaphysics, that the greater minds of the age are engaged,—that the Lockes, Humes, Kantes, Berkeleys, Dugald Stewarts, and Thomas Browns, belong to the past,—and that the philosophers of the present time, tall enough to be seen all the world over, are the Humboldts, the Aragos, the Agassizes, the Liebiges, the Owens, the Herschels, the Bucklands and the Brewsters. In the educational course through which, in this country, candidates for the ministry pass, in preparation for their office, I find every group of great minds which has, in turn, influenced and directed the mind of Europe for the last three centuries, represented, more or less adequately, save the last. It is an epitome of all kinds of learning, with the exception of the kind most imperatively required, because most in accordance with the genius of the time. The restorers of classic literature, the Buchanans and Erasmuses, we see represented in our universities by the Greek, and what are termed the Humanity courses; the Galileos, Boyles and Newtons, by the Mathematical and Natural Philosophy courses; and the Lockes, Kantes, Humes and Berkeleys, by the Metaphysical course. But the Cuviers, the Huttons, the Cavendishes and the Watts, with their successors, the practical philosophers of the present age,—men whose achievements in physical science

we find marked on the surface of the country in characters which might be read from the moon,—are not adequately represented.

“It would be, perhaps, more correct to say, that they are not represented at all; and the clergy, as a class, suffer themselves to linger far in the rear of an intelligent and accomplished laity—a full age behind the requirements of the time. Let them not shut their eyes to the danger which is obviously coming.

“The battle of the Evidences will have as certainly to be fought on the field of physical science, as it was contested in the last age on that of the metaphysics. And, on this new arena, the combatants will have to employ new weapons, which it will be the privilege of the challenger to choose. The old, opposed to these, would prove but of little avail. In an age of muskets and artillery, the bows and arrows of an obsolete school of warfare would be found greatly less than sufficient in the field of battle, for purposes either of assault or defence.”

ARTICLE VII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Report of a General Plan for the Promotion of Public and Personal Health, devised, prepared and recommended by the Commissioners appointed under a resolve of the Legislature of Massachusetts, relating to a Sanitary Survey of the State. Presented April 25th, 1850. Boston: Dutton and Wentworth. pp. 544, 8vo.*

The vast importance of the object of this report is felt and acknowledged by every man who devotes one moment's thought to the consideration of the subject. Time and labor are well employed in investigating the causes which render mankind liable to disease, and which have a tendency to shorten the brief span of existence allowed him in this world. Not more than half of those who enter into life are found to run this short race, and even then how frequently is it terminated by disease. It was

undoubtedly the design of nature that man should enjoy the whole brief period of three score years and ten, and that all should ultimately die, not through the intervention of disease, but purely the death of nature. Every observing practitioner of medicine knows, from his own experience, that the greater proportion of diseases to which mankind are liable, are entailed upon them by their own ignorance, or disregard of hygienic principles. The majority of the patients he visits daily might have avoided the maladies from which they are suffering, or at least have mitigated their severity, and shortened their duration, had they attended to a few simple sanitary precautions. The effect of vaccination upon small pox is a forcible illustration of this, familiar to all. If an individual is not perfectly protected by it, the disease with him is rendered comparatively mild and harmless, and what is true with respect to an individual is also true with regard to communities. The medical history of Russia informs us that that country was formerly scourged, and terribly so, with that frightful disease, but now, owing to the observance of their strict sanitary regulations regarding it, small pox is comparatively rare.

Where does an epidemic always rage with the greatest severity? Among the habitations of the poor, in cellars, &c., crowded with a wretched class, where filth and dirt abound—these are the hot-beds of disease, and thence it spreads in the same degree as these physical conditions exist. When some of our large cities were visited by the cholera, how unprepared were they—how much cleansing, white-washing and labor was brought into requisition • to remove the filth from private premises and even from the public streets—thus, by removing some of the causes of the epidemic, to check its progress. How much better would it be to direct our efforts to the removal of these causes of disease, before its ingression; how many lives would thus be saved.

Of late years extensive observations have been made, with a view of ascertaining the causes of disease, and of investigating how health may be best preserved, and disease prevented, by sanitary means.

In 1849 the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts passed a resolution that a committee should be appointed to prepare and

report a plan for a sanitary survey of the State; and, in accordance with this resolution, Drs. L. Shattuck, N. P. Banks, Jr. and J. Abbott were appointed by the Governor, Commissioners for that purpose, and the report now before us is the result of their labors.

After defining what is meant by a sanitary survey as "an examination or survey of the different parts of the Commonwealth, its counties, its towns, its localities, to ascertain the causes which favorably or unfavorably affect the health of its inhabitants," they adopt the following creed: "*We believe* that the conditions of perfect health, either public or personal, are seldom or never attained, though attainable; that the average length of human life may be very much extended, and its physical power greatly augmented; that in every year, within this Commonwealth, thousands of lives are lost which might have been saved; that tens of thousands of cases of sickness occur, which might have been prevented; that a vast amount of unnecessarily impaired health and physical debility exists among those not actually confined by sickness; that these preventable evils require an enormous expenditure and loss of money, and impose upon the people unnumbered and immeasurable calamities, pecuniary, social, physical, mental, and moral, which might be avoided; that means exist, within our reach, for their mitigation or removal; and that measures for prevention will effect infinitely more than remedies for the cure of disease." In the course of the report good reasons are given for this belief, which are well supported by facts and ably sustained by arguments.

The sanitary movement abroad is first noticed: this goes back to great antiquity, and is traced up to the direct revelation of the Supreme Law-giver. Sanitary laws constituted a part of the religion of the Jews, and were well adapted to the country they inhabited. The ancient Romans made extensive arrangements for ventilation and drainage, and for supplying their houses with water, the remains of which are still traceable among the ruins of some of their public buildings, and have struck our most advanced sanitarians with surprise at their remarkable adaptation to the purposes for which they were intended. From the time of the

fall of Rome there is no appearance of the existence of any sanitary regulations, until the fourteenth century, when John II. of France established the first "Sanitary Police," and this is considered as the commencement of sanitary reform; and from that period until the present have occasionally appeared a few royal ordinances and legislative proceedings for the promotion of health. But the present century is particularly distinguished in this respect, and all enlightened Governments have felt themselves compelled not only to inquire into the subject, but to provide measures for the attainment of the object.

The plan proposed in this report consists of a series of measures, presented in the form of separate recommendations, divided into two classes, to be regulated and controlled by the agencies proposed to be established, one by legislative and municipal authorities, the other by social organization and personal action. Under the first class is recommended, that the laws of the State, relating to public health, be thoroughly revised, and that a new and complete health act be passed, repealing such acts as are inconsistent with its provisions; and a bill is presented to the Legislature, comprising a simple, but systematic, efficient and practical plan, adapted to the present condition and wants of the State.

It is recommended that a general board of health be established, charged with the general execution of the sanitary laws of the State, and to be required to present, annually, to the Legislature, a report, containing an abstract of their proceedings, accompanied with remarks as to the sanitary condition of the State and its inhabitants, and advising such means as, in their judgment, would lead to improvement.

The establishment of local boards of health is also recommended, charged with the particular execution of the laws of the State, and the municipal ordinances and regulations, relating to public health within their respective jurisdictions, and authorized to make and carry into execution any rules or regulations which, in their judgment, will promote the public health and preserve life. It is recommended that they provide for periodical house-to-house visitation, for the prevention of epidemic diseases, and for other sanitary purposes,—that they endeavor to prevent, or mitigate,

the sanitary evils arising from overcrowded lodging-houses and cellar-dwellings,—that special sanitary surveys of particular cities, towns and localities, be made from time to time under their direction,—that they should endeavor to ascertain the effects of mill-ponds, and other collections and streams of water, upon the health of the inhabitants,—that the general management of places of burial, and of the interment of the dead, be regulated by them,—that they be authorized and appointed to perform the duties now imposed upon coroners, in relation to holding inquests, and be vested with the authority now vested in justices of the peace, relating to insane and idiotic persons, not arrested or indicted for crime,—and that they be required to make a report annually to the town, of its sanitary condition, and of their proceedings for the year next preceding, (a copy of which to be presented to the general board.)

It is recommended that the laws relating to births, marriages, and deaths, be perfected and carried into effect, in every city and town of the State; that measures be taken to ascertain the amount of sickness suffered in different localities, among persons of different classes, professions and occupations—among the scholars who attend the public schools and other seminaries of learning; that means be provided for the periodical vaccination of the inhabitants; and that the causes of consumption, and the circumstances under which it occurs, be made the subject of particular observation and investigation; that measures be taken to preserve the lives and the health of seamen engaged in the merchant service, and of passengers at sea, and for preventing and mitigating the sanitary evils arising from foreign immigration. There are, also, recommendations regarding the laying out of new towns, advising open spaces to be left for public walks and wide streets, both ornamented with trees; and that ample provision be made for a supply of light, air and water—for drainage and sewerage—for paving and for cleanliness.

The second class comprises social and personal measures, most of which may be carried into effect without any special legislative authority. Among which is recommended, the formation of sanitary associations, for the purpose of collecting and diffusing infor-

mation relating to public and personal health—the erection of tenements for the better accommodation of the poor, and the establishment of public bathing-houses and wash-houses in all cities and villages; that the refuse of cities and towns be collected and applied to the purposes of agriculture; that the sanitary effects of patent medicines, and other nostrums and secret remedies, be observed, and that medical compounds, advertised for sale, be avoided, unless the materials of which they are composed be known; and that local boards of health, and others interested, endeavor to prevent the sale and use of unwholesome, spurious and adulterated articles, dangerous to the public health, designed for food, drink or medicine; that persons be specially educated in sanitary science, as preventive advisers, as well as curative advisers.

It is recommended that physicians keep records of cases professionally attended; that clergymen of all religious denominations make public health the subject of one or more discourses annually, before their congregations; that each family keep such records, as will show the physical and sanitary condition of its members; and that parents and others, to whom the care of those in infancy and childhood are intrusted, endeavor to understand and discharge their duties, so that a good foundation may be laid for vigorous manhood and old age.

These are simply the principal measures recommended in the plan, which, in the report, are accompanied with illustrations and with many and cogent reasons for their approval. Several general considerations in favor of the plan are presented, which we will give without entering into the arguments adduced for their support.

The plan should be approved of, *because it is a practical measure*; it would improve the constitution of man, prevent sickness, and prolong life. “Here then is the immense field to which our measure applies. Its purpose is to reduce the great number of deaths, to prevent the vast amount of sickness, and to raise the general standard of health as high and even higher, than that of the most healthy districts; and this it proposes to accomplish, by giving to the legislature an exact knowledge of the condition of

the people; by the passage of useful laws for the promotion of their welfare; by giving to the physician a better knowledge of the causes and prevalence of diseases, that he may better adapt his remedies to their prevention and cure; and by diffusing among all classes of the people, facts concerning life and health, and the general principles of sanitary science, and by leading them to make progress in sanitary improvement." "That our measure *will accomplish what it proposes*, if put in operation, there is abundant evidence in the history of sanitary experience. The recorded facts concerning the causes of disease, and concerning disease itself, in all ages and in all countries, prove it."

It should be approved of *because it is an useful measure*; it would give the State a knowledge of its inhabitants, and it would aid the physician, and benefit the people, by diffusing among all classes, more enlightened views of life, health and disease. It should be approved of *because it is an economical measure*. One of the most common arguments brought against the adoption of preventive sanitary measures, is their expense, but it can be easily shown, that they would result in the saving of large amounts to the State in which they were adopted, and carried into effect. "It is for the interest of the public at large, no less than for the happiness of the few immediately interested in each human being, that the life once breathed should, if possible, be preserved, until it is released by the natural wearing away of its earthly tabernacle. We all know that, in the common sense of the term, a short-lived population is generally a surplus population, not only because those who are reckless of preserving life, will be careless of all its obligations, and will be poor and vicious, but because the tendency of early deaths is chiefly to shorten the existence of those who produce more than they consume, and to increase the number of those who must be dependent on the charity of others. 'A cholera widow' is a significant expression, occasionally used by the Board of Health, to indicate one who has been thrown on the parish, by the death of that husband, who, if he had not been prematurely cut off, might have supported her for years, and left his children old enough to earn bread for themselves. Many communities are now thus paying, in alarmingly swollen poor-rates,

for the short-sighted selfishness which made them grudge the cost of precautionary arrangements. *Edinburgh Review*, 1850."

The following is from a speech by Lord Ashley, delivered at a meeting held in 1850, to take into consideration the sanitary condition of the city of London. "At least one-third of the pauperism of the country arose from the defective sanitary condition of large multitudes of the people; and he had no hesitation in saying, upon the authority of experienced persons, that if the population of their great towns were placed under proper sanitary regulations, in less than ten years the poor-rates would be reduced £2,000,000 annually."

"It should be approved of *because it is eminently a philanthropic and charitable measure,—because it is a moral measure.* The indirect effects of sickness are far more hurtful, though less observable, than the direct effects of mortal disease. Those who merely suffer from fever, are about twelve times as many as those who perish. The poison arising from animal or vegetable decomposition, acts as a sedative; it lowers the tone, unstrings the nerves, and brings on physical languor and mental apathy. Persons affected by it become unfit for, and have a hatred of labor; there is no expedient they will not seek in order to escape from toil. Under this depression, and as a relief from a peculiar inward *sinking* feeling, they have a craving for the stimulus of ardent spirits, to an extent inconceivable by persons in happier circumstances; it amounts to a passion, and those debilitated beings are sometimes almost unable to control it." "These are the reasons why the districts of filth are not only the districts of fever, scrofula, consumption, and cholera, but also of crime. Habits are early formed of idleness and dishonesty, of brutality, inexpressible profligacy, and sensual indulgence; and here are educated the irreclaimable malefactors." "You cannot degrade the physical man by a life-long familiarity with scenes of filth and indecency, without debasing his whole moral nature." "The object of the measures we recommend, is to remove filth and prevent disease, to introduce those accommodations which allow and reform those habits which prevent the elevation of the physical man, the social nature and moral condition of our fellow beings. They are the

best handmaids we can give to prosperity, to morality, and to religion." "In the abodes to which we have referred, the Sabbath never comes. In vain its morning eye peeps kindly in at the gloomy windows, for it meeteth no recognition there! In vain its meridian beams, struggling through the murkiness and filth, above, around, and beneath, seek to shine into the doorways of those den-like homes, for they are quickly quenched by the deep darkness that abideth there! There the Sabbath's decencies are never cultivated—the Sabbath's peace never enjoyed—the Sabbath's festival is never kept—the Sabbath's blessing is never known!"

It should be approved of *because the progress of the age demands it, and because it involves an important duty*. Some twenty pages are devoted to enumerating and answering objections that might be brought against the measure. The report is then closed with a few appeals suggested by the subject.

It appeals to *physicians*: "The members of our profession," says an eminent medical authority, "who have already embarked in this most righteous crusade against physical corruption, cannot but feel themselves encouraged and supported by the sympathy and co-operation of the clergy; and those who have not yet taken any part in furtherance of the sanitary cause, may perhaps find a motive to execution, in the growing interest with which it is regarded by the members of other professions, and by society at large. But a sense of duty, far more than the mere force of example, ought to enlist the medical man in this holy warfare. No member of society is so cognizant as he is, of the facts of the case, or better prepared to interpret and enforce them; no one is less open to the suspicion of mean or unworthy motives; and no one has such frequent opportunities of converse, with men of every rank and degree."

It appeals to *clergymen*: "Their official duties lead them to visit the sick and the dying; and they should be forcibly impressed with the truth, that the architect and the scavenger—that sanitary reforms in their various modes of operation—are their best colleagues. They should see and feel, that removing physical suffering, and raising the social and personal condition of the sufferer,

is the surest way of gaining access to the heart, and of making their warnings, their instructions, and their consolations effectual; that the easiest and most permanent impressions, are those made before the body and the mind become degraded in filth, stupefied by disease, or hardened and seared in guilt. In their personal intercourse, and in their preaching, they should diffuse sanitary information, and urge the importance of sanitary measures. A weighty responsibility rests upon such men, and it becomes them to feel it, and to make themselves perfect masters of the subject, that they may use the information wisely and usefully, in helping forward one of the greatest reforms of the age."

It appeals to *Educated men of all classes*: "As a matter of intense interest, as a matter requiring profound investigation, as a matter of useful science—few subjects can be presented to an intelligent mind which promises more satisfactory results, than the sanitary movement. For these objects alone, it is worthy of being studied. But when it is viewed in its personal and social relations to man and mind, it in many respects transcends all other matters. To those who by education are qualified for the labor, few objects present a greater or more extended field of usefulness."

It appeals to the *Wealthy and Philanthropic*, and it appeals to the *People*: "Every man in every station has a direct interest in its success; and every one should do all in his power to establish and make it successful. Every one should, as far as possible, endeavor to understand the character and design of the measure, and should commend its principles to others; he should unite in forming local sanitary associations, and in obtaining the passage of wise sanitary laws and regulations, and he should assist the public authorities in carrying them into operation. By these means, the sanitary movement will be accelerated, and sooner accomplish the high and noble purposes for which it is destined."

It appeals to the *Periodical Press*: "The leading papers of Great Britain, and the periodical press generally, have advocated the cause with a talent, discretion and perseverance, which reflect upon them the highest honor. The combined influence of the excellence of the cause, and of the force of public opinion, has

silenced all opposition ; and sanitary reform has now taken its place among the most prominent subjects of interest among all classes of people throughout the kingdom. The subject appeals to the periodical press in this country, to imitate so noble an example. It is a subject bounded by no sectional interests, and by no party lines ; but is of universal concern, and of unbounded application, and one in which every press, of any character, may safely and properly embark. Every one that aids in its promotion, advocates a measure which certainly can do no harm, and may—judging from all past experience—do immeasurable good ; and every one that opposes it, or throws obstacles in the way of its advancement, lends his aid, not only to defeat a harmless measure, but one designed to promote the progress and elevation of society, and the best interests and well-being of the human race.”

It appeals to *Towns and Cities* : “ Life, health, physical happiness, and even the moral condition of a town, may depend, in some degree, upon the adoption or rejection of proper sanitary regulations. An immense responsibility then rests upon these local authorities ; and this impression should abide upon them, and they should be led to act accordingly.”

It appeals to the *State* : “ Massachusetts has always been eminent among the American States. On the pages of her history, are recorded the noble deeds which have given her a good name, and rendered her glorious. But her people demand at her hands a more full enjoyment of life, and a more abundant diffusion of its blessings ; and no more noble and honorable and glorious page can anywhere be found, than that which shall record the adoption of some simple but efficient and comprehensive plan of sanitary reform, by which the greatest possible amount of physical power may be produced, the greatest possible amount of physical suffering may be prevented, and the greatest possible amount of physical, social and moral enjoyment may be attained. “ This is the true glory which outlives all other, and shines with undying lustre, from generation to generation, imparting to its works something of its own immortality.”

The Report disapproves of private places of burial, and affirms that a place of burial should *never be within a populous city or*

village. It vividly sets forth the dangers incurred to the health of the living by the evolution of deleterious gases from the bodies of the dead, permeating] the surrounding soil and escaping into the air above or the water beneath. It much prefers interment in graves to interment in tombs. "Dangerous gases often escape from tombs, when insecurely closed, or when opened for new deposits." "In Mount Auburn, very properly, tombs are not now allowed. Graves alone are used. It is desirable, too, that in no grave should more than one body be placed." But it is impossible for us to go over the wide compass of this able Report. And though we are not disposed to second the recommendation of the Committee, that clergymen "should make public health the subject of one or more discourses annually," yet, as they are continually brought, in their ministrations, into contact with the living and the dead, and have duties to perform, of a spiritual nature, at "the incomings and outgoings of human existence," and moreover have their full share of influence in all *civilized* communities, it is their duty to inform themselves on all these subjects, to correct and lead public opinion aright, on all fitting occasions, in relation to them, and to exert themselves for the temporal as well as eternal well-being of their fellow men. The Legislature of Massachusetts has shown itself to have a wise regard for the welfare of its people, and their Sanitary Committee have well and ably performed the trust committed to them. Their Report condenses a vast amount of information relative to public health, interesting to the professional and general reader alike. We are willing to learn from Massachusetts while she keeps within her own proper province, and embarks in no mad crusades against the peace, prosperity, and rights of her much wronged sister States, and we wish her much success in all her schemes to promote the health, both physical and moral, of her citizens.

2. *Lectures on Theology, by the late REV. JOHN DICK, D. D. Published under the superintendence of his son. With a Preface, Memoir, &c., by the American Editor. Two volumes in one, 8vo. Robert Carter & Brothers, New York, 1851.*

In announcing this new impression of a work which has been so long before the Christian world, we feel that commendation and criticism may alike be spared. Indeed, it has already passed the ordeal to which every book must be subjected; and a favorable verdict has, perhaps, unanimously been rendered. It has enjoyed the good fortune, not only to take rank among existing systems of theology, but has become, to some extent, a manual with those just entering upon the study of Divinity. It has, indeed, many claims to popularity as an introductory work in this sublime science. It is comprehensive, embracing in these two volumes the whole circle of study in Theology proper. It discusses the evidences of Christianity, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the integrity of the sacred text—sweeps over the whole area of natural and revealed religion—and closes with disquisitions upon church government and the sacraments. All these topics are brought within readable compass: the student is not fatigued with wading through folios; but, with comparatively little effort, is put, at the end of two moderate volumes, in possession of much useful knowledge.

Another popular and meritorious feature of this work is, the transparency of its style. Dr. Dick never imposes upon his readers the irksome and needless task of ferreting out the meaning of obscure sentences. A crystal style reveals his thoughts, as unstained glass reveals an open landscape. Free from ornament, which, indeed, has no place in strictly didactic writing, it is yet liquid and plain, as easy to the reader as it is natural to the writer.

But the chief merit of these Lectures is found in the judgment and caution with which they are written. The young student cannot be supposed to have a stock of theological ideas, which he may collate and compare, and thus be conducted to safe opinions. He feels, therefore, the need of a guide upon whom he

may safely rely, until such time as he shall gain more knowledge and increasing confidence. The eminent prudence and caution of Dr. Dick afford precisely the guarantees he requires. The nervous horror, continually betrayed, of all speculation in Divine things, is a pledge to him that he will be saved the labor and peril of extricating himself from the labyrinth of metaphysical inquiry.

We are bound, however, in candor, to say, it is chiefly as a horn-book in theology that we accord any peculiar merit to these Lectures. It were a pity if our Divinity students should rest satisfied with their attainments under this master. He never grapples with the great and fundamental principles into which every subject in theology may be resolved; and discovers no particular logical ability in the topics which he does handle. As a proof of this, there is no perspective in the system which he presents to us: the great and the small, the easy and the difficult, the plain and the obscure, all loom out in equal proportions, and receive the same measure of attention. Indeed, his writings nowhere betray the working of an original and powerful mind. Being simply the reproduction of other men's thoughts, they have not the freshness and flavor of writings which embalm the conceptions of vigorous and inventive minds. Not a single thought, or shade of thought can be found in the compass of a thousand closely printed pages, of which the reader can say this is peculiarly the author's own. Consequently, there is not stimulus enough to force the student out upon an untrammelled course of thought. Dr. Dick never felt the self-reliance which the consciousness of great mental powers always imparts. He is, therefore, nervously timid; withdrawing his feet in alarm, as soon as they touch the waters of a swift and deep current. Just at the point where the student most needs the assistance of his guide, Great-heart breaks down entirely, and declines the investigation. We may admire the humility and piety which prompt him to veil his reason before the awful mysteries of God; but we must dispute the wisdom which declines all inquiry, simply because our curiosity cannot fully be gratified. Dr. Dick gives way as soon as he touches the border of some impenetrable truth: he exaggerates the mystery, by veiling the com-

prehensible and incomprehensible alike from all research; and thus leaves us under the pressure of difficulties which he might be competent to remove.

On the whole, these Lectures, however admirable for the beginner, are not exactly suited to graduate a student upon. Besides lacking the power and freshness of many of the older systems of Divinity, they tend to lower too far the spirit of research, and of vigorous and masculine thought, which should be prominent characteristics of the theologian.

- [3. *Crumbs from the Land of Cakes.* By JOHN KNOX. 12mo. pp. 192. Gould and Lincoln, Boston, 1851.

This little book is, really, an account of a tour through his native land, by a Scotchman, who, we presume, has taken, as a *nom de plume*, the venerable name of the great Scottish Reformer. The quaint title, we are told in the preface, has allusion to the oatmeal cake for which this country is famous: the crumbs of which will represent the author's brief and enthusiastic sketches of her most renowned localities. The chapters devoted to London, Paris and Dublin, can scarcely be comprehended under the title; but, as these cities were embraced in the tour, they are not omitted in the pencillings of this traveller.

The style of this writer is more racy than that of most journalists, from the fact that he is more simple and unpretending. He fills his pages, not with the petty and impertinent details of travel, but with pleasant descriptions of the spots visited, and traces, with a lively and graceful pen, the impression made upon his own mind and heart. A romantic interest must always attach to Scotland: but, with an intelligent Scotchman for his guide, who, after an absence of eighteen years, returns to his native soil, no wonder the reader catches the enthusiasm breathing through this little book, and lays it down with regret, at so soon parting from scenes and associations now more endeared than ever.

4. *The Authority of God: or, the True Barrier against Romish and Infidel Aggressions. Four discourses by the REV. J. H. MARLE D'AUBIGNE, D. D.* 12mo. pp. 305. Robert Carter & Brothers, New York, 1851.

The object of these Discourses is, to maintain the supreme authority of the Scriptures as the rule of faith and practice. As we learn from the introduction, and also from the structure of the Discourses themselves, they were prepared and delivered to counteract the influence of M. Scherer's dangerous apostacy and insidious attacks, which recently excited so profound a sensation in the Genevan School of Divinity. The first Discourse presents the testimony of God in favor of the Scriptures; which testimony is drawn from the words of Christ and his apostles, and the use made by the Holy Spirit of the truth in the conversion and sanctification of men. In the second discourse, the position of M. Scherer is historically refuted, that this authority was assigned to the Scriptures by the church, to withstand the heretics rising up in her bosom. In opposition to which, it is clearly shown that, in the earlier and purer days of the church, and by the immediate successors of the apostles, the same deference was paid to the Scriptures which they now receive. The third discourse gives the history of the attacks made upon the authority of the Scriptures, particularly at Geneva, and the lamentable consequences which have followed. It had been affirmed that German theology and criticism had reached a point where it was necessary to abandon the Scriptures. In refutation of this, the fourth and last discourse presents the testimony of Neander, as one of the best German divines: in doing which, a beautiful tribute is paid by an ardent and affectionate pupil, to the piety, learning and genius of an old preceptor. The introduction which precedes the English edition, has some pointed remarks upon the present state of the English church; in which it is forcibly demonstrated, that the same barrier which the Scriptures raise against the assaults of rationalism, will prove equally effectual against the aggressions of Romanism.

It is only necessary to say that this book comes from the same pen which wrote the History of the Reformation, to give assur-

ance of the sprightliness and vivacity of its style, and of the deep unction and spirituality of its matter. In this, as in all the other writings of this author, there are flashes of a true and sanctified philosophy, showing depths of thought which the reader has yet to fathom; and, as the light gleams through unexplored recesses, the adventurous spirit is aroused, which pushes him forward in the investigation of truth. We love a book which one cannot read without interruptive trains of thought suggested on every page, running sometimes parallel with, and sometimes athwart the path of the author; and when his thoughts come with a ringing sound upon the soul, awaking all its echoes.

5. *Midnight Harmonies: or, Thoughts for the Season of Solitude and Sorrow.* By OCTAVIUS WINSLOW, M.A. 12mo. pp. 249. Robert Carter & Brothers, New York, 1851.

Mr. Winslow has, for some time, been favorably known as the author of several works in practical Divinity. His "experimental and practical view of the atonement," his work on the Holy Spirit, and his more recent work on Declension and Revival, have all had a wide circulation, being read with equal interest in the closet and in the study. His most striking characteristic is the happy blending of the doctrinal parts of Christianity with the experimental and practical. Unlike the generality of practical writers, he takes his position first upon some vital truth of the Gospel, and elucidates it so far as may be necessary to bring it down more effectually upon the heart and conscience. This imparts a peculiar unction to his writings; which, united with the fervor and directness of his style, insures him a cordial welcome into every Christian heart. The little book at the head of this notice, though entirely fragmentary, has the same general excellencies with the larger works named above. It was composed, as a relief to the author's feelings, during a season of sorrow, and is really a song of his in the night; which will serve to interpret the title of the book. A still more correct impression will be drawn from a

summary of the topics discussed. The sections are as follows: Songs in the Night—Jesus Hiding his Dealings—Solitude Sweetened—A Look from Christ—Honey in the Wilderness—The Godly Widow Confiding in the Widow's God—Looking to Jesus—Leaning upon the Beloved—The Weaned Child—God, Comforting as a Mother—Jesus only—The Incense of Prayer—The Day Breaking. Writings like these, pregnant with piety, are sure to be read; and the favored writer is sure to be loved by the mourners whom he comforts.

6. *Expository Discourses on the First Epistle of the Apostle Peter.* By JOHN BROWN, D. D., Senior Minister of the United Presbyterian Congregation, Broughton Place, Edinburgh, and Professor of Exegetical Theology to the United Presbyterian Church. Complete in one volume. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1851. pp. 801, 8vo.

Our Scotch brethren excel in popular exposition of Scripture. Not always does it rest to the degree it should on a close and critical examination of the original text—not always does it display true exegetical knowledge and skill. But here is a popular commentary, which exhibits the true scholar, as well as the acceptable and earnest preacher. It “is, substantially, a commentary,” says the author, “though in a form somewhat peculiar. It is not a continuous comment on words and clauses, nor does it consist of scholia or annotations, nor of lectures in the sense in which that word is commonly employed in this country; nor of sermons, either on select passages, or on the successive verses of the sacred book which is its subject. The epistle is divided into paragraphs, [according to the sense: of course varying very considerably in length. Each of these paragraphs, embodying one leading thought, forms the subject of a separate discourse, in which an attempt is made to explain whatever is difficult in phraseology, and to illustrate the doctrinal or practical principles which it contains; the object being, not to discuss, in a general and

abstract manner, the subjects which the texts may suggest, but to bring clearly out the apostle's statements, and their design ; and to show how the statements are fitted to gain the objects for which they are made." Such is the author's own explanation of the objects before him. What would be interesting only to the scholar, he has thrown into notes. The recollection of the primary design of the work, the author tells us, checked him in the inclination to indulge in philological remark. More of it would have suited our tastes as well as his, and would have rendered the book more attractive and useful to the scholar. It is, however, preceded by a true scholarlike translation of the epistle, which shows us of what the author is capable in that department. From the entire book, our pastors may take some useful lessons in expository preaching, a style of preaching in which few succeed, but in which success is most desirable both for preacher and hearer. We know not a most useful study to a pastor than to take some book of the Greek or Hebrew Scriptures, and subject it to the most thorough and critical investigation, in its words and phrases, its arguments and trains of thought, until he has become completely possessed of all its sacred truths, and is animated by the same spirit which glowed in the heart of the writer ; if he will then express these truths in his own language, and bring them forth in vivid and impressive discourses for the edification of his people, he will strengthen and gladden their hearts, and lead them to a broader and more satisfying acquaintance with the word of truth, while his own theological knowledge will be continually becoming more varied and comprehensive, and his preaching ever fresh and new, by the variety of topics this course of study will bring before him. In a church which makes an examination "in the original languages in which the Scriptures were written," essential to licensure and ordination, and which affirms that "the Old Testament in *Hebrew*, and the New Testament in *Greek*, are to be appealed to in all controversies," we have sometimes been amazed, to see how soon these studies are laid aside by the ministry, and in how slight a degree the critical investigation of the Scriptures in the original flourishes. Few of our brethren will be able, we fear, to say, in the same sense in

which Luther said it, "I have shaken every tree in this forest, and never without gathering some fruit."

7. *Lecture before the Young Men's Library Association of Augusta, Georgia; shewing African Slavery to be consistent with the moral and physical progress of a nation. By C. G. MEMMINGER, of Charleston, S. C. Published by request of the Association. Augusta: W. S. Jones. 1851. pp. 25.*

Mr. Memminger maintains, in this lecture, that the institution of slavery, as it exists among us, is not a national evil, but that it is positively favorable to the moral and physical progress of both master and slave. He first presents us with the true definition of slavery, and for this purpose quotes from a previous number of this work. Slavery does not give up the whole moral and physical existence of the slave to the power of his master, but is simply "an obligation to labor for another, determined by the providence of God, independently of the provisions of a contract."

The Lecturer's first position is, that "Slavery is sanctioned by the law of God." Nothing can promote the permanent good of a nation which is opposed to God's law. The charge made by its enemies, that slavery converts a man into a thing, and deprives him of moral responsibility, would, if true, justly condemn the institution. But God's word prescribes, regulates and enforces the duties of slaves, just as it does those of wives, children or citizens. The slave continues, therefore, to be, in the sight of God, *a man*, a moral and responsible agent *in that very relation of slavery*; and God's law, both under the Old and New Testaments, sanctions the institution.

It is the second position of the Lecturer on which his strength is laid out. He appeals to the history and experience of mankind in defence of slavery. The facts from which he reasons are very striking, and we think also that he is very fair in his use of them. He arrays them distinctly before us, but they are left to make their own impressions. There is no declamation in the lecture.

It is a simple appeal to the past history and the present experience of men. The first remarkable fact adduced is, that the three nations which have exercised the greatest influence over the destinies of men are precisely those in which slavery has existed in fullest vigor. These nations were the Hebrews, the Greeks, and the Romans; each of them occupying a territory so small as scarcely to be appreciable in relation to the rest of the world.

The territory of the Hebrews (says Mr. M.) was less than one hundred miles square. The extreme length of their country from north-east to south-west was about one hundred and eighty miles, and the average width of it something like fifty miles. Yet the writings and the institutions of this inconsiderable people control and always will control the world. True, this is owing to their divine origin, but the argument is not made weaker but stronger by this circumstance. That a petty nation of slaveholders were so mighty and so prosperous, so much superior intellectually and morally, as well as physically, to the rest of the world, certainly goes far to shew that slavery is consistent with the moral and physical progress of nations; but the truth of this proposition becomes much more evident when it is considered that the political institutions of the Hebrews, as well as their other laws, were framed under the direction of God himself. For example, the Hebrew, who had sold himself into slavery, went out free in the seventh year; yet, if he had married a slave, his wife and their children were to remain in slavery. And so far from pronouncing this an injustice or a sin, the law prescribed that the husband and father might continue with his wife and children by returning to bondage himself. Now the direction for such a father to express before the Judge his desire to continue in bondage, and the direction for him to be thereupon held as a slave forever, came from God himself, who never gave any such direction to those who desired to continue in adultery or idolatry, or in any other course of sin. This direction, therefore, shews that when God designed to erect a mighty and prosperous and religious people in Palestine, He did not view the institution of slavery as inconsistent with either their moral duty or their social happiness.

Mr. Memminger has some other striking remarks upon the laws and institutions of the Hebrews. He thinks the principle of a federative republic lay at the foundation of their polity. "Their system embraced a Federal and a State Government. Each tribe, for local purposes, was independent of every other, just as our States are; and what is remarkable, as a coincidence, they had thirteen of these States, just as we had when we commenced." This, however, strictly speaking, is not an accurate representation. The Lecturer develops, at some length, also, the idea that the Hebrew Government rested on *the family basis*, in common with all the most stable Governments; by which peculiarity he shews that the Southern States are particularly distinguished. But we pass from any consideration of these points to glance with him at Greece and Rome. Athens, which exerted a more powerful influence on mankind than the great Assyrian empire of old, or the Russian Empire now, had only twenty thousand citizens able to bear arms, but no less than four hundred thousand slaves! So Rome, with as many slaves as freemen in her own immediate bounds—Rome, a single city, and its adjoining territory, conquered the civilized world, and held under their dominion one hundred and twenty millions of men, reaching from Britain to the Indus!

From these three remarkable examples, the Lecturer does not argue that slavery will necessarily cause the advancement of any nation, but that it need be no hindrance to that advancement.

He passes on to the consideration of some modern examples. The first is our three millions of negroes themselves. The history of the world can produce no such instance of progress on the part of a barbarian race. Their social and intellectual condition is equal, if not superior, to many portions of Europe; and as to their religious condition, there are among us more slave Christians in full standing as communicants, than all the heathen converts at all the missionary stations in the world put together!

Mr. M. next contrasts with these in bondage, the free red man of this continent:

"In North America, or rather in the United States, where the Indians were never reduced to slavery, the race is nearly exter-

minated ; while among the Spaniards, where whole nations were reduced to slavery, and sometimes under circumstances of very great cruelty, the native Indians have been preserved to such an extent, that they have taken the country from the Spaniards, their conquerors. In the West Indies, another course was taken. The good Las Casas, with the mistaken philanthropy of the Wilberforces and Buxtons, of our day, introduced the hardier negro to save the Indian from the cruelties of slavery. The result is, that the free Indian is exterminated, while the slave negro is under every plaintain bush and hedge, thriving among his pumpkins. Thus, too, in the United States, the tender mercies of the free States have exterminated the Indian, are thinning off, and will soon expel the negro from amongst them, while at the South, the negro in his state of slavery thrives and extends and becomes a Christian man.

We repeat, that this lecture has no declamation, but is simply an array of facts. We think those just now cited, are very pregnant ones. It is a very interesting enquiry, whether slavery be not in truth just a schoolmaster to bring the savage to liberty. Was the wild man ever yet tamed on a large scale, except by first bringing him under the yoke of compulsory labor ? We have some suggestions to offer on this point, bearing on the question of African colonization, but shall reserve them for a future occasion.

The remainder of Mr. Memminger's able and forcible argument, is occupied with a striking contrast of slaveholding, but prosperous Cuba, with emancipated and suffering Jamaica, and with some comparisons of the North and the South, after the manner of Elwood Fisher.

We pause here, however, for want of space, and not because we feel that such comparisons are either unbecoming or hurtful. The North has no right to complain of them if just ; and moreover, this kind of comparison had a Northern beginning. The truth, however, is what both North and South should be supremely desirous to ascertain and establish ; and Mr. Memminger deserves the thanks of every reader, for his timely and important contribution to such a result. We could wish Mr. M. had devoted some consideration to a theme arising naturally out of his general subject, and which his great legal knowledge, and his

high social position could have enabled him to introduce with advantage. We refer to the admitted abuses of the institution of slavery. We think, notwithstanding the excitement which foreign interference with our domestic affairs has so naturally produced among us, that we owe it to ourselves, as well as to our slaves, and still more that we owe it to our God, to reform these abuses. That there is general desire to see such a reform effected, we have no doubt; but the reformation of old abuses, is always a difficult and often a very delicate operation. And here for the present we leave this interesting and important topic.

8. *Christ's Second Coming: Will it be Pre-Millennial?* By the REV. DAVID BROWN, A. M., *St. James' Free Church, Glasgow.* New York, Carter, 1851. pp. 499, 12mo.

The former edition of this work was one of the ablest treatises that has ever appeared against the doctrine of the pre-millennial advent of Christ. It called forth replies from the advocates of the opposite hypothesis, especially from Messrs. Wood, Scott, Bickersteth, A. Bonar, H. Bonar and the Duke of Manchester, all of whom are noticed in this second edition. The book has been wholly re-written, and about half of the present edition appears now for the first time. Part I. treats of the second advent; Part II, of the Millennium; Part III. considers the objections to the writer's views. We think an unprejudiced mind will give its adherence to the post-millennial advent of Christ as most accordant with the word of God, as it also is with our own ecclesiastical standards. Mr. Brown believes himself to have shown that the pre-millennial scheme is at variance with the word of God; that it proceeds upon crude and arbitrary principles of interpretation, while it shrinks from carrying out these to their legitimate results; that, as a system, it wants coherence, and is palpably defective, making no provision for some of the most important events which are to occur in the history of our race; and that its bearing on some of the most precious doctrines

of God's word are painful and perilous. The reader of this book will also possess himself of the arguments of those who advocate the other view, and will be able to form his own conclusions. We are persuaded that the pre-millennial theory rests on a misapprehension of the language of prophecy, although, in our own country, as well as on the other side of the Atlantic, it has some zealous and able advocates.

9. *The Life and Times of John Calvin, the Great Reformer. Translated from the German of Paul Henry, D. D., Minister and Seminary Inspector in Berlin. By HENRY STEBBING, D.D. F.R.S. In two volumes. Vol. 1. New York, Robert Carter & Brothers. 8vo.*

With the two first volumes of the original work in German, we have been acquainted for several years, and have frequently resorted to it when correct information as to the great Reformer of Geneva has been needed. It is the only really thorough biography of the immortal Calvin, exhibiting great research, independence of mind, and a true appreciation of his pure and lofty character and transcendent genius. Dr. Henry is pastor of the French Church at Berlin; a German by birth, but of French extraction; and was, early in life, led by his revered parent to venerate the memory of Calvin. He has spared no pains and labor in consulting original sources of information both in Switzerland and Germany. The five folio volumes of Calvin's correspondence, and the forty-four volumes of his sermons, 2023 in number, preserved at Geneva—the one hundred and fifty volumes of his writings, preserved at Zurich—and the large collection of his autograph epistles in Germany, edited by Brettschneider, in 1835, embracing many things never given to the world, furnished him a vast body of hitherto unexplored materials. From these sources and many others, he has been able to compile a vast number of facts, a large share of which had been lost sight of altogether. The first volume of the German work was published in 1835, and

the third and last in 1844. The reprint, by the Carters, of Dr. Stebbings's Translation, will embrace the whole in two volumes. After the miserable production of Dyer, issued by the Harpers during the last twelvemonth, it will be refreshing to our American public to turn to the pages of Henry, where they will find a history of Calvin and his times, worthy of the noble theme. We cannot too strongly recommend this book to all who wish to know who and what Calvin was, and to measure the vast extent and weight of his influence upon the Christian world.

10. *Truth & Error ; or Letters to a Friend, on some of the controversies of the day.* By the Rev. HORATIUS BONAR. New York : Carters. 1851. p. 282, 18mo.

A little work, which has gone through three large editions in Scotland—in answer to the common popular objections against the doctrines of grace. It meets a want often felt in this country as well as that, of some brief and popular presentation of the truth, accompanied with a confutation of the opposing errors. It is characterized by that earnestness, sincerity, and piety, which distinguish the writings of the excellent author.

11. *Lays of the Kirk and Covenant.* By Mrs. A. STUART MONTEATH. New York : Carters. 1851. pp. 245, 16mo.

Some of the most affecting scenes in the persecutions of the Kirk & Covenant are here related in verse. They need not the accompaniment of measure and rhyme to touch the heart. Those were days of superhuman faith and heroism on the one side, of diabolical cruelty on the other. The Cameronian Dream by James Hislop, at the close of the book, is worth the price of the volume.

12. *The Broken Bud ; or Reminiscences of a Bereaved Mother.*
New York: Carters. 1851. pp. 325, 16mo.

In this volume we see the fond heart of a bereaved mother ; Memory busy with the artless ways and budding promise of her departed child, and piety turning for consolation, to the hopes and promises of the gospel. It will be read with interest, by the many who are mourning with Rachel, over their children snatched away in the dawn of life, and refusing to be comforted because they are not.

13. *Letters to my Pupils ; with Biographical Sketches.* By
Mrs. L. H. Sigourney. New York: Carters. 1851. pp. 341.

Another little volume from the prolific press of the Carters, and from the well known pen of Mrs. Sigourney. It will be interesting especially to the young in the process of their education ; and, to the numerous class of teachers, it will furnish many instructive hints, coming as it does from one of the most gifted of our countrywomen, exhibiting her own feelings and views as an instructor, and some of the methods her warm heart and fertile genius suggested, to engage the affections, train the minds, and mould the characters of her early pupils. The second and third parts *My Schools* and *My Dead*, will be especially interesting to her surviving scholars.

14. *The Believer's Daily Remembrancer ; Green Pastures for the Lord's Flock.* By the REV. JAMES SMITH. *From the Thirty-eighth London Edition. Robert Carter & Brothers : New York. pp. 380.*

From the very title of this book, the christian reader expects to find something which will refresh his spirit, as he pursues his

pilgrimage through this world ; and he will not be disappointed. It is only necessary to read a few pages, and he will feel, that the object the author had in view, must be effected in a greater or less degree, viz: "To promote the *Power of Godliness*. To speak in the closet, in the kitchen, and even in the field, to the different classes of the Lord's family ; to convince, comfort, and correct ; to fan the flame of devotion, and to produce holiness of heart and life." The selection of texts is admirable. They are adapted to the various circumstances of life, and to all the different states of mind through which the believer is called to pass.

We recommend this volume to all who desire to grow in grace and in the knowledge of the *truth*.

15. *Addresses of Rev. S. L. Graham, D. D., and of Rev. F. S. Sampson, D. D. at their inauguration, July 11, 1850.*

16. *The Committing of our Cause to God : A Sermon by Rev. FERDINAND JACOBS. Charleston.*

17. *Fugitive Slave Law. A Sermon by ICHABOD S. SPENCER, D. D. Brooklyn, N. Y.*

18. *A Discourse preached in the Second Presbyterian Church, Newburyport. By Rev. W. W. EELLS.*

19. *The Citizen and the Commonwealth. A Sermon delivered in the First Congregational Church, Holliston, Massachusetts, on the day of the Annual State Fast, April 10, 1851. By J. T. TUCKER, Pastor.*

20. *A Plea for the Old against the New in Education. An Address delivered at the close of the Annual Examination of the Presbyterian High Schools at Greenwood, Abbeville Dist. By Rev. A. A. PORTER.*

21. *Religion in Schools vindicated. An Address by* Rev. JAMES HOYT, *delivered in the Presbyterian Collegiate Institute at Taladega, Alabama. March 28, 1851.*
22. *A Tribute of Filial Affection. A Sermon occasioned by the death of Mrs. Jane Kirkpatrick, preached in the First Reformed Dutch Church of New Brunswick, N. J. By* SAMUEL B. HOW, D. D.
23. *Retribution provided for in the Laws of Nature. A Discourse delivered in the Baptist Church at Selma, Ala., April 6, 1851. By* W. T. HAMILTON, *of Mobile.*

We thus put together a number of pamphlets on various subjects, which have accumulated on our hands, some of which should have been noticed before, and in reference to which we can now say but a few passing words. The addresses of Dr. Graham and Dr. Sampson, on the important and interesting occasion of their inauguration, are an appropriate exhibition of the duties and qualifications of the Church Historian, and the Interpreter of the Scriptures. Both have an important work to perform in this our day and this our country. Many of the most important questions of a polemic nature, now pressing upon the church, fall within the Department of Ecclesiastical History, and there never was more need of thorough and enthusiastic study here. The whole department of Biblical Literature and Interpretation, too, requires to be winnowed of its chaff, those principles and way-marks must be fixed which will guide the student aright, and those barriers erected which will stem the tide of error setting in from nations the most thoroughly learned, but the most unsound in religion, and the most wavering and changeable in philosophy. We would be happy to transfer to our own pages, did our limits allow, several passages which we had marked for this purpose, from the excellent address of Prof. Sampson.

Committing our cause to God, is an argument by a Southern Clergyman, in defence of Southern institutions, based on the Scriptures, which our Northern brethren are fond of representing

as being wholly opposed to the owner of slaves. And yet, if the truth were acknowledged, almost every name honored in the Scriptures, is the name of one implicated in some manner with the institution of domestic slavery.

The Fugitive Slave Law, by Dr. Spencer, is an able and independent discourse on the religious duty of obedience to Law, in opposition to the mad spirit of resistance to Government in reference to the reclamation of fugitive slaves. It should have received an earlier notice by us, but was overlooked; the sermon has been widely circulated and with good effect.

By the following extract from the sermon of Mr. Eells, it will be seen that there is one pulpit at least in the North, in which the truth has been spoken:

"Say not, there is no danger. There is danger; and I am compelled to say that the root of this danger is at the North. It is found in that spirit of jealousy and hatred towards our brethren, here cherished, which finds its food and expression in the columns of our papers, the harangues of demagogues, in pamphlets and in sermons—yea, which sends up the opprobrious epithet from the pulpit to the Mighty God, in prayer. It is found in the constant insult and irritation heaped upon them, from this quarter, in a thousand ways, both public and private. And most of all is it found in that turbulent spirit, which over-rides all the provisions of the Constitution, and bids defiance to laws framed to carry out those provisions, and sets itself against God and man, that so it may indulge its malicious fury. These things were with us before the hateful cry of disunion was heard elsewhere. And, when we are thus driving our brethren away from us, by that aggression which makes wise men mad, it will not do to say that we meant no evil,—knew not the danger of our course. It will not do to reason that men will patiently bear all wrongs and outrage, because, by fleeing from these, they may fall into greater evils. In all these things, we are striking at the foundation of the Union. No force can hold these States together, when the spirit of brotherly love and confidence have given place to suspicion and jealousy and hatred."

Mr. Tucker's sermon is a well written discourse, maintaining the duty of obedience to law, and against mob violence. It could hardly be expected that one who has no personal acquaintance with the real condition of the slave, and no practical knowledge of the working of our system, should speak with much decision respecting it. If it be as our Northern brethren have been made to believe, a cover

for enormous and unmitigable wrongs, when palliating the system, they must speak daintily about it. A fugitive from service is, in the very act, a violater of law—is guilty of a fraud and a theft, and, in a vast number of instances, is in other respects, and has long been, a bad and vicious member of society. We greatly wonder that any one should see in Deut. xxiii. 15, the least ground for the non-rendition of the fugitive slave. Slavery existed through the entire period of Jewish history. But the interpretation put upon this passage by the abolitionists, if it had prevailed in Palestine, would have brought it to an end in a twelvemonth. If Judy must run away from her mistress every time she was reprov'd for neglecting her duty in the house, and Keturah every time she was chid for spoiling the breakfast, and Zimri when he was punished for theft, burglary or adultery, and then be protected by the master's next neighbor, or be detained, or spirited away by an underground railroad, as soon as she or he had passed from the territory of Judah into that of Benjamin, truly it would required a constant miracle to continue in existence the institution of slavery. It is not only the duty of the good citizen of the North not to resist the execution of the law, but also to aid in its enforcement, and to see to it that the fugitives are one and all restored to their masters. If they choose to be covenant breakers, the responsibility must be on their own heads. If the conditions of this great confederation are not fulfilled by them, it is they, not we, who have annulled the compact.

The Old against the New in Education.—The speaker's utterances are free and bold on the subject. He rightly believes that all motion is not progress, and chastises, with merited severity, many of the follies and mischiefs perpetrated in the matter of education.

Religion in Schools vindicated. It is a pity that religion in schools should require any vindication. We suppose the importance of it is acknowledged by all who believe in the depravity of human nature. If any doubts, let him read this discourse. On some of the topics glanced at in the address, as the pages of this review have shown, there is a difference of opinion. In the de-

sirableness and necessity of religion in schools, all, as far as we know, concur.

A Tribute of Filial Affection, is an appropriate memorial of a "Mother in Israel," daughter of Col. John Bayard, of that persecuted Huguenot stock, which the revocation of the edict of Nantz dispersed over the various protestant countries that offered them refuge. To that madness of papal France, we are indebted for some of our oldest and most influential families, and some of the most valuable members of our church. Mrs. Kirkpatrick seems to have left behind her the memory of her unfeigned piety and active charity.

Retribution provided for by the Laws of Nature, is a striking and eloquent discourse, sustaining more perfectly the author's reputation as an eloquent preacher, than any thing we have ever read from his pen. His illustrations are in many respects novel and out of the ordinary course of remark on this topic. They exhibit the traces of the author's late researches in those departments of science and archaeology, which the late skeptical attacks on the Scriptures have compelled him to make.

ERRATA.

No. 4, vol. iv. p. 563, line 16 from top, for "beggars" read "beggar ;" on p. 575 line 24 from top, for "were come down upon," read "were *borne* down upon ;" line 26 for "hapless," read "hopeless ; on p. 578, line 21 from top, for "and," read "or."

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER II.

OCTOBER, 1851.

ARTICLE I.

VALIDITY OF POPISH BAPTISM.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 52.]

2. The most conclusive proof that Romish baptism is essentially different from the ordinance of Christ, remains yet to be considered. It might, for the sake of argument, be conceded to the Reviewer, that both consist of the same matter, and are administered in the same manner; that both are regarded as instituted symbols, and nothing more, which, at once, represent and confirm our interest, in that which is represented; still their *identity* could not be asserted unless they were signs of the same truths, and seals of the same promises. It is just as essential to the form of a sacrament that it have a relation to the *right things*, as that it have the right kind of relationship itself. While it must be a sign and seal, it is equally indispensable that it be a sign and seal of the *covenant of grace*. Its specific purpose, according to the Westminster Confession, is "to represent Christ and His benefits, to confirm our interest in Him, and to put a visible difference between those that belong unto the Church and the rest of the world, and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ, according to His word." Hence all Protestants, however they have differed in other points, have regarded the sacraments as badges of Christian profession. Proclaiming as they do to the eye, the great distinguishing features of re-

demption, they cannot be consistently received, nor decently administered, when the scheme of salvation, in its essential elements, is denied or repudiated; and as their purpose is to confirm our interest in Christ, they evidently involve such a profession of christianity, as is consistent with a reasonable hope of personal acceptance through His blood. To assert, consequently, of Romish baptism, integrity of form, is to assert that he who receives it, if arrived at years, or his sponsors who present him, if an infant of days, make a credible profession of vital union with Him who is the substance of the eternal covenant, and in whom all its promises are yea and amen. Baptism administered to those who do not profess to believe the Gospel, is evidently null and void; it is an empty ceremony, a sign and seal of nothing. The question, therefore, at issue between the Assembly and the Reviewer, is whether a man, by submitting to the Romish ordinance, becomes a "professing Christian;" or, in other words, whether, consistently with the faith that the Church requires, and the obligations she imposes upon him, in imparting to him this first sacrament, he *can* cherish a scriptural hope of "his engrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life." These are the benefits which baptism signifies and seals; and if the profession, which is actually made or necessarily implied, is incompatible with the reception of these blessings, it is not a *profession* but a *denial* of the Gospel; and such baptism does not *seal* but *gives the lie* to the covenant of grace. It is important to bear in mind that the *profession* which the validity of the ordinance requires, is not that of a general belief in Christianity, without specific reference to what is, *par excellence*, called the Gospel, but one which is consistent with a saving interest in Christ. The two things are evidently distinct, though the Reviewer has more than once confounded them. There is a loose and general sense in which the term Christian is applied to all who trace their religion, whatever may be its doctrines or precepts, to the authority of Christ. It is an epithet which distinguishes them from the Jews, Pagans and Mohammedans, and all who do not believe in Jesus as a teacher sent from God.—In this application it does not indicate any particular type

of doctrine, whether Calvinism, Arianism, Pelagianism or Socinianism; it expresses simply the fact that whatever be the system, it is professedly received upon the authority of Christ.

In this sense, no one denies that Papists are Christians; no one has ever dreamed of ranking them in the same category, as the Reviewer asserts,* with Mohammedans and Pagans—with Jews, infidels and Turks. They are Christians upon the same principle which extends the epithet to Pelagians, Arians, Universalists and Socinians. But there is another and a stricter sense in which the term denotes a peculiar relation to Christ, and is confined exclusively to those who believe, or profess to believe, the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, or what is distinctively styled the way of salvation. To be entitled to this application of it, something more is required than a general belief in Jesus of Nazareth, as the author of a new dispensation of religion. The religion itself which He taught—not any system which men may choose to ascribe to Him, and recommend to the world under the sanction of His name—but that which He proclaimed in His own person, or committed to the inspired founders of His Church, which is emphatically the way of life, and the only basis of human hope, must, in its leading principles, be cordially embraced. They only can be Christians, in this strict and proper sense, who profess to receive, under the name of Christianity, nothing that subverts the economy of grace.

It may be cheerfully conceded, the Assembly has not denied, and the whole Protestant world has asserted, that, in the first sense, the Church of Rome is Christian—Christian, as the schoolmen would say, *secundum quid*, accidentally and not essentially—Christian, as professing to trace her scheme of doctrine, whatever it may be, to the instructions of Christ. She may be Christian in this sense, and yet all her children go down to hell. She may have the *name* without the *Gospel* of Christ. As the sacraments, however, contemplate the covenant of grace as a scheme of salvation—as it is not the *name* but the *religion* of Jesus which they signify and seal—if Rome, in dispensing her baptism, demands a faith and

* Princeton Review, July No. p. 465.

imposes obligations, which are inconsistent with a saving relation to Christ, however she may make professing Christians in one sense, she makes none in the only sense in which the title is important. If she does not baptise into Christianity, in its peculiar and distinguishing features, as the scheme of redemption, and the foundation of human hope, she might as well, so far as any valuable result is concerned, baptise into the name of Confucius or Mahomet.

If she is not Christian in the second sense which I have indicated—if her Gospel is not the Gospel of Christ—her religion not the religion of the Son of God, her baptism cannot be that which He instituted. Though Christian in name, she is anti-Christian in reality. The real question, consequently is, whether or not, in what she denominates baptism, Rome requires a profession and imposes obligations which are inconsistent with a saving interest in Christ, or the application of those very benefits which the Christian sacrament was appointed to represent and seal. Can a man believe what she commands him to believe, and engage to do what she obliges him to do, and be, at the same time, a spiritual disciple of Jesus Christ? This is the issue. Princeton says that he can—the Assembly and all the Protestant world have declared that he *cannot*. To determine the matter, the profession and engagements must be previously apprehended, which a man makes when he is baptized in the Church of Rome. The statements of the Reviewer upon this point are wide of the truth. By a most extraordinary paradox, as it seems to me, the merits of which will be afterwards discussed, he has been led to maintain that the recipients of Romish baptism are not made Romanists, and that the heresies of popery are not exacted in the ordinance.* But what says Rome herself? She certainly is a better witness of what she actually imposes on her children than those that are without. “Whosoever shall affirm,” says the Council of Trent,† “that the baptized are free from all the precepts of

* “It was hence argued that the recipients of Romish baptism are made Romanists, and are baptized into a profession of all the heresies of Popery. This appears to us an entirely wrong view of the subject.*** No man, therefore, is made a Papist by being baptized by a papist.” Princeton Review, p. 468, 9.

† Si quis dixerit, baptizatos liberos esse ab omnibus sanctæ ecclesiæ præ-

holy Church, either written or delivered by tradition, so that they are not obliged to observe them, unless they will submit to them of their own accord, let him be accursed." This is sufficiently explicit, and so strong is the obligation which baptism imposes to observe these precepts which make up what Rome calls a "Christian life," that those who when arrived at years, may be disposed to relinquish the vicarious promises of their sponsors, can yet be *compelled* to redeem them.* It is true that the Apostles' Creed is the summary which is actually professed at the time of baptism, but then, this contains only the heads of doctrine, the details of which must be embraced according to the system of Rome. "The true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved," and into which consequently all must be baptized, is the symbol of Pius IV. This creed, all proselytes to the Romish Church are required publicly to adopt; and hence, it must be the creed which all her children are presumed to embrace. They are at liberty to put no other interpretation upon the sacred Scriptures, much less upon minor symbols of faith, than that which the Church has authorized. Baptism is regarded as a sort of oath, to observe her statutes and ordinances, and whatever articles she proposes at the time must be taken in her own sense. The *animus imponentis* determines what the catechumen must believe, or be understood to profess, when he gives his assent to those sections of the creed which treat of the holy Catholic Church, the forgiveness of sins, the communion of saints, and the state of the dead. As she makes a public declaration beforehand, that all whom she baptizes are subject to her authority in faith and practice, as this is the known condition on which the ordinance is dispensed, it is undeniable, that those who receive it at her hands *do* virtually profess "her whole complicated system of truth and error," and become,

ceptis, quæ vel scripta tradita sunt, ita ut ea observare non teneantur, nisi se, sua sponte, illis submittere voluerint; anathema sit. Conc. Trident, Sess. 7. can. 8. De Baptis.

* Si quis dixerit, hujusmodi parvulos baptizatos, cum adoleverint, interrogandos esse, an ratum habere velint, quod patrini eorum nomine, dum baptizarentur, polliciti sunt; et ubi se nolle responderint suo esse arbitrio relinquendos, nec alia interim poena ad christianam vitam cogendos, nisi ut ab Eucharistiæ aliorumque Sacramentorum perceptione arceantur, donec resipiscant; anathema sit. Ibid. Can. 14.

ipso facto, Romanists or papists. Her notorious claim to exact obedience afterwards, *upon the ground of baptism*, would be grossly preposterous upon any other hypothesis. Bellarmine accordingly enumerates it among the advantages of the ceremonies which Rome has appended to her ordinances, that those who are baptized with them, are distinguished, not merely from Jews, Infidels and Turks, but also from heretics or Protestants; that is, they *profess*, by the reception of the rite with its papal accompaniments, not simply *Christianity* as contra-distinguished from *Paganism*, but *Popery* as contra-distinguished from *Protestantism*.*

The Reformers too, seem to have understood the matter in the same light. Regarding baptism as a species of communion with the Church, which implies the sanction of its doctrines and a promise of subjection to its precepts, they deemed it to be inconsistent with attachment to the true religion, to submit to the institute of Rome. It was not merely that she had corrupted by additions, and obscured by her mummeries the simple appointment of Christ,—this, though one, was not the principal ground of objection. But according to the Confession and Discipline of the Reformed Church of France,† those who received baptism at her hands, polluted their consciences by consenting to idolatry; they virtually endorsed the Synagogue of Satan and treated it as the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. There is a very striking passage in the “Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith,” drawn up by John Clement on the first day of April, 1556. This Clement was a remarkable witness for the truth in the reign of Queen Mary, and like many others, was doomed to the stake for his opinions, from the horrors of which he was mercifully saved by a natural death in prison. His Con-

* *Sexta est distinctio Catholicorum ab hæreticis. Nam Sacramenta sunt quidem symbola quædam, quibus discernimur ad infidelibus, tamen ab hæreticis vix per Sacramenta distingui possumus, sed per cæremonias optime distinguimur. Bellarm. de Sac. Lib. 2. cap. 31.*

† In the mean while because of those corruptions which are mingled with the administration of that sacrament, no man can present his children to be baptized in that Church without polluting his conscience. Confession of French Ref. Ch., art. 28. Quick's Synodicon, p. 12.

Such as by their proxies present children to be baptized in the Church of Rome, shall be severely censured, because they consent thereby unto idolatry. Ibid. p. 46. Discipline Fr. Ref. Ch.

fession, it would seem from the testimony of Strype, was transcribed and circulated as a faithful manual of the Reformed doctrines in England. The passage to which I have referred occurs in the seventeenth article. "Howbeit," says he, "this I do confess and believe, no Christian man ought to bring or send his children to the papistical church, or to require (request) baptism of them, they being anti-Christ; for in so doing, he doth confess them to be the true Church of Christ, which is a grievous sin in the sight of God, and a great offence to his true congregation."* Notwithstanding this extraordinary protestation, Clement acknowledged the validity of such baptisms; his objection was, not that the *child* would fail of receiving a true baptism, but that the *parent* professed by implication a false faith. He knew nothing of the Princeton theory, the Reformed Church of France had never heard of it, that baptism was simply an introduction to the Church in general, and involved a profession of the creed of no church in particular. If this hypothesis be correct, which I had previously been accustomed to consider as only a katabaptist riddle, it is hard to perceive in what the wickedness consists of receiving baptism from Rome. If her priests are true ministers of Jesus, as Princeton affirms, and impart a valid baptism, as she also asserts, if those who submit to it hold no communion with her errors, if they are made professing Christians and not papists, introduced into Christ's body and not into the papal congregation, where is the sin? What have they done that deserves the censures of the Church? surely there can be no crime in being made professing Christians, if nothing more nor worse is done. And what more! Is it that they have acquiesced in the superstitious ceremonies which precede, accompany and follow the administration of the ordinance? Was it for *ceremonies only* that the Churches of France and Scotland, and the noble army of Reformers denounced participation in the Romish rites as polluting and idolatrous, and excluded those from their own communion, who had presented their children in papistical assemblies? The Lutheran Church retained many ceremonies. Was it a sin to be baptized in it? The English Church in her palmy days was defiled with many frag-

* Richmond's British Reformers, vol. 4, p. 292.

ments of Popery. Was the participation of her baptism idolatrous? Why then if *ceremonies* are so fatal in Rome, were they not equally fatal in Germany and Britain? The truth is, *ceremonies* were the smallest item in the account. It was the *faith* of Rome which the Reformers abhorred, and because they regarded all who sought baptism at her hands as professing *that faith*, they subjected them to discipline as transgressors and *idolaters*. They believed, as all the world but Princeton believes, that he who requests baptism from Rome, declares by the act that he is a Romanist. He goes to the Pope because he loves the Pope.

But whatever Reformers thought, and whatever Princeton may think, it is plain, from the testimonies already adduced, that Rome herself looks upon all to whom she administers the ordinance as *bound to be papists*. The profession which is made is the profession of *her own creed*, the obligation assumed, an obligation to obey all *her statutes and ordinances*. Now the creed of Pius IV. which is the only distinctive creed of Rome, binds the subscriber, and every human being that hopes to be saved, to receive the canons and decrees of Trent, to render true obedience to the Pope, and to submit, by consequence, to every bull which may be issued from the Pontifical throne. The very circumstance that this creed is pronounced to be indispensable to salvation, shows conclusively, that those *must* profess it to whom in baptism is imparted the remission of sins. Now the question recurs, is *such* a profession consistent with a saving interest in Christ? *Can* a man believe the Gospel, and, at the same time, believe the doctrines of Trent, and the still more detestable doctrines of the memorable Constitution Unigenitus? Can a man "enter into an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's," and at the same time, engage to observe all the precepts, whether written or traditive, enjoined by the papal Church?

This is substantially the issue which the Reviewer himself accepts in discussing the question, whether or not the Church of Rome is a true Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. "If a man," says he, "makes no profession of faith, we cannot regard him as a believer; nor can we so regard him, if he makes any profession inconsistent with the ex-

istence of saving faith. And, consequently, if a body of men make no profession of faith, they cannot be a Church ; nor can they be so regarded, if they make a profession which is incompatible with saving faith in Christ.** If, therefore, we deny to any man the character of a Christian, on account of the profession which he makes, we must be prepared to show, that such faith is incompatible with salvation.** And in like manner, if we deny to any body of men the character of a Church, on account of its creed, we thereby assert that no man holding that creed can be saved.** Hence the doctrine of the Reviewer is, that a cordial profession of the Romish creed—for what signifies profession, without the corresponding motion of the heart—Rome being a true Church of the Lord Jesus Christ—is not incompatible with saving faith—a man may, in other words, be a sincere papist, and still be a spiritual child of God. If this proposition can be sustained, no argument can be drawn from her views of the Covenant to invalidate the baptism of Rome ; if not, the decision of the Assembly is according to truth and righteousness.

It is amusing to see the Reviewer, after having himself given so clear a statement of the issue in dispute, proceeding in the very next breath, to discuss a different question, or if it be the same, so disguised, as to suggest a different one to the mind of the reader. There are evidently two general causes which may invalidate a profession of saving faith, *ignorance* and *error*. The grounds of suspicion in the one case, are *defective* views of the economy of grace ; in the other, those that are incompatible with its principles. In the one case, we apprehend that enough of truth is not received and understood to save the soul ; in the other, that wrong notions and contradictory opinions destroy its efficacy. In the one case, the resolution of our doubts depends upon the minimum of truth essential to salvation ; in the other, upon the maximum of error inconsistent with it. The question then is, not as the Reviewer insinuates, whether Rome teaches truth enough to save the soul, but whether she teaches error enough to damn the soul ; it is not a question of *ignorance* but *heresy*, not whether her system *falls short* of the Gospel standard by *defect*, but whether it is *inconsistent* with it by *error* ; not whether

* Princeton Review, July No., 1845, p. 461.

she *fails* to profess something that *ought* to be professed in order to salvation, but whether she professes something that *cannot be professed in consistency with* salvation. These questions are obviously distinct, and yet the Reviewer has strangely blended and confounded them, confining his discussion to the first and deducing his conclusion in reference to the second. His whole argument is a glaring instance of *ignoratio elenchi*.

There are two forms of heresy incompatible with salvation. In the one, the foundation is directly denied,—in the other, necessarily subverted,—in the one, the contradictory of the Gospel is openly professed—in the other it is secretly insinuated,—the one destroys by the boldness of its attacks,—the other by the subtlety of its frauds. The Socinians may be taken as examples of the one,—the Pelagians as illustrations of the other. This last form of heresy is the most dangerous, because least suspected. It steals upon the soul in insidious disguises, recommends its errors by the truth it adopts, labels its poisons as healthful medicines, and administers its deadly draughts under the promise of life. To this class of heresy, it was contended in the Assembly, that the doctrines of the Church of Rome must be referred. Whatsoever of the Gospel she retains, is employed simply as a mask to introduce her errors without suspicion. She is a fatal graft upon the living stock of Christianity, and though the root be sound, yet she, as a branch, brings forth nothing but the fruit of death. Her creed contains some truth,—this cannot be disputed; it contains enormous error,—this is equally unquestionable. The truth is not her creed; the error is not her creed, but the two combined; and to ascertain whether her *creed* is incompatible with salvation, we must take it as a *whole*, and compare the system, which, *as a whole*, it presents, with the essential principles of the Gospel. If it is inconsistent with them, or subversive of them, it cannot be regarded as a *saving creed*. The connexion and dependence of the truth and error in a complicated system, will determine the sense in which each is apprehended, and often give a result entirely different from that which would be reached by the isolated and sole contemplation of either. It is possible to assent to propositions which, in themselves considered, contain vital and saving

truth, but yet, *as modified* by others, they may be far from having a salutary tendency. Men, for example, may profess to believe that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of the world—in making this profession they assent *in words* to a fundamental doctrine of the Gospel, and yet they may so limit and restrain it, by other propositions, as to make Christ, after all, the tool of human merit, and grace the foundation of a claim of law. The formularies of Rome may contain all the important principles of Christianity which the Reviewer thinks he has found there, and yet, after all, they may be so modified, by the introduction of different principles, as to give a result utterly incompatible with the salvation of the soul. As *she* teaches them, and as she requires her children to *believe* them, they may be essentially another Gospel. It is not enough that she mingles the elements of Christianity in her creed, she must mingle them with nothing that shall convert them into a savor of death unto death. The most discordant properties, not unfrequently, are produced by different modes of combination, when the same materials are employed.—Sugar and Alcohol contain the same chemical ingredients, but how different their qualities and effects! And so the articles which make up the creed of a child of God, may enter into the profession of a papist, and yet the system, embraced by the one, be as widely different from the system of the other, as alcohol from sugar. The question in dispute is, whether the *creed* of Rome is a saving creed; and as neither her truth nor her errors, separately taken, constitute her creed, it is as incongruous to argue from either *alone* as to infer the nature of a compound from the properties of one of its ingredients. And yet this is the fallacy which the Reviewer has perpetrated. He has seized upon the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, which he asserts that Rome holds, and *because* she holds these, he infers that her creed *must* be saving, without stopping to enquire whether they are not so linked and connected with fundamental errors, so checked, modified and limited as to convey a meaning widely remote from the teachings of the Bible.

It is nothing to the purpose to say that the doctrines of the Trinity, incarnation and atonement, are saving doctrines; no one denies it when they are scripturally under-

stood and cordially embraced; and if Rome believed nothing more or nothing inconsistent with orthodox conceptions of them, the dispute would be ended. But as these constitute only a fragment of her creed, it was incumbent upon Princeton to show that her additional articles were not incompatible with the saving application of these others.

In most instances of the mixture of error with important truth, they are brought simply in juxtaposition without any attempt to define the system which results from their combination. In such cases it is hard to determine the character of the whole, and to pronounce with confidence upon its saving or pernicious tendencies. Minds are so differently constituted that the form of words, which shall be the means of conducting one to salvation, shall prove fatal to another. The *real creed*, as it is impressed upon the heart, may be very different from what the examination of its elements might lead us beforehand to determine. But in the case of Rome, no such difficulty exists. She has stated her truths, she has announced her errors, she has gone farther and detailed the system of salvation which she deduces from the whole. Her Gospel is full and minute in the directions which it gives to the sinner who inquires, with the jailor, what he must do to be saved.

If these directions are inconsistent with the instructions of the Apostles, if their obvious tendency is to subvert and set aside the way of salvation as revealed in the Scriptures, the dispute is ended. Rome repudiates the covenant of grace of which baptism is a seal, and consequently destroys the form of the Christian sacrament.—Now the Reviewer has no where attempted to show that the creed of Rome, which is the creed of Pius IV.,* including the decrees of Trent, (in conformity with which it is expressly provided that all previous symbols must be interpreted,) and the subsequent bulls of the Vatican—contains nothing incompatible with the cordial reception of the scriptural method of salvation. This, the *real point* in dispute, he has wisely left untouched, and has wasted all his strength upon another, that Rome proclaims certain

* See an able article on the creed of Rome, in *Papism in xix. Cent.* p. 214.

propositions from which, separately taken, the essence of the Gospel may be drawn.*

His second argument, founded on the concession that there are true believers in the papacy, is not less fallacious than the first.† It proceeds upon the assumption that they were made Christians by the creed they ostensibly profess in the sense which the Church teaches and requires her children to adopt; that is, it begs the very question in dispute. If these true believers reject, in their hearts, the complicated system of the Pope, and were instrumentally converted by a different Gospel from that of Trent, the truth of their piety is no proof that the Romish creed is saving. Now it is certainly possible to be *in* Rome and not to be *of* Rome—to be in nominal connection with the Church, without believing its creed; and that this is the precise condition of true believers in the papacy, is indicated by the intense anxiety, which, in proportion to their light, they generally feel to escape from her borders. But then they are converted by no other *means* of instruction than those afforded by Rome. The *means* she affords, and the *use* to which the Spirit of God may turn them, are quite distinct. That the Holy Ghost should bring light out of darkness, and truth out of error, is proof of His own power and grace, but none that darkness is light, and error is truth. The Godly in Babylon, are saved by the mercy of our Heavenly Father, in having their attentions diverted from her monstrous corruptions, and fixed upon those propositions, which, scattered up and down in her formularies, may be made to suggest ideas, not by any means contemplated in the *real creed* of the Church. It

† “If these principles are correct, we have only to apply them to the case in hand, and ask, does the Church of Rome retain truth enough to save the soul? We do not understand how it is possible for any Christian man to answer this question in the negative. They retain the doctrine of Incarnation, which we know, from the infallible word of God, is a life-giving doctrine. They retain the whole doctrine of the Trinity. They teach the doctrine of atonement, far more fully and accurately than multitudes of professedly orthodox protestants. They hold a much higher doctrine as to the necessity of divine influence, than prevails among many whom we recognise as Christians.” Princeton Rev. July, 1845, p. 463.

‡ “It is further evident that the Church of Rome retains truth enough to save the soul, from the fact that true believers, who have no other means of instruction than those therein afforded, are to be found in that communion. Wherever the fruits of the Spirit are, there is the Spirit; and wherever the Spirit is, there is still the Church.” Ibid. p. 465.

is the force of that truth which Rome ostensibly retains, applied by the Spirit, in a sense which Rome expressly repudiates, which delivers these men from the power of Satan, and introduces them into the Kingdom of God.—They are saved *in spite* of her creed.

But, says the Reviewer, these men evince the fruits of the Spirit, and “wherever the Spirit is, there is still the Church.” I cheerfully concede that wherever a true Church is, there is the Spirit, but I am not prepared to convert the proposition without a limitation. If the Spirit is only in the Church, how are men to be converted from the world? The Bible requires them to be believers before they can belong to the Church—they cannot be believers without the Spirit, and, according to Princeton, they cannot have the Spirit unless they are *in* the Church. So that those who are without, are in a truly pitiable dilemma. They cannot have the Spirit because they are not in the Church—they cannot belong to the Church because they have not the Spirit. What, then, is to become of them? It is our unspeakable comfort that the Bible knows nothing of the Princeton doctrine upon this point. The Holy Ghost is a Sovereign, working when, where and how He chooses. In the lowest depths of paganism, in the dungeons of crime, amid Hindoo temples and Indian pagodas, in the darkest chambers of imagery, as well as the congregation of Christian people, He may be traced accomplishing the end of election, and preparing the vessels of mercy destined from eternity to glory. He works as well *out* of the Church as *in* the Church. He knows no limits but His sovereignty, no rule but the counsel of his will. Wherever He is, there are life and grace, because there is union with the Son of God,—there, too, is a membership in the *invisible* Church; but it is an act of the believer, *subsequent* to his conversion, and *founded* upon it, to seek a corresponding membership in that *visible* congregation to which the ordinances are given. True faith will engender the desire to be connected with the true Church, and hence converted papists are, for the most part, eager to renounce the Mother of harlots, as those called from the world are anxious to renounce *it*.

I have now examined the arguments by which the Reviewer would prove that the Romish creed is not incon-

sistent with a saving interest in Christ, and the reader, I trust, is prepared to render the verdict, *they are found wanting*. For aught that appears, this creed may belong to that species of heresy which, without directly denying, subverts the foundation by subtlety and fraud. It may take away our Lord, not by gross and open violence, but by stratagem and craft; it may, like Judas, betray the Son of Man with a kiss. This was the opinion of the General Assembly. It was on the ground of *heresy, fatal, damnable heresy*, that Rome was declared to be apostate, and her ordinances pronounced to be invalid.

It was indeed asserted, and asserted in full consistency with this explanation of the issue, that she *did not retain truth enough to save the soul*. The meaning was, that the *system* resulting from the combination of her truths and errors, the *real* creed which was the product of these jarring and discordant elements, as developed by herself in the accounts of the plan of salvation, left so little scope for the operation of any of the distinctive doctrines of the Gospel, according to their native tendencies, that the impression made upon the heart was not that of the truth, but of a lie. In the compound whole there was too little truth practically efficacious, or capable of being practically efficacious, to resist the working of the deadly errors.—The poison was too strong for the healthful medicine. The Romish creed is a mixture of incongruous materials,—among these materials some truth is found, but in the tendencies of the mixture, the characteristics of the truth are so lost and blended, that it fails to preserve its distinctive properties, or to produce its distinctive effects. It was only in this aspect of the case, that she was regarded as retaining too little truth to save the soul, and that in this sense the imputation is just, I shall endeavor by God's grace to prove.

The substance of the Gospel is compendiously embraced by John,* under the three-fold record of the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood—in which phraseology of his Epistle, there is obviously a reference to the circumstance, very particular mentioned in his Gospel, of the miraculous effusion from the Saviour's side, when pierced by the spear of the soldier. The Water and the Blood I take to

* 1 John v: 8, compare his Gospel xix: 34.

be emblematical expressions of the two great divisions of the work, which the Redeemer came to accomplish.—They define the nature, and specify the elements of that salvation which He dispenses to His children. A change of state, and a change of character—justification and sanctification—both equally indispensable, are the immediate benefits of the covenant of grace. The change of state is fitly represented by the Blood—an emblem of that death which consummated obedience to a broken law, satisfied its awful curse, brought in an everlasting righteousness, and reconciled the pardon and acceptance of sinners with the Justice of God—the change of character is, with equal fitness, represented by the Water—the scriptural symbol of purity and holiness—the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. When, therefore, it is said that the Redeemer came by Water and by Blood—not by Water only, but by Water and by Blood, the meaning is, that He came to justify and sanctify—not simply to restore to men the lost image of God, by the infusion of Grace, but as the foundation of every other blessing, to restore them to the lost favor of God, by the merit of His death. The Apostle guards us against the defective view of His work which overlooks the Blood—which confounds pardon and holiness—righteousness infused and righteousness imputed. As He came by *both*, the integrity of the Gospel requires *both*—and as they flowed simultaneously, and in consequence of the same act, from His side, so they are indissolubly joined together in the experience of the faithful, and are imparted without confusion, and yet without division, to all who are called by God's grace. The Spirit, on the other hand, indicates the process by which these benefits—the Water and the Blood—justification and sanctification—are applied to men. It is a compendious phrase, as I understand it,—for the whole of experimental religion. The Apostle represents the Spirit as bearing witness to the fact that Jesus came by Water and by Blood, which, I suppose, is done in that inward work of Grace, which convinces sinners of their guilt and misery, enlightens their minds in the knowledge of Christ—unites them to Him by a living faith, and seals upon their hearts a full persuasion that they are born of God. When the Spirit, the Water and the Blood

are all found in their Scriptural meaning, and their Scriptural proportions, in any Creed, that Creed is a saving one—and error in regard to any one of them singly, or their mutual relations to each other, is always dangerous, and may be fatal. He that gives us the Blood without the *Water*, is an Antinomian—he that retains the *Water* without the Blood, is a *Legalist*. And he who, either admitting or rejecting the *Water* and Blood, discards the Spirit, is a Pelagian. Our Saviour has settled the question, that Antinomians,* as such, cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Paul has taught us that Pharisees and Legalists are fallen from Grace†—and Pelagians, from the very nature of the case, exclude themselves from Christ. These heresies are deadly—in irreconcilable opposition to the characteristic principles of the Gospel—and any Creed, which derives its shape and form from them, or is a consistent developement of any of them, must be regarded as fatal. No man can be saved by such a Creed. It is true that men, professing to believe it, may be saved—for they may really embrace principles in their hearts, widely removed from the verbal declaration of the lips. But Antinomianism, Legalism, Pelagianism, never *did*, never *can*, save any one; and he who in *fact*, as well as in *form*, rests upon either of these systems, is building, if there be truth in the Bible, his house upon the sand.

In attempting to determine the question, whether a Creed is a saving one, our attention must be directed to two points: What are the benefits which it proposes to communicate—and how are these benefits dispensed? A Creed may be obviously sound as to *what* constitutes salvation, and yet grossly at fault as to *how* it is to be obtained. Justification and Sanctification may be properly exhibited in their Scriptural meaning, as the great blessings of the Gospel—and yet union with Christ—through whom alone we partake of them, may be made to turn upon a principle, which Christianity does not recognize, and which must infallibly defeat the hopes of all who rely on it.—Who would pronounce that a saving Creed which, while it commended Christ as the ultimate Saviour of the lost, taught that union with Him was effected by carnal ablu-

* Matt. v: 19.

† Gal. v: 2, 3, 4.

tions, periodic fasts, by alms and penances; which promised eternal life to every Ascetic who should starve on Fridays, flog himself on Mondays, and give tithes of all he possessed—which insisted that the mere *doing* of such things was all that God required to make men partakers of Christ, and was infallibly connected with all the benefits of the new and everlasting covenant? Who would dare to say that such a Creed was a saving one? It sets forth indeed a *true Saviour*, but it preaches a *false Gospel*—it embraces many precious and glorious truths *about* Christ, but it can never avail to introduce the sinner *into fellowship with* Christ. Should it be conceded, for the sake of argument, that Rome confesses in her symbols the true nature of justification and sanctification—that she insists alike upon the reality of the atonement, and the necessity of holiness, yet her Creed would not be proved to be a saving one, unless it were likewise shown, that she inculcates the Scriptural method of union with the Son. The Water and the Blood can never reach us, except through the Spirit. It avails little to be taught *what* salvation is—if we are not further instructed *how* salvation may be had. In regard to both points, however, Rome is fundamentally in error. She denies alike the Blood and the Spirit; and even the Water, which she professes to retain, is so miserably defiled, that it can hardly be received as a stream from Siloah's brook.

I. She denies the Blood. The Apostle, it would almost seem, had a prospective reference to her heresy, when he added so emphatically, that Jesus came not by *Water only*, but by *Water and by Blood*. The great cardinal doctrine of Christianity—so clearly revealed, so earnestly inculcated, and so variously illustrated—that of justification by grace, is robbed in her Creed of all that is distinctively evangelical and precious. The peculiarity of the Gospel is, not that it teaches justification—the Law had done this before—but that it teaches justification **BY GRACE**. Here lie the glory of the Cross and the hopes of man. This is precisely the point at which Rome begins to pervert the Truth. She does not object to justification—but justification *by grace* she cannot abide. Where the Gospel enters, Rome protests. Unfortunately for those who can trace in her features the lineaments of a true

Church, the only justification she admits, is essentially that which Paul declares impossible to man—*justification by works*. Grace, in its Scriptural acceptation, at least when used in connection with this subject, she entirely repudiates as the source of all licentiousness, and sends its advocates to hell. She is not content to put forth essentially another Gospel, but she must needs belch forth her anathemas against the true Gospel of the blessed God.

There can be no question that when the Scriptures inculcate that justification is by grace, they mean that it proceeds from the mercy of God in Christ Jesus, without any reference to *personal obedience, or inherent righteousness*. To be justified freely by God's grace, is to be justified without the deeds of the law. To be saved by grace is to be saved independently of works, lest any man should boast. "And if by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace; otherwise work is no more work." This, then, is a settled point, that grace, in the sense in which it enters into the scriptural doctrine of justification, excludes all reference to our own performances, and any creed which attributes our acceptance, either in whole or in part, to works of righteousness which we have done, *denies the grace of the Gospel*. Grace and works cannot be amalgamated; the law and gospel are fundamentally distinct. From the very nature of the case, a compound system, which proposes to justify us partly by one and partly by the other, involves a contradiction in terms. "Behold I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." To rely at all upon personal obedience is to appeal to the justice and not to the mercy of God. The argument in the Epistle to the Romans, to prove the ultimate triumph of believers over sin, proceeds on the assumption, that law and grace are incapable of confusion or mixture. "Sin," says the apostle, "shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." This conclusion would be miserably lame if it were possible to be under both at once, or in any third

state distinct from each. There are, then, but two conceivable dispensations—one of law, the other of grace—and consequently but two possible methods of justification—one by inherent righteousness and the other by the free mercy of God. The difference of the two systems may be placed in another light. To justify is to pronounce righteous. A holy God cannot, of course, declare that any one is righteous unless he is so. There are no fictions of law in the tribunal of Heaven—all its judgments are according to truth. A man may be righteous because he has *done* righteousness, and then he is justified by law, or he may be righteous because he has received righteousness as a gift, and then he is justified by grace; he may be righteous in himself, and this is the righteousness of works, or he may be righteous in another, and this is the righteousness of faith. Hence, to deny imputed righteousness, is either to deny the possibility of justification at all, or to make it consist in the deeds of the law—both hypotheses involving a rejection of the grace of the gospel. There are plainly but three possible suppositions in the case: either there is no righteousness in which a sinner is accepted, and justification is simply pardon—or it must be the righteousness of God, without the law, or the righteousness of personal obedience—it must either be none, inherent or imputed. The first and last suppositions are both embraced by Rome in one sweeping anathema. “Justification,” she declares, is not “remission of sin merely,” and subsequently adds: “Whosoever shall affirm that men are justified solely by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, or the remission of sin, to the exclusion of grace and charity, which is shed abroad in their hearts, and inheres in them; or that the grace by which we are justified is only the favor of God, let him be accursed.”*

She is, therefore, shut up to the position which she cheerfully assumes: that men are accepted in their own personal obedience. When, according to Bellarmin,† we are said to be justified freely by *God's grace*, the meaning is that we are justified by the *effects* of His grace, or the personal holiness it generates within us. Such also was the view of Trent, when it damned those who resolved

* Concil. Trident. Sess. vi: cap. 7. Canon de justificat, 11.

† De Justificat, Lib. ii: c. 3.

this grace into the unmerited favor, or free mercy of God. Rome, then, takes her stand upon inherent righteousness—justification and sanctification in her vocabulary are synonymous terms, and men are justified, *not* by *grace*, but by their *graces*. “The sole formal cause” of justification, says Trent, “is the righteousness of God; not that by which he himself is [righteous, but that by which he makes us righteous; with which, being endued by him, we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and are not only accounted righteous, but are properly called righteous, and are so, receiving righteousness in ourselves, each according to his measure, which the Holy Spirit bestows upon each as he wills, and according to our respective dispositions and co-operation.” “Justification,” it is previously said,* “is not remission of sin merely, but also sanctification, and the renewal of the inner man by the voluntary reception of grace and divine gifts, so that he who was unrighteous is made righteous; and the enemy becomes a friend and an heir according to the hope of eternal life.” “The state of the whole controversy,” says Bellarmine,† “may be reduced to this simple question—whether the formal cause of absolute justification be inherent righteousness or not. To prove the affirmative, is, at the same time, to refute all contrary errors. For if the formal cause of justification is inherent righteousness, it is not, of course, the in-dwelling righteousness of God, nor the imputed righteousness of Christ, nor solely the remission of sin, without the renovation of the inner man. And if inherent righteousness is the formal cause of absolute justification, then, of course, the imputation of Christ’s righteousness is not required, which would dispense with an inchoate and imperfect justification. Neither is faith alone our righteousness; since faith, the Lutherans themselves being witnesses, cannot absolutely justify—and therefore, according to the fourth article of the Augsburg Confession, is not reputed as righteousness by God. And so none of these errors are placed for inherent, but only for extrinsic righteousness; or if they admit inherent, they deny that it absolutely justifies. They will all consequently be refuted by proving that what simply and absolutely justifies, is inherent righteousness.” This being the doctrine of Rome, I have no hesi-

* Concil. Trident. Sess. vi: c. 7.

† De Justificat. Lib. ii: c. 2.

tation in saying that it amounts to a complete subversion of the gospel. It substitutes *law* for *grace*, works for the sovereign mercy of God. It embraces the characteristic principle of a legal dispensation, and renders the blood of Christ of no effect. The Scriptures teach that the grace, by which we are justified, excludes all reference to our own works—Rome affirms that its immediate office is to produce them, and that it actually justifies only in so far as it produces them. The Scriptures teach that the obedience of Christ, freely imputed to us of God, constitutes the righteousness in which we are accepted. Rome asserts that our own obedience, achieved by the exercise of our own free wills, in co-operation with the Spirit of God, is the only righteousness in which we can appear. The difference is certainly fundamental—precisely the difference between a covenant of works and a covenant of grace. Now my argument is a short one. No creed which teaches justification by the deeds of the law can be a saving one. The proof is the positive declaration of the apostle that the thing is impossible, and that as many as are under the law are under the curse. But Rome teaches justification by the deeds of the law, and the proof is that she makes inherent righteousness, or works, the immediate ground of acceptance. Therefore the Creed of Rome cannot be a saving one.

The second proposition in this argument is the only one, I apprehend, that can create any difficulty, that justification by inherent righteousness is justification by the deeds of the law. To my mind, however, it rests upon sure warrant of Scripture.

Paul declares, as we have seen, that there are but two methods of justification; and, as they are the immediate contraries of each other, the characteristic principle of the one must be the opposite of the characteristic principle of the other. The characteristic principle of grace, however, is, that *it excludes works*; then, the characteristic principle of law must be that *it admits them*. This follows necessarily from the doctrine of immediate contraries.* If law and grace stand in this relation to each other, as the apostle teaches, and it is the distinctive peculiarity of grace

* Paul reasons upon this principle in the 4th chap. Hebrews. See Owen's commentary on the 3rd verse.

to *reject* works, it must necessarily be the distinctive peculiarity of law to *require* them. If whatsoever is *not* of works is grace, then whatsoever *is* of works is law. Inherent righteousness most certainly does not *exclude* or *reject* works, then it must *admit* and *require* them, and consequently must be brought under the category of law.

The evasion of Rome, that the works which are excluded, are only those which precede faith and justification, and are consequently destitute of merit, is nothing worth.* The expression of the apostle applies indiscriminately to *all* works performed with a view to Divine acceptance; and as to merit, the word and the thing, in the relations of the creature to God, are both equally unknown to the Bible. According to Bellarmine,† the works excluded are those which are performed in the strength of nature without the assistance of grace. "Gratuitous justification," he informs us "does not exclude merits absolutely, but only those which are proper, which proceed from ourselves and not from God." Hence, the justification which takes place in consequence of works produced by grace, is as truly justification by grace, as that which takes place independently of works. We may accordingly be justified freely, without the deeds of the law, and yet be justified by the inherent righteousness which the Spirit effects within us. This sophistry, to which the wily Jesuit again and again recurs, is a miserable play upon the ambiguity of the word *grace*. There are two senses in which it is used; in one, which so far as I know, is seldom or never found in the Scriptures, it implies those operations of the Spirit which are connected with holiness. In the other it denotes the sovereign mercy or unmerited favor of God. Now in this first sense it is *never* opposed to law. If it were, justification by law would be under all circumstances and to all classes of creatures, hopelessly impossible. On the contrary, a legal dispensation, until its disadvantages are forfeited by failure, necessarily implies that degree of grace which shall fit its subjects to render the obedience exacted. It would shock all our notions of justice, it would be gross and revolting tyranny, to create beings wholly unfurnished for a work, and yet demand it from them as the condition

* This is the evasion of Trent. Sess. vi. c. 8.

† De Justificat. Lib. i. c. 21., comp. c. 9 of the same book.

of life. Whatever may be the law which God, in the first instance, prescribes to His creatures, He imparts to them strength abundantly adequate to keep it. Adam was unquestionably placed under an economy of works. If he had kept his first estate and been justified, he would have been justified as a doer of the law, and yet the ability, with which he was endowed, in his first creation, was as truly from God, as that which the saints receive at their new creation in Christ Jesus. Hence it is evident, that obedience does not cease to be legal, because it is rendered by Divine aid. To be justified by graces is not to be justified by grace. The proud Pharisee attributed to God his superiority to other men. It was by *grace* that he professed to have performed his alms, penances and devotions; yet, with all his pretended gratitude and love, he was a legalist at heart. Legalism and Pelagianism, though generally co-existent, are not necessarily the same. That obedience is legal, which is performed with a view to *justification*, whatever may be the strength in which it is achieved. It is the *end*, and not the *source* of it, that determines its character. And that is a legal dispensation, which prescribes a law and attaches the promise of eternal life to conformity with its precepts. To give the law is an act of grace, but to dispense the reward when the obedience has been rendered, is the discharge of a debt which God's faithfulness has imposed upon His justice. The *obedience itself*, not the strength in which it has been performed, is all that the law contemplates. If it demanded a *particular kind* of obedience, then that would be a part of the precept, and consequently no *true* obedience could be rendered, if the kind in question were withheld. The law looks to nothing and can look to nothing but the fact, that the *obedience* it requires is given or denied, and it rewards or punishes accordingly. To resolve justification, consequently, into inherent righteousness, how sincerely soever that righteousness may be attributed to the grace of God, is to resolve it into the deeds of the law. The man who is justified, therefore, upon the principles of Rome, is as truly justified by works, as Adam would have been if he had kept his integrity. Adam's original nature was as much the offspring of God as the believer's *new* nature. Adam was *free* to fall, and so, according to Rome, is every

true believer—good works being the result of our wills co-operating with grace. Adam was able to stand in consequence of what God had done for him, and so are the faithful of Rome. Adam's life depended upon personal obedience, and so, says Rome, does the salvation of the saints. The parallel is perfect; and the conclusion is inevitable that Rome utterly rejects the gospel as a dispensation of grace and turns all its glorious provisions into a covenant of works.

But what sets the legalism of Rome in a still stronger light, is the estimate which she puts upon the performances of men, achieved through the co-operation of their own wills with the stimulating grace of God—for it is, after all, but a partial agency that her creed attributes to the Holy Spirit.

Tenacious of what the schoolmen denominate the merit of congruity, she distinctly teaches, that men in the exercise of their own free-wills, concurring with the grace of God, prepare and dispose themselves for justification.* God gives them the ability to work, but it depends upon themselves whether or not they will improve it. The diligent are rewarded with larger accessions of strength, until finally "they resolve to receive baptism, to begin a new life, and to keep the Divine commandments." Then the critical point is reached, they are fully prepared to be justified, *they have done well and deserve ex congruo*, the august benefit. If this detestable combination of the pride of the Pelagian and the haughtiness of the Pharisee can be termed grace, then it

"Is of all our vanities the motliest,
The merest word that ever fooled the ear
From out the schoolman's jargon."

My soul sickens at the blasphemy that men, independently of union with Christ, can bring themselves into a state in which, though they have no claim upon the *justice* of God, they *have* a claim upon His *sense of decency*, in which He cannot refuse to receive them into favor, without the perpetration of an ugly deed.

A system which can find a place for such a doctrine, stumbles on the very threshold of Christianity, and those

* Concil. Trident. Sess. vi. c. v. canon 4.

who can embrace it are strangers to what be the first principles of the oracles of God. But the climax of iniquity and legalism is reached in the odious dogma, first broached in the schools, subsequently incorporated into the public symbols of the church, and audaciously defended by her most distinguished divines, that the good works of the faithful are truly and properly meritorious upon principles of *justice*, so that God cannot fail to reward them without the surrender of His holiness. "We shall therefore prove," says Bellarmin* "what all Catholics believe, that the good works of the just are truly and properly merits, deserving, not of any reward, but of eternal life itself." "It is the will of God," he declares in another place,† "that His children who have the use of reason, should acquire eternal life by their own labors and merits, so that it may be due to them by a double title, a title of inheritance and a right of reward, since it is more honorable to obtain by merit than by free gift alone; God, that He might honor His sons, has so arranged it, that they can procure eternal life for themselves by their own merits." The merit of these works, we are further instructed, depends partly upon the promise of God. His own sovereign appointment which brings him under an obligation of debt to reward them, and partly upon their own intrinsic excellence.‡ "Whoever shall affirm," says Trent, "that the good works of a justified man are in such sense the gifts of God, that they are not also his own good merits; or that he, being justified by his good works, which are wrought by him, through the grace of God and the merits of Jesus Christ, of whom he is a living member, does not really deserve increase of grace, eternal life, the enjoyment of that eternal life if he dies in a state of grace, let him be accursed."§

With such statements before him how can any man, who has any adequate conceptions of the distinction between law and grace, hesitate for a moment, to affirm that the system of Rome is eminently legal? that, like the Jews of old, she goes about to establish her own righteousness, and refuses to submit to the righteousness of God? She requires works, these works are to be done with a

* De Justificat. Lib. v. c. 1.

† Bellarmin De Justificat. Lib. v. c. 17.

‡ Ibid. c. 3.

§ De Justificat. canon 32.

view to justification and eternal life, and not only obtain but *deserve* both in consequence of the compact of God and their own inherent excellence. If this be not law, it would be hard to specify an economy that is; and if it *be* law, how can the inference be avoided that it can *save* none who rely on its provisions? Is there a man who can lay his hand upon his heart and say that he honestly believes that any sinner can, consistently with the Scriptures, be accepted in the righteousness in which Rome says he must be accepted before God? If the Galatians, by submitting to circumcision, fell from grace and became debtors to the whole law, what shall be said of those who boldly proclaim that Heaven can be bought by works, and audaciously put eternal life to sale in the market of human merit? If such principles are saving, or a creed can be saving which admits them, in the name of truth and righteousness, what creed on earth can be a damning one?

In the face of all these clear and positive proofs of the most disgusting legalism, the Reviewer asserts, that Rome "holds that we are justified by the merits of Christ," and that she teaches the doctrine of atonement far more fully and accurately than multitudes of professedly orthodox Protestants." The proof of these bold assumptions turns upon the fact, that Christ is uniformly represented as the *meritorious* cause of all the blessings we receive. Trent says, in the passages quoted by Princeton, that "our sins are freely forgiven us by the Divine mercy, for Christ's sake," that "the meritorious cause of justification is the well beloved and only begotten Son of God, who, when we were enemies, for the great love wherewith he loved us, merited justification for us by his most holy passion on the cross; that Christ by his most holy passion on the cross, merited justification for us, satisfied God the Father on our behalf, and no one can be righteous unless the merits of the passion of the Lord Jesus Christ are communicated to him." To these extracts are added two sentences from Bellarmin, one affirming that "we are justified on account of the merits of Christ," and the other, according to the Reviewer, containing a true statement of the Scriptural doctrine of imputation.

As to the expression that Christ is the meritorious cause of pardon and acceptance, though taken by itself and apart

from its connection, it might be interpreted as Princeton seems to have understood it, yet Rome is far from employing it to denote our justifying righteousness, or that which immediately commends us to God. She does not mean to teach that the personal obedience of the Saviour is the ground on which a sinner is declared to be just. That which constitutes him righteous, she denominates, not the *meritorious* but the *formal* cause of justification, and as this consists in the graces of the Spirit, whatever sense should be attached to the phrase, *meritorious cause*, the legal feature of her system, inherent righteousness, is by no means excluded. But we are not left in darkness as to the meaning of the phrase itself. "The merits of the righteous," says Bellarmin,* "are not opposed to the merits of Christ, but spring from them; and whatsoever praises the merits of the righteous are entitled to receive, redounds to the glory of the merits of Christ. He is the vine, we are the branches; and as the branch cannot bear fruit except it abide in the vine, so we can do nothing without Christ. And as no one was ever stupid enough to assert, that it detracted from the glory of the vine when its branches bore much fruit; so none but a fool would say that it detracts from the glory of Christ, when his servants, by his grace, by his Spirit, by faith and charity inspired by him, perform good works, which are so truly righteous, that a crown of righteousness is due to them from a just judge. The objection is without foundation that if the merits of men are required, those of Christ are unnecessary. For the merits of men are not required on account of the insufficiency of those of Christ, but on account of their very great efficacy. For the works of Christ merited from God, not only that we should obtain salvation, but that we should obtain it by our own merits; or what is the same, they merited for us not only eternal life, but also the power of meriting it ourselves. Because God uses the sun to enlighten the world, fire to heat, and wind and showers to refresh it, it is not to be ascribed to weakness as if he were unable to accomplish these things by Himself, without sun, fire or breeze, but to His omnipotence, by which He is not only able to do these things Himself, but also to bestow upon creatures the power of doing them."

* De Justificat. Lib. v. c. 5 sub fine.

"Neither do our merits," says Dens,* "diminish the virtue of those of Christ, as heretics yelp, since our merits derive all their power of meriting from those of Christ, as the branches derive their power of bearing fruit from the vine. Wherefore our merits commend the merits of Christ, inasmuch as he, by his merits, has procured for us the power of meriting." When, therefore, Trent affirms that "the meritorious cause" of justification is God's "only-begotten and well-beloved Son," she means that the passion of the Divine Redeemer has established that dispensation, under which we are required to procure salvation for ourselves, and are furnished with the necessary helps for the arduous work. His atonement is the immediate ground of pardon and acceptance to no one; it simply places the race in a new relation to God, and that a relation of law, in consequence of which they can be and do what God exacts from them. Without the death of Christ they could not have been favored with this new opportunity of life. His merits have given them another *chance*, but success or failure depends upon themselves; He merited justification, by meriting that their own works should be accepted as a justifying righteousness. Hence his *passion* is only the basis on which a *legal scheme* of salvation is erected for *fallen man*; as the goodness of God was the basis on which a similar scheme was erected for man in innocence. As God's kindness furnished Adam and gave him strength for his first trial, so the death of the Redeemer has instituted a new trial, and fitted and qualified men to comply with its provisions. Such is the honor which Rome gives to Christ.

Princeton says, however, that Rome as a community "holds that we are justified by the merits of Christ." This proposition, I am constrained to deny. Some of her Divines have held it, but the Church in her public symbols, in the decrees and canons of Trent, in her authorized creed, has taught no such principle. Rome teaches that we are justified, in the language of Bellarmin, "*on account* of the merits of Christ," but not *by* them. To say that we are justified *by* them, is to affirm that they constitute the righteousness in which we are accepted, to say that we are justified *on account* of them is to teach that they

* Vol. 2. p. 459. Tract. de Merito. No. 35.

are the meritorious cause of acceptance in the sense already explained. Bellarmin* has accurately noted the distinction: "In strict propriety of speech," says he, "it is not *on account of* (propter) but *by* (per) which is used to designate the formal cause. If one should ask *by* what man lives, *by* what fire is warm, *by* what the stars shine, it would be rightly answered *by* the soul, *by* heat, *by* light, which are formal causes. But if he should ask *on account of what* the commander triumphs, *on account of what* the soldiers fight, it will be answered not by assigning the *formal*, but the *meritorious* or *final* cause." Hence the first sentence which Princeton has quoted from Bellarmin contains a very different view of justification from that which she asserts that the papal community maintains. His own exposition of his terms is conclusive proof, that in saying we are justified *on account* of the merits of Christ, he intended to deny that we are justified *by* them, or that they constitute the righteousness which immediately commends us to God. Of precisely the same import is the next passage. Occurring in the midst of a chapter, expressly devoted to the disproof of the doctrine of imputation, and taken from a book which contains an elaborate and crafty defence of inherent righteousness, it cannot, without violence to the author, and violence to its connection, be interpreted as Princeton understands it. There is, indeed, no necessity for this violence. All the expressions are in perfect harmony with the dogma, that Christ is the *meritorious*, in contradistinction from the *formal* cause of justification. His merits are given to us, by being made available to generate merits within us; they are given, not by imputation but by infusion, and whatsoever efficacy our righteousness possesses, is derived from the passion of Christ. If he had not died, we should neither have been able to perform works of righteousness, nor would works of righteousness have saved us. It is in consequence of what He has done that our own doings are effectual. His merits are given in the same way that His wisdom is given, the one to make us meritorious as the other removes our ignorance; and we can present them to the Father for our sins, because in consequence of them, remission may be expected according to the tenor of the new law under

* De Justificat. Lib. ii. c. 2.

which they have placed us. Our prayers, penances, satisfactions and obedience could not purge our consciences from guilt, unless the blood of the Redeemer had imparted this efficacy to them, as the sun could dispense no light without the sovereign appointment of God. Such I take to be the meaning of Bellarmin.

Of what has been spoken upon the first point, the denial of the blood, this then is the sum. It has been proved, in the first place, from the testimony of Paul, that no creed which teaches salvation by works can be a saving one. In the second place, that the creed of Rome *does* teach it, because she resolves our justifying righteousness into personal holiness, damns the doctrine of imputation, audaciously proclaims the figment of human merit, both of congruity and condignity, and makes Christ only the remote and ultimate cause of pardon and acceptance. These premises being established, the conclusion necessarily follows, that the creed of Rome cannot be a saving one. It robs God of His glory, and the Saviour of His honor, gives us ashes for bread, a scorpion for an egg, and death for life.

ARTICLE II.

CHIVALRY AND CIVILIZATION.

This juxtaposition of names may at first suggest an association of ideas somewhat singular and paradoxical. The coupling of these topics may seem to involve the notion of variance and contrast, rather than of affinity and analogy. The question starts up, what combination in the nature of things, or in the events of history, can justify us in bringing Chivalry and Civilization into one view? What, and wherein, have they to do with each other?

At first blush, the subjects here linked together may seem to have slender relations to each other, and much in their nature essentially and widely different. Chivalry

belongs to the domain of history and romance. Civilization is concerned with what is moral, practical and political. The one has its interest in the visionary and ideal; the other, in the material and utilitarian. Nevertheless, it will be found that there are some links, subtle and delicate, it may be, but really actual and important, which form a subject-matter in common between Chivalry and Civilization, and which have had greatly to do with the developements of history and with the fortunes of the human race. In illustrating moral subjects, every thing is heightened by contrast; for by this method we may often best define a question, fix its boundaries, illustrate principles and define results. And in here presenting the serious views belonging to a true civilization, in connection with the romantic subject of chivalry, it is for no intent of giving fancy sketches, or personifying the creations of imagination, but, by this selection of a compound topic, to exhibit some of the facts of history in their bearing upon certain principles of human nature, in the actual progress of social civilization.

It will of course be seen that the subject stated can be adequately viewed, only by taking a stand-point which is at once historical, speculative and moral. But to illustrate the purpose now in view, it need not require a lengthy detail of the events of former times, as spread upon the pages of European history in its mediæval ages, and in the times of Chivalry and the Crusades. A limited scope of facts is all that is required for exhibiting the principles and results aimed at in this brief essay. It is the province of the philosophical student of history to fix his view clearly upon those comparatively few grand turning-points in the progress of events, by which he may develope the governing principles involved in the progress of society, without a voluminous detail of irrelevant facts. To hit the clue aright, to find the master key, is a work that calls for patient research and comprehensive reflection.

To render the definitions of our subject clear, and to fix its boundaries with some precision, it is only requisite to ascertain what Chivalry was at the period of its historical beginning, and in its organized developement, as connected with the contemporaneous civilization, and the subsequent progress of society. And in doing this, we may restrict

our view, in a large extent, to that course of events which is mainly identified in the progress of the English race. The subject is eminently one of English history: for no people ever possessed in an equal degree all that was truly desirable in what Chivalry had to offer, with such an equal exemption from its defects and disadvantages. And in this investigation it remains to be seen, in conclusion, that the subject may offer some practical hints of importance in its application to the present times, and to the present stage of the progress of society. We will first consider our subject, in the bearing upon it, of some leading views connected with the history of the English race.

Chivalry in England had its origin in the heroic and martial spirit of the times; and had for its objects mainly a reference to the interests of religion, and a romantic reverence for the female sex. And we may assume the general period of the twelfth century as furnishing the historical facts to illustrate the views held forth in this exhibition. The chivalric character and its accompanying institutions were the product of the organic influences through which society had passed in its long preceding stages. These institutions arose at that period of European history when its vast society was beginning to arise from the fallow state in which it had been mellowing, ready for a later growth, during the long lapse from the downfall of the Roman empire in the fifth century. Through the seven following centuries, the strange and discordant masses of the European races were becoming fused into a bodily texture and unity unlike what they had known before. It is a period which indeed is often designated as the "Dark Ages" of European history; and owing to the fragmentary character of its scattered and dislocated records, it is often indeed difficult to lift the veil by which a clear and connected view of those formative stages of civilization may be comprehended. Doubtless it is apt to appear to us that human society was most likely to have been retrograding in a period when its records are so scanty, and the monuments of its ancient civilization were in so large a measure suffered to perish. In the burning of the royal library of Alexandria by the Saracens, the great magazines of ancient science and learning, containing countless treasures of what was important in history, valuable in art, ele-

gant in literature, and beautiful in poetry—all, indeed, that the taste and industry of man had accumulated in the ages which had travelled onward from the infancy of the human race, became lost to the world in a single day. From this immense magazine of ancient intellectual wealth, only those portions of such knowledge, intrinsically valuable, which had become consecrated as classics, and preserved in other smaller and contemporaneous libraries, and in individual possession, survived the unsparing desolation. Much of that ancient recorded knowledge has been retrieved only by the critical research and industry of the thousand years which have since elapsed—but much that would throw light upon the history and institutions of the human race, was irrecoverably lost.

But it is not wise nor well for us, of these modern times, to think that the world was all that while living to no good purpose. The truth is, we know much less of the world's real history and progress than we often like to confess; and could we connect more of those fragments of facts and events, which the chroniclers and compilers of books have secured and registered, as they drifted down on the great surface of that stream of human life which began with man, and which will end with the abode of the race on this world, we should acknowledge that society was all the while living to a purpose; that "the ancients had understanding as well as we;" and that it is as great an infirmity of mind, in this generation, as in the age of Job, to say, with complacency, "no doubt we are the people, and wisdom shall die with us." It is much the vice of the present age to think that the mines of truth have only been lately penetrated, and are now worked with any profit. We think we are not only very rapid, but very wise, in our hurried motions, since men have learned to use the mariner's compass, the art of printing, the steam engine, the agents of chemistry, the magnetic telegraph, and the making of many books. But it is well to remember that there were genius and strength in those times, even of a high antiquity, when Nineveh, with her magnificent architecture, was a city enclosing a compass of three days' journey; when Babylon was built, with her hanging gardens; when the magnificent temples of Thebes arose, as if by enchantment; when the pyramids towered towards the

clouds ; when sculpture and statuary made the rough marble almost breathe and start with life. There were chemical agents and mechanical forces in use, three thousand years ago, compared with which our modern enginery may have proved but playthings. Men had eyes to see as well, and ears to hear, and limbs as strong, as we have now. They began as infants, just as we do ; but they lived as long, and lived as *much*, and were as wise, at threescore years and ten, as the men of the present generation. The products of strength and genius which the Phenicians, Chaldeans and Egyptians have left, were effected by a knowledge of science—mechanical, chemical, astronomical and physical—in some respects superior to these later ages ; and many of the great works of antiquity, such as the pyramids, were constructed with a taste and expense, and by combinations of mechanical forces, to which all succeeding generations have never furnished a parallel.

And with regard to moral developement and social progress, it is well to remember that in those times of the pupillage of our ancient race, the actors on the stage of life were more content than we are now to remain longer as children, before they put on the garb and airs of men ; and when the time of their manhood came, there was some root and substance for the stock of manhood to grow on ; and the fruit it bore was often ripe and rich.

The recorded monuments of language and history, though now such scanty proofs of ancient civilization, may, however, be the exponents of language quite as useful, and of a civilization quite as refined, in those days, when, though men had fewer *words* in use, they may have had thoughts, as many and as good ; when *language* was the garb for nature's truth to walk in, rather than a cloak for concealing, instead of revealing men's thoughts.

The ancient civilization *still* lingered in the East, when that movement began, which formed the channel for the heroic and enterprising spirit of Teutonic civilization to flow in. It is true, that after the downfall of the Roman empire, the pall of darkness seemed to have fallen both upon European civilization, and upon the nations afterwards governed by the Moslems. But when we view the events of this period, in their connection as causes and

consequences, we may admit that the darkness, at first sight so unpromising, was rather apparent than real. With all the remaining ancient civilization, and the military glory of the growing Saracenic power, it was doubtless the ignorant and fanatical bigotry of Omar, the Moslem leader, that caused the destruction of the invaluable treasures of the Alexandrian library; for in reply to the philosophers who interceded for its preservation, the Mohammedan replied, "If the writings of the Greeks *agree* with the Koran or book of God, they are *useless*, and need not be preserved; if they *disagree*, they are pernicious, and ought to be destroyed." Nevertheless, we shall have occasion presently to notice, that genius and refinement, though disfigured by the barbaric forms of Moslem fanaticism, long retained the ascendant under the heroic chivalry and antique civilization of these Oriental people.

After the Roman empire had become finally broken up, and resolved into those formative communities which have subsequently become the matured and consolidated nations of Europe, the process of Western civilization did really find that substantial form for an onward progress, which, though apparently disguised and shaded when brought into contrast with the old Roman literary refinement and military splendor, was effectually leading human society onward toward its grand destiny of development. The barbaric nations from the North soon ceased to make their irruptions into the Southern and Western parts of the Continent; and they blended and merged into the mass of the more civilized and effeminate, whom they conquered, and to whom they imparted energy while they received refinement. While this transition process was going on, in the midst of Continental Europe, the true and characteristic Teutonic spirit was destined to penetrate still more thoroughly the great body of the British race, insulated, and heretofore comparatively uninfluenced by the great changes which had formerly affected society on the Continent.

At that period of British history, when Chivalry became an organized institution, the great body of the English people had undergone *three* important organic changes in the composition of its society. The first of these was effected by the partial introduction of Christian civilization

amongst the wild aboriginal race of Britons,—and in their comparative progress from the commencement of the second, till the middle of the fifth century of the Christian era. At about the latter date, owing to the withdrawment of the last of the protecting legions of the declining Roman empire, the original British people, soon and rapidly, became intermixed with several other races. The Picts and the Scots from the North overspread the British territory, while the Angles, Jutes and Frisians, adventurers from the Continent, penetrated the island by sea. Thenceforward the original homogeneous character of the British people in the fatherland, became greatly changed. Wave after wave of foreign population, poured in upon the native race, and became intermixed with the original British stock. The most numerous and successful of these invading hordes, were the *Angles*, a valiant race of Germanic or Teutonic origin, from the vallies of the Elbe, who, rapidly combining with the original British, impressed upon them the strong features of their own character, and gave their *name* to the principal part of the island, which thenceforward, from the Angles, first took the name of *Angland*, and in modern times has borne the present name of *England*. This was the *first* great process which led to the composition of that stock in which the subsequent race of the English people formed their national origin.

But this change was, thus far, only partial. A large portion of the native British, inhabiting the interior of the island, resisted this admixture of races. Many of their young men especially, who had been trained to arms under the former Roman discipline, valiantly resisted the approach of these invading foreign races, and sometimes even drove back the barbarous tribes from their island.—These foreign predatory bands, however, still continuing to return and desolate their country, the British people who were still unmixed with these foreign tribes, called in to their aid and defence, the powerful arms of the German Saxons, who, by stratagem and treachery, combined with the Angles themselves, whom they had been called in to resist, and after many bloody and desperate battles, drove the remaining portion of the unmixed British, of the original Cambrian stock, before them into the mountains of Wales, and took complete possession of the entire coun-

try of England proper, comprising the body of the island. By this juncture of the Angles with the Saxons, and both together being grafted on what remained of the original British in England, there was laid the foundation of modern English society, the basis of the Anglo-Saxon character, and the real groundwork of mediæval and modern English civilization. This was the *second* great transformation which the English people passed through in their social composition, political organization, and historical progress.

The *third* great change was that effected by the Norman conquest, a little after the middle of the eleventh century; and this was followed by the introduction of a new and foreign governing family, a new order of nobility, and the establishment of that aristocracy in the State, and that hierarchy in the Church, which gradually acquired the ascendancy, by which the events of all the subsequent history of England have been shaped and controlled.

This brief, but connected bird's-eye view, embraces those great changes of society which the English people had passed through at the period which we may regard as the historical beginning of Chivalry in England. The state of the ecclesiastical system, at this period, corresponds to the state of social progress, and will unfold the moving causes which originated a system of gallantry that had respect at once to the interests of religion, and of the female sex.

The first five Norman kings, from William, the Conqueror, to Richard I., occupy about one hundred and twenty-five years of English history, terminating about ten years before the end of the 12th century. The romantic and military passions of the people, with their superstitions in religion, will account for that singular system which now became so popular and powerful. The passion of the age was in correspondence with that period of development in the individual human being, when the ardor of youth, before a coming manhood and maturity, has not yet been chastened and controlled by the dominion of reason over the impulses and imagination.

There are three great ruling passions wrapped up in the constitution of human nature, which more or less mark the progress of every man who is left to act out his origi-

nal tendencies ; and these are, the love of pleasure, the love of power, and the love of money. The indulgence of the senses comes first in the order of nature ; then grows up the ambition for influence and dominion ; and last of all, the love of wealth, or of fixed possessions, condenses, energises, and holds, with an unchanging grasp, the later and permanent habits of the most of men. And while this is more or less true of the individual man, there have been epochs in human society when the spirit of the age has been the controlling passion which has subsidized all other passions and interests into its own direction. Thus the passion for letters and the arts, in certain periods of ancient Grecian civilization ; the passion for conquest and military glory among the Romans ; the spirit of religious chivalry among the Crusaders ; the passion for scientific invention and discovery following the revival of learning in the 14th century ; and the application of scientific discovery to the useful arts, and to the accumulation of property, in the present age, are all instances of the absorbing spirit which, at peculiar junctures, possess the mass of minds among a whole people and generation.

At the period of English society, when the spirit of gallantry was concentrated into an institution, an enthusiastic, intense, but indefinable thirsting after some unreal and imaginary glory, formed the impulsive and fervid temperament of the English people. It was the susceptible, impulsive, restless and reckless period of their youth, as a nation. The twofold objects around which these enthusiastic and powerful passions concentrated, were the almost supernatural admiration for the female sex, the false position of the ministers of religion, and the superstitious reverence which they both commanded, alike from the martial and the timid. Both women and ecclesiastics were excluded, by a jealous superstition, from their proper position and intercourse in the relations of general society. The position by which ecclesiastics were estimated, will be apprehended by a brief reference to this period of history.

It was during the reign of Henry I. that foreign priests had become fully possessed of the rule of ecclesiastical affairs. The most powerful of these, in effecting their purposes, were Anselm and Laufranc, who had been successively elevated to the primacy of England. The fol-

lowing condensed statement will show all that is requisite on this point. Under the dominion of Anselm, a council was held in London, to enforce the celibacy of the clergy, in 1108; and though this measure had been zealously promoted before, there were now ten new canons passed, more rigid than any hitherto promulgated. "All married priests, of whatever degree, were compelled instantly to put away their wives, not to suffer them to live on any lands belonging to the Church, and never to see them or converse with them, except in urgent cases, and in the presence of witnesses. As a punishment for their crime in marrying, they were to abstain from saying mass for a certain period, and to undergo several penances. Those who refused to banish their wives, were to be deposed and excommunicated; their goods were to be confiscated, and their wives as adulteresses, to be made slaves to the bishop of the diocese."*

This unnatural and violent separation of the professed ministers of religion from the endearing and practical relations of domestic life, was the consummation of a long growing tendency. We may, therefore, regard the celibacy of the clergy as the exponent and type of the social and ecclesiastical system, which at the same time had its peculiar counterpart in the isolated and dependent condition of the female sex. While the priest came to be regarded with a superstitious veneration which placed him above the level of humanity, woman was admired with a romantic extravagance, which placed the chivalrous defence of her, upon a footing little below the sanctions and authority of religion.

It was in this way that Chivalry as a system arose. The ministers of religion, by the restraints of their situation, and the sanctity of their visible functions, were believed to possess severer and more celestial virtues, than any other class or race of human beings. The feeling of our nature, which requires perfect purity in the object of its worship, as well as in the agent dispensing its ministrations, invested them with the romantic and mysterious enchantment of supernatural sanctity, which, seen through the dim religious distance of their impassable separation,

* *Pictorial History of England*, by Craik and Macfarlane, vol. I; Book 3, p. 533. — *Spelman's Concilia*, I. p. 29.

from the practical relations of life, gave them a mysterious power over the minds of the common mass of men. But it was also a period of turbulence, and of imperfect laws. The ministers of religion were as defenceless and unwarlike, as they were venerable in their character and position. The powers they wielded were only the invisible and supernatural. Hence for personal protection, they required the chivalrous defence of the brave and the adventurous.

The same was true of the position of the female sex. The warlike classes of society, who composed its strength, had but rare opportunities for familiar society with those of the gentler sex, especially those who were young, delicate, beautiful and of noble blood. These were guarded by a jealousy as rigid as if amongst the nations of the East. The same restrained and unnatural position which excluded ecclesiastics, made the females in the more favored classes of that age objects of an enchantment intense and glowing, in proportion to the distance from which they were viewed. The effect of such a state of things might be easily imagined, even if we had not such abundant evidences of history as we have on record. It made military valor the substitute and synonyme of manly piety. And such was its effect, by way of counterpart and necessary process of reaction, that the women of that age, weak and timid themselves, but revered by mail-clad warriors, looked with mysterious awe and wonder upon the brave exploits of sturdy men and valiant knights. The process so graphically told by Shakspeare, in *Othello*, is the historical exponent of the times,—“She loved me for the dangers I had seen, and I loved her, that she did pity them.” And thus military valor came to pre-occupy entirely the common mind, as the highest masculine and religious virtue, and the want of it, among the laity, was regarded as impiety. We have now struck upon the clue which gives an insight of the prevailing human policies at this interesting period of society. The course of events which grew out of this state of things, animated and governed the movements of all subsequent history. And as we have now seen the agency which woman, willing or unwilling, had in originating the institutions of Chivalry, we may, on the other hand, trace the effect which Chivalry

itself produced upon the general state of society, in moulding its institutions, and in modifying the conditions of the female character.

The great practical purpose which Chivalry was employed to serve, was the enterprise of the *Crusades*. The pilgrimages to the holy places in Palestine had for ages been regarded as acts of piety, in performing which, the highest religious merit was believed to be attained. These had now for a long time been interrupted by the burdens and annoyances to which the pilgrims were subjected by the Turks. Peter, the hermit, and Pope Urban II. at length aroused the chivalric orders of Europe to lead off the great body of worshipping pilgrims for the recovery of the holy sepulchre. It was the mission of the institution of Chivalry, representing so many romantic and religious interests, and animated by so much enthusiasm, to execute the enterprize marked out by the head of the Western Church, in Europe. Nobly did it accomplish this mission; and it thus became probably, the means of really saving the nations of Europe from destruction. For at this period, the fate of all Christians nations seemed truly alarming. The Greek empire in the East, was tottering, ready for its fall. On the opposite west of the Continent, the Moors had occupied a large part of Spain for nearly six centuries, and their formidable dominion threatened rapidly to extend itself, to join hands in the centre of the Continent, with the growth of the Mohammedan power on the East. The Moslems maintained the declaration of perpetual war against all nations of a different faith; and they inscribed on their banners, and proclaimed in the van of their conquering armies, their motto: "The Koran, the tribute, or the sword." Already had the Saracen armies, marching from the East, begun to penetrate the territory of Southern and Western Europe. In view of such an alarming crisis, nothing was more justifiable than for the European nations to carry on a defensive and aggressive war into the very heart of the Mohammedan territory; for it was the only means by which they could secure themselves against future attacks of the same kind. The Moslem faith recognised none of the principles and boundaries of ancient and modern international law. Besides, the Christian nations had acquired the right, before the

Mohammedan power ever existed, to visit the sacred places of Judea ; and this right, enjoyed for so many centuries, they were now forcibly deprived of by the Saracens. The whole proceeding of the Crusades, considered as a military policy, and in the light of modern international law, would now be justified, both as a measure of political necessity, and of moral equity, should the same causes and occasions possibly arise in the present age. If the Autocrat of the North should attempt to enforce the Russian ecclesiastical, or political despotism upon the smaller nations of the South and West, it would justify a general hostile armament among the neutral nations, and especially among the contiguous countries enjoying constitutional freedom. For the same reason, as we humbly conceive, the gratuitous project of extending the area of Republicanism, by trespass upon the chartered rights of governments, even if monarchical and despotic, should have its vaulting ambition humbled by the visitation of retributive justice.

But while the agency of Chivalry, in prosecuting the Crusades, was justifiable by the necessity and equity of the case, it is nevertheless pertinent to our subject to compare the moral influence of Chivalry, with the morality of the Moslem system, which it was opposing, and the effect of both systems respectively upon the general civilization and progress of society. Considered in its moral influence, the system of faith represented by the Saracens, would not suffer much, if any, in comparison with the system of practical ethics represented by the Crusaders. In purity of morals, and polish of manners, the meed of praise might be justly challenged by the Saracens. Personal bravery, and chivalric magnanimity, characterized them as much as the Crusaders. In this respect, indeed, the Turks have never been surpassed by any people, even up to the present time. Their bravery is only equalled by their proverbial veracity. A genuine Turk can scarcely be found to tell a lie. Their veracity is the product of their bravery, and they despise falsehood, for this, if for no other reason, that it implies the cowardly *fear* of speaking the truth.

The moral effect of the discipline in the Moslem system in the age of Chivalry, seems to have held a severe restraint upon the passions of its adherents than was exhib-

ited by the mass of the Crusaders. The Koran was indeed based upon the Bible ; it acknowledged the Divine authority and the severe system of morals of the Old Testament, and also the entire authenticity of the historical parts of the New. It acknowledged Jesus as the greatest person who had ever appeared upon the earth, previous to Mahomet. The fundamental truth of the Koran, expressed in one sentence, was, "There is only one true God, and Mahomet is his prophet." But without venturing any statements that might unnecessarily start questions for historical criticism and controversy, we may yet not hesitate to encounter some of the impressions which we think are too current, concerning the general merits of the case before us, but which would be very likely to be modified by a thorough and candid understanding of the facts in this period of history. To apprehend the true estimate of the moral character of the Crusading and the Moslem systems, we may point to a few prominent and parallel cases, as specimens for comparison. The Saracens were conscientious in their devotion to the Koran, and in their zeal for carrying on an aggressive warfare to promote it ; the Crusaders were not more conscientious in their devotion to the faith of the Church, nor less fierce in their fanaticism to maintain it with the sword. Without noticing many other events connected with this period, we may select one or two of the best known and most authentic cases, to illustrate the temper of the age, and the ethical policy which animated eastern and western chivalry.

At the siege of Acre, in the third great crusade in which Richard of England bore so distinguished a part, the blockaded armies of the Saracens, worn down by famine, and reduced by losses, were compelled to capitulate. They agreed to release 2500 Christian prisoners on the spot, and to pay an immense sum for the release of a corresponding number of Turkish prisoners, in two months ; and, after certain other stipulations were agreed upon, the Turkish army retired, shewing, as they left, according to the words of a Christian chronicler, who was present, "a courage and virtue which no man could surpass them in, if their faith had been pure." But after such a display of magnanimity by the Saracens, owing to some delay on the part of Saladin to pay the first instalments of the im-

mense sum agreed upon for the ransom of the remaining Turkish captives, on the Assumption day of the blessed virgin, Richard, with a ferocity never equalled by any Turk, drew out his army before the walls of Acre, and leading out 2500 Turkish captives, without exception and without pity, put them all to the sword. "It was done," says a chronicler and companion of Richard, "with the assent of all."

Let us take, in contrast with this, the conduct of the Turks, when, twelve months after the capitulation at Acre, the allied armies of the Crusaders before Jerusalem were compelled to raise the siege, and sue for a truce. The retiring pilgrims ventured to leave the ground in the presence of the superior Saracen forces, who, to a man, stood to their treaty. Many of them, the parents and relatives of the murdered garrison of Acre, on their knees, with prayers and streaming eyes, besought the Saracen chief to avenge their murdered kindred who had been so falsely slain by Pilgrim hands. The faith of the Saracen could not be broken; the hostages of the Crusaders remaining in their hands were treated with hospitality and courtesy. To one of the English bishops Saladin proposed the question, "What do they say among you of your king and of me?" "My king," replied the bishop, "is owned to surpass all men in unshaken valor and in liberal gifts. In short, if your unbelief were cured, and your endowments and virtues shared with king Richard, there would not be two such princes in the world." With characteristic frankness, Saladin replied, "I would rather emulate the wise in docility and modesty, than advance my fortune by immodesty and mere audacity." This magnanimity was in keeping with his whole character through life, and shone forth in the noblest exhibition in his dying hours, a short time after. "Go," said the dying Saracen chief to his standard-bearer, "show this flag of the dead to the army, and tell them that the lord of the east could bring nothing but a single garment to the grave." He said to his son, "Honor the greatest of beings, and obey his commandments; for he is the root of good, and in him is all our weal. Spill no blood, for it will one day reach thy head. Preserve the hearts of thy subjects with loving care; for they are entrusted to thee by God. Hate no one; for all

are your fellow mortals. If thou hast offended against God, repent ; for he is of great mercy."

It is not compromising the claims of truth and justice in behalf of the Crusaders, nor of the religion in the name of which they were acting, to concede these noble qualities of the chivalric Saracens. With respect to refined civilization, the Moslems were the undoubted superiors of the Crusaders, and of the western nations from which they were drawn. They had also the advantage of the remains of that ancient moral economy which for more than three thousand years had been mellowing and ennobling the nations surrounding the cradle of the human race ; and the oracles of the ancient Hebrew faith had probably been as thoroughly imbedded in the minds of the readers of the Koran as the facts and truths of the later dispensation had been really moulded into the temper and understanding of the western people, who had nominally received it. In refinement of wealth and magnificence the Saracens were surrounded by softening influences unknown to the younger and ruder people of the west. In all the fine arts, music, sculpture, embroidery, architecture, and military tactics, the Mohammedan nations were far in advance of their crusading competitors.

Hence resulted the great practical benefits of the crusades, by their reacting influence upon the Europeans themselves. They returned to their homes with ideas such as they had never known before. Their taste was subdued and softened by seeing the splendid and still uninjured remains of Baalbec and Palmyra, and the astonishing displays of genius and industry, the growth of many centuries. Immediately on their return there was an immense advance in the improvements made in the useful as well as in the fine arts. Agriculture in all its forms was rapidly perfected by lessons learned in the East. Architecture, especially the Arabesque, introduced and combined with the now nascent Gothic, were the immediate consequences of the growing refinement learned among the Orientals. In Spain these improvements had already been advancing in the hands of the Moors for ages. And it is an indisputable fact, that one leading cause of the decline of modern Spain, which began in the sixteenth century, is to be largely attributed to the fanati-

cism of Philip, who expelled the last of the Moors, and sent a million of them into the States of Africa. Their Alhambra and other princely palaces fell into ruins; agriculture and the fine arts declined; and the effeminacy of their lately acquired wealth, and the timidity and indolence forced upon them by a bigoted ecclesiastical despotism, helped to perfect their national degradation, which has since come to pass.

But the beneficial effects of the Crusades reacted with equal power upon all the arts of peace, and the general policy of European civilization. Two millions of the most turbulent and worthless of the Pilgrims left their bones on Saracen soil. By the withdrawment of these, the barbarism of Europe wore down; an open space for a pacific policy was established; and the enormities of the feudal system rapidly diminished. Chivalry, as a system, had done its work, and at length outdid itself; its charm soon disappeared; and, in a few short ages after, its remaining usages and institutions were thrown into a discredit from which they never recovered. The genius of Chivalry became inseparably associated in the minds of men with the ludicrous heroism of Don Quixote; and this imperishable romance, written by Cervantes, at the close of the sixteenth century, put a final rest to that singular system which had so wonderfully contributed in the organization of society, and in forming the code of morals and manners which for ages had prevailed throughout the most of Europe.

The purpose of the foregoing illustrations has been to form a true moral and historical estimate of the leading elements which entered into the system of chivalry. It did all that it was capable of doing. It grew out of a state of society which was remarkably debased by ignorance and demoralization, while much that is intrinsically valuable in human nature was embodied and exemplified in its actings. But with the Crusaders, as with the followers of the Arabian prophet, the escutcheon of religion was mounted in the van of conquering armies. With the former the imagination was dazzled by the splendors of ritual and sacramental worship, the pageantry and romance of an enterprize which deemed the recovery of the holy city an object worthy of the blood of millions, and the accumulated treasures of ages. And yet probably not one in a

thousand among those crusading pilgrims had ever read the gospel histories, or the inspired epistles which had made known the true character of Jesus Christ. The redeeming power of the true atonement, of which the cross was the outward symbol—this central truth of the gospel, was felt in little of its vitalizing power, and exemplified as little in their doctrine and their practical experience. The popular christianity of those times was a religion of ritual worship, priestly prerogative, sacramental intercession, and chivalric pageantry; and by all the more that these peculiarities prevailed, by so much the less did their christianity exhibit any practical and saving power. The gospel was thus indebted to Chivalry, less for its true developement than for the extinguishment of its heavenly light. And thus, too, by consequence, the moral progress of society in Europe was indebted to Chivalry, only by the decline and reaction of that system. Of itself, it rather depressed than elevated the great mass of the people; it had no power even to hold society to any point of progress to which it had attained; and if left to no stronger bond than this, the mass of society would at length have fallen to pieces by its own weakening and corrupting weight. The conservative and counteracting agencies that came in to keep society up, as chivalry went down, were the growing love of domestic life, the revival of ancient learning, the awakening of scientific discovery, and the connecting power of a common religious faith, derived from the Scriptures, placed in the hands and language of the people.

In England and Germany the foundations of their massive civilization were laid in their proverbial love of home, in the elevation of woman to the dignity of a domestic companion. In Spain, much of the enthusiastic admiration of oriental life still lingered; and in France, the chivalric but inconstant gallantry, by which that people have always been distinguished, still kept the heart of the nation weak—and which made the perplexing problem for Napoleon, when, in later days, in his plans for consolidating the moral elements of society, he asked Madame De Staël what he should do for the people; and she replied, "give them mothers, and give them homes." But within the century, when an errant chivalry began to give place to domestic quiet and household religion, the nations of

western Europe had come into possession of the other great agencies of modern civilization. The art of printing and the mariner's compass had been invented, a new continent revealed, Galileo had discovered the laws of the heavenly bodies, Kepler explained those laws by the application of mathematics, Des Cartes demolished the tottering systems of the physical sciences of the schools, Bacon soon after introduced the Inductive Philosophy, and Newton, combining and perfecting these discovered materials of knowledge, laid the immovable foundations of that modern science on which our civilization is so firmly built.

The effect of Chivalry, however, among the Saracen and Moslem races, was relieved by no such compensating and redeeming agencies. In the palmy days of the system, the true chivalric character of magnanimity doubtless existed in as pure forms amongst them as amongst the Crusaders. But with them nothing better took its place. There was no treasure of the Gospel, long kept in abeyance, which could be revived when the time for restitution came. They had no lively oracles of truth, no Christian Scriptures, which, though long disguised and concealed, as among the western nations, could at length be brought out from their hiding places, and be made the instrument for the regeneration of a nominal religion, and for the spiritual life of men. Their enthusiasm spent itself in bigotry for an objectless religion, or in a dreamy imagination of a paradise filled with fairies, and guarded by houris. Accordingly, the Moslem system has never advanced beyond the age of Chivalry; it first became stationary, and began to retrograde. It finally fixed the stamp of moral palsy upon the nations that embraced it; and Mohammedan nations now bear the stereotype imprint of decay and prostration. There is now, as there ever was, as little in Islamism as in Chivalry to penetrate the great heart of humanity, and to vitalize society with a quickening spiritual power.

Probably the best and truest exponent of that system of Islamism, which still remains where Chivalry left it, is in the acknowledged position of the female sex amongst its adherents. Woman is as trifling and insignificant, under the operation of that system, as she was six centuries ago. Practically, in society, she is a cypher. Hundreds of her

sex may scarcely be counted as a worthy equivalent for the value and dignity of one lordly man. A harem, with its effeminate inmates, is an aggregate of imbecile beings, whose collective minds, like so many fractions, are not taught to believe themselves capable of forming together one noble and vigorous soul.

But, in the western nations, woman has found her real dignity and value in that position which the God of nature and the author of her constitution has fitted for her. She is no more indebted for her ennobling, now, to Chivalry, than she was in the days of the crusades. Then it placed her in a false position, and by necessity enfeebled and depressed her. So does Chivalry now, though it may bear another name, and assume the form of artificial manners and fashionable etiquette. For doubtless it is, that much of the usages, sentiments and manners of our modern civilization, has received impression and coloring from the institutions of Chivalry, though, as a historical system, it has long since disappeared. These peculiarities, in the texture and spirit of our modern society, are supposed to give much of the charm which attaches to the higher forms of polished life. There is still a magic in the name of Chivalry; and it yet gives an enchantment to the associations of history, in comparison of which the interests of a peaceful and matured civilization, and our every day life, seem to many minds but common-place and tame.

But it is not to be forgotten that the system of manners, morals and education, which grows out of a false estimate of woman's nature and her relative position, while it may pretend to invest her with magical charms and an ideal interest, tends only to enfeeble and debase her, and to depress the moral principle and tone of the society in which she is thus regarded. It may be an ungracious saying, perhaps, that much of the etiquette and mannerism which now prevail in some of the forms of social life, while it has the appearance of acknowledging woman's superiority, in reality implies her feebleness and insignificance. But the truth is, that, by the ordination of Providence, there is intended to be no superiority in either sex over the other; if woman is the weaker, it is only because in other points, enough to maintain the equivalence of character, she is so much the stronger. Man has more native physical stock;

woman has more inherent moral susceptibility. Man has more power of sustaining mental application ; woman has more intellectual perception, and native intuition. The excess of the one, in peculiar points and capacities, is balanced by the deficiencies of the other. But the contrasts of excess and deficiency make up a "law of compensation" by which the ordination of Providence is made good, in the final result, to the value of the character of both man and woman. And it is a remarkable fact ascertained by innumerable statistics, that where the purest civilization has penetrated the mould of society, the actual number of males and of females, is always balanced with remarkable accuracy. This holds true, by authentic investigations of the smaller populations of districts, the large masses of States, and the immense bodies of people in countries and empires. The proportion and equality hold good. And yet, in particular families, there is almost always a striking disproportion. One family has an excess of females, another of males. The instance is rare in which the number of sons and daughters is the same ; and in large families there is nearly always a great majority one way or the other. But while such inequality prevails in by far the greatest number of families, individually, the equality in the numbers of either sex, collectively, maintains its law in a community and a country. But it is not so in pagan countries. Females are neglected in their training, or perish by neglect in infancy. In the ages of Chivalry, and in Mohammedan countries, the preponderance in numbers is believed to have largely turned on the side of males.

In fixing the proper position which this view of an historical and moral subject assigns to woman, it may not be untimely to suggest, that under the present advancing tendencies of some forms of our modern, and especially our American civilization, there may be danger of going to another extreme. Woman may get ostensibly and factitiously in advance of her true position. She may assume a public character, may seek to originate new ideas as to her calling, and venture upon enacting a part, which the author of her constitution never intended for her. If for any imaginary project of social and moral reform, she overacts her part, and unsexes herself, she loses her pow-

er, and defeats the end of her mission in life. While it is not hers to act in public, it is nevertheless true that woman sways at least half of the influence of the world upon its public objects, though in her own private and characteristic way. Her sex does not more truly make up one half of the mass of the individuals in the human race, than they truly form one half of the opinions, and sway the actions of the whole world of mankind. If woman is true to her nature, by so much the less, as she may seem to change the material mass of things, by so much the more, does she really control the mental, social, and moral world. Let her therefore know that God has invested her with the peculiar and selectest gifts of Heaven.—She has a superior moral susceptibility, and a predominance of affections above the other sex, and by these the world is governed more than by logic, and intellect and physical force. And let her know that for the progress and perpetuity of society, she governs in a realm where conquerors are conquered; and which led Alison, in his great work, to say, when in the breaking up of society in France, and when all human things seemed getting afloat, “that what held England together was her two millions of fireside homes.”

ARTICLE III.

THE LIFE OF THOMAS PAINE,

Author of “Common Sense,” “Rights of Man,” “The Age of Reason,” &c. By G. VALE. New York: 1849.

We have long wanted to see a book of this kind—a Life of Paine, by an advocate of his principles. That there are numbers of such men, it were worse than idle to forget; and we felt it desirable that they should celebrate the apotheosis of their hero; should state his and their own case; “hold up” *their* “mirror to” his “nature;” and give us what they regard as the very form and presence of his mind and character.

Paine (and it involves no small compliment to his memory) may be called an inferior Cromwell,* of Modern Infidelity. Born for a destructionist, and memorable chiefly for the coarseness of his assaults on what he could not destroy—together, in Clarendon's pithy phrase, "a brave, bad man," he was both too bold and too politic, with his prototype, to be, in some respects, the bad man he has been thought. Neither of these men were throughout life sincere to some truths they both acknowledged; but neither of them was a hypocrite of ordinary stamp, nor chargeable with "all the vices." They had each a portion of misbelief, which kept them inwardly trembling too much for a course of entire insincerity; they understood also too well the conveniencies and conventional influences of virtue, not to affect generally, and for a considerable part of their lives, a *degree* of moral excellence; not to know that a given accumulation of personal vices would defeat all their personal ends. In middle life, Paine sustained a character for decent behavior, or he had not been the guest for many months of Monroe, nor the occasional associate of Hamilton, Jefferson and Washington; Cromwell through life maintained a religious character among the pious, for other purposes, we fear, than those which are sanctioned by religion. Both were cast upon times (as such men always are) strikingly favorable to the development of their respective characters. Paine was eminently a vain man; Cromwell superbly proud and self-reliant—too proud to be vain. The latter soon comes into comparison with none but the vacillating Charles, and exhibits qualities far more kingly; the former is incessantly comparing himself with Franklin, Washington and Jefferson, and thinks that America owes more to him than to them. He is jealous of every modicum of praise they received. "Old Noll" cared not a shoe-tie who was praised, so long as he kept steadily advancing to power.

The most striking feature in this book (and we pray our considerate readers to peruse this part attentively) is the

* It appears to us a strange association which here brings together for comparison the characters of Cromwell and of Paine. However, we presume that the former, after two centuries of reproach, will not be over sensitive now; and might perhaps reply, with a certain living statesman, who was equally unfortunate in being once caught in bad company, that he "has character enough to bear it." (Eds. S. P. R.)

"Appendix," or Paine's two remarkable Letters to General Washington. They have never come before in our way; were first given to the world by Paine, through an obscure London publisher, in 1797; and have not hitherto been included (through the avowed fear of depreciating his American fame) in the writer's published works. General Washington, we are quite sure, was glad enough, at an early date, to forget both them and him.

His biography has little of incident; and as we shall return to these Letters for some of its more striking parts, our sketch of the rest must be brief.

He was born at Thetford, in the county of Norfolk, England, 29th of January, 1737, of quaker parents. In the town was an excellent "grammar school," where, according to the English custom, the rudiments of Latin are taught by some superior graduate of the Universities; here, therefore, with "reading, writing and merchant's accounts," our youth obtained a slight acquaintance with that language. His friendly biographer confesses that he afterwards imbibed "an aversion, or contempt, for" what he calls "the dead languages." Such was Mr. Paine's admirable fitness for the criticism of the Bible. He hated the only languages in which it is contained.

At thirteen years of age his education closes, and for the next three years he remains at home, learning his father's trade of stay-making. Why he started for London does not appear, but at sixteen he is first, "for some weeks," with a stay-maker in Long Acre, then he goes to Dover and works for a short time at his trade; then, "to sea," as a common sailor, in the Terrible privateer. "From this adventure" he himself tells us, he "was reclaimed by the affectionate and moral remonstrances of "his father." But he again "assumes the naval profession" as Mr. Vale, his new biographer, calls it. That is, he enters "shortly after," the King of Prussia privateer, as a common sailor. At twenty-two years of age he marries, settles for one year, and the next fails in business as a master staymaker, at Sandwich in Kent.

Any one acquainted with English society will know that this is the history of no very hopeful youth. To start twice "to sea," in the most unprincipled and profligate of all services, privateering, would be no recommen-

dation to a decent merchant's counting house ; nor to any situation of common respectability and confidence. It qualified Mr. Paine, however, for a low situation in the Excise, the civil privateering of the coast-towns of England. Dr. Johnson would never retract his definition of this resource.* Paine is, however, dismissed from it, whether to his credit or discredit, it is difficult to say. If, upon principle, it was to him a "hateful" and tyrannical one, he in point of fact remained in it as long as he could ; and made his only complaint, at last, in a pamphlet on the amount of the salary—"the numerous evils arising to the Revenue, from the two great poverty of the officers of Excise." The poor Tory, Johnson, was clearly more honest about this matter.

He was an Excise officer from 1763 to 1772, with an interval of suspension of eleven months. His first wife lived only about a year ; from his second, whom he married in 1771, he separated by consent, in 1774. We see no proof of his having ill-used either of these ladies ; the latter, who lived for many years as a professor of religion at Cranbourne, spoke of him, it is said, with respect. Again failing in business, he has recourse to London ; obtained, through a Commissioner of Excise, an introduction to Dr. Franklin, and sails for this country in the autumn of 1774.

During the temporary retirement from his duties in the Excise, he had been an assistant in an English School, and seems at this period to have cultivated, with diligence, his opportunities for self-improvement. Attending the lectures of Martin and Ferguson, he imbibed a taste for Natural Philosophy ; purchased globes, and became a second-rate pamphleteer.

The situation of the North American colonies at this time, combined with his own necessities, made him a pamphleteer of the first-rate influence ; a demagogue of

* "A hateful tax, levied upon commodities, and adjudged not by the common judges of property," &c. The Attorney General was consulted on the propriety of prosecuting Johnson for this definition. A curious illustration of the meaning of another word is not so well known ; and might, worthily, have been Paine's. Under the verb *to sit* (13th definition) he quotes, in his Dictionary, Judges v. 10, as—"Asses are ye that sit in judgment ;" the verse reading, "Speak ye who sit on white asses ; ye that sit in judgment, and walk by the way." This escaped his late laborious and *Rev'd* Editor, Mr. Todd.

unusual adroitness. The worthy Dr. Rush meets with him in 1776, while editor of the Philadelphia Magazine, and suggested to him the subject, or the happy title of "Common Sense," that "celebrated pamphlet," (as Burke calls it shortly after) "which prepared the minds of the [American] people for Independence." It was, as it deserved to be, the beginning of Paine's better fortunes. The Pennsylvania Legislature voted him, as a reward, £500, and the University complimented him with the title of M. A. He "awoke one morning," as Lord Byron says of the publication of his *Childe Harold*, "and found himself famous." His new biographer, now before us, talks of the profits being "enormous," and of Paine's great disinterestedness in giving the copyright to the United States. But he has not the candor to notice the Pennsylvania *bonus*, as designed for a recompense—(itself a pretty good profit for the copyright of any pamphlet)—and keeps out of sight here the \$3000, which Congress afterwards granted for his "ingenious and timely publications." In addition to these services, as we are upon the point, it may be added, New York granted him, on this same account, the forfeited estate of a Mr. Devoe, a loyalist. Paine's own account of his "Common Sense," is, "I saw an opportunity in which I thought I could do some good, and I followed exactly what my heart dictated. *I neither read books, nor studied other people's opinions—I thought for myself.*" He omits altogether any suggestion of this matter from Dr. Rush.

Cheetham, no friendly biographer of Paine, says:

He "now accompanied the army of independence as a sort of itinerant writer, of which his pen was an appendage almost as necessary and formidable as its cannon. Having no property, he fared as the army fared, and at the same expense, but to what mess he was attached I have not been able to learn; although, from what I hear and know, it must, I think, though he was sometimes admitted into higher company, have been a subaltern one. When the colonists drooped, he revived them with a 'Crisis.' The first of these numbers he published early in December, 1776. The object of it was good, the method excellent, and the language suited to the depressed spirits of the army, of public bodies, and of private citizens, cheering. Washington, defeated on Long Island, had retreated to New York, and been driven with great

loss from Forts Washington and Lee. The gallant little army, overwhelmed with a rapid succession of misfortunes, was dwindling away, and all seemed to be over with the cause, when scarcely a blow had been struck. 'These,' said the 'Crisis,' 'are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph: what we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly.'

"The number was read in the camp, to every corporal's guard, and in the army and out of it had more than the intended effect. The convention of New York, reduced by dispersion occasioned by alarm, to nine members, was rallied and reanimated. Militiamen, who, already tired of the war, were straggling from the army, returned. Hope succeeded to despair, cheerfulness to gloom, and firmness to irresolution. To the confidence which it inspired may be attributed much of the brilliant little affair which in the same month followed at Trenton."—pp. 53-4.

An early sentence of this "Crisis" has become proverbial: "These are the times that try men's souls," reminding us of the wise and witty South, "A plausible and insignificant word in the mouth of an expert demagogue, is a dangerous weapon." Shortly after this (19th April, 1777) Paine is made *clerk* to the Committee for Foreign Affairs, and assumed, without any other suggestion than that of his own amiable "heart," the title of *Secretary* for Foreign Affairs; "assumed a proper dignity," says his biographer, Mr. Vale, "useful to his adopted country." That is, a national Secretary for Foreign Affairs being always a leading and responsible officer, and the clerk of all public bodies being ordinarily an irresponsible one, or answerable only for the accuracy of his records. It was a political, perhaps Dr. Paley would say, a white lie. In less than two years he resigned this office, we here are told, "in consequence of a disagreement which had taken place between the Congress and Mr. Paine, respecting a person of the name of Silas Deane."

Of this story there is another and very different version. He resigned, says Mr. John Jay, then a member of Congress, to avoid "the disgrace of being discharged." Not possessed altogether of the discretion, while so patriotically

assuming the dignity, of a diplomatic post, he made public reference in a newspaper to an "Account" in his "office," which went to prove how early the French government engaged to assist this country, and the French ambassador caught his eye upon this reference; "feeling very sensibly," says Mr. Jay, "how much the honor of France was wounded by a supposition," &c. of the *fact*. Mr. Gerard, by memorial, called upon Congress to disavow the publication. We enter into no discussion of what it must have proved "the men of high degree" in the French government. Paine, clearly enough, had no justification* for referring to public documents confidentially entrusted to him, for party purposes. "The majority were of opinion," Mr. J. asserts, that Paine "had prostituted his office" to such purposes, "and therefore ought to be discharged."†

He still retained friends in Pennsylvania, who procured him the office of Clerk to the Legislature; and having suggested the propriety of a further application to France, when Congress appointed Col. Laurens to proceed to Europe, Paine was taken with him. "Before this," he himself states, "I was strongly impressed with the idea, that if I could get over to England, *without being known*, I could open the eyes of the country to the madness and stupidity of its government." But his American friends held him back; and the capture of Burgoyne having transpired, the mission of Col. Laurens was successful. He returned, bringing with him two million livres in cash, and Mr. Paine.

Various supplementary and supernumerary numbers of his "Crisis" now followed. The sword of Washington and compeers had, however, settled the question of Independence; in 1783 we find Paine settled comfortably on his estate at Bordentown, and General Washington, being in that neighborhood, inviting him to his camp.

But "Othello's occupation" in America, was gone. Paine now seeks, therefore, in time of perfect peace, to

* Particularly when, as this new biographer states, the American Commissioners had given "a pledge that the transaction," or grant of the French Ministers "should remain a secret."

† MS. Documents of Jay. See Bp. McIlvaine's Evidences, 6th edition, p. 339.

carry forward his designs against the government and tranquillity of England ; and passing hastily through France, published in London (1787) a pamphlet on the state of the nation. This, Mr. Vale calls one of his "disinterested exertions" in the cause of both English and French liberty. But who, at this time, had given either into his charge ? The French Convention luckily invited him over into their body sometime afterwards, and he was then, no doubt, justified in offering his advice and counsel to France. He was now, however, a citizen of the United States, well provided for by the public bounty ; the far-seeing President always counselled an avoidance on the part of this country of the entangling politics of Europe ; but Paine was too noble a philanthropist to listen to such counsels. Washington, we shall soon see, was altogether too "pusillanimous" a leader for him. In all his "seven campaigns," Paine can detect no "exploits"—only "the Fabian system of *doing nothing*." Our patriot, therefore,

"The friend of every country *but* his own,"

(and it will apply to both his native and his adopted country) travels to establish Revolutionary principles ; and is self-commissioned (about 60 years ago) to pull down the monarchy of England. The 'Last Minstrel' of Scotland has a fine 'Lay' describing, by anticipation, this, Paine's last visit to England :

"Breathes there the man with soul so dead
Who never to himself has said,
As home his footsteps he hath turned,
From wandering on another strand ;
This is my own, my *native* land ?
If such there be, go mark him well,
For him no minstrel-raptures swell ;
Despite his talents, powers or pelf,
The wretch, concentrated all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown ;
And, doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile dust from whence he sprung,
Unwept, unhonored and unsung."

The English authorities would have been fully justified, we must think, (had they been aware of his object) in anticipating their subsequent treatment of a similar worthy, Aaron Burr, and ordering our agitator out of the kingdom

in 24 hours. But he remained to publish, in 1791, his *Rights of Man*, parts I and II. His own friend says, "The generality of those who had previously written on the subject of government, appear to have drawn their principles from *existing systems*, and all that they had attempted to effect, was the correction of a few extreme abuses. But our author's attack was of a different nature; he not only deprecated the practice, but condemned the principle (?) He not only declared his contempt for the monarch, but his detestation of the monarchy." He himself speaks in a pamphlet of the time, vindicating his course, of having attempted "to expose the fraud and imposition of every species of hereditary government." The Attorney General was at length (1792) ordered to prosecute his *Rights of Man*, as a dangerous and seditious libel; when the invitation of the French Convention, to which we alluded, opportunely arrived, and saved him, at least, from an English jail.

Mr. Paine embarked for the Continent; was elected a deputy for Calais, and two or three other towns; and "*vive Thomas Paine*" resounded through the Hall of the Convention. He sat on the trial of Louis XVI.; "voted that he should be tried," says his biographer, "but strongly opposed the vote for his death," and published his "*Reasons*." In 1793, he is excluded from the Convention, as a foreigner, and in the following year committed to the Luxembourg, under a decree for imprisoning all persons born in England. Late in that year (4th Nov.) he obtained his liberty. In the interim, the publication of the first part of his *Age of Reason* was superintended by his friend, Joel Barlow. It is of the alleged neglect of him, by General Washington, during this imprisonment, that he so loudly complains. On his liberation, he was received at the house of Mr. Monroe, recently appointed Ambassador to France, for 18 months.

The rest of his career has but little of public interest. He resumed his seat in the French Convention, but commanded no particular notice. In the winter of 1795-6, he gave some proof, we think, of the failure of his faculties; or we may regard the Tract he now published, as a happy anticipation of Fourierism. It is entitled "*Agrarian Justice*, opposed to Agrarian Law and Agrarian Mo-

nopoly; being a Plan for meliorating the condition of Man, by creating in every nation a National Fund, to pay to every person at the age of twenty-one years, £15 sterling, to enable him or her to begin the world; and also £10 sterling annually, during life, to every person now living at the age of fifty years, and to all others when they arrive at that age, to enable them to live an old age without wretchedness, and go decently out of the world." The fund was to be raised by taking, at the death of every individual, 10 per cent. of his property as due to society, and from 5 to 10 per cent. more, if there were no near relatives. It is somewhat remarkable to observe "Common Sense" to be the title of his first political Tract, and this, that of his last. Our biographer, wisely enough for Paine's fame, omits all mention of this piece; perhaps we should add that Mr. Jefferson complimented him with the offer of a passage from France to the United States, in a national vessel; and spoke of his "useful labors" as "having contributed with as much effect as those of any man living," to the "sentiments of former times." He arrived finally in this country in 1802, and died at New York in 1809.

His private life has generally been thought to be stained by a questionable connection with Mad. Bonneville, the wife of a bookseller of Paris, whom he brought with him on his return home, and who left her husband and family in that city to the period of Paine's death. The lady, however, brought an action against Cheetham, for a libel against her on this point, and obtained \$250 damages, "out of which the costs were to be paid." Bp. McIlvaine and other writers, we think, have had no sufficient ground for charging him with living with her "as the victim of seduction."

From the charge of habits of gross intemperance, in his later life, Mr. Vale in vain attempts to rescue his memory. Joel Barlow, whose letter is here quoted, says, "You ask what company he kept. He always frequented the best, both in England and France, *till* he became the object of calumny in certain American papers; till he conceived himself neglected and despised by his former friends in the United States. From that moment *he gave himself*

very much to drink, and consequently, to companions less worthy his better days.

Something was said at one period, of his having retracted his deistical opinions on his death bed. Of this we find no fair evidence. He only sullenly replied to the attending physician, who asked him whether he had any belief in Christianity? "I have no wish to believe on the subject."

We may now put on record such a portion of his two characteristic Letters to Washington as we can find space for. While in all lands which the history of the United States has reached (including the ablest of England's modern statesmen and men of letters) the great President's name has risen to a height of unqualified and unequalled respect and regard, this is Mr. Paine's estimate of him. He writes from Paris, in August, 1796:

"The eventful crisis, to which your double politics have conducted the affairs of your country, requires an investigation uncramped by ceremony.

"There was a time when the fame of America, moral and political, stood fair and high in the world. The lustre of her revolution extended itself to every individual, and to be a citizen of America, gave a title to respect in Europe. Neither meanness nor ingratitude had been mingled in the composition of her character. Her resistance to the attempted tyranny of England left her unsuspected of the one, and her open acknowledgment of the aid she received from France precluded all suspicion of the other. The politics of Washington had not then appeared.

* * * * *

"I declare myself opposed to several matters in the Constitution, particularly to the manner in which what is called the executive is formed, and to the long duration of the Senate; and if I live to return to America, I will use all my endeavors to have them altered. I also declare myself opposed to almost the whole of your administration; for *I know it to have been deceitful, if not perfidious.*

* * * * *

"It was with pleasure that every sincere friend to America beheld, as the natural effect of union, her rising prosperity, and it was with grief they saw that prosperity mixed, even in the blossom, with the germ of corruption. Monopolies of every kind marked your administration, almost in the moment of its com-

mencement. The lands obtained by the revolution were lavished upon partisans; the interest of the disbanded soldier was sold to the speculator; injustice was acted under the pretence of faith; and the chief of the army became the *patron of the fraud*. From such a beginning, what else could be expected than what has happened? A mean and servile submission to the insults of one nation; treachery and ingratitude to another.

* * * * *

"Meanness and ingratitude have nothing equivocal in their character. There is not a trait in them that renders them doubtful. They are so originally vice that they are generated in the dung of other vices, and crawl into existence with the filth upon their back. The fugitives have found protection in you, and the levee-room is their place of rendezvous.

* * * * *

"The part I acted in the American revolution is well known. I shall not here repeat it. I know also that had it not been for the aid received from France, in men, money and ships, your *cold and unmilitary conduct* (as I shall show in the course of this letter,) would in all possibility have lost America; at least she would not have been the independent nation she now is. You *slept away your time in the field*, till the finances of the country were completely exhausted, and you have but little share in the glory of the final event. It is time, sir, to speak the undisguised language of historical truth.

"Elevated to the chair of the presidency, you assumed the merit of everything to yourself; and the natural ingratitude of your constitution began to appear. You commenced your presidential career by encouraging and swallowing the grossest adulation; and you travelled America from one end to the other to put yourself in the way of receiving it. You have as many addresses in your chest as James II. As to what were your views, for if you are not great enough to have ambition, you are little enough to have vanity, they cannot be directly inferred from expressions of your own; but the partisans of your politics have divulged the secret.

* * * * *

"Could I have known to what degree of corruption and perfidy the administrative part of the government of America had descended, I could have been at no loss to have understood the reservedness of Mr. Washington toward me during my imprisonment in the Luxembourg. There are cases *in which silence is a loud language*.

* * * * *

"As my citizenship in America was not altered or diminished by anything I had done in Europe, (on the contrary, it ought to have been considered as strengthened, for it was the American principle of government *that I was endeavoring to spread in Europe,*) and as it is the duty of every government to charge itself with the care of any of its citizens who may happen to fall under an arbitrary persecution abroad, and this is also one of the reasons for which ambassadors or ministers are appointed, it was the duty of the executive department in America to have made at least some inquiries about me, as soon as it heard of my imprisonment. But if this had not been the case, that government owed it to me on every ground of honor and gratitude. Mr. Washington owed it to me on every score of private acquaintance, I will not now say friendship—for it has sometime been known, by those who know him, that he has no friendships; that he is incapable of forming any; he can serve or desert a man, or a cause, with constitutional indifference; and it is this cold hermaphrodite faculty that imposed itself upon the world, and was credited a while by enemies, as by friends, for prudence, moderation, and impartiality.

* * * * *

"I neither saw nor heard from any person for six months; and the only hope that remained to me was, that a new minister would arrive from America to supersede Morris, and that he would be authorized to inquire into the cause of my imprisonment; but even this hope, in the state to which matters were daily arriving, was too remote to have any consolatory effect, and I contented myself with the thought that I might be remembered when it would be too late.

* * * * *

"I had been imprisoned seven months, and the silence of the executive part of the government of America (Mr. Washington) upon the case, and upon everything respecting me, was explanation enough to Robespierre that he might proceed to extremities.

"A violent fever, which had nearly terminated my existence, was, I believe, the circumstance that preserved it. I was not in a condition to be removed, or to know of what was passing, or of what had passed, for more than a month. It makes a blank in my remembrance of life. The first thing I was informed of was the fall of Robespierre.

"About a week after this, Mr. Monroe arrived to supersede Gouverneur Morris, and as soon as I was able to write a note legible enough to be read, I found a way to convey one to him by means of the man who lighted the lamps in the prison; and

whose unabated friendship to me, from whom he had never received any service, and with difficulty accepted any recompense, *puts the character of Mr. Washington to shame.*

* * * * *

"I was now at no loss to understand Mr. Washington and his new-fangled faction, and that the policy was silently to leave me to fall in France. They were rushing as fast as they could venture, without awakening the jealousy of America, into all the vices and corruptions of the British government; and it was no more consistent with the policy of Mr. Washington, and those who immediately surrounded him, *than it was with that of Robespierre or of Pitt*, that I should survive.

* * * * *

"All that period of my imprisonment, at least, I owe not to Robespierre, but to *his colleague in projects*, George Washington. Immediately upon my liberation, Mr. Monroe invited me to his house, where I remained more than a year and a half; and I speak of his aid and friendship, as an open-hearted man will always do in such a case—with respect and gratitude.

* * * * *

"Morris still loiters in Europe, chiefly in England; and Mr. Washington is still in correspondence with him. Mr. Washington ought, therefore, to expect, especially since his conduct in the affair of Jay's treaty, that France must consider Morris and Washington as men of the same description. The chief difference, however, between the two, is, (for in politics there is none,) that the one is profligate enough to profess an indifference about moral principles, and the other is prudent enough to conceal the want of them."

Such is about a third of Letter I.

LETTER II.

"I cannot understand your silence upon this subject upon any other ground than as connivance at my imprisonment; and this is the manner it is understood here, and will be understood in America, unless you will give me authority for contradicting it. I therefore write you this letter, to propose to you to send me copies of any letters you have written, that I may remove this suspicion. In the preface to 'Second Part of the *Age of Reason*,' I have given a memorandum from the handwriting of Robespierre, in which he proposed a decree of accusation against me, *for the interest of America, as well as of France.*' He could

have no cause for putting America in the case, but by interpreting the silence of the American government into connivance and consent. I was imprisoned on the ground of being born in England; and your silence in not inquiring the cause of that imprisonment, and reclaiming me against it, was tacitly giving me up. I ought not to have suspected you of treachery; but whether I recover from the illness I now suffer, or not, I shall continue to think you treacherous, till you give me cause to think otherwise. I am sure you would have found yourself more at your ease, had you acted by me as you ought; for whether your desertion of me was intended to gratify the English government, or to let me fall into destruction in France, that you might exclaim the louder against the French revolution; or whether you hoped by my extinction to meet with less opposition in mounting up the American government; either of these will involve you in reproach you will not easily shake off.

* * * * *

"As everything I have been doing in Europe was connected with my wishes for the prosperity of America, I ought to be the more surprised at this conduct on the part of her government. It leaves me but one mode of explanation, which is, *that everything is not as it ought to be among you*, and that the presence of a man who might disapprove, and who had credit enough with the country to be heard and believed, was not wished for. This was the operating motive with the despotic faction that imprisoned me in France, (though the pretence was that I was a foreigner,) and those that have been silent and inactive toward me in America, appear to me to have acted from the same motive. It is impossible for me to discover any other.

* * * * *

"Had I wanted a commentary on his (Washington's) silence, with respect to my imprisonment in France, some of his faction have furnished me with it. What I here allude to, is a publication in a Philadelphia paper, copied afterward into a New York paper, both under the patronage of the Washington faction, in which the writer, still supposing me in prison in France, wonders at my lengthy respite from the scaffold. And he marks his politics still farther, by saying: 'It appears, moreover, that the people of England did not relish his (Thomas Paine's) opinions quite so well as he expected; and that for one of his last pieces, as destructive to the peace and happiness of their country, (meaning, I suppose, the '*Rights of Man*,') they threatened our knight-errant with such serious vengeance, that, to avoid a trip to Botany Bay, he fled over to France, as a less dangerous voyage.'

"I am not refuting or contradicting the falsehood of this publication, for it is sufficiently notorious; neither am I censuring the writer; on the contrary, I thank him for the explanation he has incautiously given of the principles of the Washington faction. Insignificant, however, as the piece is, it was capable of having some ill effects, had it arrived in France during my imprisonment, and in the time of Robespierre; and I am uncharitable in supposing that this was one of the intentions of the writer.*

"I have now done with Mr. Washington on the score of private affairs. It would have been far more agreeable to me had his conduct been such as not to have merited these reproaches. Errors or caprices of temper can be pardoned and forgotten; but a cold, deliberate crime of the heart, such as Mr. Washington is capable of acting, is not to be washed away. I now proceed to other matter.

* * * * *

"The character which Mr. Washington has attempted to act in the world is a sort of non-describable, chameleon-colored thing, called prudence. It is, in many cases, a substitute for principle, and is so nearly allied to hypocrisy, that it easily slides into it. His genius for prudence furnished him, in this instance, with an expedient that served (as is the natural and general character of all expedients,) to diminish the embarrassments of the moment, and multiply them afterward; for he caused it to be announced to the French government, as a confidential matter, (Mr. Washington should recollect that I was a member of the convention, and had the means of knowing what I here state,) he caused it, I say, to be announced, and that for the purpose of preventing any uneasiness to the French, on the score of Mr. Jay's mission to England, that the object of that mission, and Mr. Jay's authority, were restricted to the demanding of the surrender of the western posts, and indemnification for the cargoes captured in American vessels. Mr. Washington knows that this was untrue.

* * * * *

"The Washington faction having waded through the slough of negotiation, and while it amused France with professions of friendship contrived to injure her, immediately throws off the hypocrite and assumes the swaggering air of a bravado. The party papers of that imbecile administration were on this occasion

* I know not who the writer of this piece is, but some late Americans say it is Phineas Bond, an American refugee, and now a British consul; and that he writes under the signature of Peter Skunk, or Peter Porcupine, (Cobbett,) or some such signature.

filled with paragraphs about sovereignty. A poltroon may boast of his sovereign right to let another kick him, and this is the only kind of sovereignty shown in the treaty with England. But those dashing paragraphs, as Timothy Pickering well knows, were intended for France, without whose assistance, in men, money, and ships, Mr. Washington would have cut but a poor figure in the American war. But of his military talents I shall speak hereafter.

* * * * *

"The injury which Mr. Washington's administration has done to the character as well as to the commerce of America, is too great to be repaired by him. Foreign nations will be shy of making treaties with a government that has given the faithless example of perverting the liberality of a former treaty to the injury of the party with whom it was made.

"In what fraudulent light must Mr. Washington's character appear in the world, when his declarations and his conduct are compared together! Here follows the letter he wrote to the committee of public safety, while Jay was negotiating in profound secrecy this treacherous treaty:

* * * * *

"As the letter was addressed to the committee of public safety, Mr. Washington did not expect it would get abroad in the world, or be seen by any other eye than that of Robespierre, or be heard by any other ear than that of the committee; that it would pass as a whisper across the Atlantic, from one dark chamber to the other, and there terminate. It was calculated to remove from the mind of the committee all suspicion upon Jay's mission to England, and in this point of view it was suited to the circumstances of the moment then passing; but as the event of that mission has proved the letter to be *hypocritical*, it serves no other purpose of the present moment than to show that the writer is not to be credited. Two circumstances served to make the reading of the letter necessary in the convention: the one was, that they who succeeded on the fall of Robespierre, found it most proper to act with publicity; the other, to extinguish the suspicions which the strange conduct of Morris had occasioned in France.

* * * * *

"It is laughable to hear Mr. Washington talk of his *sympathetic feelings*, who has always been remarked, even among his friends, for not having any. He has, however, given no proof of any to me. As to the pompous encomiums he so liberally pays

to himself on the score of the American revolution, the propriety of them may be questioned; and, since he has forced them so much into notice, it is fair to examine his pretensions.

"A stranger might be led to suppose, from the egotism with which Mr. Washington speaks, that himself, and himself only, had generated, conducted, completed and established the revolution. In fine, that it was all his own doing.

"In the first place, as to the political part, he had no share in it; and therefore the whole of *that* is out of the question with respect to him. There remains, then, only the military part; and it would have been prudent in Mr. Washington not to have awakened inquiry upon that subject. Fame then was cheap; he enjoyed it cheaply; and nobody was disposed to take away the laurels that, whether they were *acquired* or not, had been given.

* * * * *

"But when we speak of military character, something more is to be understood than constancy; and something more *ought* to be understood than the Fabian system of *doing nothing*. The *nothing* part can be done by anybody. Old Mrs. Thompson, the housekeeper of headquarters, (who threatened to make the sun and the *wind* shine through Rivington of New York,) could have done it as well as Mr. Washington. Deborah would have been as good as Barak.

"Mr. Washington had the national rank of commander-in-chief, but he was not so in fact. He had, in reality, only a separate command. He had no control over, or direction of, the army to the northward, under Gates, that captured Burgoyne; or of that to the south, under Greene, that recovered the southern States. The nominal rank, however, of commander-in-chief, served to throw upon him the lustre of those actions, and to make him appear as the soul and centre of all military operations in America.

"He commenced his command June, 1775, during the time the Massachusetts army lay before Boston, and after the affair of Bunker's hill. The commencement of his command was the commencement of inactivity. Nothing was afterward done or attempted to be done, during the nine months he remained before Boston. If we may judge from the resistance made at Concord, and afterward at Bunker's hill, there was a spirit of enterprise at that time which the presence of Mr. Washington chilled into cold defence. By the advantage of a good exterior he attracts respect, which his habitual silence tends to preserve; but he has not the talent of inspiring ardor in an army.

* * * * *

"How far Mr. Washington, as general, is blameable for these matters, I am not undertaking to determine; but they are evi-

dently defects in military geography. The successful skirmishes at the close of that campaign (matters that would scarcely be noticed in a better state of affairs,) make the brilliant exploits of General Washington's seven campaigns. No wonder we see so much pusillanimity in the *President*, when we see so little enterprise in the *General*!

* * * * *

"It is as well the ingratitude as the pusillanimity of Mr. Washington, and the Washington faction, that has brought upon America the loss of character she now suffers in the world, and the numerous evils her commerce has undergone, and to which it is still exposed. The British ministry soon found out what sort of men they had to deal with, and they dealt with them accordingly; and if farther explanation was wanting, it has been fully given since, in the snivelling address of the New York chamber of commerce, &c.

* * * * *

"This is the ground upon which America now stands. All her rights of commerce and navigation are to begin anew, and that with loss of character to begin with. If there is sense enough left in the heart to call a blush into the cheek, the Washington administration must be ashamed to appear. And as to you, sir, treacherous in private friendship (for so you have been to me, and that in the day of danger,) and a hypocrite in public life, the world will be troubled to decide whether you are an APOSTATE or an IMPOSTOR—whether you have abandoned good principles, or whether you ever had any.

THOMAS PAINE."

Such is infidel *justice* and *charity* toward the character of the best public man of his age.* It needs little comment.

* M. Guizot's admirable "Essay on the Character and Influence of Washington," has recently been published. It is worth the attentive perusal of every true American at this juncture. We have only room for a few of his concluding sentences. "The disposition of the most eminent men, and of the best among the most eminent, to keep aloof from public affairs, in a free democratic society, is a serious fact. . . . Washington sighed for retirement. It would seem as if, in this form of society, the task of government were too severe for men who are capable of comprehending its extent, and desirous of discharging the trust in a proper manner. Still, to such men alone is this task suited. In men who are worthy of this destiny, all weariness, all sadness of spirit, however it might be permitted in others, is a weakness. Their vocation is labor. Their reward is, indeed, the success of their efforts, but still only in labor. Very often they die, bent under their burden, before the day of recompense arrives. Washington lived to receive it. He deserved and enjoyed both success and repose. OF ALL GREAT MEN HE WAS THE MOST VIRTUOUS, AND THE MOST FORTUNATE. In this world God has no higher favors to bestow."

Paine was imprisoned about seven months; during the last two, Mr. Munroe did apply to the French authorities for his liberation, and obtained it. We will not heed such a man as Paine, so far as to take it for granted that Mr. Morris, the predecessor of Munroe, did nothing in his behalf. Then it is to be considered of the other *five* months, *three* would be occupied in the transmission of intelligence to and from America to France. It is quite probable, therefore, that President Washington was unacquainted with the case as an extreme one. It is certain that he had good reason to regard Paine, at this period, as a mere political adventurer, who had embroiled himself alike with England and France, against all good American policy; and one whose friend no great man *could* long remain.

We would hold the balance even in weighing the demerits of such a man; nothing is gained by injustice to them; every thing by a fair exhibition of his principles, as *he* wrought them out.

Opportunity for such a purpose as we have been preparing this paper, Mr. Grant Thorburn, under his literary name of Laurie Todd, has been contributing Reminiscences of Paine to a respectable New York Journal. We have room only for a passage respecting his later personal habits.

"Carver and I were fellow craftsmen. . . . He kept a porter house on a small scale," where Paine lodged.

"Hundreds of his old political and free-thinking friends resorted hither to meet him. I witnessed some of their interviews; but oh, what consternation! instead of the pale-faced man of thirty-six, when he wrote *Common Sense*, they beheld an old remnant of mortality, drunk, bloated, and half asleep. Very few of the better sort ever returned. Mr. Paine was sensible of his forbidding appearance, and generally was very morose to strangers.

"His chief companions were journeymen mechanics of the baser sort. One evening I stepped into his room. He was setting forth the Bible to a dozen of these characters, and painting it in the blackest colors. When he ceased, I said, 'Mr. Paine, you have been in Ireland and Scotland.' He had. 'Scotland, comparatively speaking, is full of Bibles; every one reads it, and it is their chief schoolbook.' This he conceded. 'They have very few Bibles in Ireland, and there are very few who can read them, and those who can read, are prohibited by the priest from looking in the Bible.' This also was conceded. 'Now, said I, Mr. Paine,

if the Bible was a bad book, those who used it most would be the *worst members of society*, but the contrary is the fact, for while our jails, penitentiaries, State prisons, and alms-houses are filled from Ireland, this day there is not a Scotsman, or woman in any of them.' 'Besides,' I continued, 'I see in this room a few of my own shopmates. And what are they now? Having heard the lectures of blind Palmer, and read your *Age of Reason*, they became free-thinkers; and if they continue in the same course they now are following, they will soon be freedrinkers also.'— 'And what are they following?' said Paine. Said I, 'They now go to the tavern on Sunday, sit drinking, smoking, and talking politics; their children in the streets or fields, learning everything that is wicked: having spent fifty or sixty cents, each one comes home late, and better than half drunk; he has a headache next morning, and perhaps is unable to work till 2 P. M., thus losing a half-day's wages. Disease and death soon follow, when his widow and orphans are sent to the alms-house.'

"I continued: 'Mr. Paine, Hume, yourself and other free-thinkers, all profess to write for the good of society.' He assented. 'Well,' said I, 'which is the most useful member of society; he who spends his time and money in the tavern, leaving his children to grow up a curse to the world; or, the man who leads his children to church on Sunday, keeps them in sight through the day, and thus preserves them from the path of the destroyer, besides the saving of his money, and the preservation of his own health?' The clock in the room struck ten as I spoke the last sentence; two candles were burning on the table; he took one, and walked off to bed without saying a word.

"On a subsequent evening, he told me the particulars of his remarkable escape from death, but the narrative is too long for this article. He said the *Fates* had ordained he was not to die at that time. Said I, 'Mr. Paine, I will tell you what I think; you know you have written and spoken much against the religion of the Bible; you have extolled the perfectibility of human reason when left to its own guidance, unshackled by priestcraft and superstition. The God in whom you live, and move, and have your being, has spared your life, that you might give to the world a living comment on your doctrines. You now show to the world what human nature is, when left to itself to wander in its own counsels. Here you sit, in an obscure, uncomfortable dwelling, powdered with snuff, and stupified with brandy. You, who were once the companion of Washington, Jay, and Hamilton; but are now deserted by every good man, and even respectable Deists cross the street to avoid you.' He said, he cared not a straw for the opinions of the world. Said I, 'I envy not your feelings,

for I wish so to conduct, that I may gain the esteem of my fellow men.' He died on the 8th of June, 1809. Few knew that he was alive that month, till they saw his death announced in the papers of the ninth; had he died on the day when he was chalked for the guillotine in Paris, his name would have stood high in the temple of fame. But he was spared ten years longer, till his profane and hateful life put a veto on his infidel writings."—*N. Y. Observer.*

ARTICLE IV.

The Moral, Social and Professional Duties of Attornies and Solicitors. By SAMUEL WARREN, Esq. F. R. S., of the Inner Temple, Barrister at Law. New York. Harper & Brothers: 1849.

The Importance of Religion to the Legal Profession, with some Remarks on the Character of the late Charles Chauncey, Esq. A Discourse. By HENRY A. BOARDMAN, D. D. Philadelphia. Published by Wm. S. Martien: 1849.

The Obligations of Legislative Science to the Bible. By GARDINER SPRING, D. D. New York. Taylor & Dodd: 1839.*

We have placed these works at the head of this article, not because they are of very recent date, or because we intend to make them the subject of special review. They are widely and favorably known to the reading public. We propose to treat of a subject to which they all more or less particularly refer, and which we consider one of special interest and importance. In our remarks we shall have occasion to refer frequently to the very able and interesting works above named. The subject is "*The Relations of Christianity to Legal Science, and the Legal Profession.*"

* Lecture III. in Spring's Obligations of the world to the Bible.

Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, iii : 31, where he asks, "Do we then make void the law, through faith?" and declares, "God forbid! yea, we establish the law," paid his impressive tribute, as a Christian, to the ancient moral law. It had been said by cavillers against the Gospel, that the revelation of a new ground of justifying man, other than by his own obedience to the law, was calculated to weaken its force, and sully its glory. The apostle repels this insinuation, as to the licentious tendency of the doctrine of justification by Faith, and shows conclusively, that it tended rather to exalt and commend the law to the reverence and obedience of every true and pious heart. The truth, that its claims were satisfied with nothing less than the obedience, sufferings and death of the Son of God, who honored it alike by his life of obedience, and his death of agony and shame; and the truth, that faith in Christ and love for him, leads every believer to reverence more sacredly, and obey more scrupulously, all its requirements, both testify to the influence of the Gospel upon the law, and prove, that instead of making it void, it established it on an immovable, and everlasting, and glorious foundation.

But while the system of religion taught by our Saviour and his inspired apostles, is not in opposition to the divine code, known as the moral law, neither is it opposed to the science of human jurisprudence. Nowhere is human law so well defined, respected and obeyed; nowhere does it so fully carry out its noble mission, as the guardian of human rights, and the defender of man's dearest interests, as where Christianity is most widely diffused among the people. Those who are the most zealous advocates for the support of law, and the maintenance of public justice, who cultivate and uphold a law-loving and law-abiding spirit in the community, are not the vicious and depraved and abandoned portion of the people, but they are the sober, the virtuous, the godly—those who reverence the divine, and therefore are bound to respect the human law. And if the genius of lawlessness and anarchy would seek to establish her reign of terror in the State, and trample beneath her feet the dearest rights of men, her first blow should be levelled against the religion of the Bible, for nothing would prove such an insuperable obstacle to her

progress, as the conservatism of piety. Faith must be abolished, if men would make void even Human Law.

One great distinction between a Christian and a heathen nation, is the enthronement of Law, in its majesty, among the people, and the regular, unfettered, impartial administration of justice. In such a land, the science of Jurisprudence will be honored as one of the noblest of the sciences, and the legal profession, whose vocation it is to expound and apply its principles, will be deservedly regarded as one of the most honorable and important of all earthly vocations. It is well said by the eminent English jurist and author, whose work we have noticed above, "that the due discharge of the varied, arduous and responsible duties of the lawyer, his intellectual and moral fitness for his profession, is a matter of vital concernment to society at large; to every individual in the community, from peer to peasant; nay, from the august occupant of the throne, down to the very humblest subject in her dominions." And the distinguished divine of our own country, above named, also remarks with truth, that "the moral character of the Bar, no less than its character for learning and ability, is a matter of deep and universal concern. It is not a matter, gentlemen of the Bar," says he, "which pertains merely to your reputation as individuals, nor to the relations between yourselves and your clients. Even if it were, it might be pertinent to ask, who are your clients? For the purposes of this argument, the whole community are your clients. There is no citizen, however humble, or however exalted, who may not at any time become your client. There is not one among our honorable and opulent merchants, among the ministers of religion, among the able and upright jurists who preside over your own courts; nay, not one among our refined and gentle females, our mothers, wives, and daughters, who may not on any day be compelled to invoke your protection. You are the conservators of our property, of our liberty, our lives, our characters, the guardians of our fire-sides, the defenders of our altars. Have we no stake then in your character? Have we no right to insist, that a profession which is the depository of our most sacred earthly interests, shall omit nothing that may help to qualify them for their high trust? that they shall not only make themselves

masters of their noble science, in its principles, and its technicalities, but cultivate those elevated moral sentiments, which alone can assure us that our confidence will not be misplaced?"

The Bar, likewise, in all civilized countries, and especially in our own, is the royal road to distinction in the State. Lawyers are the leading men, generally, in all public movements, and exert a greater influence than any other class of men, in guiding and controlling the public mind. They are at the head of our parties, they are usually the selected orators in our popular assemblies, they shape the course of our legislative bodies, they fill the chairs of State, and bear the insignia of office; they are, in a word, *our public men*. They direct the councils and policy of the nation, they are often our representatives at foreign courts, and have our national honor in their keeping. Surely it cannot be a matter of too great importance, that the legal profession be qualified to discharge its high behests, in such a manner as to be at once the ornament and the safeguard of the State.

In considering the relations of Revealed Religion to Jurisprudence, it will be pertinent to glance briefly at the history of Legal Science. Dr. Spring, in his able and learned Lecture, gives us valuable aid.

It is an interesting fact, that the first written code of law ever delivered to any people, is found in the Holy Scriptures. The Mosaic code, delivered by the great Legislator of the Universe to His ancient people, is the first published code which the history of the world has recorded; and, it may be remarked, that it is a very perfect system of law. We know that it has been said, that in the early history of our race, when the state of human society was ruder, their manners simpler, and the whole social structure less complicated and ramified than in later days, codes of law were necessarily rude and simple, and that the science of Jurisprudence, like other sciences, has been enlarged and improved from age to age, as the wants of society demanded, and increasing civilization and refinement ensured. It is undoubtedly true, that great additions have been made to this science in the progress of time, and that the application of its principles has been extended over a vastly wider range. Mercantile Law has

had its origin and made its progress since the Mosaic code was published, for the ancient Hebrews were not to any extent a commercial, but an agricultural people. And the isolated character of the Hebrew commonwealth would, doubtless, leave much for after ages to add in the form of International Law. The condition of different countries, too, would call for special enactments, appropriate to those countries. But when you look at the great principles of legal science, the genius of human jurisprudence, you will find them in that first great code which the ancient Hebrew patriarch received from the hand of the Almighty, amid the thunders and lightnings of Sinai.

Foremost in that code, coming with all the authority of the Legislator of Heaven, stands *The Moral Law*.

This wonderful and comprehensive code is not, as some have asserted, a system for the government of individual conduct, in which the Divine Being, or conscience, his vice-gerent in the human heart, alone sits as Judge. It is true that this law has to do with the relations which man sustains to the moral government of God; that it concerns the inner as well as the outer life of men; that it extends its sceptre into that mysterious mental and moral realm, over whose affairs human law has no jurisdiction, and issues mandates which earthly tribunals cannot enforce. But it is no less true, according to Dr. Spring, that it lays down principles and rules for men in communities and States, which are essential to their very existence, which indeed lie at the foundation of human society. No social organization, he remarks, could exist, much less could it advance and secure the best interests of men, which was not based upon the statutes of the Moral Law. These statutes are, in fact, but the embodiment of those immutable and eternal principles of right and wrong, to which God himself always conforms, and which are designated by writers on Jurisprudence, as the "*Law of Nature*." This moral law "is founded in those relations of justice, that existed in the nature of things antecedent to any positive precept." The things which it requires are right, and those which it forbids are wrong, by the universal, immutable verdict of reason, of man's natural constitution, as well as by the various codes of all but the most barbarous and degraded of the nations of the earth. All the

enactments of human law, respecting man's duties to his fellow-man, spring from this code, and to this they owe all their force. The crimes of murder, of theft, of adultery, of perjury, are prohibited and punished by human law, but they but re-echo the condemnation of the divine code. Human legislation can add nothing to the unlawfulness of those offences. It arises out of their being in opposition to the laws of God, and this intrinsic unlawfulness cannot be affected by human enactments. All the legislation on earth could not take away the moral turpitude from murder, nor make it right for a man to rob his fellow of his money or his good name. The Divine code has made it wrong, the law of nature asserts boldly its unlawfulness, and human jurisprudence can only add its feeble assent to these majestic enunciations.

And when we examine those three general precepts so famous in human jurisprudence, to which the Emperor Justinian, in the sixth century, reduced "the whole doctrine of Law," "*honeste vivere, alterum non lædere, suum cuique tribuere*," what is there here but the very spirit of the moral code of the ancient Hebrew legislator? Let these precepts be carried out into practice, and what statute of that code would not be observed? Ancient and venerable as are the Institutes of Justinian, there is an earlier and more authoritative system than his, and for his three great principles, which are so often quoted by the expounders of human codes, we must go back not only five hundred years to the God-man Christ Jesus, and his heavenly teachings, but we must travel across the waste of twenty centuries, and behold the hoary patriarch of Israel, receiving them from the hand of Jehovah, on the trembling and smoking mountain.

But when we examine the civil code of the ancient Hebrews, we shall still find that the fundamental principles of allwise legislation, and the basis of the science of Jurisprudence, is contained in that first written code of laws known to history. Dr. Spring has specified various particulars, in which the Mosaic laws have not been surpassed by the enactments of any succeeding code, especially in respect to personal rights, and the transactions of ordinary life. Says he, "the caution with which the Mosaic laws prevented the accumulation of debt; the fidelity with

which they required the restoration of lost property; the restoring of property which was injured, or stolen, in the former case to the full amount of its original value, and in the latter to double that amount, and the distinctness and simplicity of the law of bailment, are replete with instruction to every succeeding generation of men. Any man who carefully reads that beautiful treatise of Sir William Jones on this last subject, will see that all the leading principles of the law of bailment, there illustrated, are found in the law of Moses. In the Mosaic code you find the following law in relation to injuries arising from carelessness and inattention: "If a man shall open a pit, or if a man shall dig a pit, and shall not cover it, and an ox or an ass fall therein, the owner of the pit shall make it good, and give money unto the owner of them; and the dead beast shall be his. And if one man's ox hurt another's that he die, then they shall sell the live ox and divide the money of it; and the dead ox also they shall divide." (Exodus, 21 : 33, 35.) This law contains the germ of all the existing refinements of the law of injuries arising from want of care, and those arising without fault. There is a nice equity in this law, where upon payment for the damages 'the beast shall be his' who was the occasion of the injury. The division of the loss, too, where neither party is in fault, is a very refined notion of equity. It is the rule at the present day in the case of the collision of ships, and is both more equitable and more tender, than leaving the loss upon that party who by accident first sustains it. Dividing the loss, also greatly diminished the temptation to quarrel about the probable fault, and to prevent the litigation, and this is a cardinal object of all wise governments. * * * The law of depositaries, or the law concerning property given in charge for safe keeping, is not to be surpassed for wisdom and equity; and all the refinements of the law to this day, do not carry the principle any farther. No rule of damages, in cases of seduction, is so wise as that in the law of Moses. It is the usual one lawyers now present to juries, where the case is one of real deception. These, and other similar laws, are expressive of great wisdom, and have been uniformly honored by all wise and benevolent legislators."

History, too, according to Dr. S., testifies to the obliga-

tions which modern jurisprudence owes to that code of law of which we speak. It cannot be doubted that the surrounding nations were acquainted with the Jewish code of laws. Egypt, Persia, and Greece herself, felt the influence of that code. Many points of resemblance, between the laws of the Hebrews and those of the Greeks, have been traced out by learned writers. Not to speak of others, it may be interesting to mention, that in the history of the common law of England, written by that eminent jurist, Sir Matthew Hale, it is declared, that there is almost an exact resemblance between the codes in these two nations in regard to the law of descents.

The Roman law, which was collected and reduced to system under the direction of the Emperor Justinian, is the foundation of modern civil Jurisprudence. No pains was spared in its compilation and arrangements. The regal constitutions of their ancient kings, the twelve tables of the decemviri, the edicts of the prætors, and the opinions of learned lawyers, were examined, and from their immense stores the "body of the civil law" was formed. But it is a matter of history, that when the twelve tables were formed, the laws of Greece were carefully examined, and the element infused into the Grecian codes from that of Moses, doubtless thus found its way into the Roman law.

In the History of the Fall of the Roman Empire, by Sismondi, it is said that when Alfred the Great, who, as is well known, collected a portion of the common law of England, "caused a republication of Saxon laws, he inserted several laws, taken from the Jewish Ritual, into his Statutes, as if to give new strength and cogency to the principles of morality." "And hence," says Dr. S., "it is no uncommon thing in the early English reporters, to find frequent references to the Mosaic law." Sismondi also states, he continues, that one of the first acts of the clergy under Pepin and Charlemagne of France, was to introduce into the legislation of the Franks, several of the Mosaic laws found in the books of Deuteronomy and Leviticus. The learned Michaelis, who was professor of law in the University of Gottingen, remarks, "that a man who considers laws philosophically, who would survey them with the eye of a Montesquieu, would never overlook the laws

of Moses. And one of the most distinguished statesmen of our own country, whose name will always live in American history, the celebrated Fisher Ames, remarked that "no man could be a sound lawyer, who was not well read in the laws of Moses."

It thus appears that Legal Science is under peculiar obligations to the Bible and the Christian religion; that it is indebted to Divine Revelation for the very principles and genius of its institutions. The highest glory of Human Law is, that it is the reflection of the Divine; faint indeed, and far less glorious than its original, yet irradiated with splendors from its heavenly source, which justly command our admiration and respect.

If this be so, then the Bible should find its warmest friends and supporters among the members of the legal profession. It should be regarded indeed as a text book, wherein the principles of that noble science, of which they are the expounders and administrators, are laid down and enforced with all the authority of Divinity. Containing the first code of law which was ever recognized among men, and which came from the hand of a Divine Legislator, embodying principles which have largely entered into the various systems of human jurisprudence, and reflecting upon them something of the grandeur and dignity of the Divine Original, it is worthy to be had in the highest reverence and admiration, by that important and honorable profession, whose relations and duties are now under consideration.

But we think that the Bible is worthy of such respect and admiration, because of the special honor which it seems to do to the legal profession. The most superficial reader of its pages cannot have failed to notice that frequent allusion is made to the forms and proceedings of legal tribunals, as well representing that most august and solemn transaction to which all human life is tending, and upon which all the events which are transpiring around us, are exerting a most important influence. There is a scene which is to be enacted before the moral universe, of which no type or representation could be found, save in the solemnities and forms of a court of justice. The Judge is to be seated on the Bench, arrayed in all the dignity and majesty of that position, and to conduct the

trial of the world according to the principles and requirements of an infinite and eternal Law. The individuals to be tried are to appear before the tribunal. The law is there, the evidence is there, recorded in massive volumes then to be opened for the acquittal or condemnation of those who are on trial. It is to our mind a circumstance worthy of notice, that the Holy Scriptures, when they would represent the most solemn and momentous transaction in which men can be engaged, and shadow it forth in a most striking and impressive form, should have selected a scene with which the members of the legal profession are most familiar, and in which they are most frequently the actors. This could never have been the case were this profession an unnecessary and injurious one to the interests of human society, or the scenes of its practice other than solemn and impressive. It may indeed be the case that our courts are burdened with much unnecessary and frivolous litigation. But he who can be indifferent to the scenes which are sometimes enacted there, when man's dearest interests are involved in the issue, must have lost his sensibility to all that is solemn and overwhelming in interest and impressiveness. When we see an earthly tribunal sitting in judgment upon the case of an individual whose life is at stake, it is to us a fitting type of that tremendous scene which is to be presented at the last great day. The position and office of the Judge acquires additional solemnity and dignity in our estimation as we remember that the Holy Scriptures make Him a type of that Great Being who shall sit upon "the great white throne," and "judge the world in righteousness." The office of the Advocate also gathers fresh claims to our consideration when we recall that language of the inspired Apostle which declares that "if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous."—The whole scene gathers force and impressiveness from the consideration that the Divine Spirit has used it in the sacred volume to describe and image forth that most stupendous transaction which the universe is to behold—the *final judgment*.

And if this be so,—if the Divine Spirit has singled out from among all the scenes which are enacted among men, those which lie in the daily path of the legal profession,

and in which they are the principal actors, to represent that event to which all the providences of God, and all the actions of men are tending, which is to be the winding up of the affairs of Time, and the opening of the unchanging destinies of Eternity, it is to us no slight tribute to the dignity and the majesty of earthly tribunals, and to those who are called to administer their lofty behests.— Their character should ever be such as to make them worthy of the sublime association.

It has also seemed to us that the members of the legal profession were under peculiar obligation to examine fairly into the divine claims of Christianity. The very nature of their profession leads them to habits of the nicest investigation, and the most rigid scrutiny of evidence. Testimony is everything with them. We are not insensible to the power and value of eloquence in our tribunals of law. We have listened with admiration to an earnest and impassioned advocate in his plea for an unfortunate client whose liberty or life was in danger. We have seen the rapt attention of bench, bar, jury and spectators, the breathless silence, the rapidly varying expression, the deep drawn sigh, yea, the sob, the tear that testified to the power of the speaker, as he touched with a master-hand the deepest chords within the soul and swept them at his pleasure. We know that some of the noblest efforts of genius, and some of the finest specimens of eloquence, have graced the annals of tribunals of law. But even in these cases the foundation of the masterly argument, the vivid description, the thrilling appeal, was *the evidence*, and the great effort of the advocate was to place *that* before the minds of his auditors, and give it a thousand voices that *it* might speak conviction either of the guilt or innocence of his client, to the minds of those who were the arbiters of his destiny. To place the evidence clearly before the jury, to sift it thoroughly and keenly, to examine and cross-examine until everything which has a direct or remote bearing upon the case, is brought out as clearly and unequivocally as possible, "*hic labor, hęc opus est*," in conducting a case. Therefore lawyers, from the very nature of their profession, should and do attach great weight to evidence, and make it a principle to take nothing for granted. But the system of Christianity is one

which proffers its high claims to universal reception upon the infallible evidence which it adduces. It asks nothing at the hands of man, but a thorough examination of that evidence. It invites the most rigid, and only asks that it be a candid, scrutiny. The testimony of miracles, of prophecy, of the noble and exalted system of morals it proposes, the perfect agreement of all parts of its great text book with each other, and with profane history, the character of the writers, and the moral effects which it has produced upon the world; this chain of testimony, which has stood the assaults of unbelievers for two thousand years, and of which not a link is broken, Christianity offers to the world. Who then so fitted, by the very nature of their daily avocations, to examine and feel the force of the evidences of Christianity, as the members of the legal profession? There never was a case adjudicated in a court, where the evidence was as conclusive and overwhelming as that which Christianity adduces, and she appeals with peculiar force to those who are, by the very nature of their profession, fitted to appreciate and investigate claims thus presented and supported. To be an unbeliever in Christianity, then, seems to be peculiarly inconsistent in a member of the legal profession. To reject a system which challenges the nicest scrutiny of the evidence which supports it, and presents a chain of testimony which would carry instant conviction to the minds of any unprejudiced tribunal, is unworthy of those who are accustomed daily to the examination of evidence with careful scrutiny, and the most minute and thorough investigation, and to base their opinions, and their line of action, upon the results of such examination. Let lawyers give to the evidences of Christianity the same scrutiny, subject them to the same searching process, examine and cross-examine with the same critical acumen which they display in the conduct of their cases in the courts, and they will be convinced that Christianity has fully established her case, and that the evidences of her divine character cannot be invalidated.

Again: To be not only a believer in Christianity, but practically to honor its claims in daily life, seems to be, in a peculiar sense, binding upon the members of that profession, whose obligations and duties we are considering.

They are the guardians, defenders, expounders, and administrators of *the Law*. They are sworn to maintain and advance the interests of truth and justice. They are to see that the good are protected, and that the bad are punished. Every kind of crime is to be by them rebuked, and its perpetrators held up to deserved reprobation. The dearest earthly interests of society are to be protected by them, and, in fine, there is no class of men on earth, except the ministers of the Gospel, who are called to such a noble and important vocation. But does it not seem to be a striking inconsistency, that he who is set for the maintenance and observance of human, should himself be a violator of the divine, law? Does it not seem to be in the highest degree consistent with his professional obligations and responsibilities, that he who is the expounder and minister of that law which has been well said by Mr. Warren to be "that power by which civil society is constituted and sustained in existence, overpowering the unruly elements of our fallen nature; with heaven-born energy converting the savage into the citizen, making the wilderness to bloom and blossom as the rose, redolent of the balmy air of peace and order, and surrounding its confines with impregnable bulwarks against brute force and arbitrary will;" does it not, we say, seem in the highest degree consistent for him who is the minister of a system so noble and beneficial, to respect profoundly and obey faithfully, that "*higher law*" of which this is but the shadow and the abridgement? Shall he who inculcates the duty of obedience to the laws of man, himself set the example of disobedience to the laws of God? Shall he who expounds and maintains the enactments and requirements of human legislators, and whose professional life is regulated and controlled by these, and whose business it is to see that by their proper interpretation and application the order and prosperity of human society are preserved and advanced, be regardless as to the ordering of his life by the principles of that law "whose seat is the bosom of God, and whose voice is the harmony of the universe?" Inasmuch as human law is the creature of the divine, and shining with reflected light, feebly images forth the glories of its sublime original, with what propriety or consistency can the lawyer insist upon the claims

of the less, without a practical acknowledgement of the obligations of the greater? Shall the puny articulations of the legislators of earth command his personal respect, and claim the devotement of his noblest talents and his most precious time; and shall he refuse to hear and obey the mighty utterances of the great Lawgiver of the Universe? Shall he spare no pains to bring the offender against the laws of his country to merited punishment, and thus secure the best welfare of that country, and yet never feel within his bosom a pang of bitter self-condemnation for his own daily breaches of the laws of God's moral universe, which, in their infraction, bring the direst confusion, wretchedness and ruin upon the great family of man? Shall he stand up to plead for a fellow man arraigned at the bar of an earthly court, and not ask, "who will be my advocate before the tribunal above?" Shall he engage in the daily business of the court, and not be reminded of that assize where he must soon appear, not as an advocate, but a client; not as a minister, but as a subject, of Law? No conformity or devotion to the law of man will be received at that day as a substitute for a constant neglect of the laws of God. Yea! his must be an aggravated condemnation. Next to him who appears as the herald of the skies—God's ambassador to men—and is faithless to his trust; must he stand in depth of guilt and bitterness of condemnation, whose earthly vocation it was to uphold the majesty and the sanctions of law and justice among his fellow men, and was yet regardless of the law of God. If any man should be rebuked by his daily vocation for an irreligious life, by the very principles which he is called upon daily to uphold, defend and apply, it should be a member of the legal profession. Its high vocation, and honorable and important mission, impose upon it peculiar and proportionably solemn responsibilities. And will it not be seen to be a truth in its application to this most honorable profession, that a solemn sense of the paramount obligations of the Law of God, and a consistent practical obedience to that law, is entirely compatible with and friendly to the most distinguished attainments in jurisprudence, and the highest honors of the bench or the bar. The names of Hale and Selden, and Marshall, and Reeve and Sherman, give ample testi-

mony to the truth of this, in whom the attainments and honors of the jurist were so beautifully blended with the faith and graces of the Christian.

Again: the peculiar relation which the members of the bar sustain to the community, makes it in the highest degree desirable that they should be men actuated by pure Christian principle. We have already adverted to the fact that the bar is the high road to preferment; that lawyers generally are our public men, who make our laws, administer our government, and have our national honor in keeping. In these public relations it is easy to see how desirable it is that they should be pure, upright, God-fearing men. But we speak now more particularly of that intimate and confidential relation which, as lawyers, they sustain to the community and to their clients. The character of that relation has been well described by Mr. Warren, and we therefore quote his words at length. He remarks, addressing lawyers:

"Gentlemen, I repeat, speaking as one of the public, that we could not do without you, even if we wished. Whatever be our talents or acquirements, whatever our tempers and dispositions, whether amiable and yielding, or exacting, irritable and overbearing; whether we be virtuous or profligate, we may have to take you into our confidence, and open to you the most secret recesses of our hearts. We tell you what we would declare to no one else on earth; we pour into your ears the accents of anguish all but unutterable; to your eyes are exposed hearts bleeding and quivering in every fibre, pierced by the serpent's tooth of ingratitude, broken by the loss of those whom we love more than life itself; whether taken from our arms by death, or ravished from us by fiendish lust or the ruthless ruffian hand of violence. When our domestic peace is slain—when the most hallowed relations of life and society are dislocated by the evil passions of others; by cupidity, perfidy, fraud, hypocrisy, malice and revenge; in short, whether our honor, our life, our liberty, our property, or those of our families, are endangered or outraged, to you per force we must fly in our extremity; living or dying, yes, I say dying, for we descend into the grave in reliance on the discretion and integrity with which you have undertaken to carry into effect our wishes on behalf of those loved ones whom we are leaving behind us, whom we would fain shelter as far as we may from calamity and the world's reverses, by providing for them, out of the produce of a life's labor, anxiety and privation; and we look

to do all this through the instrumentality of your judicious and conscientious exertions.

“When the shaft of calumny has wounded us, it is to you that we fly to vindicate our smarting honor; into your ear are poured the affrighted accents of those to whom guilt is imputed; crime of fearful enormity, attaching infamy maddening to contemplate; crime too, which may be *falsely* imputed to him whom the mere imputation is blighting before your very eyes, and who in his agony and horror has sent for you—has summoned you that he may listen in the dread gloom of a prison cell, to your sympathizing words of counsel and guidance; that he may whisper into your ear the indignant protestations of an innocence which with confiding eagerness relies on you for its vindication.”

This peculiar, intimate and confidential relation, renders it especially desirable that they in whom we are thus obliged to confide should be worthy of the trust. They should be men of sterling integrity, purity and honor; of quick sympathies, of nice discrimination, of refined delicacy of feeling. We do not say that all these may not be possessed in a good degree where there is not piety, for we think we have known such cases; but it is certainly true that there is greater security where religion adds her graces to the character, and gives also to natural endowments a crowning glory. The influence which the lawyer may have over his client, growing out of the confidential relation existing between them, may be immense. He becomes acquainted with his secrets, his embarrassments, his perplexities, his fears, his trials; he often takes his property into his hands, or what is far more precious, his reputation; his client is forced to put himself entirely in his power, and commit to his discretion and fidelity the guardianship of his dearest interests. Surely there is great opportunity for the abuse of influence, the perversion of power, here; how difficult for poor human nature to maintain under such circumstances always a spirit of integrity and disinterestedness, and how valuable the aids of true piety. Here again we quote from Mr. Warren, and give you a few sentences from the close of one of his Lectures. After presenting in a very comprehensive and forcible sketch the duties and responsibilities of the profession, he proceeds:

“Well may you modestly ask, who is sufficient for these things? You cannot become so, except through help from on

high. I tell you that your character will be utterly rotten, all your resolution and efforts abortive, unless under the constant influence of piety and virtue, ruling the heart and directing the will on all occasions whatsoever. Oh let not an immortal spirit bow itself into the dust forgetful of its high destiny and becoming of the earth, earthy. It can degrade itself, but cannot get rid of those awful responsibilities which it has incurred in this transitory scene of probation. Forget not God, but remember him constantly, and obey his precepts. Piety and virtue will give you true elevation of character; can alone extinguish envy, hatred, malice and uncharitableness; extract the sting from adversity; dignify even failure, and add unspeakable sweetness to success."

Finally—we think that the peculiar temptations of the legal profession are such as to demand the aids and influences of piety. We trust that we have expressed, in sufficiently explicit terms, the high estimation in which we hold both the science and the practice of jurisprudence. There is a well known passage from Hooker, one of the ablest of the old English divines, of the sixteenth century, which expresses in masterful style what ought to be every man's opinion. It is this:

"Of law there can be no less acknowledged, than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power; both angels and men, and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy."*

And in Sir James Mackintosh's "Discourse on the Law of Nature and Nations," occurs the following forcible passage:—

"There is not in my opinion, in the whole compass of human affairs, so noble a spectacle as that which is displayed in the progress of jurisprudence; where we may contemplate the cautious and unwearied exertions of wise men through a long course of ages, withdrawing every case as it arises, from the dangerous power of discretion, and subjecting it to inflexible rules, extending the dominion of justice and reason, and gradually contracting within the narrowest possible limits the domain of brutal force and arbitrary will."

* Hooker's Works, p. 240.

Yet noble as is the science, and essential to the well being of society; and honorable as is the practice of jurisprudence, it cannot be denied that there are great and peculiar temptations connected with it. The lawyer immersed in the duties of his practice, may sometimes fail to keep before his mind's eye "the lofty and everlasting principles of virtue and justice which are concerned in the structure of law," and is in danger of overlooking the importance of always so using his office as to "magnify and make it honorable."

There is one peculiarity about the legal profession, as Dr. Boardman remarks: "Its daily element is controversy." This is the source of its great temptations. The excitements of the judicial arena are not altogether favorable to the preservation of a candid, even, magnanimous temper, free from envy, malice, petulance, and an unscrupulousness in the use of means; nor is this arena always the scene of that noblest of all victories, the conquest of self.

"There is no sphere," continues Dr. B., "in which integrity is of greater value, and none where it is more rigorously tested than at the bar. The temptations to swerve from it are of daily recurrence, and are sometimes clothed with a most specious garb. The profession has to do with two classes of persons, the wronged and the wrong doers. And to deal with either as their confidential adviser, in a perfectly frank, straightforward and kind manner, demands a stern and lofty virtue. We know how difficult this is in private life, and the difficulty must be greatly increased when the parties bear to each other the relation of client and counsel. Among men who live by the law—who look to it for support and for fame—the inducements must be very strong to encourage litigation. It has always been the opprobrium of the profession, that it was infested by individuals who were ready on all occasions to pander to the basest passions, and to become the instruments of the avaricious, the revengeful and the hard hearted, in oppressing their victims. Such men unhappily rarely want for clients."

Yet while this is true, there are many instances where the lawyer has been the means of settling on an amicable basis a case of difference which might have grown under his fostering care into a vexatious protracted litigation; involving not only a ruinous expenditure of property, but

cherishing every malignant failing of the heart, and entailing sometimes a deadly feud upon after generations.—The public are not aware how often the legal profession, often represented as a promoter of strife and discord, is entitled rather to the noble benediction, “Blessed are the peace-makers.”

Yet the temptations are certainly very powerful the other way. It is no easy thing for one whose character and support are dependant upon his professional business, to refuse any case that offers, or any side of any case.—When clients come excited and heated by real or fancied injuries to seek from their attorney the redress which the law provides, when they demand that the screws shall be applied without mercy, and every means of harassing and crushing their adversary shall be put into operation which the mighty engine of the law can furnish, it requires very high and noble views of duty to rise above the promptings of self-interest, and endeavor to soothe their excitement; examine into the real merits of the case, and endeavor to settle it by an equitable compromise. It requires a lofty moral courage, especially in one who is young, and naturally ambitious of rising in his profession, to decline a case presented, either on account of its frivolous character or its injustice, and to refuse peremptorily to allow his client to attempt not only to perpetrate a wrong under color of law, but to do it through his agency. And there is equal need of stern virtue in the conducting of a case, where rightfully undertaken, in the avoidance of any of the tricks of the trade, the packing of juries, the brow beating and intimidation of witnesses, the misquoting or straining of authorities, the appeal to the baser passions, or to sectional or political preferences, the attempt to direct the mind from the real question at issue and secure a verdict on other grounds than its real merits. All these things may purchase the reputation of being a very keen lawyer, but this is not the same thing with being a true, honorable man. Let him contend for the rights of his client as firmly as he may, but let him contend fairly; let him remember the fundamental principle, “*suum cuique tribuere*,” and apply it even to his opponent, so that if successful his laurels may be greener because fairly won, and if unsuccessful, he may at least console himself with the

reflection that he contended honorably, and suffers no disgrace in failure.

Lawyers often see the worst side of human nature.—Avarice, revenge, malice, cupidity, falsehood, often come to them to seek, by their means, to gain their wicked ends. They may hold out a glittering bribe to influence the counsel they consult, and win them to their vile uses.—They may have the letter of the law on their side, but not its spirit; and therefore an honorable, high minded practitioner will refuse to prostitute his abilities in their cause. It needs a lofty sense of the responsibilities of the profession, to take this course—to scorn to become the knife with which some merciless “Shylock” will cut away “his pound of flesh,”—to look beyond the bare technicalities of the case, and ask, “is the *spirit of the law* with my client?” We do not mean to say that this temptation is never resisted save by the aid of religious principle—there are men of intrinsic nobleness of mind, who would scorn to become the agents of avarice or revenge; but it is not always resisted, and it cannot be sure of universal resistance, except the pure principles of virtue and piety pervade the entire profession. Then, indeed, would this noble science, and this honorable and useful profession, take everywhere the exalted rank which belongs to it; then would the stale and groundless insinuation that its practice was unfriendly to integrity and virtue, be forever silenced, and its true nature and excellency would be acknowledged by the world. Then would there be more numerous instances of men like Sir Matthew Hale, of whom his biographer has well said that “the singular uprightness and piety of his life, which excited the admiration of his contemporaries no less than of posterity, have rendered interesting to the most ordinary peruser, the quaint and sententious record of his thoughts and actions which have been transmitted to us by himself and his historian.” And what a noble testimony is it to his goodness, that “the beautiful details of his domestic life have rendered his memory even more cherished by the good and pious in all professions, than it is venerated on other grounds by the learned of his own. His piety among his many virtues was the most conspicuous, and is the best remembered.” He was an intimate friend of the pious

Baxter, and this intimacy was the source of mutual advantage and pleasure to both. "Once, when suddenly called upon in the capacity of counsel, he shrank not like a true hearted follower of Christ from averring as the reason of his unpreparedness, that it was late Saturday night before he had notice of the engagement, and that the next day was not a day to think of these things." His conscientious observance of the Sabbath was a trait in his character in which he has set a noble example to the profession of which he was one of the brightest ornaments. Nottingham, Talbot and Blackstone, all eminent jurists, paid their tribute to religion and her claims, and proved that the temptations of their profession and position could be successfully combated by the aid of piety.

Far be it from us to say that there have not been instances in the legal profession of distinguished ability and of high moral excellence, when there has been no pretension to piety. Doubtless there have been and are such instances. "But," as Dr. Boardman well remarks, "it is contended that even in cases of this sort religion would impart an additional lustre to the character; while its influence, if diffused throughout the body, would be most advantageously felt in removing the prevalent vices and defects of the profession, and augmenting all those virtues which make it one of the chief supports and ornaments of a refined civilization. What the profession would be if it were consecrated by the pervading power of a vital Christianity, may be inferred from such instances as I have mentioned, and other examples of living members of the bar, of men who combine the noblest intellectual gifts, the most accurate and profound knowledge of jurisprudence, rhetorical abilities of a high order, the purest affections, and the greatest amenity of manners, with an enlightened and unostentatious piety."

It would be a blessed thing for Society if such were the character of every member of the legal profession.— Important, useful, honorable as it is, its influence must be great upon the public welfare. It is said that there are more than twenty thousand lawyers in our country—more than one to every fifteen hundred of our population. Let this large body of men, who are, as a class, well educated, intelligent, honorable men, foremost in public life by virtue

of their peculiar relation to the community, wielding a more universal and universally powerful influence than any other class of men, our orators, our rulers, our ambassadors to foreign nations—let them be men of moral worth and true piety, and what a blessing and a pride they would be to our country! Says Dr. Boardman,

“Piety alone will not fit men to become jurists, diplomatists or legislators. But piety is the basis of good morals. It makes men conscientious. It stimulates them to acquire the qualifications demanded by the station Providence may assign them, and puts them upon using their abilities for the best ends. If evangelical Christianity were enthroned, not in our halls of justice merely, but in the hearts of all who serve at her altars, their great influence would tell far more auspiciously than it does now, upon the leading interests of this country. It would moderate the spirit of faction, the bane of all republics. It might repress the idolatry of mammon, and curb the lust of conquest, two of the brood of baser passions which have acquired an Herculean growth in our soil. It would check the prevailing tendency to rash and hasty legislation, and teach visionary reformers that they ‘should approach to the faults of the state, as to the wounds of a father, with pious awe, and trembling solicitude.’ It would be felt throughout all the framework of society, in extinguishing vice, alleviating misery, fostering education, and consolidating the institutions of Christianity.”

We would, then, respectfully recommend to those whose high vocation it is to expound and administer human law, to study deeply its divine original; we would urge them to be familiar with its principles and its precepts; to recognize its peculiar claims upon them, and to fulfil with fidelity and zeal all its holy requirements. Then shall their earthly course be one of honor, of usefulness and success, and when at last they appear before the great tribunal of God, not to conduct another's case, but for the final adjudication of their own, they shall receive a sentence of approval, from the Judge of all, which shall admit them to the unfading glories and the everlasting joys of The Heaven of the Good.

ARTICLE V. *Rev. S. M. May*

SCRIPTURALISM AND RATIONALISM.

The skilful physician must have an extensive range of knowledge. He must be a close observer, and a correct thinker. His information must extend to many classes of subjects. It is said that in diseases there are prevailing types which affect different regions, and belong to distinct periods, and which enter more or less into the various forms of disease with which the physician meets; modifying the symptoms and determining the treatment. These he should be able to detect.

The minister of the Gospel is a physician. He has to treat the moral and spiritual diseases of mankind; his vocation requires knowledge. He should be acquainted with the anatomy of his subject, and the nature and modifications of his disease. He should know the remedy and the method of its application. This, too, covers a wide range; it implies a knowledge of himself, of man in the various relations which he sustains, of human language, of the Sacred Scriptures, and an experimental acquaintance with the Gospel. Not only should he know men, in the sense of being able to discover the feelings and character of the individuals with whom he may come in contact, but he should be able to take a comprehensive view of society, and of the world, in their intellectual, moral and religious aspect. There are great phases of human thought and feeling, which he ought to comprehend. In every heresy there is a *πρωτον πσευδος*, which being overthrown, the error falls to the ground. In every great system there is a primary hypothesis. In every age there are peculiarities of mental and moral phenomena, which pervade, more or less, the educated and intellectual world. A great idea, when once thrown out, cannot be arrested. Cherished perhaps at first by a single mind, it finds a lodgement in another, and then it reaches a third, and so continues to spread, until it is impossible to set limits to its progress. Such was the progress of that sentiment that led to the Reformation; such the history of the political sentiment, that all men are free and equal. So also was with theories of astronomy and philosophy, which.

though once despised, are now almost universally received. And as there are great movements which pass over society, and modify it, intellectually, morally and socially; so there are great causes which operate as hindrances to the progress of the Gospel. The *grand* hindrance is human depravity. But then the manner in which this universal fact operates, depends upon circumstances which may vary in different ages and countries. Thus, it is obvious that the circumstances which hinder the progress of the Gospel in Spain and Portugal, are widely different from those which effect the same result in China and India. So also in respect to periods. In the first ages of the Christian dispensation, the civil, social, mental and moral conditions of the world were such, as by their combined influence upon the doctrines and polity of the Church, to produce a state of things most disastrous to the cause of Christ. In the words of Luther, the Gospel was sifted in baskets of coal. The result was the production of a Christianized Paganism; ultimately, the supremacy of the Pope, and a universal corruption of morals, and enslavement of mind.

At the Reformation there were tremendous convulsions throughout Christendom. A large and fair portion of his dominions were wrested from the Pope; and throughout the reformed countries, many of the rights and responsibilities of man were felt and asserted. But many passed from one extreme of credulity and subserviency, to the opposite extreme of skepticism and anarchy. Those who had believed in Papal infallibility and transubstantiation, now denied the authority of the Scriptures, and the truth of all religion.

Among Protestants, the war of infidelity succeeded. Even in the bosom of the Catholic Church, infidelity prevailed. The reason is obvious. The human mind had been aroused from its long sleep; old land-marks had been swept away; things which had been received under the sanction of religion, were found to be false, wicked, absurd. It was easy and natural to confound the Gospel with the abuses of the Gospel, and thus there was everywhere an effort to discard the Christian religion, as a system of priestcraft and deception.

We believe that God is in history. We believe in the

progress of the Church. Glorious things are spoken of thee, Jerusalem, thou city of God. God has promised to give unto his son the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession.

Yes, thou shall reign forever,
O Jesus, King of Kings;
Thy light, thy love, thy favor
Each ransomed captive sings;
The isles for thee are waiting,
The deserts learn thy praise,
The hills and valleys greeting
The song responsive raise.

To the universal conquest of the Church, all things under the providence of God, are tending. The current of events to this end, is like the rushing of a great river toward the ocean. Its passage is onward, and still onward. There may be obstacles which oppose its progress, but they are swept away. The line of direction may sometimes be changed, and the current, running against the opposing bank, may seem to be driven back by its own force; there may be an eddying of the waters; or a rapid stream may pour in, in such a direction and with such violence, as to seem to force back the parent river; but still His course will be onward toward old ocean, and He will reach it in due season. The wandering of the Israelites through the wilderness, was but a type of the pilgrimage of the Church. Long and tedious was their journey, numerous were their enemies, and many their sins and chastenings; but still the Lord was with them. The pillar of cloud was over them by day, and the pillar of fire by night; He led them through the Red Sea; He sent the manna from heaven; He caused the rock to gush forth waters; He vanquished their enemies; He divided the waves of Jordan; He led them by the right way, to a place of habitation. So now Jesus is head over all things to the Church. Amid all trials and difficulties and storms, He is the pilot at the helm, and she shall at last reach the port in safety.

The ever varying forms of error, while they show the alertness and activity of the enemy, still prove the power of the truth. The universal supremacy of the Pope has long been denied. The influence of corrupt and pagan superstitions, which belonged to the Romish Church, has

been overthrown ; in the larger part of the thinking world, open and avowed infidelity, too, has, to a great extent, been silenced ; but still the enemy, with all his former energy, and with a more dangerous mask, battles with the Sacramental Host of God's elect.

The great intellectual battle of the age, is that which is now going on between Scripturalists and Rationalists.

This is a struggle, on which the welfare of the Church and the salvation of the world, alike depend. Rationalism is now the grand prevailing type of error. It is the *πρῶτον πσευδος*. The "open sesame"—the key which solves the various forms in which opposition is now made to spiritual religion in the intellectual world. It is intimately connected with the intellectual, moral, political and social condition of the world, and is deeply imbedded in the spirit of the age. Its influence is felt, more or less, in every Christian land, and through all classes of society.

By Scripturalism, we mean the faith of those who receive the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the inspired word of God, and as an infallible rule of faith and practice. By Rationalism, we mean that system which so exalts human reason, as to deny the necessity, or destroy the authority, of the Divine Revelation.

And here it is proper to remark, that the very name which Rationalists have assumed, is calculated to make a false impression upon the minds of the unguarded. There is nothing in which a party can show more skill, or on which their success more depends, than the selection of a name. Socinians have taken the name Unitarian, as if they alone believed in the unity of the Godhead, and in the same manner, the name of the Rationalists would seem to indicate, that they alone contend for the exercise of reason in matters of religion.

The danger is, that men will be led to suppose that Scripturalism is inconsistent with the proper exercise of reason. So far is this from being true, that we suppose Scripturalism is the most reasonable of all systems of religion. It proceeds upon the following grounds : 1st, It is altogether reasonable that God should make a revelation to man. 2d, It is reasonable to believe, that if a revelation were made, it would be so made, as to carry to the candid mind conviction of its truth.

It is not contrary to reason, to say that God *can work miracles* ; nor to believe that he would do so in attestation of the Divine commission of one whom he had sent to teach.

3d, It is reasonable to believe, that a revelation if made, would be in language suited to the capacity of men.

4th, It is reasonable, that the teachings of this revealed system should be regarded as authoritative.

So far then from denying reason its proper place, the Bible submits its credentials to be judged of by reason. It only demands, that its claims be decided according to the ordinary laws of evidence. These credentials being acknowledged, Scripture demands of reason such an interpretation, as would be given to any other book. That is, that it be interpreted according to the established usage of language. It then challenges the submission of man to its teachings as authoritative. This claim, it rests upon the reasonable ground, that man is bound to believe what God speaks. In other words, it bases its claim upon the veracity of God.

As the word of God, the Sacred Scriptures demand of man a candid investigation of their credentials. These admitted, it is the office of reason to inquire and decide, what do the Scriptures teach. And to the doctrines thus taught, she requires of man childlike submission.

Rationalism, on the other hand, proceeds upon the ground, that the human mind is of itself capable of deciding what a revelation ought to be, and of elaborating for itself a system of Divine truth. Being independent of the Scriptures, they are tolerated rather than received, and as often as their teachings come in conflict with the more reliable deductions of the inner man, they must be set aside. In Germany, we have had an exhibition of the practical working and ultimate effects of this system ; there, the masses of the professedly religious have forsaken the fountain of living waters, and hewn to themselves broken cisterns, which can hold no water. It is needless to enumerate the wild and visionary theories which have been propounded. They are obscure and dreamy ; they rest upon no fixed and certain foundations ; their speculations conflict with each other, and they leave the mind which attempts to follow them, bewildered in a labyrinth of transcendental absurdities.

With one, God is everything, and with another, God is nothing—while another impiously declares “I will now create God.”

Passing over the extravagancies and absurdities of German transcendentalism, it may not be uninteresting or useless to notice some of the rationalistic tendencies, which may be observed nearer home.

1. The first and heaviest blow which has been struck at the Sacred Scriptures, is the attempt which is now making to divest them of their claim to inspiration. This is the foundation stone, on which the authority of the Scriptures rests; here they base their claim to be an infallible rule of faith and practice. If they are not inspired, they cannot be a safe and reliable guide.

Rationalistic writers are aiming their heaviest artillery at the doctrine of inspiration; some have attempted to show, that inspiration cannot be predicated of writings, but only of men, and even though the writers of the Old and New Testaments were inspired, yet their writings are not. Again it is contended, that the only kind of inspiration which the writers of the Sacred Scriptures possessed, was that which every contemplative mind possesses. They are not productions of men whose intuitional consciousness was elevated and excited, and have no higher authority than the speculations of Kant, and are only true, in so far as the intuitional consciousness of men of the present day, determines them to be so. Nor are we to suppose, that speculations of this sort are confined to any land; they are everywhere to be found; under this banner the great adversary is marshalling his forces; Judas betrayed our Saviour with a kiss. Just so, multitudes who nominally praise and honor the Sacred volume, are doing all in their power to remove the very foundation on which it rests.

2. But there are tendencies to rationalism, which shew themselves in other forms. Scripturalism is the inductive philosophy of religion. By an induction of facts, we prove that the Bible comes from God. This determined, we ask what the Bible teaches? To find out this, we examine its contents, and by the plain and ordinary laws of language we decide. This revealed system we receive upon the highest of all evidence, the testimony of God. Such

a Divine system we expect will reveal mysteries, things too high for the human mind to discover, or when revealed, fully to understand ; these revealed truths are the subjects of faith. Accordingly, in the Sacred Scriptures are found many doctrines which we receive upon God's testimony, and which, though not contrary to reason, are above reason, in the sense, that unaided human reason could never have discovered them.

Especially is this true of those doctrines which relate to the method of the Divine existence, and to the plan of salvation provided for sinners. As matters of pure revelation we may mention the doctrine of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the Atonement, of Christ's vicarious sacrifice and absolute satisfaction for sin, of regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Ghost, the imputation of Adam's sin, and of Christ's righteousness, &c. To the scripturalist these doctrines are true, because he finds them in the word of God plainly taught. He believes them on the testimony of God, and bases on them his hopes : moreover, the very fact that they are found there, is to him a proof of the Divine origin of the Scriptures themselves. For, as they pass the conception of the human mind, they could not have been of human invention, and so are what the book in which they are found declares—a revelation from God.

Rationalism, however, proceeds upon a different principle. Exalting human reason above the Scriptures, many (and they are found among Christians and even among those who admit the inspiration of the Scriptures,) go to the word of God determined to make its teachings bend to their preconceived notions of what a revelation ought to be.

Thus we find in the nominally Christian world men who deny all the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. The great doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ—of the sovereignty of God—of the Atonement—of the resurrection of the body, and regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Ghost—have been separately and collectively denied, on just such grounds. It being settled that these doctrines are not such as reason would say a revelation ought to teach, and therefore that they are not true ; the question next arises, what is to be done with those passages of Scripture which appear to

teach them? To get rid of these, a system of forced interpretation is resorted to, so as to make the true and obvious meaning of language bend to preconceived theories of truth. Those passages which teach the representative relationship of Adam to his posterity, and our fall in him, are allegories. Where Christ is spoken of as suffering in the place of the sinner, and represented as offering himself a vicarious sacrifice, thus making a real atonement, we are told that the sacred writers used hyperbolical expressions, intended to show that Christ, by his sublime teachings and by his holy example, has conferred great blessings on the human family, and that in his sufferings we have, as a governmental act, a display of God's displeasure at sin.

Many of the purely didactic and doctrinal portions of Scripture are regarded as mythical and poetical—while others suppose that the word of God contains two systems of theology, viz: the theology of the understanding, and the theology of the feelings.

The effect of all this is obvious. It destroys the authority of the word of God. It teaches that it is in no sense an infallible guide as to truth and duty—that they who come to it for instruction, must look within themselves for *light*. They in effect deny to man the benefit of revelation at all. They put out the glorious sun in the heavens and substitute a taper in its stead. While God speaks to them from heaven, in plain and distinct language, they stop their ears, refuse to listen to his voice, and ask counsel as to spiritual and eternal things of the uncertain guide within. They do much to increase open and avowed infidelity. These rationalistic interpreters of the Scriptures affirm that certain doctrines of religion are unreasonable, and therefore untrue; and that, as such, they cannot be found in the Bible. The infidel, on the other hand, affirms that these doctrines are found in the Bible, and as Christians themselves admit that they are unreasonable and untrue, they conclude that the Scriptures in which they are contained must be false. Thus we perceive that rationalism tends directly to increase and to strengthen infidelity.

But there are other rationalistic tendencies which are observable in the age, and which ought not to pass unnoticed in this discussion. We live in an age of the upturn-

ing of the foundations of civil society—an age of revolution. The human mind has burst the bonds which, for so many centuries, had enchained it. Like the captive eagle, which has regained its liberty, it soars aloft, and luxuriates in its freedom. The new ideas which were given to the world in the sixteenth century, on the subject of civil and religious liberty, have been in their course like the progress of a mountain torrent—feeble at first, gathering strength and speed as it goes, till at last it sweeps away every thing that opposes its descent. Great good has been done to the world. The condition of the mass of men has been improved. But the tendency of our nature is to extremes. Every good gift we are prone to abuse. As, in reference to the doctrines of religion, we observe a tendency to pass, from a blind servility, a total submission of the conscience and the judgment to the priesthood, to the opposite extreme of deifying reason, so there is manifestly a disposition in the world to pass from tyranny to anarchy, and from passive obedience and the divine right of kings to the upturning of every safe basis on which civil society can rest.

Rationalism in religion is closely allied with radicalism in politics. There is a widely extended disposition to overturn the scriptural basis on which civil society rests, and to substitute in its place theories which are the result of human speculation, and which are as unreliable as they are visionary. The true ground on which human governments rest is the will of God. The Bible teaches the necessity that government exist, and that it be clothed with authority. It indeed establishes no particular form, but it lays down principles from which it may fairly be deduced that different forms are legitimate, and that the form may vary according to the different circumstances in which the governed are placed. It teaches that the social position of a man may lawfully be determined by the accident of birth. It teaches the necessity of subordination. It enjoins obedience to magistrates. Christ and his apostles obeyed and enjoined obedience to the governments under which they lived. The Scriptures teach the duties of rulers and the ruled, of parents and children, of husbands and wives, and of masters and servants. But while Scripturalism admits the legitimacy of different forms of government

and of the different relationship of social life, it proclaims truths and secures influences whose obvious effect is to bind mankind more and more in a common brotherhood, and to fit men for receiving and enjoying the largest amount of rational liberty.

A theory, however, of absolute social equality has taken deep root in the public mind. It springs from false views of the nature of the "social compact," and from a mistaken notion of the perfectibility of man. It looks upon man not as a fallen and sinful being, but as possessed of an ideal perfection. It would provide a government for men not as they are, but as they *ought* to be. The fundamental idea in the whole theory is, that men in society should be in all respects equal, and that all distinction is morally wrong. This, we say, is rationalism, because it is erecting a standard of right not found in the word of God, and based upon a mere abstract, and we assert a false, theory of government. The effects of the theory we see in socialism, women's rights conventions, red republicanism, the denial of all right of property, anti-capital punishment societies, opposition to scriptural views of the marriage relation, and in the mania for the political emancipation of the African race. We do not assert that all who hold any of the above mentioned opinions are to be classed among professed rationalists. The evil exists in the minds of many pious people, who are little conscious of the root from which their opinions spring. Look for a moment at the proposition that the slaveholding relation is, of necessity, a sinful one. The minds of multitudes in our land would assent to it as true. Lovers of the Bible and haters of the Bible would agree. Yet the proposition never has been and never can be established from Scripture. It is not the offspring of Scripturalism, but of a rationalistic and radical theory of government. And yet so powerful is the impression which a conviction of its truth has made upon the minds of a vast portion of the people of this land, that it is impossible to predict the effects to which it may lead. It is a sin in the sight of heaven, and many have rejected the Bible because it has not denounced it. Thus, in a recent convention of freemen in this land, it was resolved,

"That if the current religion of the day were exchanged for

downright infidelity, the abolition of slavery would be comparatively easy."

So impressed are many with the greatness of this sin, that they are ready, on its account, to overthrow the government under which we live, because it does not condemn it. They care not for consequences. Experience teaches that the two races cannot dwell together on terms of social equality, and that where emancipation has been attempted it has been effected only in part; both of which facts are proved by the condition of the free negroes in this country, North and South.

It matters not that the actual condition of the slaves in any one of the Southern States is better than that of the same number of their race in any part of the world—that it is better than that of the laboring classes in any country in the world, except the United States—that they are now advancing more in civilization and religion than any other portion of the heathen (for they but lately belonged to the heathen) world—that if emancipated now, it would result in their extermination or relapse into barbarism. Yet still their social theory demands the extermination of slavery. They require their representatives to violate the Constitution and falsify their oaths. They are willing to bring upon the nation disunion and civil war—a war which would result in the extermination of the race they profess to be anxious to bless—a war whose effect would be to throw the world and the church, civilization and religion, a century in the rear of what they now are—a war whose first blast would sound the requiem of civil liberty.

But we have to notice another effect of the same radical theory. We refer to those who hold to the doctrines of universal emancipation, and still attempt to defend African slavery. This they aim to do, by proving by the deductions of science, that the Bible doctrine, that God has made of one flesh all men that dwell upon the earth, is not true; but that negroes belong to a different race, are not human beings, and so may be enslaved in perfect consistence with the theory of absolute social equality. Thus we see rationalism on the one hand rejects the Scriptures, because they do not denounce slavery as a sin, and on the other radicalism attacks the Scriptures, because they teach us that the negroes are human beings, fellow

creatures of the same God with ourselves, and that though in God's providence they are our slaves, God requires that we care for them as brethren. But thanks be unto God, the friends of the Bible shall ever stand firm on the foundation on which they have placed their feet.

In view of the tendencies to Rationalism which have been developed, and which, if time allowed, we might continue to develop to a much greater extent, there are a few reflections which suggest themselves.

1. As Presbyterians we have reason to congratulate ourselves, that Scripturalism and Conservatism to so great an extent, pervade our body.

We may safely boast, that Presbyterians have been among the firmest friends of civil liberty, the world has ever known. The old school Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America, is now exerting an influence in behalf of conservatism and good order, which subjects her to the taunts and reproaches of extremists and fanatics throughout the world. The secret of her conservatism, is her evangelical faith and scriptural doctrines, and polity. We are republicans, without being socialists; in faith, we are independent of human authority, and yet submit to the teachings of the Bible.

2. The contest which is now going on, is one in which every Christian and patriot should feel the deepest interest. Suppose for a moment that the conflict is over, and that our enemies have been victorious; the authority of the Bible is overthrown; it is proved to be full of error, mistakes and contradiction; the human family have no revelation from God; the foundation of all our hopes has been overthrown; the best friends of religion give up the argument. Oh how bleak and desolate would this world be. The foundations are destroyed, and what more shall the righteous do? Where shall we now go for light, for hope, for consolation; what foundation can now be laid for public or private virtue, what basis for civil government? Suppose the sun should cease to afford light or heat, the moon and stars should be put out—how cold and bleak and desolate would this world be; men for a little time would wander in darkness, and *soon, very soon*, all would droop and die. Such would be the moral effects, if it were possible for man to wrest from the world

the Bible. But we rejoice that it is the gift of God—that in it He appears—He is the sun and shield—He will give grace and glory—it is His word—the promises which He there makes are sure—what His word hath spoken, His power will effect—He will put down all opposition—His knowledge shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the face of the great deep; they that contend for the Scriptures are fighting on the Lord's side, and they shall ere long prove victorious. Let us then, brethren, take fresh courage, let us ever remember, that they that wait upon the Lord, shall renew their strength—they shall mount up on wings as eagles—they shall walk and not be weary—they shall run and not faint.

3. We have much need to cultivate in the Church, and among her ministers, the spirit of piety; we need the simplicity of faith; learning we must have, ministers of strong and well cultivated minds, the Church cannot dispense with—men acquainted with science—men familiar with the philosophical speculations of the day—men read in all the wild and mystical theories of transcendental philosophy; but what she most needs is men of piety—men who will lead sinners to the cross—who will sit at the feet of Jesus, and learn of him; to this end we have need to pray for the presence of the Spirit in our churches. The Holy Ghost convinces men of sin, of righteousness, and of a judgment to come. He shows them their need of a Divine Saviour, and He convinces the wisest and most learned, of the truth of evangelical doctrines, by showing their suitableness and adaptedness to the wants of the soul. Let the Holy Ghost be withdrawn, and the Church becomes lifeless—religion becomes a form—doctrines are theories—theorizers cut loose from the word of God, and it is impossible to say to what extravagancies the wickedness and the arrogance of the human mind will drive those who once set out in this career of folly. The result will be either blank infidelity, leaving men free from all the restraints of religion, or else, the superstitions and fanaticism of some corrupt system—a “strong delusion,” sent as a punishment to their unbelief and foolish presumption. The simplicity of faith, then—the true spirit of piety—let it be the first thing at which we aim—let us as Christians seek its influences in our own hearts—as min-

isters, let it appear in our ministrations—let us strive to cultivate it among the people to whom we preach, and to its establishment in the world, let us devote our time, our talents, our labors, our strength and our lives. And may God bless our efforts to his own glory, for Christ's sake—Amen.

Rev. E. W. Green

ARTICLE VI.

THE HARMONY OF REVELATION AND NATURAL SCIENCE; WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO GEOLOGY.—NUMBER II.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 111.]

We ventured the assertion, in our former number, that the facts of Geology do not contradict the revelations of the Bible; but that on the contrary, this science, yet in its infancy, has already performed for Theology, natural and revealed, the most important service, and furnished both with many of their most conclusive arguments and sublimest illustrations.

First—Geology *meets* and *annihilates* the strongest and indeed the only plausible objection ever urged against the miraculous evidence for Christianity—Hume's celebrated argument against the Credibility of Miracles. It is not our purpose to expose the many logical inconsistencies of this once celebrated treatise. One is tempted to wonder, that so poor a sophism should ever have attained such wide celebrity. It is a *misconception* throughout; first of the strong point in his own argument, then of the real position of his antagonists. Our confidence in the uniformity of the course of nature, (the basis of his argument,) he grounds upon a uniform experience; whereas it rests upon a far deeper foundation,—on an original, universal, irresistible, instinctive conviction of the relation between cause and effect, anterior to all experience—independent of experience—the foundation of all experience; indeed, a fundamental law of human belief, and an essen-

tial element of human thought itself. Now the course of nature is but a series of causes, and their correlative effects, and to assert a violation of this established relation, would be to assail these fundamental laws, on which all our belief is founded, and thus to plunge wildly into universal scepticism. From this impregnable position, it might be safely and unanswerably argued—"If all the laws of belief are overthrown, then man can believe nothing, and a miracle, even if it should occur, would be incredible;" but the asserter of a miracle does not assert a VIOLATION or *suspension of the laws of nature*, of the relation between the cause and its appropriate effect. HE STANDS UPON THIS INVARIABLE RELATION, and from a new and extraordinary effect, deduces a new and extraordinary cause. He does not interfere with the established sequences of nature, but from the law of causation itself, deduces the irresistible conclusion, that a new antecedent will be followed by a new consequent; and a new consequent, by the same invariable law, supposes a new antecedent. If then, there be an omnipotent and omnipresent power, superior to all the other agencies in nature, to assert a miracle, is only to assert the operation of a cause *known to exist, to be present, and equal to the asserted effect*. Nor is this a suspension of the other laws of nature; the existence and operation of a superior power, do by no means annihilate or suspend the inferior, else the existence of a creator must necessarily destroy the universe which he has made; and all the various powers of nature could *only exist by their mutual annihilation*. All nature is an aggregate of powers, or of agencies, which continually co-operate with or counteract each other; yet the attraction of the magnet does not annihilate the law of gravitation, nor does the law of gravitation violate, or for a moment suspend, the laws of motion—or the superior laws of animal life, supersede at all the laws of vegetable organization—or the energies of man's spiritual being, annihilate the laws of his corporeal nature. Nor does the discovery of some *new energy* in nature, or of some new result, however unsuspected or astounding, overthrow its established harmony—or nullify the fundamental principles of human belief—or suspend the authority of that common testimony, on which all are alike admitted. It

is received at once, upon its own appropriate evidence, amongst the known powers in operation all around us; *nor is its existence or its agency*, at all supposed to violate the order of nature, or suspend the operation of one of her laws. It is a NEW CAUSE, and from the very nature of causation, supposes a *new effect*. Now, precisely *such a cause* universally admitted, and SUCH AN EFFECT, as the NATURAL RESULT of *its agency*, and nothing more than these, are asserted in the miracles of the Bible. That cause is the WILL OF OMNIPOTENCE, and that effect is the consummation of his purpose, whether in the healing of the sick, the resurrection of the dead, or the creation of a universe. The greatest of all conceivable miracles, then, is continually before his eyes, even the universe which God has made; and he who denies the possibility of a miracle, and yet acknowledges God as his creator, is in his own person, a living instance of the very miracle whose possibility he denies. The argument has not even the poor merit of originality. As an argument from experience, it is simply the formal statement in scientific terms, of that vague and vulgar prejudice prevalent amongst men, in precise proportion to their ignorance, which leads them to confine all the possibilities of things within the narrow boundaries of their own limited experience; the philosophy of the emperor of Timbuctoo, *who denied the possibility of ice*, because neither he nor any of his sublime progenitors, through all recorded centuries of observation, had ever witnessed a phenomenon so extraordinary.

As an argument from *uniform causation*, it was anticipated many centuries before; and stated with far greater precision, ingenuity, condensed brevity and force, by Cicero, in his ingenious treatise—De Divinatione, Lib. 2, Sec. 22. One of the interlocutors in this entertaining discussion of the old heathen system of divination, had referred to an event which he considered miraculous. To this the other replies, “A wonderful occurrence indeed, because it does not *often happen*; but if it could not happen, then it would never have occurred. And this is good against ALL MIRACLES—what *could not* come to pass, never *did occur*; but if it WAS POSSIBLE, then it was NO MIRACLE.” “*Res mirabilis, quia non sæpe fit. Sed si fieri non potuisset, facta non esset. Atque hoc contra*

OMNIA OSTENTA VALEAT, *nunquam, quod fieri non potuerit, esse factum; sin potuerit, non esse mirandum.*" Here the argument is clear. To assert a miracle, is to assert *an effect without a cause*, and is at once *incredible* and *impossible*—and incredible precisely because it is impossible; but to admit with Mr. Hume the possibility of miracles, and yet deny their credibility, is too absurd, *for surely what we believe to be possible, it is possible to believe.* The fundamental atheism in both is here, too, distinctly visible, since the argument denies, and in any form must deny, the existence of a power which is able to perform the asserted miracle; for surely, if the existence of such a power be admitted, then the question concerning its operation, is like any other question in regard to the agency of any new and extraordinary power—or rather, has this peculiar advantage in favor of the miracles of the Bible; that, whereas in the former case, the question regards the operation of a power, previously known to exist; in the latter, it relates to the very existence of a power, not previously known to operate.

Notwithstanding the logical fallacy of the argument, and its atheistical application by the author, in his treatise on the "Natural History of Religion,"—though it had been anatomized, on its first appearance, by the keen logic of Campbell—then confronted by Paley, at the bar of common sense, and condemned—then subjected to the metaphysical analysis of a mind *as subtle* and more comprehensive than his own, and its component gases separated and scattered to the winds—yet this exploded sophism was revived, in the year 1815, by the Edinburgh Review, the same journal which had patronized the dreams of Bailly long after they had been hooted from the land of their nativity, and deduced such prodigious conclusions, with such magisterial authority, from the zodiacs of Denderah and Ezneh. Those who are at all acquainted with the literary history of Edinburgh at the period, know with what profound contempt and pity this attempt was witnessed by all the real thinkers of that literary metropolis. Scarce three years had passed away when the progress of *Geological Science* forced that journal, for the first and last time since the first announcement of its oracular and infallible decisions, to *retract and refute* its own superficial infidelity.

"The late discoveries in Geology (Ed. Rev., No. 104,) lead *irresistibly* to another observation. It is one of still greater importance, for it seems *to us to be fatal to the theory* (Hume's) which we have presumed to call a *misconception of the uniformity of causation*, as signifying an *unalterable* sequence of causes and effects.

"Those who have read neither Lyell nor Cuvier are yet aware that the human race did not exist from all eternity. *Certain strata have been identified with the period of man's first appearance.* We cannot do better than quote from Dr. Pritchard's excellent book (Physical History of Mankind,) his comment and application of this fact. 'It is well known that all the strata of which our continents are composed were once a part of the ocean's bed. *There is no land in existence that was not formed beneath the surface of the sea, or that has not risen from beneath the water. Mankind had a beginning* ; since we can look back to the period when the surface on which they live began to exist. We have only to go back in imagination to that age to represent to ourselves that, at a certain time, there existed nothing on this globe but unformed elements, and that in the next period there had begun to breathe and move a *human creature*, and we shall have admitted, perhaps, the *most astonishing miracle* recorded in the whole compass of the sacred writings. In the first ages of the world events were conducted by operative causes of *a different kind from those which are now in action* ; and there is nothing contrary to common sense or probability in the supposition that this sort of agency continued to operate from time to time as long as it was required—that is, until the physical and moral constitution of things now existing was completed, and the design of Providence attained.' '*No greater changes*,' continues the reviewer, '*can be well imagined* in the ordinary sequence of cause and effect, such as constituted the laws of nature, as they had been previously established, than took place on the day when man was, for the first time, seen amongst the creatures of the earth.' But this, it may be urged, is the language of an anonymous reviewer, supported, though it be, by the authority of a single name, distinguished in natural science. Let us hear from other men, the acknowledged expounders of geologic truth.

And, that we may see the bearing of each fact and argument, let us distinctly apprehend the subject under discussion. The Bible asserts the occasional interposition of divine and supernatural power, for moral purposes, in the ordinary course of physical events. *This*, infidelity, in all its forms, denies and derides. The atheist denies the existence of such a power, and asserts an infinite series of successive beings, or a progressive upward developement, from the lowest gelatinous monad to the highest animated existence, through the spontaneous agency of natural causes. The deist *acknowledges* the existence of this power, but denies his agency. To all these Geology replies, by pointing to the same great series of wonderful discoveries. To the atheist she says, 'I have followed up your eternal series for six thousand years, and there it abruptly terminates. I have examined your ascending series of progressive developement, and find it contradicted by all the facts. I find a giant where you had asserted a dwarf, and in my lowest strata examples of the highest organization.' She points to the myriad miracles recorded indelibly upon the everlasting rocks, and says to the deist, 'There are the foot-prints of the Creator, whose existence you admit, but whose direct agency you deny. Each new formation and each animated species whose remains are perpetuated there, is cumulative evidence of the miracle which brought them into being. To all, she says, in the language of her latest and one of her most gifted advocates, 'The relics that stand out in such bold relief from the rocks beside us, are the results of miracle. The perished tribes and races which they represent, *all began to be*. But how? No true geologist holds by the developement hypothesis. It has been resigned to sciolists and smatterers, and there is but one other alternative. They began to be through the miracle of creation. By the evidence furnished by these rocks, we are shut down to the belief in *miracle*. Hume is at length answered by the severe truths of the stony science.' (Foot-Prints of the Creator, pp. 301-2.) Such is the language of one for whom Brewster, and Lyell, and Buckland, and Murchison and Agassiz have expressed the profoundest admiration; and such is, without exception, the voice of all the ablest scientific geologists of our day. (See Buckland's Bridgewater Treatise, p. 54, vol. I.; Cuvier's Osse-

men's Fossiles, &c.) Even Lyell, the three volumes of whose 'Principles of Geology' are expressly written to sustain the theory of *an absolute uniformity* in the course of nature, through all geologic eras, recoils from the consequences of his own positions when he approaches the birth of man, and *acknowledges here* the intervention of a power superior to all the agencies of nature, and the appearance of a new being, such as none of those agencies, either before or since, has ever been able to produce.

"The establishment, therefore, by *geological evidence*, of the *first intervention* of such a *peculiar* and *unprecedented agency*, long after other parts of the animate and inanimate world existed, affords ground for concluding that the experience, during thousands of ages, of all the events which may happen on this globe, would not enable a philosopher to speculate, with confidence, concerning future contingencies. If then, an intelligent being, after observing the order of events" (the course of nature) "for indefinite series of ages, had witnessed, at last, so wonderful an innovation as this, to what extent would his belief in the regularity of the system be weakened? Would he cease to assume that there was permanency in the laws of nature? To these questions it may be answered that had he previously presumed to dogmatize respecting the absolute uniformity of the order of nature, he would undoubtedly be checked by witnessing this new and unexpected event, and would form a more just estimate of the limited range of his own knowledge, (experience,) and the unbounded extent of the scheme of the universe. But he would soon perceive that the modifications now introduced for the first time, were the accompaniments of new and extraordinary circumstances; and those not of a physical but of a moral nature. We have no right to anticipate any modification in the results of existing causes, in time to come, which are not conformable to analogy, unless they be produced by the progressive developement of human power;" (Is not human power one of the existing causes with all thinkers?) "Or perhaps by some other new relations which may spring up hereafter between the moral and material worlds. We ought not to look for any anomalous results, unless where man has interfered, or unless where clear indications appear of some other moral

source of temporary derangement."—(Lyell's *Principles of Geology*, vol. I., p. 259, 260; Boston edition, 1842.) In accordance with these views, it is distinctly admitted, (page 251-8,) "That a real departure from the antecedent course of physical events, can be traced in the introduction of man;" and that this did "constitute an anomalous deviation from the previously established order of things." Here, then, is the triumph of christianity—final, complete, decisive, irreversible. The ordinary course of nature, arrested, reversed, by an unseen omnipotent moral agency; and the record there distinct, indisputable, imperishable, on the "everlasting rocks," nature wearing on her brow the signet royal of her king; symbol, at once, of supremacy and allegiance! The whole vast array of Christian evidences, then, remains untouched in all their combined and cumulative power, without even the shadow of an antecedent improbability to impair their force. And we might well leave the subject here. Defeated here, infidelity may, in vain, attempt to rally elsewhere. The centre is broken—the rest is an affair of the wings; the skirmishing of outposts, when the citadel has been stormed—the pattering of small arms, when the heavy artillery has been spiked, and the strong battery silenced. And it ought to quiet the anxious fears of Christians, trembling for the very foundations of their faith, to know that all this has been conclusively accomplished by the discoveries of Geology.

We have dwelt the longer, on this particular branch of our general subject, for a threefold reason: first, because this assumption of an absolute uniformity in the course of nature, and denial of all supernatural interposition, is really the last resort of every species of infidelity—the metaphysical infidelity of England—the critical, exegetical and philological of Germany; and the geological of our own and other lands; and to sweep it conclusively away, is really to terminate the controversy.

Second—We desire to direct the attention of our readers to the very obvious, yet forgotten truth, that the geological is but a subordinate department of the logical—that all physical science is at last a phenomenon, not of matter, but of mind, and every classification of its phenomena, in whatever department, must proceed upon the

same fixed principles—the unchanging laws of the one enquiring mind. Whatever, therefore, is logically and philosophically false, cannot be geologically true; and the arbitrary assumption by some modern geologists, of an exclusive jurisdiction over this consecrated territory, as if some peculiar mystery hung around its facts and its processes, penetrable only by some initiated hierophant, who has made his geologic pilgrimages over hill and valley, with bags and hammer, collecting specimens and relics, is at once unphilosophical and supremely ludicrous. If it be a science, then its facts can be distinctly stated to those who have never seen them, and classified as well, nay better, by the logical thinker, than by the most diligent and curious observer, whose individual observations (necessarily limited) might naturally assume a disproportionate importance in the construction of his theory. Thus, we have the Scotch, the French, the Swiss schools in Geology, each bearing the characteristics of the country where they originated, not merely of the nation's mind, but of her geologic monuments. If Geology challenges the approbation of the general mind, she must accept the verdict of the general intelligence, and we are just as competent to sit in judgment on her facts and theories, (without having spent a life time amongst her monuments,) to collect, arrange, classify the one—to accept, modify, or reject the other; to hesitate, where they appear insufficient, incomplete, or mutually irreconcilable, as to perform the same function in regard to any other department of human enquiry.

Third—This erroneous theory of “Uniformity” and denial of supernatural interposition, is a logical or metaphysical heresy, which, first openly avowed, and then openly renounced, then tacitly assumed again, pervades a very large portion of our most popular geological literature; and will meet us again, attended by its necessary contradictions, and involved in its inextricable perplexities, in an important part of our subsequent discussion.*

* For the benefit of those who need the authority of great names, we quote a brief extract from a recent address, by Monsieur Guizot, before the Bible Society of Paris: “What is, gentlemen,” he said, “what is—speaking religiously—the great question, the supreme question, which now occupies the minds of men? It is the struggle between those who admit, and those who do not admit, a supernatural order, or to call things by their true

We proceed to notice some remarkable coincidences, between the discoveries of Geology, and the teachings of revelation, in regard to two most extraordinary occurrences—one past, the other prospective—in the history of our globe—the deluge and the final conflagration; and 1st, regarding the deluge.

One can readily conceive the smile of incredulous derision, which will play upon the features of some youthful and sceptical Geologist, at the bare allusion to the deluge in connection with Geology, and can almost hear the triumphant question, “has not Dr. Buckland long since retracted his ‘*Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*,’ with its supposed confirmation of the Mosaic Deluge?” By way of introduction to the subsequent discussion, we simply answer “No! he has not retracted a single geologic principle, or geologic fact, that at all affects our present argument, but on the contrary, after many years of anxious and profound investigation, has, in his ‘*Bridgewater Treatise*,’ re-affirmed them all. While all the other theories, which have attempted to explain and harmonize the facts, maintain a tremulous and shivering existence, amidst doubtful glaciers, accumulated at doubtful periods, on doubtful mountains, and sweeping through doubtful valleys; or amidst hypothetical icebergs, marvellously large, sweeping over hypothetical oceans as marvellously shallow, and grazing and polishing the summits of hypothetical mountains, beneath the waters of a sea, whose iceberg formations for successive centuries, have left behind them not even the bare hypothesis of a marine existence.*

names, between supernaturalism and rationalism.” “For our present and future salvation, faith in a supernatural order, respect for a supernatural order, submission to a supernatural order, must return to the world, and to the human soul, to great minds, as well as to simple, to the higher circles, as well as the lower. The Sacred Scriptures best teach this sublime truth—they are the history of supernatural order, of God in man, and in the world.”

* “The evidence which I have collected in my *Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*, 1823,” says Dr. Buckland, “shows, that one of the last great physical events that have effected the surface of our globe, was a violent inundation, which overwhelmed a great part of the northern hemisphere, and that this event was followed by the sudden disappearance of a large number of the species of terrestrial quadrupeds, which had inhabited these regions, in the period immediately preceding it. I also ventured to apply the term *diluvium*, to the superficial beds of gravel, clay and sand, which appear to have been produced by this great irruption of water. The description of the facts that form the evidences presented in this volume, is kept distinct from the ques.

Geology has done for the Bible, in reference to the deluge, precisely what she has done in relation to miracles; she has brought the geologic miracles, to confirm the historical, not as identical in time, but in principle, as dependent both on the same omnipotent agency, and the reality of the one, establishing not merely the possibility, but the probability of the other, and leaving them, without antecedent prejudice, to rest on the broad basis of their own historic evidence.

Precisely of the same kind, is her relation to the Mosaic deluge. The Bible relates the occurrence of a terrific deluge, early in the history of our race—co-extensive with the object to be accomplished—the sin to be punished—the race to be destroyed—which swept the whole inhabited globe, and buried man and beast beneath the overwhelming inundation. The infidel scoffs at such a visitation, points to three thousand years of comparative repose, and asks “Where are the elements of such a fearful inundation?” Geology furnishes both the example and the elements, the precedent and the power. She tells of her geologic deluge, or *deluges, perhaps*, which at a recent period of the earth’s history, and within the present geologic era,* have spread their devastations far and wide, over all our continents and islands, and left the traces of their power deep upon the face of universal nature. She points to her valleys of denudation, and shews the evidences, there, of some stupendous power, which has burst through

tion of identity of the event attested by them, with any deluge recorded in history.” “This important point, however, cannot be considered as completely settled, till more detailed investigation of the newest members of the pliocene, and of the diluvial and alluvial formations shall have taken place.” Bridgewater Treatise, vol. 1st. p. 80-1. His is the “diluvial theory,” of the various phenomena to which we shall soon refer. “The event in question,” he proceeds, “was the last of the many geological revolutions produced by violent irruptions of water.”

* “It is impossible,” says Mr. Lyell, “to compare the scattered portions” (of the dislocated strata) “without imagining that the whole country has once been covered with a great body of sandstone, and that masses, from 1000 to more than 3000 feet in thickness, have been removed.” “These appearances occur in mountains several thousand feet high, and separated by intervals of many miles or leagues in extent.” “Some of them, at least,” (fragments called ‘boulders’) “must have been carried into their present position since the commencement of a very modern geological period, for they rest, near Stockholm and elsewhere, on layers of sand and marl, containing shells of the species now inhabiting the Baltic.” (Lyell’s Elements, p. 81 & 86.)

her mountain barriers, three or four thousand feet in height, has torn them for many miles, and even leagues, from their deep foundations, and borne them forward on its bosom, scattering its shattered fragments for many hundred miles along its path. "An agent thus terrific," says Dr. Buckland, "appears to have operated universally on the surface of our planet, at the period of the deluge; the spaces then laid bare by the sweeping away of the solid materials, that had before filled them, are called "Valleys of Denudation;" and the effects we see produced by water, in the minor cases just mentioned, prepare us to comprehend the mighty and stupendous magnitude of those forces, by which whole strata were swept away—and valleys laid open—and gorges excavated in the more solid portions of the substance of the earth, bearing the same proportion to the overwhelming ocean, by which they were produced, that modern ravines, on the side of mountains, bear to the torrents, which have created, and continue to enlarge them," (*Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*, p. 237.) Those mountains stand there still in continuous ranges, on either side the valley, and their strata, thus laid bare, correspond as accurately as if they were but a few hundred feet apart, and recently divided by a section of a rail road or canal.

Now let one picture to himself just such a current, many miles in width, and of corresponding depth, sweeping on, with increased rapidity and volume, from its momentary interruption, and bearing on its bosom, as it moves surging and boiling onward, the huge mountain mass, that has been uprooted in its course,—and all the other phenomena will result as unavoidable consequences. It reaches a mountain gorge too narrow to yield a ready passage for its waters. Its broad current would be stayed for a moment in its course. All its accumulating materials would soon be piled high, each above the other. Some would burst over the mountain summits, grinding and polishing them as they passed; others would be whirled around and around in the eddying current, dashing one against the other, and smoothed and rounded by the collision; while others again, as they struggled to pass through, would, with their sharp granite angles, plough deep into the mountain sides, leaving large furrows in the hardest rock to mark the direction

of the current, while the deep primitive formations below would be bared of their soil, and ground and polished by the superincumbent mass, as it dragged heavily through, often to the smoothness and brightness of a mirror. Even the hardest granite, beneath such a weight, and with such ceaseless agitation of the waters, would be ground to powder, or be rolled and rounded into a regular shape, its sharp edges worn off, and its mass diminished. Now precisely such are the phenomena. Many of these valleys (that, for instance, in which Edinburgh stands,) have all these marks of powerful diluvial action, from the slight scratch of some small stone or pebble to the groove or furrow more than a foot in depth, and all in one direction, from the north-west to the south-east; and thus throughout the world, with few exceptions, resulting from local changes in the direction of the current. The smaller hillocks in these valleys "lie in precisely the direction of the general valley. The long hollows between the hills observe the same direction. The hills are bold and abrupt towards the west, but slope away towards the east, melting in that direction into the general plain. The trap beneath, wherever exposed, is full of grooves, from several inches to a foot in depth, and all observing exactly the same direction as the hills and valleys." The huge rounded stones, thus torn from their native beds, and scattered over all the world, with the smaller stones, gravel and general drift that attend them, are called "*The Boulder Formation.*" Their distribution over the globe corresponds to the other facts. The mountain mass, which we have employed above, by way of illustration, (and concerning whose removal, by some cause or causes of inconceivable energy, there is and can be no diversity of sentiment,) would be held together for a time by the adhesion of its several parts; be buoyed up and borne forward by the depth and rapidity of the current. But soon the larger fragments, by the force of gravity, would begin to fall, and the larger quantity of all its component elements would be found nearest to the original bed, from which they had been torn. As it swept on, tossed by the waves and whirled in the eddies of such an ocean stream, the smaller stones would be loosened from their hold, the smaller next, and finally, in succession, the coarser sand and the finest soil. "In tracing along this remarkable de-

posite," writes Mr. Lyell, "through the borders of the Baltic, we sometimes find fragments of rock that must have travelled hundreds of miles from their point of departure; and, as a general thing, we shall find that they grow larger in size as we approach the region from which they were derived. This I found to be the fact in going north from the margin of the Rhine to Holstein and Denmark, where I found fragments of Scandinavian rocks; in Sweden, nine and sometimes forty feet in diameter; and at last the whole country was made up of these rocks. Thus, by tracing the stream along, we shall find that, as it diminishes in size, the stones continually diminish in their individual dimensions. This may be seen anywhere between the Thames and the Tyne; and, by following it out in any region, you will become convinced that there has been a general drift from the north. In Europe it is particularly noticeable in the country bordering the Baltic; beginning with Finland, and through part of Russia and Poland to Pomerania, Prussia and Denmark, through the lower part of Sweden. The whole country consists of land, at a moderate elevation, covered, to depths that have never been pierced, with this boulder formation, sometimes a thousand feet thick, and often, indeed, still more. It contains no strata. Sometimes we find the boulder formation entirely unstratified, passing into other strata, which are arranged in layers. The absence of fossils, of organic remains, is another characteristic which makes it difficult to decide the nature or origin of this formation." (Lyell's *Lectures in New York*, p. 49.) This "stream," passing through successive geological formations, would of course bear a portion of the minerals of each, and we would often find mingled in one locality the minerals which it had collected throughout all its course. Dr. Buckland collected in the county of Durham, England, within a few miles, pebbles of more than twenty varieties of green stone, rock and slate, which occur nowhere nearer than the lake district of Cumberland. He has minutely traced the course of quartzose pebbles from Warwickshire to Oxfordshire and London, and found the quantity decrease in proportion as we recede from the original bed. "Mr. Conybeare has observed that it would not be difficult to collect almost a complete geological series of English rocks in the single

neighborhood of Market Harborough, from the rolled fragments and boulders which there occur." Nor are these phenomena confined to any portion of the globe. They are found in all their great outlines—in the direction of the current of the deep grooves in the primitive rocks, beneath the soil; in the distribution of the larger and smaller fragments of the original rocks; in the huge boulders and smaller detritus; almost identically the same in England, over the whole north of Europe, in the United States, and in some of the attendant phenomena in the West India Islands. In America, as in Europe, the same drift from the north, "immense deposits of sand and rolled masses of rock, found in heaps at every level, both upon the continent and islands. These fragments are almost exclusively primitive, and can be identified with the primitive rocks *in situ* on the northern shore," extending from the lakes over a large portion of the United States, as far south as the 40th degree of latitude, or, as a recent writer (in Chambers's Edinburgh Journal) asserts, "is now pretty generally acknowledged as far south as Florida, and even on grounds 3,000 feet above the sea." In Jamaica, De La Beche has traced the same course of this diluvial current from north to south, (as in Europe and North America,) from the St. Andrews and Port Royal mountains to the great plain upon which Kingston stands. This plain he represents as wholly composed of diluvial gravel, consisting of detritus from these mountains, and evidently produced by causes not now in operation, in the same manner and probably at the same period with the numerous tracts of European gravel which have resulted from the partial destruction of European rocks.

The agency of water as the principal element, at least, in all these astounding changes, is rendered certain by another class of facts, which no other species of agency has yet been seriously considered sufficient to explain. "We allude to those huge pinnacles of granite, or other hard rock, which seem to stand detached and insulated from the neighboring mountains. Mount Cervin, in the Vivarais, presents a pyramid 3000 feet high, upon the loftiest Alps, and is thus commented on by Saussure: 'it is impossible for me to believe that such an obelisk issued directly from nature's hand, in this shape. The surround-

ing matter has been broken off, and swept away, for nothing is seen around but other pinnacles, springing like it abruptly out of the ground, with their sides in like manner abraded by violence.'"^{*} Such a current as we have supposed, meeting a granite hill of peculiar hardness, would sweep away the surrounding matter, and leave the granite towering in prisms as at Greiffenstein, or in pyramids, as in mount Cervin, alone on mountain top or plain.

Again, though the "irruption of waters" has been considered by many as the cause and the explanation of these extraordinary facts in nature, it is neither necessary nor reasonable to exclude other powerful cotemporary agencies from their appropriate share in the complicated phenomena to be explained. If, as is now generally conceded, the deluge of waters was occasioned by the upheaving of the Northern ocean, this would bring along with it all the huge icebergs of that frozen sea, which, mingling with the glaciers swept by the deluge from our loftiest mountains, would add to the transporting power of water, and accumulated masses of soil and timber, (of themselves sufficient to transport the largest boulders,) the transporting power of ice, and thus add to the diluvial theory, or rather include as its necessary complement, all that is true, or credible, in the glacial and iceberg theories of Agassiz and Lyell.

These extraordinary facts, and many others, when first distinctly stated, led all men to the unhesitating conclusion, that here was the action of a deluge, terrible as that recorded in the Sacred Scriptures, and perhaps, too hastily to mingle geology with history, and attribute all the phenomena to a single inundation, and this identical with that of Noah. Whether these phenomena belong all to a single period, or to several successive inundations, or whether Geology can certainly identify any of them with that of Noah, is unimportant to our present argument. The geological conclusion is at any rate, almost universal, and absolutely irresistible, in favor of one or more terrible catastrophes, and at a very recent period of the earth's history.

"The surface of the earth which is inhabited by man," says Mr. Parkinson, "displays, even at the present day,

^{*} Wiseman's Lectures, p. 196, quoting, "Voyages dans les Alpes."

manifest and decided evidences of the mechanical agency of violent currents of water. Nor is there a single stratum, that does not exhibit undeniable proofs of its having been broken, and even dislocated, by some tremendous power, which has acted with considerable violence on this planet, since the deposition of the strata of even the latest formation."

"I am of opinion," says Cuvier, "with De Luc and Dolomieu, that if there is any circumstance thoroughly established in geology, it is, that the crust of our globe has been subjected to a great and sudden revolution, the epoch of which cannot be dated much farther back than five or six thousand years; that this revolution had buried all the countries which were before inhabited by men, and by the other animals that are now best known; that the small number of individuals of men, and other animals, that escaped from the effects of that great revolution, have since propagated and spread over the lands then newly laid dry; and consequently, that the human race has only resumed a progressive state of improvement, since that epoch, by forming established societies, raising monuments, collecting natural facts, and constructing systems of science and learning." "By a careful examination," he proceeds, "of what has taken place on the surface of the globe, since it has been laid dry the last time, and since its continents have assumed their present form, it may be clearly seen that this last revolution, and consequently, the establishment of our existing societies, could not have been very ancient. This result is one of the best established, and least attended to, in rational Zoology, and it is so much the more valuable, as it connects natural and civil history together in one uninterrupted series. It must have been since that last retreat of the waters, that our rivers have begun to flow in their present courses, and to form alluvial depositions—that our existing vegetation has begun to extend itself, and to form vegetable soil—that our present cliffs, or steep sloping coasts, have begun to be worn away by the waters of the sea; and dating from the same epoch, colonies of the human race must have then begun, for the first or the second time, to spread themselves and to form new establishments in places fitted by nature for their reception. De Luc and

Dolomieu have most carefully examined the progress of the formation of new grounds, by the collection of slime and sand, washed down by the rivers, and although exceedingly opposed to each other on many points of the theory of the earth, they agree exactly on this." *Essay on Theory of the Earth*, section 34.

"And with respect to the striking diluvial phenomena of drifted masses of rock," says Dr. Buckland, "the greater part of the northern hemisphere, from Moscow to the Mississippi, is strewed, on its hills, as well as its valleys, with blocks of granite, and other rocks of enormous magnitude, which have been drifted mostly in a direction from north to south, a distance, sometimes, of many hundred miles from their native beds, across mountains, valleys, lakes and seas, by a force of water which must have possessed a velocity, to which nothing that occurs in the actual state of the globe, affords the slightest parallel."

"The conclusion to which I have been irresistibly forced," says Professor Hitchcock, "from an examination of this (diluvial) stratum in Massachusetts is, that all the diluvium previously accumulated by various agencies, has been modified by a powerful deluge, sweeping from the north and north-west," (as in Europe,) "over every part of the State, not excepting the highest mountains." "If it be true, that continents and vast chains of mountains have been elevated at different periods by paroxysmal efforts of nature, it is impossible but that deluges of tremendous violence and universal extent, should have been the consequence." *Report on Geology of Massachusetts*, pages 148, 520.

It was to such a paroxysmal upheaving of the great Scandinavian chain, probably contemporary with a correspondent elevation of the Alps, that all the phenomena of the "drift period," or "boulder formation," with its deluge of mingled ice and water, have been attributed, by Sir Robert Murchison, Beaumont, Milne and other eminent geologists. And although the truth of revelation is not at all dependent on any geologic theory, nor does the vindication of her historic accuracy rest upon the certainty of geologic evidence, for a deluge absolutely universal, yet, if this diluvial theory in any of its forms be true, then it is impossible, on hydrostatic principles, that the deluge

should not have been universal. "A small district of the earth" says Humboldt, "surrounded like Bohemia and Cashmeer, (and like many of the valleys in the moon,) by annular mountains, may, by partial inundations, be long covered with water, but submersions so general as to embrace a hemisphere, can, from hydrostatic laws, only be imagined as extending at the same time over all parts of the earth. The sea cannot permanently overflow the boundless plains of the Orinoco and the Amazon, without also overwhelming the plains adjoining the Baltic. The sequence and identity of the sedimentary strata, and of the organic remains of plants and animals belonging to the ancient world, enclosed in those strata, show that several great depositions have taken place almost simultaneously over the entire globe." (Humboldt's *Aspects of Nature*, page 120: Am. Edition.) In perfect harmony with this conclusion, drawn from hydrostatic laws and geologic observation of the same strata in distant regions of the globe, is the wide diffusion of the "boulder formation," covering from one-half to two-thirds of both hemispheres, and thus indicating a diluvial agency (if any at all) of universal extent. "I maintain," says Agassiz, in his latest work, '*Lake Superior, its Physical Character, &c.*' p. 398, "that the cause which has transported these boulders, in the American continent, must have acted simultaneously over the whole ground which these boulders cover, as they present throughout the continent, an uninterrupted sheet of loose materials, of the same general nature, connected in the same general manner, and evidently dispersed at the same time. There is no ground at present, to doubt the simultaneous dispersion of the erratics (boulders) over northern Europe and northern America." No partial agency here; no successive, limited, merely provincial catastrophes! "So that" he proceeds, "the cause which transported them, whatever it may be, must have acted simultaneously over the whole tract of land west of the Ural mountains, and east of the Rocky mountains, without assuming anything respecting northern Asia, which has not yet been studied in this respect; that is to say, at the same time over a space, (already examined), embracing two hundred degrees of longitude." The extreme limit of these phenomena in our northern hemis-

phere, has been variously stated ; the 50th degree of north latitude, the 40th, the 38th, the 35th by Agassiz, (p. 398, 399, 400,) the 30th by Chambers and other writers, and by De La Beche, as far South as Jamaica, between the 17th and 18th. Supposing then, that the unexplored regions of the globe correspond in their geological phenomena to those already thoroughly examined, the most moderate form of the proposition contended for by Mr. Agassiz would be, that from one-half to two-thirds of the whole globe bears the incontestible evidence of the simultaneous operation of this one common agency ; and if this agency was water, then according to Humboldt's reasoning, it must have been universal.

The historic period of this agency must be decided from historic testimony—the geologic evidence distinctly identifies it with our own geologic era.

“As to the age of these boulders,” says Mr. Lyell, “you find them, both in America and in Europe, standing over rocks, all of the most modern tertiary strata. I had an opportunity, in Sweden, of showing how modern some of these erratics are, by finding fragments of gneiss, sixteen feet in diameter, resting upon a layer of sand ; then came a bed of blue marl, containing an immense number of shells of the eatable muscle, from which the blue colour of the marl is derived. That muscle is now a living species in the Baltic ; and is found at Upsala, near the ancient university. The water of the Baltic contains only one fourth as much salt as the waters of the ocean ; and the shells found in its brackish waters, though not of different species from those of the ocean, are yet of a dwarfish form, and of a different shape from those that live in the sea. There are also found fresh water shells, which have been brought down by rivers. We may observe then how very modern is the transportation of some of these blocks, for not only do we trace them to the time when those species existed—the same as those which now live ; but when they lived placed under those peculiar geographical relations, which have modified the character of the waters.”—(Lyell's Lectures, p. 51.) This great convulsion of nature, then, has occurred since the present distribution of our continents and oceans, our seas and rivers ; since the Baltic occupied its present basin—depos-

ited its heaps of muscle shells—receded from its shores, and left them in large masses to be covered by the boulder formation ; in fine, long since the present reorganization of our earth, which has prepared it for the abode of man, and his cotemporary species, and belongs to the last of those great eras into which geologic history has been divided : “The fourth—the modern age, characterized by the appearance of the most perfect of all created beings—The Reign of Man.”—(Agassiz’s *Zoology*, p. 190.) But whether we attribute all these phenomena, with Agassiz, to one great catastrophe, extending simultaneously over the larger portion of the globe ; or to a series of successive catastrophies of more limited extent, we may at least adopt the language of Lyell, and Sedgwick, and Say :—“In speculating on catastrophes by water, we may certainly expect great floods in future ; and, therefore, presume they have happened again and again in past times. Notwithstanding, therefore, that we have not witnessed, within the last three thousand years, the devastation by deluge of a large continent, yet, as we may predict the future occurrence of such catastrophes, we are authorized to regard them as part of the present order of nature.” “The time will come, however distant, when a deluge will lay waste a considerable part of the American continent.”—(Lyell.) “We have shown,” (says Prof. Sedgwick, of Cambridge, England,) “that paroxysms of internal energy, accompanied by the elevation of mountain chains, and followed by mighty waves desolating whole regions of the earth, were a part of the mechanism of nature. And what has happened again and again, from the most ancient up to the most modern period in the natural history of the earth, may have happened once during the few thousand years that man has been living on its surface. We have, therefore, taken away all antecedent incredibility from the fact of a recent deluge ; and we have prepared the mind, doubting about the truth of things, of which it knows not either the origin or the end, for the adoption of this fact, on the weight of historic testimony.”—(Proceedings of Geol. Soc. vol. I, p. 314 : 1831.)

The deluge asserted in the Bible, therefore, stands between deluges past, and deluges yet to come ; and amidst the operation of all those terrific agencies which have

heaved up whole oceans from their beds, and poured their devastating waters, mingled with ice, over all our existing continent, overwhelming, burying, grinding, crushing all things in their course. Geology proves the reality of such deluge or deluges—their recency, in our own geologic era, and since the deposition of our latest strata ; gives the elements of which they are composed, the agencies by which they are produced, and then hands over to historic evidence the question of a great historic deluge within the last six thousand years. And here the testimony of history is unanimous, uncontradicted, unsuspected. It comes from every quarter of the globe, every age of the world, and every condition of human society ; from the Greek, the Roman, the Chaldean, the Egyptian, the Hindoo, the Chinese, the Scythian ; and when century after century has elapsed, and wide oceans intervene, we find amidst the natives of the new world the same tradition in all its essential elements. Every where we have a flood to punish the increasing wickedness of men ; a single family saved in a ship or ark ; a raven sent out first, or some other bird of the same genus ; a dove, a humming bird, or some other of the gentler species, sent forth the second time, and returning with a green twig, to indicate the subsiding of the waters ; and generally there immediately succeeds the planting of the vine, and new peopling of the globe. “Every where,” says Humboldt, astonished by the traditions which he met in South America, “every where the traces of a common origin, the opinions concerning cosmogony, and the primitive traditions of nations, present a striking analogy even in minute circumstances. Does not the humming bird of Fiezpi call to mind the dove of Noah, that of Deucalion ; and the birds, according to Berosus, which Xisuthrus sent forth from the Ark, to try if the waters had subsided ; and if, as yet, he could erect altars to the gods of Chaldea.”—(Humboldt, *Vues Des Cordilleres*, p. 227.)

Now if there were many races of men scattered over the globe from many different centres, as infidelity asserts, then where is the objection to the absolute universality of the deluge ? For it is the same deluge preserved in all their traditions, recorded in their histories, celebrated in

their poetry, engraven on their monuments, taught in their mysteries, and incorporated with their religions.

But again: If the deluge was not co-extensive with the globe, and the nations whose traditions we possess were gathered within the limited area which it might be supposed to cover, and thus all experienced and recorded the same catastrophe,—then what becomes of the ethnological objection to the unity of the human race?

Such was the general, almost universal state of opinion, when, about fifteen years ago, "The Glacial Theory" was originated. It obtained for a season wide celebrity, and even enthusiastic approbation from many of the most eminent geologists abroad—has been recently applauded by several of our most popular foreign journals, and defended with great earnestness and ability by Agassiz, in his recent work on "Lake Superior, its Physical Character," &c. (1850.)

The snow which falls on mountains above the point at which the temperature suffices to melt it, gathers, as is well known, in a deep bed, preserving a character which may be described as something between snow and ice. A stream of this *nevé*, or imperfect ice, pouring down some long descending hollow in the mountain side, is called in Switzerland a glacier. Now some fifteen years ago it was observed that many of the same phenomena above described—the huge boulder stones, the accumulated masses of various materials, called "drift," and in Switzerland "moraine,"—the smoothed and polished surface of the rocks, with the deep grooves in the mountain sides—were found in immediate connection with these glaciers as they descended in huge masses from the higher Alps, and at last deposited their burden, when melted by the sun, in the valleys below. It was a bold but not an unnatural hypothesis (if held simply as an hypothesis, a guide to farther investigation,) that all analogous phenomena in every portion of the globe were likewise produced by the same glacial agency, whose actual existence had been recognized there.

It was soon discovered, however, that, to sustain this hypothesis, even in Switzerland, demanded the adoption of two other hypotheses, concerning the alternate elevation and depression of the Alps. Fifteen hundred feet and

more above the bottoms of the neighboring valleys were seen these identical marks of glacial action on the faces of the Swiss mountains. Nay, even on the other side of the great basin of Switzerland the faces of the Jura mountains were found polished and grooved to a height not much short of three thousand feet above the sea; while on their topmost summits lay huge travelled blocks of Alpine gneiss, borne from the Alps, 10,000 or 15,000 in height, across the deep valley of the Jura, fifty miles in breadth; while far down the valley of the Arve, where no glacier now appears, at least as far down as Servoz, the same smoothed and striated surface of the hills is seen. Here, then, were appearances attributed to the agency of glaciers, where no glacier, in the memory of man, or in the earliest records of human history, had ever been known to exist. But when did a true philosopher ever abandon a favorite theory because it was contradicted by the facts? You have only to *imagine* a state of things totally different from all that now exists, and the difficulty is removed. Let the Alps be elevated several thousand feet, and you lower the temperature proportionally. Let them again be lowered, and you elevate the temperature; and thus, by successive (hypothetical) elevations and depressions, you may have glaciers at any height and of any magnitude. So the philosopher said — "Let the mountains be elevated," and they arose; "Let them descend," and they came down.

But, unfortunately, with all this magnificent apparatus of mountains, such as man never saw, rising at their command, the conditions of the problem at last were not even plausibly met. For elevate these mountains to twice their present altitude, and still where will you obtain a glacier so voluminous and profound as to cross the great valley of the Jura, 50 miles in breadth, "contrary to all the laws of glaciers, upon a dead level," and travel up its sides, a distance of 3,000 feet, to deposite the Alpine gneiss and granite on its summit? Even the philosophic face of Mr. Lyell relaxes into a smile of quiet mirth, as he describes one of these giant glaciers taking a walk across one of the deepest and widest valleys in the world, on such an errand.

"The remarkable fact is, that we have, on the Jura, fragments of rock, such as we must suppose (on this hypothesis) glaciers to have carried straight across the valley, fifty

miles wide. To suppose this, is in defiance of all analogy of the motion of glaciers,"—"that we should have them moving along a dead flat, which is contrary to all the laws of glaciers—that they should walk across this level, and lodge these blocks upon the Jura peaks." (Lyell's *New York Lectures*, p. 55.)

And the redoubtable author of "*Vestiges of Creation*," as he leads on the forlorn hope to the assault against the impregnable facts, sadly concedes, that if they were glaciers at all, they were such as no mortal man has ever seen, and the motive power which urged them forward, such as no human observation has hitherto discovered; nay, that the form which the ice must have assumed to accord with the phenomena, defies scrutiny, and transcends our powers of conception. Discussing these phenomena, as they present themselves to observation in the Grampian Hills, and the low country of Scotland, he remarks, "it has been suggested that it, the ice, bore exactly the shape of the modern glaciers, proceeding for instance, in Scotland, from the Grampian Hills to the low country. But while it may be admitted that local glaciers account for some of the local phenomena, it is contrary to all our knowledge of glacier movement, that a stream of ice proceeding from Ben Nevis, could travel through the neighboring vales for a hundred miles, without any adequate declination of ground to give it impetus. When we think of the many hundred miles of flat country, in North America and Sweden, over which ice appears to have travelled, we see still more clearly, that the form of the ice could not be that of common glaciers, or its dynamical power derived from the same source." Again, speaking of the same theory, "It was hardly possible to imagine such a thing, but it was manifest that ice had somehow been at work, and that it had in some way been the carrying agent, by which the blocks had travelled so far from their original seat." (*The Glacial Theory*, by Robt. Chambers. *Edinburgh Journal*.) But if this hypothesis cannot be reconciled with the facts, amidst the mountains of Switzerland and Scotland, their steep declivities and comparatively narrow vales, what shall we say of the same phenomena, over the broad plains of northern Europe, and "the entire surface of North America, from the Lakes,"

(we quote the same author) "as it is now pretty generally acknowledged, as far South as Florida?" It is well known, that according to "the laws of glacial movement," "an inclination of at least 3 degrees is necessary for their motion." What then is the motive power that has borne them over these vast plains, where there is no such inclination, and over the high hills and valleys of an undulating country, in an undeviating course? Nothing daunted by the difficulties of the problem, Agassiz proposed his Glacial Theory. A huge northern glacier, travelling on southward from the Polar regions, by the expansive power of freezing water, slowly, up hill and down, over mountain and valley, inch by inch, still creeping on, clasping the solid earth close in its icy embrace, smoothing, polishing, grooving, crushing, levelling, grinding, all things, in its irresistible progress. *Monstrum horrendum, ingens!* It is difficult to record these extravaganzas of genius, without an involuntary shiver and a smile, and thus appearing to substitute ridicule for reasoning. We shall, therefore, present a brief view of this theory, by the devoted glacialist just quoted above.

"Prof. Agassiz of Neufchatel," says Robt. Chambers, "in order to account for the wide prevalence of glacial action in the northern hemisphere, started a theory, which, for a while, met with some favor. He suggested, that at a particular period the circumpolar ice extended much farther South than it now does. There was, in fact, a cap of ice on the northern hemisphere, reaching a point far within the limits of the present temperate zone. The glaciers, he said, move by a process of dilatation, dependent on the expansion of water, when it takes the form of ice. There are chinks in all glaciers. The water melted during the day, by the sun's rays, trickles into these chinks; at night, when the influence of the sun's rays is withdrawn, the water freezes; consequently expands; hence the movement of the glacier. He supposed that in this way, the ancient circumpolar ice was urged athwart Europe and America, grinding down the entire surface, and leaving the appearances which we now see." "It has clearly been" he proceeds, "a sheet of ice, moving over the ground in the same close, hugging, equably pressing manner, that we see in existing glaciers, preserving one

general direction, ascending hills several hundred feet high, passing in short, in a straight course over hill and vale of an undulating country."

"But this theory did not stand long. Prof. Jas. Forbes, of Edinburgh, by a series of ingeniously contrived experiments, completely ascertained that they moved by the force of gravitation. It thus became evident, that were there a cap of ice over the northern hemisphere, it would not move so as to produce the observed appearances, because it would not have the requisite of a down hill course. An inclination of at least three degrees is necessary for its motion. The glacial theory has, therefore, stood for some years at an awkward point, or rather has been in a great measure given up." Yet, rejecting the theory both of Agassiz, and of Lyell, as palpably irreconcilable with the best ascertained phenomena, he proceeds to contend for the "action of ice" "in some way" and "some how," most probably "by rafts of ice floating along in currents upon the sea, when the land was deeply submerged;" let us add "by the last great irruption of the waters," and we have "the diluvial theory," including all that is credible in either of the other theories proposed.

The theory of Lyell may be briefly stated. The phenomena for which it is designed to account, are the same which have been already mentioned—1st, The wide diffusion, the vast amount, and the peculiar character of the "boulder formation;" 2d, The polishing and smoothing of the mountain tops, and of the deep grooving of the mountain sides, the deepest and widest valleys, and the most extensive plains of northern Europe, and North and South America. 3rd, The valleys of denudation, where mountain ranges have been manifestly broken through, and whole strata, from 1000 to 2000 or 3000 feet in depth, have been swept away for many leagues. (See "Elements," p. 80-81-2.) The latter he attributes to the agency of water, but to submarine currents at an earlier period of the world's history. Both the former, to the agency of icebergs, drifted by these currents Southward, and in their course, grazing and polishing the mountain tops and sides, and depositing through successive centuries this immense boulder formation. (See "Elements," p. 86-88; "Principles," vol. 1st, book 2d, chap. 3d.)

To this theory it has been, among other things, conclusively objected, 1st, That no conceivable magnitude of the supposed icebergs, would at all meet the demands of the case; no possible glacier, according to his own argument, against Agassiz, (*Lectures*, p. 55,) could fill, or even cross the valley of the Jura—50 miles in breadth—"one of the broadest and deepest valleys in the world." (*Elements*, p. 86.) Yet these icebergs are, (according to *Principles*, vol. 1st, p. 378,) only "glaciers loaded with mud and rock," which "descend to the sea, and there huge fragments of them float off and become icebergs." Can even the "huge fragment" of a glacier fill a valley fifty miles in breadth, and 3000 feet in depth, grooving the mountain's face on either side up to the summit, which the original glacier in its totality could not have filled? "We must acknowledge," says Agassiz, "that the icebergs of the present period at least, are insufficient to account" for the phenomena, p. 405-6. And again, "the highest ridges, the highest rugged mountains, at least on this continent, and north of the Alps, in Europe, are as completely polished and smoothed, as the lower lands." So that the agency demanded must operate, at once, from the tops of the highest mountains, to the depths of the profoundest valleys. And where is the iceberg provision for such prodigious agency as this? "Capt. Scoresby counted 500 which rose above the surface, from the height of 100 to 200 feet," (*Principles*, vol. 1st, 378,) "and they measured from a few yards, to a mile in circumference."

In 1839, one was observed between 250 and 300 feet in height, p. 380. And finally, imagination probably stimulating conjecture, "the Utica, which has just arrived, talks of icebergs 400 feet high above the water, and as there are eight cubic feet below, for one above, the surface, we may judge of the enormous size of these icebergs, which were several miles in circumference." Take the most exaggerated "talk" of icebergs, several miles, (say 3 miles, or 6 in circumference, 1 or 2 miles in diameter,) and what proportion would it bear to one, which should be necessary to fill even the valley of the Firth of Forth, a plain 50 miles in length, and from 8 to 20 in breadth, not to mention the valley of Jura, 50 miles in breadth, and 3000 feet and more in depth?

2d, The deposite from these icebergs covers almost two-thirds, certainly more than half of the known world, and over a large surface, more than 1000 feet in depth. For thus sheeting the world with ice, the largest provision made is by Scoresby—of 500 icebergs, “from a few yards, to a mile in circumference!” Multiply them by one hundred, and they will not suffice to meet the demand in northern Europe, alone! How many centuries would they require to cover 50,000 square miles, 1000 feet in depth? With good reason, therefore, does Agassiz say, (Lake Superior, p. 416,) “I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, that they, (the advocates of the iceberg theory,) will find the source of their icebergs fall short of the requisite conditions, which they must assume, to account for the whole phenomena as they have really been observed.”

3d, These icebergs, like those of our day, must have been floated on submarine currents, and their diffusion limited to the vicinity of these currents. “If we institute a comparison, it will be seen that there is nowhere a current, running from the Poles to the lower latitudes, either in the northern or southern hemisphere, covering an extent equal to one-tenth of the currents, which should have existed, to carry the erratics into their present position. The widest current is west of the Pacific, which runs parallel to the equator across the whole extent of that sea, from east to west, and the greatest width of which is scarcely fifty degrees.” (“Lake Superior,” p. 399.)

4th, It may be urged equally against both the glacial and iceberg theories, that the deposite, whether from the glacier or the iceberg, can only occur when they have reached, respectively, in their progress southward, the melting point in temperature. This can never be far northward, even now, much less could it during that period of almost universal ice, which both theories alike demand. The glacier does not deposite its moraine near the summit of the Alps, nor does the iceberg dissolve, and drop its burden high in the northern seas. It melts as it descends southward, and deposites its contents as it melts. Why then do we find in the extreme north of Europe the largest accumulation of the boulders, and the drift? “The whole accumulation is called in Switzerland ‘moraine,’

which is slowly conveyed" says Lyell, "to inferior valleys, and left where the snows and ice melt upon the plain." "The ice transports indifferently, and to the same spots, the heaviest blocks, and the finest particles, mingling all together in one confused and promiscuous heap, wherever it melts." ("Principles," vol. 1, p. 377.) And this is equally true of the glacier, and the "huge fragment of a glacier," floating on the ocean; they deposite only where they melt, and in proportion as they melt, and promiscuously, large and small fragments, equally and all together. Yet, in direct opposition to these ascertained phenomena, the boulder deposite is largest as you ascend towards the north; the quantity is decided by proximity to the original beds from which its materials have been torn, and the larger stones, instead of being promiscuously mingled with the other portions of the mass, fall first, (by their superior weight,) and increase in number and quantity, as well as size, as you approach their origin.

"As a general thing, we shall find," says Lyell, "that they grow larger in size as we approach the region from which they are derived." Again. "By tracing the stream along, we shall find that as it diminishes in size, (the stream of the deposite,) the stones continually diminish in their individual dimensions." Again. "This (increasing magnitude and number of the stones, as we advance toward the north,) I found, in going north from the margin of the Rhine to Denmark, where I found fragments of Scandinavian rocks, and in Sweden 9 and sometimes 40 feet in diameter, and at last the whole country was made up of these rocks." Again. "Beginning with Finland, (between the 60th and 70th degrees of north latitude,) through part of Russia and Poland, to Pomerania, Prussia and Denmark, the whole country consists of land covered to depths that have never been pierced, with this boulder formation, sometimes 1000 feet thick, and often, indeed, still more." (Lectures, p. 49.)

This vast deposite, whether from glaciers or icebergs, demands, (as Agassiz has well argued, p. 406,) alike, a period of intensest cold—"an ice period"—so cold that all animals previously existing must have perished; and this intensity of cold, shrouding the world in a sheet of ice, or covering it with icebergs of incalculable numbers, and

prodigious dimensions, must have so lowered the temperature, as to render wholly impossible, the rapid thaw and enormous deposit, in that extreme northern climate. The two terms of the proposition are absolutely irreconcilable. A temperature so low as to wrap the world in ice, or girdle it with icebergs, of unimaginable magnitude, and a temperature so high, in the latitude of 60 or 65 degrees, as to melt huge ice continents, which no summer's sun in the climate of 40 degrees north, would with our greatly elevated temperature, even now, seriously affect.

"To bring icebergs," says Agassiz, "in any way within the extent which would answer for the extent of the distribution of erratics, we must assume that the northern ice fields, from which these icebergs could be detached and float southwards, were much larger at the time than they are now. That is to say—we must assume an ice period, an extensive cap of ice upon both poles." (Lake Superior, p. 406.)

Here, then, we find that the "Glacial Theory of Agassiz" is to Lyell incredibly absurd, and absolutely ludicrous in its extravagance—that the icebergs of Lyell are clearly shewn by Agassiz to involve all the most serious difficulties of his own, and some additional, peculiar to itself; while the author of the "Vestiges" repudiates both, and in this "sea of trouble" betakes himself to a "raft of ice." Dissatisfied and bewildered there, he seeks a change of position. The idea is certainly plausible, yet it is not easy to imagine how an "ice-raft," borne on a current, could pass through a valley like the Firth of Forth in such a vast volume and depth, and so rigid a form, as to mark the whole, uniformly, to several hundred feet up the hills. "It is an idea difficult to form." "The ice was applied in a way which we can scarcely understand," &c. Why not accept the explanation of De Luc and Dolomieu, of Cuvier and Parkinson, of Buckland, Saussure and Von Buch, of Murchison and Milne, and acknowledge the transporting power of water, not as the only agent, but bearing on its bosom, heaping up in the valleys, scattering over the most extensive plains, and sweeping over the mountain tops all those mingled elements of rocks and sand and mud and ice, (from upheaved ocean or mountain gorge,) whose agency, past or present, is clearly ascertained?

But the question is often asked—why, if the catastrophe were universal, are the principal memorials of it limited to the Arctic and temperate regions, diminishing in quantity as they approach the equatorial countries, and disappearing as we come near the tropics? This question may be answered by another. When, by some sudden congelation, the world was wrapped in glaciers, extending over one hundred degrees of latitude, (fifty from each pole,) and then, by some correspondent elevation of temperature, this world of ice was melted—what became of all the water? If the water issuing from the diminutive Rhone glacier expands into the majestic Rhone, and then into the broad lake of Geneva, what would be the expanse and depth of waters when every hill and valley and every plain over seven thousand miles in one direction, (north and south latitude,) and twenty thousand in another, (east and west longitude,) poured forth its rush of waters, simultaneously, from glaciers of enormous magnitude, in comparison with any one of which the Rhone glacier would be as the snow-drifts of Virginia to the accumulated mass upon the tall summits and amidst the deep ravines of the higher Alps? Is not here abundant provision for a deluge, even in the glacial theory, with its immeasurable glaciers, as they melt, (for they have disappeared,) and their world of waters? Or shall we suppose that the laws of fluids, as well as those of glaciers, were suspended, and that, while the former, “contrary to all known laws,” could travel over fifty degrees of latitude, northward or southward, the vast streams issuing from them would be arrested in their course, and proceed no farther than the original glaciers from which they flowed?

ARTICLE VII.

CORRESPONDENCE.

We publish the documents below, at the request of all the parties concerned. The papers will explain themselves.—[EDS. SO. PRES. REVIEW.]

Extract from Minutes of the Proceedings of the Palmetto Regiment, at their meeting in Columbia, S. C., on the 20th August, 1851.

"Capt. Marshall brought to the notice of the meeting, an allegation made by the Rev. Dr. Curtis, and published in the Southern Presbyterian Review, to the effect that a majority of those members of the regiment, who returned to South Carolina, could not write their names; and moved that a committee, consisting of one member of each company, be appointed to inquire and report upon the matter.

"The committee retired, and in a few moments reported that the total number of the members who returned was 375; that the total number of those who could not write their names was 16; and that the Southern Presbyterian Review be requested to publish this statement to correct the error made public on its pages by Dr. Curtis."

To the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review.

LIMESTONE SPRINGS, 22D SEPT., 1851.

Dear Sirs :—Observing that the gentlemen of the Palmetto Regiment, propose to publish in your Review their "Report" on the state of the Regiment as it returned from Mexico, and that they allege a statement I made on the subject in my Education "Address" to be an "error," I have addressed a note respecting it to my neighbor, Governor Johnson, and would request you to insert that note, and the reply of Gov. Johnson, in the same number with the Report.

I remain, dear sirs,

Yours faithfully,

THOS. CURTIS.

Dr. Curtis to Ex-Governor Johnson.

LIMESTONE SPRINGS, 17TH SEPT., 1851.

Dear Sir :—The gentlemen who now compose the Palmetto Regiment, and who lately met in Columbia, treat, as you may

have observed by the papers, my observation respecting the Regiment as it returned from Mexico, as "an error;" and very naturally, wish to put on record their own Report upon the facts of the case. Between you and me, it lies to account for the error, if such it be. You will recollect, I believe, mentioning the statement I made to me in conversation, and that I read my "Address" to you, containing this passage, before it was delivered. I am quite sure you intended no error or misstatement in the case, any more than myself. I mentioned the supposed fact with regret, and with the view to a remedy, or the removal of its causes, in our inadequate system of Popular Education. Perhaps you will have the goodness to state some of the facts from which you derived the representation of this matter which the gentlemen controvert. I remain, dear sir,

Yours faithfully,

THOS. CURTIS.

Hon. D. JOHNSON, Ex-Governor.

State of South Carolina, &c. &c.

Governor Johnson to Dr. Curtis.

LIMESTONE SPRINGS, 20th Sept., 1851.

Dear Sir:—In your note of the 17th inst., received this morning, you request me to state the facts on which I founded my representation to you in regard to the state of the education of the members of the Palmetto Regiment. Mr. Peter Corney, jr. of New Orleans, a native, I believe, of Charleston, was employed by me to disburse a sum of money placed in my hands by the Legislature to aid the necessitous volunteers who had been discharged in returning from Mexico. In one of his letters to me he stated the fact deplorably that a portion of them were unable to sign their names to the necessary vouchers, suggested the necessity of a better organized system of public instruction, and added that he would take some other occasion to communicate more fully with me on the subject. The letter has been lost or

mislaide, and I do not remember that Mr. Corney mentioned what proportion of these persons were unable to write; and suppose that his remarks were general. In some of the many conversations you and I have had on the subject of our system of public education I remember to have spoken of Mr. Corney's letter, and I am sure that the absence of all inducements will acquit Mr. Corney and you and myself of any intention to detract from the well-earned fame of the Palmetto Regiment. I know that in its ranks, amongst the private soldiers as well as the officers, there were very many of the best educated gentlemen to be found in the State. The mass may not be able to write the best hands, but they have left a mark on a page of the history of Mexico that will grow brighter and brighter as centuries shall roll on.

I am, very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

DAVID JOHNSON.

Rev. Dr. THOMAS CURTIS.

ARTICLE VIII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *The British Squadron on the Coast of Africa.* By Rev'd. J. L. WILSON, *American Missionary at the Gaboon, Africa.*

This pamphlet was received too late for notice in our last issue. It is marked with all that good sense which characterizes the performances of our missionary brother. Indeed so just and statesmanlike are the views it takes of the matter it discusses, it could not fail to have an effect on the minds of those for whom it was intended. Learning that the withdrawal of the squadron from the coast of Africa, was contemplated by the government of Great Britain, Mr. Wilson addressed this letter to an eminent merchant of Bristol, who brought it to the notice of Lord

Palmerston. This distinguished minister was so struck with the views and facts it presented, that he caused several editions of it to be published and largely distributed, especially among members of the British Parliament. It forms, we learn, one of the Parliamentary documents, and had its influence in effecting that result so desirable—the continuance of the British fleet on the African coast. The facts Mr. Wilson has brought forward, appear more than once in the Parliamentary debates, and he has received the thanks of the Prime Minister of England, for the service he has rendered. Mr. Wilson shows that under the protection which the colonies, the missions, and commerce have received from the fleet of Great Britain and other nations, the slave trade has been discontinued from more than three fourths of the points at which it was formerly pursued. It has been banished from more than two thousand miles of the Atlantic coast, and the attention of the people has been directed to other branches of commerce, which stimulate native industry, and direct them from those horrid wars and barbarities which prevailed in former years. Within the fifteen years of Mr. Wilson's residence on the coast, ten or twelve missions have been established, the Gospel has been preached to hundreds of thousands, the Scriptures have been translated into languages never before reduced to writing, printing presses are at work for the regeneration of Africa, more than 10,000 children are gathered into Christian schools, and not a few have been brought to a saving knowledge of Christ. The withdrawal of the squadron would leave them without protection, would invite the inroads of tribes of barbarians upon their peaceful settlements, would discourage the arts of peace, and bring back that unlawful commerce which has infested for so many years that unhappy continent.

[The absence of the editors from home during the greater part of the summer, and the trespass already committed upon the pages of the next number, must account to the reader for this abrupt termination of the *Critical Notices*, after being just commenced.—EDS. S. P. REVIEW.]

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER III.

JANUARY, 1852.

ARTICLE I.

J. A. Thomwell

VALIDITY OF POPISH BAPTISM.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 207.]

II. To make acceptance with God dependent upon personal holiness, is to repudiate the distinction between depravity and guilt, and to endorse the detestable doctrine of the Socinians, that repentance is an adequate ground of pardon, since it effaces those moral qualities the possession of which is what renders men liable to punishment. Rome and the Fratres Poloni differ, not in the principle on which justification immediately proceeds—both ascribe it to inherent righteousness—but in the source whence the principle in reference to the fallen derives its efficacy. The change of character, which is supposed to be inseparably connected with the favor of God, and a title to happiness, is, according to the Socinian hypothesis, attainable by the strength of nature, without the assistance of grace. Rome, on the other hand, contends that, although free will has not been extinguished in men by the fall, yet they have become so completely the slaves of sin and the subjects of the devil, that neither Jews nor Gentiles, independently of the passion of Christ and the aid of the Spirit, could be restored to liberty and peace. The inherent righteousness, by which we are justified, is, in the theology of Rome, the *infusion of grace*; in the theology of Socinus and his followers it is the product

and offspring of nature. When the question is asked *how* we obtain it, these Doctors differ ; but when it is inquired *what it accomplishes* or *what is its office*, Herod and Pontius Pilate are agreed—the Papist and Socinian strike hands in harmonious accord, impelled by equal fury against the most glorious truth of the glorious gospel of the blessed God—*justification by grace*. That which, according to both, effaces guilt and exempts from punishment, is the possession of personal righteousness. The inward purity which expunges the stain, obliterates the crime. Men cease to be *punishable* as soon as they cease to be wicked. Though their personal identity remains unchanged, yet, as guilt attaches only to *character*, it must be expunged as soon as the character undergoes a change. God deals with men according to the present condition of their moral qualities, and he, consequently, who would escape from punishment, must escape from that moral pollution which the law condemns, and acquire those traits which the law approves. Men can cease to be guilty only by becoming just—their righteousness covers their iniquities—their purity cancels their guilt. Abandoning the grounds of displeasure against them, they procure the favor of God.

Whatever objections may be drawn from the ordinary conduct of Providence, and however fallacious the reasoning itself may be, yet the conclusion at which it aims must be confessed to be plausible—it falls in with our instinctive conviction of propriety ; and as the government of God is moral, dispensing rewards and punishments according to the principles of distributive justice, there is felt to be a manifest incongruity in treating the righteous, no matter how or when they become so, as if they were wicked. The fact of being righteous would seem to be sufficient to exempt from punishment, though it might entitle to no positive rewards. Accustomed to regard purity as the parent of happiness, and misery as the offspring of vice, we spontaneously pronounce it to be absurd, no less than a contradiction in terms, to suppose that the holy can ultimately perish, or the good be abandoned of God. Still the claims of violated law are sacred and immutable. God has inseparably linked together punishment and crime, and it is the dictate alike of reason and revela-

tion—*the soul that sinneth it shall die*. Whatever changes may have been experienced in the moral qualities of the agent, his personal identity is untouched—he is the man who sinned—and as the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, and as the sin cannot be visited except in the person of the transgressor himself—he is the man that must suffer. It would appear, then, that if a sinner could repent of his iniquities, and undergo a complete and thorough transformation in his moral nature, so as to be possessed of all the qualities which God requires, the change in his character would create an emergency in the divine administration, the issue of which it would be impossible for us, upon any principles of natural religion, to predict with certainty. Penal justice, constituting an indispensable ingredient of the holiness of God, would be evidently forfeited if the *past* offences of the guilty were permitted to escape with impunity; and yet the idea that hell should be peopled with the righteous—with those who bear the image of their Maker, and are intent, even amid their agonies, upon the glory of His name—cannot for a moment be endured.

How, then, shall this problem be resolved? Most evidently by denying the possibility of the case. Piety instinctively suggests what reason and Scripture concur to authenticate—that the government of God is too wisely ordered in all its arrangements to permit emergencies to arise, as they often occur in human administrations, which cannot be adjusted without inconsistency, compromise or concession. It can never consequently happen, in the course of the divine economy, that moral fitness shall be violated by dooming the upright to punishment; neither can penal justice be foregone by allowing the guilty to escape. These two principles, equally sacred and immutable, must be preserved in inviolable harmony—their demands can never be permitted to clash. Hence the guilty must necessarily be incapable of rectitude. They can never acquire the character which moral fitness shall approve, while they continue in the state which penal justice must condemn. Pardon is accordingly indispensable to repentance; the liability to punishment, or what Protestants denominate guilt, must be cancelled, before refor-

mation is possible or holiness attainable. Sanctification, independently of a previous justification—previous in the order of nature, though not necessarily in the order of time—involves a gross contradiction in terms. Personal holiness, according to the uniform teachings of the Scriptures, results from union with God; and union with God necessarily implies the possession of His favor. Good works—proceeding as they do from the love of God as their source, governed by His law as their rule, and directed to His glory as their end—cannot be conceived to exist among outcasts and aliens. Men without God are without hope in the world. As the light of the sun is the prolific parent of life, beauty, vegetation and growth to the earth, so the light of the divine countenance diffuses health, cheerfulness and vigor in the hearts of the children of men. His favor is to the moral what the sun is to the material world, and the soul that is darkened by His frown can no more “move in charity and turn upon the poles of truth,” than a soil covered with perpetual night can be enriched with verdure or adorned with animals and plants. In the beautiful language of the Psalmist—HIS FAVOR IS LIFE, AND HIS LOVING KINDNESS IS BETTER THAN LIFE. Union with Him is the only source of strength, purity and peace. This is what the Scriptures denominate *life*.

Now what is the condition of an unpardoned sinner? His first transgression, upon the necessary principles of retributive justice, has *doomed* him to the *curse*. But to be under the curse, and at the same time enjoy the favor of God, are contradictory states. The curse implies something inconceivably stronger than a bare negation of favor—it fixes an illimitable chasm between the sinner and his Judge. It effects that awful separation from God, that banishment from His presence, that aggregate of all that is terrible, which the Bible compendiously expresses by death: in this condition of wretchedness and of exile, the dominion of sin must be unbroken and complete. Corruption riots on its victim. The curse which banishes from God banishes from holiness. The unpardoned sinner, consequently, from the very nature of his state, is as incapable of aspiring to holiness as a corpse is incapable of the functions of life. It is his doom, like the serpent, to crawl upon his belly and to lick the dust. The con-

demnation which sends him out, like Cain, from the presence of the Almighty, forever precludes the possibility of repentance—places him beyond the pale of communion with his Maker—beyond the reach of spiritual impulses, and leaves him to wither in the atmosphere of death. Such is the strength of the law to crush the victims of its penalty. All that are under the curse are dead—cut off from the fountain of life; the only works they are competent to perform are *dead* works.

The effect of a single sin upon the relations of a creature to God is by most men inadequately apprehended, in consequence of confounding spiritual death with the extinction of the moral nature.

As long as habits of incurable wickedness are not formed, while conscience in any measure continues to discharge its office, and the understanding recognizes the distinctions of right and wrong, there is supposed to be a form of spiritual life, which, by vigilance and culture, may be restored to strength and nurtured to maturity. Death in trespasses and sins is represented as the result of a *course* of transgression, a permanent condition of depravity produced by the natural operation of habit. This is to confound the cause with its effects, the tree with its fruits—death as a *state*, with its ultimate and complete exhibitions. According to the Scriptures, the slightest sin, like a puncture of the heart, is instantly attended with this awful catastrophe. It dissolves the union betwixt the sinner and God—it superinduces the condemnation of the law, and whatever operations the moral nature may subsequently perform, are destitute of the only principle which can render them acceptable.

As natural death consists in the separation of the soul and body, so spiritual death consists in the separation of the soul and God. As the body, though destitute of life, may long resist the process of putrefaction—preserving the integrity of its members and all the features and lineaments of the man—so the soul, though banished from God, may long resist what may not unaptly be styled the process of moral putrefaction, continuing to possess sensibility of conscience, delicacy of perception, and revolting at the thoughts of abandoned wickedness. As the body may be beautiful in death, so the soul, deserted of God and bereft

of the light of holiness, may yet retain something of original brightness in its form, and reveal in the grandeur of its ruins, the glory of the state from which it fell. It is a great mistake to suppose that spiritual death is the destruction of all moral susceptibilities and impressions. There may be total depravity without desperate atrocity, a complete alienation from God without degradation to the fiendishness of devils, an utter destitution of holiness without the possession of all conceivable wickedness. The condition which the moralist and Pharisee might acknowledge to be death, is that to which spiritual death necessarily tends. As soon as the soul is cut loose from God, it begins a career which, sooner or later, effects the prostration of the whole moral nature. It is in a state to form the habits which bind it in fetters of massive depravity, as the body ultimately moulders in decay from which the soul has taken its flight.

Spiritual death, consisting as we have seen in the separation of the soul from God, must continue to reign until a re-union shall have been effected. There can be no holiness until the sinner has been restored to the favor of his Maker, and he cannot be restored to this state until the curse of the law has been removed. He must, therefore, continue to be incapable of holiness as long as the law continues to condemn. Its penalty is an awful barrier betwixt his soul and life, and until that barrier is some way or other destroyed, he must remain the victim of everlasting death. Hence the removal of the curse is the first step in his progress to holiness; the removal of the curse implies pardon, so that he must be pardoned before he can repent, he must cease to be condemned before he can breathe the atmosphere of life. Repentance and reformation, proceeding from communications of divine love, involve the possession of divine favor, and can never consequently obtain among those whom God pronounces to be vessels of His wrath. To suppose that a sinner can be sanctified, is to suppose that he can enjoy fellowship with God, and perform those works which flow from the participations of divine love. To suppose that he can be sanctified without being justified, is to suppose that he can be in a condition in which God denounces him as the object of vengeance, and at the same time in a state of reconcil-

iation and favor, that he can be and not be at one and the same moment under the curse. Repentance, therefore, implying restoration to favor and communion with God, is incompatible with a state of condemnation which debars from both ; and, consequently, an unpardoned sinner cannot repent.

If now, pardon be essential to repentance, acceptance indispensable to holiness, it necessarily follows from the hypothesis of Rome, which confounds the water and the blood, that repentance and holiness are hopelessly impossible. The object of justification is to put the sinner in a state in which the light of the divine countenance can be lifted up upon him, in which he can receive communications of grace, and enjoy communion and fellowship with God. If these manifestations of favor are indispensable to holiness, and can only be imparted when the sinner is justified, justification must be the only basis on which righteousness of life can be reared. Rome, however, has reversed this order, and made holiness essential to acceptance ; the necessary consequence is, that justification is denied to be of grace, and sanctification is impossible. With all her pretended zeal for the interests of righteousness, her extravagant adulation of works and her presumptuous confidence in merit, she has proclaimed a creed, which, whoever cordially embraces and consistently endeavors to embody in his life, must everlastingly remain an alien from God, under sentence of condemnation, in bondage to spiritual death. Philosophy and Scripture concur in declaring, that whoever would be holy, must be in union with his Maker, that union with God is inseparably connected with the possession of His favor, and the possession of His favor a fruit of justification, so that whoever would be holy must necessarily be justified. Rome on the other hand, proclaims in foolish confidence of boasting, that the sinner must begin in holiness and end in the favor of his judge, begin at a point which he can never reach, and of course end precisely where he was, under the wrath and curse of the Almighty. Here, then, is the insuperable difficulty of Rome, she denies the *blood*, and in denying the blood, inevitably corrupts the *water* ; she takes away the cause, and of course must renounce the

effect. Upon her hypothesis sanctification is subverted. How then can hers be a saving creed?

The impossibility of constructing a system of sanctification, independently of a gracious justification, does not strike men at once, because they are apt to confound two widely different conditions, that of a fallen and an unfallen creature.

In an unfallen state, justification is possible by the deeds of the law, because personal obedience is within the power of the agent. Created in the image of God, possessed of a holy nature and governed by holy impulses, there are no obstructions in their persons and character to the free communications of divine favor. They are united with God, are consequently able to do all that His law demands. But so long as they are not justified, this union is precarious, they may fall from their integrity, and lose their rectitude of nature; justification confirms this union, and renders their apostacy forever impossible, giving them at the same time a right to whatever rewards had been promised to obedience, so that perpetual security is one of its leading and characteristic benefits. But the justification of a sinner, of a fallen being, though essentially the same, yet in consequence of the different condition of the subject, includes the imparting of an element which in the other case was previously possessed. As an unfallen creature already enjoys the favor of God, he is simply confirmed in its possession, while a fallen creature, who, from the nature of the case is alienated from his Maker, must first acquire this privilege before he can be confirmed in it; his union with God must be instituted as well as established. As then in the justification of a sinner, communion with God is to be procured as well as confirmed, he cannot be justified by deeds of law, which pre-supposes its existence. His acceptance must be of grace, or it cannot be effected at all. It must precede personal obedience, or personal obedience can never take place.

It is vain to allege in extenuation of the beggarly theology of Rome, that in consequence of the work of the Redeemer, communications of grace may be imparted to the guilty, which enable them to repent, to bring forth the fruits of righteousness, and so to be justified by works. These communications either imply the possession of the

divine favor and deliverance from the condemnation of the law, or they do not. If they do, the sinner is already justified without works, and pardoned independently of repentance, which is contrary to the hypothesis. If they do not, then they leave him under the curse, in the power of spiritual death, and of course do not impart spiritual life, so that the works which they enable him to perform are only dead works. The conclusion is, therefore, unaffected, that without a gracious justification, no sinner can be sanctified. Pardon and acceptance must precede repentance and holiness.

The practical effects of the Romish system are so modified by the temper and constitution of those by whom it is received, as to present no uniform appearance. In some, it produces an awful bondage. Anxiously solicitous about the salvation of their souls, and taught to seek for the divine favor in works of righteousness, which their hands have wrought, they exhaust the resources of their nature in vain and servile efforts to compass obedience to the law. Tortured by conscience, which always in the guilty forecasteth grievous things, groaning in spirit under the intolerable burden of aggravated guilt, they multiply devices of superstition and will-worship, in the delusive hope of bringing peace to their troubled and agitated breasts. They know nothing of the liberty of the sons of God. Strangers to that glorious spirit of adoption, which the sense of acceptance generates, existence is felt to be a curse, and God dreaded as a terrible calamity. Their obedience is the effort of a slave to propitiate a tyrant, and after a life dragged out in galling servitude, death comes to them, clothed with ten-fold terror. Eternity is shrouded in insupportable gloom, and the dismal tragedy of life closes with an awful catastrophe. To such sensitive and conscientious minds, Rome presents her system in the aspect of unbending severity. She imposes penances and privations, pilgrimages and fasts, vows of poverty and self-denial, hair-cloth and rags, the torment of the body for the good of the soul.

Eternity alone can disclose the groans, the sufferings, the agony, which the cells of her monks, and the chambers of her nuns have witnessed among them, who are anxiously enquiring wherewith they should appear before

the Lord, and bow themselves before the Most High God. And all this anguish has been occasioned by her devilish cruelty, in suppressing the grace of God. She has refused to point the wounded spirit to the fountain opened in the house of David, for sin and for uncleanness; she has refused to proclaim a free and glorious justification through the obedience unto death of the Son of God, to open the doors of the captive and strike the fetters from the hands of the prisoner. Instead of acting as the herald of mercy, she has betrayed the cruelty of a tyrant; brooding in vindictive malice over the woes and anguish, which, with the scorpion whip of the law she has wrung from hearts, where the oil of grace should be imparted; she has rejoiced in thickening the horrors of superstition, where she was bound to diffuse the light of the gospel. Like the ancient Pharisees, she binds heavy burdens upon men and grievous to be borne, and lays them on their shoulders, and will not move them with one of her fingers. She shuts the kingdom of heaven against them, neither entering herself nor permitting others to do so. Like ancient Egypt to the Hebrews, she is literally the house of bondage. Some, like Luther, have escaped from her cruelty. The key which opened their prison doors, and enabled the soul to laugh at her terrors, was justification by grace. This precious truth, for which their hearts had panted in Babylon, was the talisman of joy, of peace, of holiness. Delivered from the curse of law, the dominion of the devil, and the horrors of conscience, they could serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of their lives.

There are others whose apprehensions of sin are less feeble and impressive; disposed to make a mock of its consequences, they indulge in presumptuous hopes, and treat the salvation of the soul as an easy and comparatively light matter. These, Rome flatters with the deceits of a frivolous and deadly casuistry; corrupting the first principles of morals, she makes sin to be no more sin, law to be no more law; with elaborate ingenuity, she has undertaken to solve the problem, what is the minimum of decency, and the maximum of sin, with which men can enter into heaven. She has confounded the distinctions of truth and falsehood, of right and wrong, and left no-

thing certain, but her own pretended authority, and all to accommodate easy consciences, to reconcile hopes of heaven with a careless and wicked life.

Such is the working of the system. Theoretically, it makes sanctification impossible—practically, it verifies the truth of the theory.

Extremes meet. An old writer has pithily observed, that the least touch of a pencil will translate a laughing into a crying face. In illustration of the proverb, it would not be difficult to prove, that the vaunting legalism of Rome really terminates in a filthy and disgusting antinomianism. She degrades the majesty of the divine law, substitutes a fictitious standard of excellence, and represses those emotions which must characterize the heart of every true penitent. Her doctrine of venial sins, which are confessed to be transgressions of the divine commandments, is utterly incompatible with those awful impressions of the malignity of the least departure from rectitude, which the holiness of God, and the atonement of the Redeemer alike inculcate. She teaches that men may disregard the authority of their maker, and yet not be deserving of death; that there are some precepts so insignificant, and some offences so trivial and harmless, that a few signs of the cross, and muttered incantations, a little holy water, an Ave Maria, or a Pater Noster, are abundantly sufficient to expiate. Is not blasphemy written on the portals of a church which can preach such a doctrine as this? Does she not make the commandments of God of none effect by her traditions?

But the odious tendencies of her doctrine are not only manifested in her slight estimate of some of the commandments—one she has absolutely expunged.

The pure and sublime idea which the Scriptures inculcate of a spiritual God, neither possessed of a corporeal figure, nor capable of being represented by visible symbols, is as much a stranger to the theology of Rome, as to the “elegant mythology of Greece.” Hence we are told that “to represent the persons of the Holy Trinity by certain forms, under which, as we read in the Old and New Testaments, they deigned to appear, is not to be deemed contrary to religion or the law of God.” Accordingly the second commandment is annulled by the hierarchy, (in

books of popular devotion it is wholly suppressed,) the windows of papal churches are frequently adorned with images of the Trinity, the breviaries and mass-books are embellished with engravings, which represent God the Father as a venerable old man, the Eternal Son in human form, and the blessed Spirit in the shape of a dove.

Sometimes grotesque images, hardly surpassed in the fabulous creations of heathen poets, where centaurs, gorgons, mermaids, with all manner of impossible things hold undisputed sway, are employed to give an adequate impression of Him who dwells in majesty unapproachable, whom no man hath seen or can see. To picture the Holy Trinity with three noses and four eyes and three faces, and in this form these divine persons are sometimes submitted to the devout contemplation of papal idolaters—is to give an idea of God, from which an ancient Roman or a modern Hindoo might turn away in disgust. Such gross and extravagant symbols, however carefully explained, or allegorically interpreted, involve a degradation of the Supreme Being, which it is impossible to reconcile with the sublime announcement of our Saviour, that God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth. The adoration which is paid to the Deity, under any corporeal figure or visible representation, cannot be vindicated from the charge of idolatry upon any principles, which do not exempt from the same imputation every form, whether ancient or modern, of pagan superstition. It is quite certain, from the accounts of heathen philosophers and poets, that the images of their Gods were regarded simply as visible memorials of invisible deities, as signs by which their affections were excited, and through which their worship was directed.

The veneration with which they were treated, was purely of that relative kind, which the Romish doctors impute to the devotees of their own communion. Pagan statues and Romish pictures are due to the operation of the same principle—an attempt to accommodate the receding majesty of a spiritual being to human sympathies, and to divest the adoration of an infinite object of some of its awful and mysterious veneration, by reducing its grandeur to the feeble apprehension of human capacities. Fallen humanity, having originally apostatized from God, and lost

the right as well as the power of intimate communion with the Father of Spirits, seeks to gratify its religious aspirations by tangible objects, around which its sympathies can readily cling. Unable to soar to the unapproachable light in which Deity dwells in mysterious sanctity, it spends its devotion upon humbler things, to which it imparts such divine associations as may seem, at least, to reconcile the worship with the acknowledged supremacy of God. When we cannot rise to God, the religious necessities of our nature will drag Him down to us. In the Papal community, the degradation of the Supreme Being seems to have reached its lowest point of disgusting fetishism in the adoration of the bread and wine of the sacramental feast. I know of nothing in the annals of heathenism, that can justly be compared with this stupendous climax of absurdity, impiety, blasphemy and idolatry. The work of the cook, and the product of the vintage, bread and wine, the materials of food which pass through the stages of digestion and decay, are placed before us, after having been submitted to the magical process of sacerdotal enchantment, as the eternal God, in the person of the incarnate Redeemer. The eucharistic elements are not memorials of Christ, nor visible symbols of his love, they are, after the pretended consecration of the priest, the Son of God himself. They are worshipped and adored, eaten and drunk, received into the stomach and passed into the bowels, as the Creator, Preserver, and Saviour of mankind.

The ancient Egyptians, in paying religious veneration to inferior animals, and to a certain class of vegetables, regarded them as sacred, as we learn from Herodotus and Cicero, on account of their subservience to purposes of utility. They were considered as instruments of divine providence—not as Gods themselves—by which the interests of husbandry were promoted, and noxious vermin were destroyed.

But where in the whole history of mankind, among the darkest tribes of Africa, or the benighted inhabitants of the isles of the sea, is another instance to be found of a superstition so degraded, or a form of idolatry so horribly revolting, as that which is presented in the doctrine of the Mass?

The infernal incantations of the witches in Macbeth, chanting their awful dirges over the boiling caldron, in which are mingled the elements of death, are to my mind less insupportably disgusting, less terrifically wicked, than the priests of Rome, pretending to subject the Saviour of the world, in cold-blooded cruelty, and for purposes of hire, and that in increasing millions of instances, to the unutterable agonies of Gethsemane and Calvary.

While she thus depresses the divine standard of holiness, mutilates the first table of the law, and makes idolatry a part of devotion, she fabricates a standard of her own. She assumes to be a law-giver, and proclaims her impious precepts upon the pains of the second death.

Men may violate the law of God with impunity, but the authority of Rome must be guarded with the awful sanctions of eternity. She has instituted days, and months, and years—she has appointed confessions, penances and ceremonies—she has constructed a vast system of will-worship, and has conceded the palm of distinguished holiness to the sanctimonious hypocrites, who most scrupulously comply with her minute and painful observances, although they may be living in flagrant contempt of some of the most palpable injunctions of God.

And what shall be said of the fiction of supererogatory merits, of the competency of one man to satisfy for the sins of another, and of the power of the Church to dispense indulgences for gold? What shall be said of purgatory, private masses, auricular confession, and priestly absolution? What are all these but so many proofs of the desperate blindness of Rome, in regard to the nature of holiness, the beauty and simplicity of spiritual truth, and the compass, purity and extent of the divine law; so many monuments of presumptuous confidence in the resources and ability of man, and contempt for the provisions and efficacy of God's grace?

Her whole system, in regard to the water, is fundamentally corrupt. She renders the sanctification of the gospel hopelessly impossible, substituting for a spiritual devotion, the grievous bondage of superstition, and for holiness of life, the sanctimonious hypocrisy of will worship.

3. Having shewn that Rome is essentially unsound in regard to the water and blood, I proceed to consider her

doctrine of the Spirit, or the account which she gives of the application of redemption to the hearts and consciences of men. Upon this point, although the reviewer has asserted that she holds "a much higher doctrine as to the necessity of divine influence, than prevails among many whom we recognize as Christians," yet, according to the standard of the Reformation, the theology of the Vatican is in fatal and fundamental error. If we take the Creed of Rome—not from the speculations of private doctors—nor the peculiar opinions of chosen schools—if we appeal, not to Dominicans, Thomists and Jansenists, but to the public and authorized symbols of the Church, it seems to me impossible to deny, that her theory of grace is exactly in accordance with the conditions of a legal system, and presents as wide a departure from the simplicity of the gospel, in regard to the operations of the Spirit, as her views of justification, in regard to the righteousness of Christ. Representing the economy of salvation as a new dispensation of law, she makes its blessings contingent and precarious, dependent upon the decision of its subjects, and not upon the agency of God. As freedom and mutability of will are evidently essential to a state of proper probation—freedom, as implying the power to fulfil whatever conditions are exacted—mutability, as denoting that the power may be abused, and the required obedience withheld, Rome can consistently admit no other operations of the Spirit than those which shall impart ability to stand, without affecting the liability to fall.

Able to stand and liable to fall—this is a compendious description of man in his condition of innocence, and must appertain to him, under every economy which suspends acceptance upon personal performances. Hence, Rome places the destiny of the sinner in his own hands—*Suæ quisque fortunæ faber est*. Whatever may be her pretensions on the subject, and they are vain enough, the supernatural gifts which she attributes to the Spirit, since they are intended to qualify men for a legal dispensation, are no more entitled to be denominated grace, than the natural endowments of the Pelagian. They stand in the same relation to salvation, spring from the same source, and are dispensed for the same end. If, as Rome contends, we are the subjects of an original pro-

bation, whatever is necessary to fit us for the trial, must be imparted on principles of justice—and it is a mere question of priority of time, whether the necessary qualifications which must be possessed, shall be traced to creation or to some act subsequent to birth ; it is equally a question of words and names, whether they shall be called nature or grace. To be born with them is as truly to receive them from God, as to acquire them by an extraordinary communication, and in either case they are intended to adapt us to the exigencies of a legal condition. Gifts springing from the same source, directed to the same end, accomplishing the same results, are unquestionably of the same nature, whatever may be the order of time in which they are bestowed. The only point in which the hypothesis of Rome has the advantage of the most unblushing Pelagianism, is in relation, not to the doctrine of grace, but the natural condition of man. In the papal creed, the fall, as a federal transgression, is admitted, and guilt and depravity confessed to be the inheritance of Adam's descendants. In the Pelagian creed, it is denied to be any thing more than a private sin, and its penal consequences are accordingly restricted to the author of the act.

But both parties represent the *present* as a legal state, the Pelagian as a continuance of our first trial, and therefore he supposes that we are born with all that is requisite to meet it. The Papist as a new trial superinduced upon the ruins of the first, and, therefore, as he must admit that we first reap the consequences of the original failure, he confesses that we are *born* in sin, yet because of the *new* dispensation, he makes provisions to fit us for the race which is now set before us. The creed of one has more truth, but not more *grace* than the other, for both are equally a covenant of works, and equally destructive of the principles of the gospel.

In conformity with this reasoning, no operations of the Spirit can be justly denominated grace, which leave the decision of his destiny in the hands of the sinner. The agency of God may be carried so far as to make men *able* to stand, yet if it depends upon themselves to stand or fall, to use or reject the assistance which is given, there is nothing in such a state to distinguish it from the grossest

legalism. The spirit is evidently the *servant* not the *master* of the man, grace *obeys* but *does not reign*. All such schemes, whatever honor they may pretend to ascribe to the Holy Ghost, are insulting to God, since they lay a foundation for boasting in the creature. That alone is grace, in the strict and proper application of the term, which independently of works on our part, determines the will, and not only makes it able to stand, but guards it against the possibility of failure. As in justification, it is the righteousness of God that reigns, to the exclusion of human obedience ; so in regeneration, it is the will of God that reigns, to the exclusion of that of man. This is the doctrine of the Scriptures. Of His own will begat He us ; it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy. This is the only view of the subject which is consistent with the doctrine of gratuitous justification, and hence, those who have attributed a sovereignty to the human will, which God cannot control without destroying its nature, have invariably denied the imputation of the Saviour's righteousness. From the very necessity of the case they must be legalists—the reason why one is justified and another not, they must seek in the sinner himself, and hence justification cannot be wholly irrespective of works. What is commonly called free-will, is as directly contradictory to the grace of the spirit in effectual calling, as works of righteousness to the grace of the Redeemer in justification. Grace must reign, or it ceases to be grace, and the office of the human will is not so much to concur with it, as to obey it ; its efficacy consists in removing the spirit of resistance and implanting the spirit of obedience. "The Grace of God," says Quesnel, in his 'Moral Reflections on the New Testament,' "is nothing else but His Omnipotent will." "God," says a higher authority, "worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure." All the analogies by which it is illustrated in Scripture show that, in regeneration, man is the subject of an Almighty operation, extending to all the faculties of the soul, the will itself included. It is not a change *in* man, it is a change *of* man. In his natural condition he is as completely *nothing* in regard to the proper ends of his existence, as if he possessed no being at all, and the power which recalls him from this state is as independent

of his concurrence, as that which originally created him from nothing. The human will, therefore, must be excluded from any participation in the work of regeneration, or grace ceases to be grace, man reigns, God is dethroned, and a legal system is established. Grace is the antithesis of the sovereignty of man. Hence, the Reformers who reviewed the doctrines of grace, were deeply impressed with the indispensable necessity of laying deeply the foundation of the Spirit's work in the bondage of the human will. They perceived at a glance, that gratuitous justification could not be maintained a moment, if it depended upon man himself whether he should be justified or not. Luther, accordingly, while he denominated justification by grace, the "*articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*," attached no less importance to the resistless power of the Spirit in the new birth, as that by which alone the grace of the former could be preserved. What appeared to his age his most extravagant paradoxes, were put forth on the natural impotence of man. His sense of the necessity of maintaining the servitude of the will, as the only adequate foundation of grace, may be judged from the fact that he paid to Erasmus, who had written an elaborate defence of its freedom, the distinguished compliment of being the only champion of the papacy who understood the controversy betwixt the Reformers and Rome. "I must acknowledge," says Luther, "that in this great controversy, you alone have taken the bull by the horns." It is evident, that if the doctrine of justification were the hinge upon which the Reformation turned, the servitude of the will was the hinge upon which the controversy about justification turned. The supremacy of the divine will, and of Christ's righteousness, stand or fall together. Effectual grace, and free justification, are inseparable elements of the same system. These precious truths carry in their bosom the kindred doctrines of personal election, final perseverance, and particular redemption, which are so indissolubly united together, that to deny one is logically though not always in fact, to deny them all, and to admit one is logically though not always in fact, to admit them all. These are the truths, which, combined into a system, constitute pre-eminently the doctrines of grace, which after having been buried and obscured for ages—with the

exception of a cloister here and there, or a few hearts doomed to solitude and suffering, in which their light still dimly burned—burst upon the world in their original lustre at the time of the Reformation. These are the truths which bring glory to God in the highest, and distribute peace among men. They are the hope of our race—the stars which adorn the firmament of revelation. In their light we behold the sovereignty of God, and the nothingness of man—here the Creator is supreme, while the creature is prostrate in the dust. They force from us the doxology of earth, “not unto us, not unto us,” and the pealing anthem of heaven, “the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.”

That Rome denies the efficacy of grace, which is equivalent to denying its reality, as contradistinguished from the qualification of a legal state, may be inferred not only from the logical necessity of her system, but from the canons of Trent, and the subsequent bulls of her Popes.

The Tridentine Fathers affirm, in the first place, that liberty of will is not extinguished by the fall, it is only enfeebled and bent. This cautious phraseology implies, that notwithstanding the ruins and desolation of sin, there yet lingers in man some germ of spiritual life, some latent susceptibility of holy emotions, which proper nourishment and care may develope into heartfelt exercise. Man is not dead in trespasses and sins—he is only crippled and exhausted; he does not require to be created anew, it is amply sufficient to nurse his attenuated power, to stop the progress of disease, and leave to nature the action of its *vis medicatrix*. “Free will,” says Andradius,* in explaining this very statement of the council, “without the inspiration and assistance of the Spirit cannot perform spiritual actions. This, however, does not result from the fact that the mind and will which man possesses from his birth, are, previously to conversion, utterly destitute of any of the power, abilities or faculties, which are necessary for beginning or consummating spiritual actions. It is rather because these natural abilities and faculties, though neither effaced, nor extinguished, are so involved in the snares of sin, that man cannot by his own strength extricate him-

* As quoted in Chemitzii Exam. Conc. Trident Pars i. Loc. 7. § 2. p. 169.

self from the net. As he who is fettered with iron shoes may have the natural ability to walk, yet although he possesses, he cannot use it and actually walk, until the fetters are broken which hinder and retard his motion." Here is the famous distinction, which should always have been confined to the forges of Rome, between natural and moral ability. The sinner possesses the power to act, but his energies are restrained by superior strength. Conversion simply throws off the superincumbent pressure, and permits the wearied and exhausted faculties of man to develope and expand. Grace imparts no new susceptibilities, communicates no supernatural faculties, it only takes from the garden of nature the weeds which infest it.

An illustration similar in import to that of Andradius, is employed by Bellarmin.* In answer to the question, how the will can possess the power of contrary choice, when it is unable to do good, he observes: "That the will is indeed free, but its liberty is bound and restrained; it becomes released and disentangled when the proximate power or working is imparted to it by the preventing grace of God. Something similar we experience in regard to the power of vision, where the sensible species is absent; man still possesses the power and liberty of seeing, for that species is not the cause of either. The power, however, is remote, and the liberty bound, until the species being present, the power is perfected and may be actually exercised."

The doctrine of Trent then plainly is, that man is possessed of natural, though not of moral ability, to comply with the commandments of God, and if this doctrine has recently been regarded as fatal in the Presbyterian Church, it is hard to understand how it can be saving in the Church of Rome. Anywhere and everywhere it breathes the spirit of a legal covenant.

In the next place, the phrases by which Trent distinguishes the operations of the Spirit, are studiously accommodated to this absurd theory of the freedom of the will. Grace excites and helps,—expressions which obviously imply that there are dormant energies to be stimulated and fainting strength to be assisted.

* *De Gratia et Lib. Arbit. Lib. vi. c. 15.*

But the most detestable feature in her theory is, that the influences of the Spirit derive their efficacy not from the will and power of God, but from the consent and concurrence of man. Such is the sovereignty of the human will that all the efforts of the Almighty to regenerate the heart may be rendered abortive by an obstinate resistance. The will is *above* the reach of Deity Himself. God may persuade, but He cannot subdue. To ascribe such dominion to man, is utterly destructive of the reality of grace—and yet Trent expressly teaches* that it is by the free consent and co-operation of the sinner that the agency of God accomplishes his conversion; that he is fully competent to reject the inspiration of the Spirit, and so is what every subject of a legal dispensation must be, able to stand and liable to fall. The fourth canon on justification, though awkwardly and even absurdly expressed, was obviously aimed against the Lutheran, which is the scriptural hypothesis, that man is passive in regeneration, a doctrine absolutely essential to preserve the completeness of the analogy betwixt Christ and Adam. There must be a double union with both, in order that the effects of their respective covenants may be communicated to their respective seeds—a federal union, which renders their public conduct *imputable*—a personal union, through which it becomes actually imputed.

Now the personal union with Adam, which consists in descent from his loins, is unquestionably instituted without any concurrence on our part. The very act which makes us men makes us his children, and, by necessary consequence, the heirs of his guilt and ruin. Why, then, should not our union with Christ, which is constituted in effectual calling, be also independent of our own co-operation? If our connection with the head of the first covenant is confessedly involuntary, why should not the analogy be sustained, and our connection with the Head of the second be equally involuntary? If the act which makes us the *seed* of Adam is prior to our possession of natural being, why should not the act which makes us the *seed* of Christ be also prior to our possession of spiritual existence? The truth is, we are new-created in Christ, as we were

* De Justificatione, Cap. 5, Can. 4.

originally created in Adam—we are the *subjects* of both operations, and *active* in neither. We can no more be our own spiritual than our natural fathers.

The attempt of the Dominicans to reconcile the Tridentine theory of grace with the doctrines of their great master, Augustin, deserves to be briefly noticed, as it has led to the impression which the Reviewer himself has sanctioned—that the decrees of the Fathers are ambiguous. The council said expressly that “man can dissent from God, exciting and calling him, if he should will to do so.”* This seems to be a plain denial of efficacious grace, and yet, by a quibble grossly contradictory and absurd, the Dominicans endeavored to prove that it was not inconsistent with their favorite doctrine. They admitted that man might dissent if he should *will* to do so, but they denied that it was possible to have such a will when the grace of God was imparted.

It was the essence of grace to take from him the power of willing to the contrary. In the midst of this trivial sophistry the Dominicans had forgotten what Bellarmine commends to their attention, that the council had previously determined that man could *reject* the grace itself. How could he reject it without a previous will? “The impossibility of willing to dissent,” continues Bellarmine,† “is utterly inconsistent with free will, if it be maintained, as the adversaries maintain, that this impossibility of willing to dissent results from the fact that grace actively and intrinsically determines the will to the contrary. We have already declared that man can believe or love God, if he will—that he cannot will, however, without assisting grace. There is no inconsistency here, because free will is feeble for good, and therefore requires assistance. But when the assistance is imparted we affirm that man can will, and not will, and that in this way he is truly and properly free. But, if grace being present, man cannot will to dissent—grace being absent, he cannot will to consent—there is no liberty of will, no departure from the opinion of heretics.”

The Dominican interpretation is further contradicted by notorious facts. For the space of a century and a half after

* Biblical Repertory, April, 1846, p. 342.

† De Gratia et Lib. Arbit., Lib. vi. Cap. 15.

the dissolution of the council of Trent a bitter and ferocious controversy was waged in the Church of Rome upon the doctrines of grace—and all the authoritative documents which were published during that period were decidedly semi-pelagian, and sometimes worse. They are, to be sure, for the most part negative, but they are negations of the fundamental truths of Christianity.

On the first of October, 1567, Pius V. issued a bull condemning the seventy-six propositions which were said to have been extracted from the works of Baius. It is nothing to my purpose whether or not this distinguished professor really entertained all the sentiments which his enemies ascribe to him; it is enough to know what the oracle of the faithful pronounced to be heresy. Among the repudiated propositions are the following:

XX. No sin is of its own nature venial, but every sin deserves eternal punishment.

XXXV. All the works of unbelievers are sins, and the virtues of the philosophers are vices.

XXXVII. Free will, without the assistance of God's grace, can do nothing but sin.

XXXVIII. It is a Pelagian error to say that, by free will, man can avoid any sin.

XXXIX. What is done voluntarily, though it be done necessarily, is done freely.

XLI. The only liberty which the Scriptures recognize is not from necessity, but sin.

LXV. To admit any good use of free will, or any which is not evil, is Pelagian error, and he does injury to the grace of Christ who so thinks and teaches.

LXVI. Violence alone is repugnant to the natural liberty of man.

When the authenticity of the bull denouncing these propositions had been seriously called into question, it was solemnly confirmed by a constitution of Gregory XIII., bearing date the 28th January, 1579.

Upon the infallible authority of two Popes, Urban VIII. in 1642, Innocent X. in 1653, five propositions, purporting to be taken from the Augustin of Jansen, were subjected to the odious imputation of heresy. These propositions asserted the impotency of man—the invincibility of grace

—the certainty of predestination, and the definite nature of the atonement. I give them in order.

I. There are some commands of God which righteous and good men are absolutely unable to obey, though disposed to do it—and God does not give them so much grace that they are able to observe them.

II. Inward grace in the state of fallen nature cannot be resisted.

III. To constitute merit or demerit in the state of fallen nature, man does not require liberty from necessity—liberty from coercion being sufficient.

IV. The semi-pelagians admitted the necessity of inward preventing grace to every act, even the beginning of faith, but their heresy consisted in this—that they maintained this grace to be such that the human will could resist or restrain it.

V. It is semi-pelagian to say that Christ died for all men.

The first of these propositions is condemned as “rash, impious, blasphemous, heretical”—the second and third are declared to be “heretical,” the fourth is pronounced to be “false and heretical,” and all the vials of Pontifical abuse seem to be emptied on the fifth; it is denominated “impious, blasphemous, contumelious, derogatory to piety, and heretical.”*

The last document to which I shall refer, is the memorable constitution, *Unigenitus*, signed by Clement XI. at Rome, on Friday, the 8th of September, 1713, the birthday, as Romanists assert, of the Immaculate Virgin. This Bull,† whose professed object was to condemn one hundred and one propositions, extracted from a work of Quesnel, entitled *Moral Reflections upon each verse of the New Testament*, contains a formal reprobation of the distinguishing doctrines of grace. How far in each case the censure extends it is difficult to determine. The propositions are “respectively” denounced as “false, captious, shocking, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious to the Church and her practice, contumelious not only against the Church, but likewise against the secular powers, seditious, impious, blasphemous, suspected

*Leydekker's *Historici Jansenismi*, p. 126, p. 278. Mosheim, vol. 3, p. —.

† I have made my extracts from the copy given in Lafiteau's *History* of it.

of heresy, and plainly savoring thereof, and likewise favoring heretics, heresies and schism, erroneous, bordering very near upon heresy,—often condemned, and in fine even heretical, and manifestly reviving several heresies, and chiefly those which are contained in the infamous propositions of Jansenius, even in the very sense in which those propositions were condemned.” The term “respectively,” indicates that this medley of epithets is to be distributed, that all are not to be applied to each proposition, but only that each epithet should find a counterpart in some proposition, and each proposition be embraced under some epithet. But the allusion to Jansenius shows that whatever may be said of the rest, the propositions containing his doctrines, are to be regarded as heretical.

Among the one hundred and one condemned articles are the following truths of the word of God, numbered as they are numbered in the Bull.

I. What else remains to the soul that has lost God and His Grace, but sin and the consequences of sin, haughty poverty and lazy indigence, that is, a general impotence to labor, to prayer, and to every good work?

II. The grace of Jesus Christ—the efficacious principle of every sort of good, is necessary to every good work—without it nothing either is done or can be done.

V. When God does not soften the heart by the inward unction of His grace, exhortations and external advantages serve only to harden it the more.

IX. The grace of Jesus Christ is sovereign—without it we can never confess Christ, and with it we shall never deny him.

X. Grace is the operation of God’s Almighty hand, which nothing can let or hinder.

XII. When God wills to save a soul at any time or place, the effect indubitably follows the determination of His will.

XIII. Whenever God wills to save a soul and touches it with the inward hand of His grace, no human will resists Him.

XIV. However remote an obstinate sinner may be from salvation, whenever Jesus is revealed to him in the saving light of His grace he yields, embraces him, humbles himself and adores the Saviour.

XIX. The grace of God is nothing else than His omnipotent will. This is the idea which God himself gives us in all the Scriptures.

XXI. The grace of Jesus Christ is strong, mighty, sovereign, invincible, being the operation of God's Almighty will—the consequence and imitation of the working of God in making the Son incarnate, and raising Him from the dead.

XXIII. God has given us the idea of the almighty working of His grace in representing it as a creation out of nothing, and a resurrection from the dead.

XXX. All whom God wills to save by Christ are infallibly saved.

XXXVIII. The sinner is free only to evil without the grace of the Saviour.

XXXIX. The will, without preventing grace, has light only to wander, heat only for rashness, strength only to its wounding. It is capable of all evil and incapable of any good.

XLI. Even the natural knowledge of God, such as obtained among the gentile philosophers, must be ascribed to God, and without grace produces only presumption, vanity and opposition to God, instead of adoration, gratitude and love.

LXIX. Faith—its use, increase and reward, are wholly the gift of God's pure liberality.

LXXIII. What is the Church but the congregation of the sons of God, dwelling in His bosom, adopted in Christ, subsisting in His person, redeemed by His blood, living by His spirit, acting by His grace, and waiting for the grace of the future life?

These documents establish by the most conclusive negative testimony, that Rome repudiates the only theory of grace which can bring salvation to the lost. She utterly denies its power. The terms efficacious grace are indeed found in the writings of her cherished theologians, but in a sense widely different from that which the Reformers taught. It is an efficacy consisting in the skilful adaptation of motives on the part of God, to the mind of man, by which the will is determined in conformity with the divine desire. God does not determine it, but only presents considerations, which from His knowledge of the

man, He perceives beforehand will induce it to determine itself. It is the efficacy not of power but of persuasion—God acts the part not of a sovereign but of an able orator. “It cannot be understood,” says Bellarmin,* “How efficacious grace consists in an inward persuasion which may be spurned by the will, and yet infallibly accomplishes its end—unless we add, that with all those whom God has infallibly decreed to draw, He employs a persuasion which He sees to be adapted to their disposition, and which He certainly knows will not be despised.”

It is not a little strange that Princeton should attribute to Rome a “much higher doctrine as to the necessity of Divine influence than prevails among many whom we recognize as Christians,” when the orthodox portion of the Protestant world has already condemned her opinions. The creed of Rome differs only for the worse, from the creed of the Remonstrants; it is not so full and clear upon the subject of depravity, and much bolder in the freedom of the will. Still their respective theories of grace are substantially the same, and if the orthodox world in the seventeenth century conspired to suppress the errors of the Remonstrants, as dangerous and fatal, what magic has extracted their malignity in the lapse of two hundred years and upwards, so that they are harmless in the hands of the Pope? So striking is the similarity between the principles of the Remonstrants, and the decrees of Trent, that I am constrained to place them in a note, in juxtaposition, that the reader may see at a glance, what Princeton denominates a “much higher doctrine as to the necessity of divine influence, than prevails among many whom we recognize as Christians.”† Both seem willing to ascribe

* *De Gratia et Lib. Arbit.* Lib. 1. cap. 12., last sentence.

† “Man”—says the Remonstrants—“has not saving faith of himself, nor by virtue of his own free will, for as much as being in a state of sin, he can neither think, will nor do, by or of himself, any good, especially such as proceeds from a saving faith. But it is necessary he should be regenerated and renewed by God in Christ, through His Holy Spirit, in his understanding, will and all his faculties, to the end that he may rightly understand, reflect upon, will and fulfil the things which are good and which accompany salvation. But we maintain that the grace of God is not only the beginning but likewise the progress and completion of all good: insomuch that even the regenerate themselves are not able without this previous, or preventing, exciting, concomitant, and consequent grace to think, will, or effect, any good thing, or resist any temptation to evil; so that all good works and actions

every thing to God, but the conquest of the will. He may teach, enlighten, remonstrate and persuade, but He cannot subdue. The will sits as a sovereign upon her throne, and can laugh at all his thunder.

If the Creed of Rome is fatally unsound in regard to the nature of effectual calling, there is nothing to redeem its errors, but much to heighten its dangers, in what it teaches of the reason, office and operations of FAITH—in the production of which the mystical union is completed and upon which the whole application of redemption depends. The calling, indeed, is never effectual, and the condition of the sinner is never safe until faith is actually wrought. To it all the promises of salvation are addressed—it is pre-eminently the work of God—that which He requires at our hands—without which it is impossible to please Him—with which it is impossible to be condemned. It is the characteristic principle of Christian life, comprising, in its nature and results, the whole mystery of Christian experience. “I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live: yet, not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by faith upon the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.” The blessedness and joy—the light, fortitude and peace—the hopes which stimulate the zeal and the beauties which adorn the char-

ought to be ascribed to God. Nevertheless we do not believe that all the zeal, care and pains employed by men in order to the working out their salvation, are before faith and the Spirit of renovation, vain and unprofitable, and even more prejudicial than advantageous; but on the contrary we maintain, that to hear the word of God, to be sorry for and repent of our sins, earnestly to desire saving grace and the Spirit of Renovation, (which however cannot be done without grace,) are not only not hurtful, but rather very useful and absolutely necessary to the attaining faith and the spirit of renovation. The will has no power in the state of sin, and before the call, of doing any good to salvation. And, therefore, we deny that the will has, in every state of man, the liberty or freedom of willing the saving good as well as evil. Efficacious grace whereby men are converted, is not irresistible, and though God works in such a manner by His word, and the internal operations of His Spirit, as to communicate the power of believing and supernatural strength, and even to cause men actually to believe; yet, nevertheless, men may of themselves reject this grace, and refuse to believe, and consequently be lost through their own fault.”

In the first place—says Trent, “the holy council maintains that it is necessary, in order to understand the doctrine of justification truly and well, that every one should acknowledge and confess that since all men had lost innocence by Adam’s prevarication, and had become unclean, and, as the Apostle says, “by nature children of wrath” as is expressed in the decree

acter of those who love God, their change of state and the gradual transformation of their minds, are all in the Scriptures ascribed to *Faith*—without it, the WATER and the BLOOD are nothing worth—the invitations of the Gospel, the monitions of Providence, the persuasions of the ministry, and even the signs in the Holy sacraments are vain and nugatory lifeless appeals, which play around the head or amuse the fancy, but are incapable of reaching the heart. The spirit of faith is the spirit of life. Faith justifies the guilty and cleanses the impure; faith is the shield, in the panoply of God, which quenches all the fiery darts of the wicked, the victory which overcomes the world, and extracts lessons of experience from trials of patience. Faith conquers death and opens the kingdom of heaven to the triumphant saint—it is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.

The contrast is amazing betwixt the importance which the Scriptures every where attach to this grace and that which is assigned to it in the Theology of Rome. While, according to the unvarying tenor of the Gospel, which is, BELIEVE AND BE SAVED, faith is the first, second, third thing, comprehending every thing else in the department of personal religion—according to the Creed of the Papacy it is at best a very slender accomplishment, having

on original sin, they are so completely the slaves of sin, and under the power of the Devil and of death, that neither could the Gentiles be liberated or rise again by the power of nature, nor even the Jews by the letter of the law of Moses. Nevertheless free will was not wholly extinct in them, though weakened and bowed down." The council further declares that in adult persons, the beginning of justification springs from the preventing grace of God, through Christ Jesus; that is, from his calling, wherewith they are called, having in themselves no merits; so that those who, in consequence of sin were alienated from God, are disposed to betake themselves to His method of justifying them by His grace which excites and helps them, and with which grace they freely agree and co-operate. Thus while God touches the heart of man by the illumination of His Holy Spirit, man is not altogether passive, since he receives that influence which he had power to reject, while on the other hand he could not of his free will, without the grace of God, take any step towards righteousness before Him. Whoever shall affirm that all works done before justification, in whatever way performed, are actually sins and deserve God's hatred; or that the more earnestly a man labors to dispose himself for grace, he does but sin the more, let him be accursed."

These extracts are taken, the first from Brandt's History of the Reformation, vol. 3, book 35, p. 87-8; the second from Cramp's Text book of Popery, the article of Justification, chaps. 1, 5, and canon 4.

no necessary connection with salvation, capable of existing among those who are without Christ, without God, and without hope in the world. It may distinguish as well the victim of perdition as the heirs of heaven. The single fact that Rome declares that believers may be lost, while the Bible asserts that every believer shall be saved, is conclusive proof that her theology and that of the Bible are fundamentally at variance.

There are two principal points, in connection with this subject, in regard to which she is grossly and fatally unsound—the relation of faith to the Christian life, and the immediate reason of faith itself.

1. The distinguished efficacy which the Scriptures uniformly attribute to this grace does not depend upon its own intrinsic excellence, nor the natural operation of the truths, important as they are, which it receives and assimilates. These, however exalted, however cordially embraced, however admirably adapted to generate the active principles of love, hope and fear, could never achieve the splendid results which proceed from the influence of faith. As an accomplishment of the spiritual man—an integral element of inherent righteousness, charity is certainly entitled to precedence, yet charity is never said to justify—it applies neither the Water nor the Blood, but pre-supposes the application of them both. It is not, then, as a grace, or an act of formal obedience to the authority of God, that faith performs its wonders. The source of its power is not in itself—in moral dignity and worth it is the least of graces—nor are the propositions, abstractly considered, which it brings in contrast with the understanding and the heart; the result of these could only be the production of diligence, zeal, gratitude, love, hope and fear, which, singly or combined, avail nothing in the justification of the guilty. The secret of its efficacy lies in its relation to Christ. It is a bond of union with Him. As an exercise of holiness, it has its appropriate place among the elements of personal obedience. It receives the whole revelation of God, and becomes the medium through which the different emotions are excited which the various aspects of the word are suited to inspire. Through it divine truth penetrates the heart, presenting the terrible majesty of God to the consternation of the guilty, and disclosing the ineffable tenderness of His

love to the consolation of the humble ; but faith saves us, not because it believes the truth, but because it unites us as living members with a living Head. It is not the believer that lives or works ; it is Christ who lives in him ; *He* is our life, and faith is the channel through which His grace is efficaciously imparted. He dwells in us by His Spirit and we dwell in Him by faith. And as He possesses all the elements of salvation in Himself—wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption ; faith, which cements a union with His person, must involve communion in His graces. As He is emphatically the *LIFE*, those who are possessed of the Son must be possessed of life. We are justified by faith, because, in connecting us with Christ, it makes us partakers of His righteousness and death. We are sanctified by faith, because the Spirit is communicated from the Head to the members, revealing the true standard of holiness in the Person of the Son, presenting the true motives of holiness in the grace and promises of the Gospel—implanting operative principles of holiness in gratitude, love, hope and fear, and giving efficacy to all subordinate means by the omnipotent energy of His will. Faith saves us, because it joins us to Him who is salvation, and who is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God through Him.—Such is its potency. Nothing in itself, it makes us one with Christ—by it we suffer with Him—we die with Him, we are buried with Him, we rise with Him, and with Him we are destined to reign in glory.

Rome, however, knows nothing of this mystical union with Christ, and consequently the only efficacy which she attributes to faith, in the application of redemption, is that of a spiritual grace, constituting one of the elements of the formal cause of justification. It is a *part* of the righteousness in which the sinner is accepted before God. “The principal reason,” says Bellarmin,* “why our adversaries attribute justification to faith alone, is because they suppose that faith does not justify after the manner of a cause, or on account of its dignity and worth—but only *relatively*, as it receives in believing what God offers in the promise.”

“For if they could be convinced that faith justifies by

* Bellarmin De Justificatione, Lib. i. cap. 17; of Lib. i. cap. 3.

procuring, meriting, and, in its own way, beginning justification, they would undoubtedly acknowledge that the same might be predicated of love, patience and other good acts. We shall prove, therefore, that true and justifying faith is not, as the adversaries affirm, a naked and sole *apprehension* of righteousness, but is an efficacious cause of justification. All the arguments to this point may be reduced to three heads. The first shall be taken from those testimonies which teach that faith is a cause of justification in general, the second those which prove that in faith justification is begun, the third from those which demonstrate that by faith we please God, and procure and in some way merit justification." In developing these arguments Belarmin repeatedly ridicules the idea that faith is an instrument which apprehends the righteousness of Christ. According to him, it contributes to our justification only in so far as it is an act of righteousness itself—its value depending not upon its relation to Christ, but upon its own intrinsic excellence. Its inherent dignity and worth are an element of personal holiness. To the same purport the council of Trent declares that* "we are said to be justified by faith, because faith is the *beginning* of human salvation—the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God, and come into the fellowship of His children." In other words, faith is the *first* grace which, among adults, enters into the disposition or the state of heart which is preparatory to the reception of this great blessing. It is the *first* element of righteousness which is infused into the soul, and, as being first and intimately connected with all the rest, it is the root and foundation of a holy life. But its only influence is that which it possesses as an inward grace, meritorious in itself, and capable, through the truth which it embraces, of generating other motions of good. But as the righteousness in which we are accepted must correspond to all the requisitions of the law, and as faith alone is only a partial obedience, Rome teaches that it must be combined with other graces, particularly with charity, in order to secure our justification. Charity indeed she pronounces to be the end, perfection and form of all other virtues—without it,

* Trident. Concil. Sess. vi. cap. 8.

faith is unfinished and dead, incapable of meriting life or of commending to the favor of God.

If there be any one doctrine of the Bible against which Rome is particularly bitter, it is, that we are justified by faith alone, without the deeds of the law. This principle strikes at the root of the whole system of infused and inherent righteousness. It removes all occasion of glorying in the flesh. It prostrates the sinner in the dust, and makes Christ the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end—the all in all of human hope. Hence Trent enumerates no less than *seven acts** as constituting the disposition preparatory to the reception of justification—among which faith is found, and it entitled to no other pre-eminence than that it is the first in the series, having, from the nature of its operations, a tendency and fitness to excite the rest. Hence, also, it pronounceth† its anathema upon all who, in conformity with the Scriptures, shall affirm “that the ungodly is justified by faith only, so that it is to be understood that nothing else is to be required to co-operate therewith in order to obtain justification, and that it is on no account necessary that he should prepare and dispose himself to the effect of his own will.” Hence, too, the doctrine of imputation is condemned, being consistent with no other hypothesis but that which makes faith a bond of union with Christ as a federal head—appropriating His obedience and pleading the merits of His death. “Whosoever shall affirm that men are justified only by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ or the remission of sin, to the exclusion of grace and charity, which is shed abroad in their hearts, and inheres in them: or that the grace by which we are justified is only the favor of God, let him be accursed.”‡

* Trident. Concil. Sess. vi. cap. 6. Bellarmin remarks—De Justificatione Lib. i. cap. 12, “The adversaries, therefore, as we have before said, teach that justification is acquired or apprehended by faith alone. Catholics, on the other hand, and especially the Tridentine Synod, which all Catholics acknowledge as a mistress, (Sess. vi. cap. 6,) enumerates seven acts by which the ungodly are disposed to righteousness: faith—fear—hope—love—repentance—the purpose of receiving the sacrament and the purpose of leading a new life and keeping the commandments of God.” This opinion he goes on in several successive chapters to establish.

† Conc. Trident. Sess. vi. can. 9.

‡ Conc. Trident. Sess. vi. can. 11.

It cannot fail to be observed that the Romish theory of faith is peculiarly unfavorable to the cultivation of humility. Abstracting the attention from the fullness and sufficiency of Christ, and dignifying personal obedience into a meritorious cause of salvation, it must bloat the heart with spiritual pride, and generate a temper of invidious comparison with others, equally fatal to the charity which thinketh no evil, and the self abasement which should characterize debtors to grace. When the efficacy of faith is attributed to the relation which it institutes with Christ, it is felt to be nothing in itself; every blessing is ascribed to the sovereign mercy of God; it is no more the sinner that lives—but Christ lives in him—it is no more the sinner that works, but Christ works in him. The Divine Redeemer becomes the all in all of his salvation—his wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. It is only when faith is apprehended as a bond of union with Christ that it produces the effect which Paul attributes to it, of excluding boasting—in every other view it furnishes a pretext for glorying in the flesh: as an instrument, it exalts the Redeemer—as a meritorious grace, entering into the formal cause of justification, it exalts the sinner—as an instrument, it leads us to exclaim that, by the grace of God, we are what we are: as a meritorious grace, to thank God that we are not as other men.

2. But the Papal creed is hardly less unsound in reference to the *nature* than it is in reference to the *office* of faith.

If there be any thing in the Scriptures clearly revealed and earnestly inculcated, it is that the faith, by which we apprehend the Redeemer as the foundation of our hope, depends upon the *immediate testimony* of God. It is supernatural in its *evidence*, as well as supernatural in its origin. The record which God has given of His Son bears upon its face impressions of divinity which are alike suited to command the assent of the understanding, and to captivate the affections of the heart.

The argument by which we ascend from redemption to its author is analogous to that (though infinitely stronger in degree,) which conducts us from nature to nature's God. The Almighty never works without leaving traces of Himself; a godlike peculiarity distinguishes all His operations.

He cannot ride upon the heavens, but His name *Jah* is proclaimed—the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal *power* and Godhead. But if the material workmanship of God contains such clear and decisive traces of its Divine Author—if the heavens declare His glory, and the firmament sheweth his handy-work—if sun, moon, and stars, in their appointed orbits, demonstrate an eternal Creator, and leave the atheist, skeptic and idolater without excuse—much more shall that stupendous economy of grace, which bears pre-eminently the burden of His name, reveal the perfections of His character, and authenticate the divinity of its source. The evidence that it sprang from the bosom of God, and that its voice is the harmony of the world, must be sought in itself. It stands—a temple not built with hands—bearing upon its portals the sublime inscription of God's eternal purpose—of His wisdom, power, justice, goodness, and grace. It is the palace of the great King—where His brightest glories are disclosed—His choicest gifts bestowed. Jesus is *seen*, is *felt* to be the *image* of the invisible God—the first born of every creature. The believer has only to look upon His face, and he beholds His glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, has shined into our hearts, and revealed the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ.

But while redemption contains the evidence of its heavenly origin, such is the deplorable darkness of the human understanding in regard to things that pertain to God—and such the fearful alienation of men from the perfection of His character—that though the light shines conspicuously among them, they are yet unable to comprehend its rays. Christ crucified proves to all, in their natural condition, whether Jews or Gentiles, a stumbling block or foolishness. Hence, to the production of *faith*, there must be a heavenly *calling*, in order that the infallible evidence, which actually exists in the truth itself, may accomplish its appropriate effects—the eternal Spirit, who sends forth His cherubim and seraphim to touch the lips of whom He pleases, must be graciously vouchsafed to illuminate the darkened mind, and manifest in the provision of the Gos-

pel the power of God, and the wisdom of God unto salvation. It is the Spirit that quickeneth—the flesh profiteth nothing. Redemption is a spiritual mystery, and faith is the spiritual eye, supernaturally imparted, that beholds it. He that believeth hath the witness in himself—the divine illumination of the Spirit is the immediate and only reason of a true and living faith. Other arguments may *convince*, but they cannot *convert*—they may produce *opinion*, but not the *faith* of the Gospel—and those who, in their blindness, rely upon miracles and prophecy—upon the collateral and incidental proofs with which Christianity is triumphantly vindicated from the assaults of skeptics and infidels—they who rely upon the fallible deductions of reason to generate an infallible assurance of faith, have yet to learn in what the testimony of God consists, which establishes the hearts of His children. *Their* witness is not within themselves—it lies without them, in historical records, musty traditions, and the voice of antiquity.

The Romish Doctors are not reluctant to admit that faith is supernatural in its origin. “Whoever shall affirm,” says Trent,* “that man is able to believe, hope, love, or repent, as he ought, so as to attain to the grace of justification, without the preventing influence and aid of the Holy Spirit—let him be accursed.” “It is impossible,” says Stapleton, as quoted by Owen,† “to produce any act of faith, or to believe with faith, rightly so called, without special grace, and the divine infusion of the gifts of faith. “This is firmly to be held,” says Melchior Canus,‡ I again quote from Owen—“that human authority, and all the motives before mentioned, nor any other which may be used by him who proposeth the object of faith to be believed, are not sufficient causes of believing as we are obliged to believe; but there is moreover necessary an internal, efficient cause, moving us to believe, which is the especial help or aid of God. Wherefore all external human persuasions or arguments are not sufficient causes of faith, however the things of faith may be sufficiently proposed by men; there is moreover necessary an internal cause—that is, a certain divine light, inciting to believe, or certain

* Conc. Trident. Sess. vi. can. 3.

† Owen on the Reason of Faith. Works, vol. 3, p. 364.

‡ Owen on the Reason of Faith. Works, vol. 3, p. 364-5.

external eyes to see, given us by the grace of God." But there is a still more remarkable passage in Gregory of Valentia.* "Whereas," saith he, "we have hitherto pleaded arguments for the authority of Christian doctrine, which, even by themselves, ought to suffice prudent persons to induce their minds to belief; yet I know not whether there be not an argument greater than they all—namely, that those who are truly Christians, do find or feel by experience their minds so affected in this matter of faith, that they are moved (and obliged) firmly to believe, neither for an argument that we have used, nor for any of the like sort that can be found out by reason, but for somewhat else, which persuaded our minds in another manner, and far more effectually than any arguments whatever. It is God Himself, who, by the voice of His revelation, and by a certain internal instinct and impulse, witnesseth unto the minds of men the truth of Christian doctrine, or of the Holy Scriptures." And the same doctrine is maintained by Bellarmin in the second chapter of his sixth book on grace and free will.

All this seems wonderfully orthodox. But it is a deceitful homage rendered to the work of the Spirit. Rome grants that He enables us to believe, but departs widely from the truth, and assigns to the Spirit a mean and subsidiary office, when she undertakes to specify the evidence through which He produces a living faith. The immediate end of His illumination, according to her theology, is not to reveal the evidence which lies concealed in the Gospel itself, but to ascertain the inquirer of the Divinity of her own testimony. The office of the Spirit is to prove that she is the prophet of God, his lively oracle, which must be devoutly heard, and implicitly obeyed. The testimony of the Church, and not of God's Spirit, she makes to be the immediate and adequate ground of faith. Whatever light the Spirit imparts, is reflected from her face, and not from the face of Jesus Christ—and whatever witness the believer possesses, he possesses in her, and not in himself. Hence Stapleton,† while he admits the necessity of divine illumination, gives it a principal reference to the judgment and testimony of the Church. "The secret tes-

* Owen on the Reason of Faith. Works, vol. 3, p. 365.

† Owen on the Reason of Faith. Works, vol. 3, p. 365.

timony of the Spirit is altogether necessary, that a man may believe the testimony and judgment of the Church about the Scriptures." Bellarmin says,* "in order that faith may be certain in relation to its object, two infallible causes are required—the cause revealing the articles, and the cause proposing or declaring the articles revealed. For, if he who reveals, and upon whose authority we rely, can be deceived, faith is obviously rendered uncertain. Therefore, the cause revealing should be none other than God. And, by parity of reason, if he who proposes or declares the articles revealed, is liable to error, and can propose anything as a divine revelation, which, in fact is not so, faith will be rendered wholly uncertain. Mahometans and heretics, therefore, although they suppose that they believe on the ground of a divine revelation, yet in fact they do not, but simply believe, because they rashly choose to believe, inasmuch as they acknowledge not a cause infallibly proposing and declaring the revelation of God. For if one should enquire of the heretics, how they know that God has revealed this or that article, they will answer, from the Scriptures. If it should be further enquired, how they know that their interpretation of Scripture is correct, seeing that it is differently expounded by different persons, or how they ever know that the Scriptures are the word of God, they can answer nothing, but that this is their opinion. They reject the judgment of the Church, which alone God has declared to be infallible by numberless signs and prodigies, and many other testimonies, and every one claims for himself the right of interpreting Divine Revelation. Who, without great rashness, can believe his own private judgment of divine things to be infallible, since such infallibility can be proved, neither by divine promise nor human reason? Catholics, on the other hand, have a faith altogether certain and infallible, since it rests on the authority of revelation. That God has given the revelation, they are equally assured, since they hear the Church declaring the fact, which they are certain cannot err, since its testimony is confirmed by signs and wonders, and manifold arguments." Whatever the Church authoritatively enjoins, is a material

* Bellarmin, *De Grat. et Lib. Arbi* Lib. vi. cap. 3.

object of faith. "The authority of the Church," says Dens, "affords the first and sufficient argument of credibility."* The Rules of Faith are divided by Dens† into two classes, animate and inanimate, the latter comprehending the Holy Scriptures and tradition, and the former embracing the Church, General Councils, and the Pope. "The inanimate rule of faith is that which declares to us the truth, which God has revealed, so that it may propose them with sufficient authority, to be believed as it were by a divine faith." Even Erasmus,‡ half-reformer as he was, could utter such detestable language as the following: "With me the authority of the Church has so much weight, that I could be of the same opinion with Arians and Pelagians, had the Church signified its approbation of their doctrines. It is not that the words of Christ are not to me sufficient, but it should not seem strange, if I follow the interpretation of the Church, through whose authority it is that I believe the Canonical Scriptures. Others may have more genius and courage than I, but there is nothing in which I acquiesce more confidently, than the decisive judgment of the Church."

It is a point on which all Romanists are heartily agreed, that somewhere in the papacy, either in the Pope, a General Council, or the Pope and a General Council combined, an infallible tribunal exists, whose prerogative it is to settle controversies, and to determine questions of faith. From its decisions there is no appeal, its voice is the voice of God, it is the Urim and Thumim of the Christian Church. The possession of such a living oracle is made the distinguishing glory of their sect. The Doctors of Rome are accustomed to boast that in consequence of this boon, they have the advantage of an infallible faith, while Protestants are doomed to the uncertainty of opinion, or the delusions of a private spirit. Their divine faith consequently, depends upon the testimony of an infallible Church, and not upon the witness of the Spirit of truth. They believe, because the Church declares, and, of course,

* Dens, vol. 2. De Virtutibus, No. 18.

† Dens, No. 59. De Reg. Fidei. vol. 2. p. 93. See particularly No. 20. De Resolutione Fidei. vol. 2. p. 30.

‡ Erasmus as quoted in Waddington's History of the Reformation, vol. 2. p. 165, chap. 23.

must believe what the Church declares. The practical working of the system, is to make every parish priest, and every father confessor, lords alike of the conscience and understanding. Every man, upon the Papal hypothesis, no matter what may be his condition and attainments, has infallible evidence, that the material objects of his faith are divine revelations. But to the great mass of private individuals, the testimony of their priests or confessors is all the evidence that they can have, and hence these priests and confessors must themselves be infallible.—“Though there have been infinite disputes,” says a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, “as to where the infallibility resides, what are the doctrines it has definitively pronounced true, and who to the individual, is the infallible expounder of what is thus infallibly pronounced infallible; yet he who receives this doctrine in its integrity, has nothing more to do than to eject his reason, sublime his faith into credulity, and reduce his creed to these two comprehensive articles: “I believe whatsoever the Church believes,” “I believe that the Church believes whatsoever my father confessor believes that she believes.” For thus he reasons, nothing is more certain than whatsoever God says, is infallibly true; it is infallibly true that the Church says just what God says; it is infallibly true that what the Church says is known; and it is infallibly true that my father confessor, or the parson of the next parish, is an infallible expositor of what is thus infallibly known to be the Church’s infallible belief, or what God has declared to be infallibly true. If any one of the links, even the last, in this strange *sorites* be supposed unsound, if it be not true that the priest is an infallible expounder to the individual, of the Church’s infallibility, if his judgment be only ‘private judgment,’ we come back at once to the perplexities of the common theory of private judgment.”

Now, as the whole doctrine of Papal infallibility is a fiction, all pretences to a divine illumination which reveals it must be a delusion of the devil, and that faith which rests upon nothing but the testimony of men, whether collectively or individually, whether called a Church, Pope or Council, is human, earthly, fallible—it is not the faith of God’s elect. The degree of assent should rise no higher than the evidence which produces it, and as the

Romanist can never be assured that his Church is inspired, he can never have assurance, according to his principles, that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of men, much less can he be assured of his own interest in the Redeemer. Doubt, perplexity, apprehension and uncertainty, must characterize his whole Christian experience.* As faith is measured by the testimony of the Church, and it is not the office of the Church to disclose the state of individuals, none can be certain of their own conversion or order their cause with confidence before God. They may hope for the best, but still, after all, it may be their fate to endure the worst. Unquestionably the direct witness of the Spirit to the fact of our conversion, is one of the most comfortable elements of Christian experience; it is the only evidence which is productive of full and triumphant assurance, and yet upon the hypothesis of Rome, which interposes the Church betwixt the sinner and Christ, it is difficult to conceive how the Spirit can impart this testimony to the hearts of God's children. It is, therefore, in consistency with the analogy of her faith, that she denounces her anathemat upon those who pretend to assert that they know that they have passed from death unto life, by the Spirit which God hath given them. "It is on no account to be maintained, that those who are really justified, ought to feel fully assured of the fact, without any doubt whatever, or that none are absolved and justified, but those who believe themselves to be so; or that, by this faith only, absolution and justification are procured, as if he who does not believe this, doubts the promise of God, and the efficacy of the death and the resurrection of Christ. For while no godly person ought to doubt the mercy of God, the merit of Christ, or the virtue and efficacy of the sacraments, so, on the other hand, whosoever considers his own infirmity and corruption, may doubt and fear whether he is in a state of grace, since no one can certainly and infallibly know that he has obtained the grace of God."

So important an element of personal religion is the direct witness of the Spirit, that, where it is cordially em-

* See this subject discussed in Dens. De Justificatione, No. 31, vol. 2. p. 452, seq.

† Conc. Trident. Sess. 6. chap. 9.

braced, it will infuse vitality into a dead system, counteract the principles of a professed Remonstrant, and mould his experience into a type of doctrine which he ostensibly rejects. It is the redeeming feature of modern Arminianism, to it the school of Wesley is indebted for its power, it is a green spot in the desert, a refreshing brook in the wilderness. Wherever it penetrates the heart, it engenders a spirit of dependence upon God, a practical conviction of human imbecility, and an earnest desire for supernatural expressions of divine favor; it maintains a constant communion with the Father of lights, a habitual anxiety to walk with God, which, whatever may be the theory of grace, keeps the soul in a posture of prayer, and cherishes a temper congenial with devotion and holiness. He that seeks for the witness of the Spirit, must wait upon God, and he that obtains it, has learned from the fruitlessness of his own efforts, his hours of darkness and desertion, his long agony and conflicts, that it is a boon bestowed in sovereignty, the gift of unmerited grace. It is through this doctrine that the personality of the Spirit as an element of Christian experience is most distinctly presented. It compels us to adore Him as a living agent, working according to the counsel of His will, and not to underrate Him as a mere influence connecting moral results with their causes. Rome, consequently, in discarding this doctrine from her creed, has discarded the only principle which could impregnate the putrid mass of her corruptions with the seeds of health and vigor.

3. Not satisfied with displacing faith from its proper position, and corrupting the evidence by which it is produced, Rome proceeds to still greater abominations, in ascribing to the sacraments the same results in the application of redemption, which the Scriptures are accustomed to ascribe to faith. The mode of operation, however, is vastly different. The sacraments, according to the Papal hypothesis, are possessed of an inherent efficacy to generate the graces which render us acceptable to God, while faith, according to the Scriptural hypothesis, makes us one with Christ. The sacraments, according to Rome, enable us to live. Faith, according to the Scriptures, makes us die, and Christ lives in us. The sacraments, according to Rome, are efficient causes of salvation. Faith, accord-

ing to the Scriptures, is but an instrument which appropriates and applies it. In the operation of the Sacraments, therefore, Rome combines the work of the Spirit, and the functions of faith. By baptism we are alike regenerated and justified; whatever takes place before the administration of the ordinance, is only in the way of preparation; that which crowns the whole, and actually introduces us into a state of favor, is the reception of the sacrament.* Those, too, who, subsequently to baptism, have fallen into mortal sin, are recovered from their error, not by the renewed exercise of faith in the Son of God, but by the fictitious sacrament of penance. The weak are established, not by looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of faith, and praying for the unction from the Holy One, which shall enable them to know all things, but by submitting to Episcopal manipulation, and trusting to Episcopal anointing. If the soul feeds upon the body and blood of the Redeemer, it is not as the food of faith to the spiritual man, but the food of sense to the natural man, which, instead of uniting us to Christ, assimilates Him to our mortal flesh. Her ministers are called to her altars by a sacrament; a sacrament blesses the marriage of her children; her first office to the living is a sacrament, her last office to the dying is a sacrament, and she follows the dead into the invisible world with sacramental sorcery. Her power to bless, to justify and save, depends upon her sacraments; these constitute her spiritual strength, these are her charms, her wands of spiritual enchantment.

If Rome were sound upon every other point, her errors in regard to the application of redemption are enough to condemn her. What though she speak the truth as to the essential elements of salvation, yet if she directs to an improper method of obtaining them, she still leaves us in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity.

The application of redemption—this is to us the question of life and death, and a wrong answer here, permanently persisted in, must be irretrievably fatal. Christ will profit none who are not united to him by faith. Baptism will not save us. Confirmation will not impart to us the Spirit—the Eucharist is an empty pageant, penance a

* Conc. Trident. Sess. 6. chap. 7.

delusion, and extreme unction a snare, without the faith of God's elect. Christ is the power of God, and the wisdom of God unto salvation to believers, to believers only and not to the baptized, and whatsoever creed sets aside the office of faith, practically introduces another gospel. In Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which works by love. Here, then, is the immeasurable distance between the way of life proposed in the Scriptures, and that which is proposed in the papacy. The Bible says "believe and be saved," Rome says, be baptized and be justified—it is the difference between the spirit and the flesh, the form of godliness and its power.

I have now finished what I intended to say upon the Romish creed. Having compared it with the standard of an inspired Apostle, I think that it has been sufficiently convicted of fundamental departures from the doctrines of the gospel—it corrupts the blood, the water, and the Spirit. It denies the doctrine of gratuitous justification, it makes the Redeemer the minister of human righteousness, converts his death into the basis of human merit, destroys the possibility of Scriptural holiness, degrades the perfection of the divine law, exalts the Church into the throne of God, and erects a vast system of hypocrisy and will-worship upon the ruins of a pure and spiritual religion. Divine grace is divested of its efficacy, and the Almighty is reduced to the pitiful condition of an ancient German Prince, whose sole influence consisted in the authority to persuade, but not in the power to enforce.

Faith is dislodged from its legitimate position, perverted in its nature, and corrupted in its evidence, while the sacraments, clothed with preternatural power, are foisted in its place. Such is the creed which, to the astonishment of the land, Princeton has pronounced to be not incompatible with a Scriptural hope of life. I have never said, neither do I now assert, that all who are nominally in Rome, must necessarily be of Rome—that every man, woman, or child, who ostensibly professes the papal creed must be hopelessly doomed to perdition. It is the prerogative of God alone to search the heart, and He may detect germs of grace in many a breast which have never ripened into the fruit of the lips. But I do confi-

dently assert, that no man who truly believes and cordially embraces the papal theory of salvation, can, consistently with the Scriptures, be a child of God. If his heart is impregnated with the system, it is impregnated with the seeds of death. To make his own obedience, and not the righteousness of Christ, the immediate ground of his reliance—to look to the power of the human will, and not to the potency of divine grace, as the immediate agent in conversion—to depend upon the sacraments, and not upon faith, for a living interest in the benefits of redemption—to defer implicitly to human authority and reject the Spirit except as He speaks through a human tribunal—this is to be a papist; and if these characteristics can comport with sincere discipleship in the school of Jesus, the measures of truth are confounded, humility and pride are consistent, and grace and works are synonymous expressions. Even Hooker, the semi-apologist for papists, is compelled to admit that though in the work of redemption itself they do not join other things with Christ, yet “in the application of this inestimable treasure, that it may be effectual to their salvation, how demurely soever they confess that they seek remission of sins not otherwise than by the blood of Christ, using humbly the means appointed by Him to apply the benefits of His holy blood, they teach indeed so many things pernicious to the Christian faith, in setting down the means whereof they speak, that the very foundation of faith which they hold, is thereby plainly overthrown on the force of the blood of Jesus Christ extinguished.” This witness is true, and if true, the baptism of Rome is nothing worth. It wants the form of the Christian ordinance, which derives its sacramental character from its relation to the covenant of grace—it is essential to it that it signifies and seals the benefits of redemption. Apart from the gospel it cannot exist. The institute of Rome is neither a sign nor a seal, however she may apply these epithets to it—and even if it were, as she has introduced another gospel, and another scheme of salvation—she must necessarily have introduced another baptism. The one baptism of Paul is inseparably connected with the one Lord and the one faith. When the truths of the covenant are discarded, its signs lose their efficacy, and its seals their power.

[NOTE.—For some admirable remarks on the immoral tendencies of the Romish doctrines, see Taylor's *Dissuasive from Popery*. See also the preface to his *Ductor Dubitantium*, for a brief account of Papal Casuistry. If I can do so without offence, I would also refer to a recent work on the Apocrypha, for some arguments not altogether common, upon the tendencies of Rome to skepticism, immorality and superstition. Some use has been made of this work in the present article.]

ARTICLE II.

S. J. Cassel

ARMINIANISM RESTRICTIVE OF DIVINE FREE AGENCY.

It has been alleged, again and again, that Calvinism destroys the liberty of the human will, and thereby renders man a mere passive instrument in the hands of his Creator. It is our design in the present article to prove the converse of this—that Arminianism, if legitimately carried out, restricts the free agency of the Creator, and thus leaves the infinite interests of the universe under the control of an Almighty Governor, it is true, but one whose will is perpetually intercepted and thwarted by His creatures. We mean no controversy with our neighbors of the Arminian school, but simply to retort an argument, whose very verbiage is almost worn out by the frequency of its use.

The fundamental doctrine of the Arminian school of theology is, that no act of a creature can be free, and yet predestinated. According to this system, predestination and free agency are the antagonists of each other. Where predestination exists, free agency falls; and where free agency exists, predestination falls. The school of the Calvinist, on the contrary, embraces these seemingly contrary elements of doctrine. It is so charitable and comprehensive as to maintain that God may predestinate, and yet man remain free. It denies neither human free agency on the one hand, nor divine foreordination on the other. It admits them both; and it is for this admission that Calvin-

ism has been so generally reproached. The enemies of the system, however, always pursue a beaten path in assailing its citadel. They cast the second article of the Calvinist's creed altogether into the dark; and taking it for granted that he renounces human freedom, press him solely upon the point of Divine pre-ordination. It is our intention to retort this mode of attack, which we do with the greater freedom because the Arminian does not, like the Calvinist, admit the two doctrines, but openly avows his rejection of predestination, in order to establish his theory of free agency. We shall assume it then as a *postulate* on the part of the Arminian school, that there can be no predestination where there is freedom.

Predestination is the agency of God, exercised in reference to His creatures and their actions.* Freedom is the capacity which a creature has of acting in accordance with the laws and principles of its nature.† It does not require that a creature have the power of changing its nature, or even of setting aside those fundamental laws under which it is created. If it can act in conformity to those laws—in other words, if its actions and its nature agree, there is freedom. The flower that expands its pe-

* This definition does not verbally include a purpose or decree formed in a past eternity. Strictly speaking, there is with God neither past nor future, but an *eternal present*, including both. Certainly God never acts without *determining* to do so; and as eternity is enthroned in His very being, all His acts may justly enough be said to be the results of an eternal purpose or decree. "The will of God," says Knapp, "that any thing exterior to Himself should take place, is called His determination or decree. What that will is, can be learned only from its effects." "God's predestination," says Augustin, "is the preparation of grace; but grace is the effect of predestination itself."

† It is more usual to affirm that freedom is the power of acting according to the choice of the will. The soul, however, is a simple essence; and what we mean by the will is simply the soul willing or choosing. This willing or choosing of the soul, however, is not a capricious matter, but results from the general character or nature of the soul. Some affirm that the will follows the understanding. But what is the understanding but the soul itself, exercising the power of attention, comparison, judgment, &c.? Besides, if the will follow the understanding, what does the understanding follow? Possibly the emotion; and thus shall we be chasing the freedom of a moral assent from faculty to faculty, in a sort of perpetual circle. We consider the will as the soul choosing, which choice results from the fixed moral condition of the soul itself. When that condition is sinful, the will will incline *invariably* to sinful objects; where it is holy its choice will be just the contrary. Hence the force of that beautiful paradox of St. Augustin: "What is freer than the free will that *cannot* sin?"

tals and exhales its perfumes—the bird that unfolds its wing and sports in the atmosphere—the fish that spreads its fins in the waves of the ocean—all possess a species of freedom. If the petals of the flower were bound up, if the wings of the bird were tied, or if the fish were prevented from swimming, there would be coercion, there would be force. The laws of nature in such cases would be subverted, and those of violence would predominate. The same principle is applicable to man. As long as he has the capacity to act according to the laws of his nature, he is free. This difficulty, however, presents itself in his case. The nature that he now possesses is not his *original* nature. If he act according to the nature he now possesses, he will at every material point violate the principles of the nature he has forfeited. To obey nature now, though it be freedom, is nevertheless sin. Freedom, therefore, is a physical power, and may be virtuously or viciously exercised, according to the nature in which it inheres. In angels, and all holy beings, it is wholly on the side of virtue; in devils, and all fallen beings, it is wholly exercised in rebellion and sin.

There is another source of obscurity, if not of difficulty, on this subject, in relation to man. His redemption by Jesus Christ, and the purpose of God thus to save at least a part of the race, gives a complexity to the moral machinery, which renders it the more difficult of solution. Had man remained under condemnation, it would be comparatively easy to gauge the amount of his freedom. It would have been equal in all cases to his depravity.* Or, were the work of the Gospel instantaneous, and had all men been sanctified by it, human freedom might then be a subject of far easier comprehension. But the design of the Gospel is to transform a fallen and impure being into a holy and obedient child of God. This work, though instantaneous in its occurrence, is nevertheless progressive

* There is a sense in which the will may be said to be *enslaved*, as the nature to which it belongs is vicious. This slavery, however, refers to the incapacity of such a being to fulfil his moral duties, not to his inability to choose and prosecute that which is evil. In the latter sense, the will of Satan is as free as that of Gabriel; in the former, it is fettered as by the hand of fate. To choose evil, he is entirely competent; to choose good, he has no power.

and gradual in both its antecedents and consequents. To look, therefore, after human freedom in a moral chaos like this, is like searching for a ship tossed in the wildest storms. Still, however, the great beacon-light is clear, that whether a man obey nature or grace he is free. If, under the impulses of the old Adam, he commit sin, he was free to do so; and if, under the teachings of the new man, he was led to do that which is right, he still was free.

There is an idea of freedom contrary to this, which some seem to entertain. According to this theory, freedom consists in the power of acting, not according to, but *against* the laws of, one's nature. The fish must fly in the air, the birds must swim in the ocean, devils must awake the hosannas of Heaven, and angels be employed in the wailings of hell! Man, fallen, lost and prostrate, must have full power to obey the commands of God, and man redeemed and sanctified, must be not less capable of self-expatriation from the kingdom and glories of Heaven! Yea, more; according to this dogma, God himself may not only be tempted, but may sin!! As neither theology, philosophy, nor common sense recognises a freedom of this sort, we can, of course, have no controversy with it, but simply note it as one of the extremes of folly into which the eulogisers of human nature run.

Now, the doctrine of Arminianism is, that wherever divine agency intervenes to make sure and certain any given act or any series of acts on the part of the creature, there the power to obey the laws of its nature—that is, to act with freedom, has been destroyed. How a result of this kind can follow from the premises, we are utterly at a loss to determine. God has not only given to His creatures their natures, and impressed upon those natures certain laws, but His presence and operation are absolutely essential to both the continued existence of such creatures and the permanent action of those laws. “In Him we live, and move, and have our being.” The exercise, therefore, of the agency of God in those matters in which man is free, is absolutely essential to the very existence of that freedom. Predestination, therefore, instead of destroying human free agency, is its true origin and source.

But the Arminian claims a freedom for man, untouched by the predestination of God. Jehovah must stand aside,

and man must act *alone*, or he is not free. Now, it is evident that if human freedom be claimed on this principle for man at one point, it must be claimed at all. If the act of faith by which a sinner becomes a participant in the blessings of salvation be an unpredestinated act, such must all his other acts be that stand associated with his voluntary agency. Thus in buying and selling, in building and planting, in doing good and in doing evil, must a man be left, not to chance or accident, but to *himself* ! And what is true of one man is true of all men ; and what is true of man on earth is also true of all intelligent creatures everywhere. What a chasm does this theory introduce into the universe ! All the actions of all the accountable creatures of the great God are here seen to revolve in spheres, unpervaded by the presence, and power, and love of their glorious Author. What atheism ! What regions of chill, and gloom, and death ! According to this theory, too, so far as we can see, the material universe would also be deprived of a God. If God's operation in man destroys free agency, equally true is it that His agency in the material universe subverts the regular action of its inherent laws. So that this theory, if legitimately carried out, utterly destroys, if not the being, the efficient agency of God, in the government of His creatures. He may be an eye-witness of the actions and doings of His creatures ; He may approve or disapprove of those actions, but to order it otherwise is out of the question, inasmuch as by so doing, He would infringe the liberty of those who are the immediate actors in the scene. Thus is the divine freedom supplanted to establish that of man, and the agency of God fettered and bound by the creatures He has made. There is a curious fable among the Greeks of certain giants attempting to bind Jupiter. The purport of that fable is surely carried out, when the free agencies of men and angels are wrought into a vast chain with which to fetter the purposes and doings of the infinite God ! If the Arminian, then, allege that predestination destroys free agency in man, we retort upon him that the free agency in man, of which he speaks, utterly subverts the efficiency of the divine will. If he attempt thus to run us into a palpable absurdity, we make an attempt equally earnest to run him into a greater one. If he represent us as depri-

ving man of freedom, and thus converting him into a mere passive instrument, we represent him as taking the crown from the Almighty, and casting it beneath the feet of his insignificant creatures.

The subterfuges of the disciples of Arminius to avoid this dilemma, are various. Some are willing to allow that God's agency is employed on all the circumstances of a given agent or a given act, but not upon or in such agent or act. Some are ready to admit a present operation of God in matters connected with human agency, but deny the predetermination of the Deity to exercise such power. Others again maintain an efficient Divine agency in all matters human, yet not such as to establish their certainty. In short, the Arminian winces at everything like a pre-established plan of moral government on the part of God, by which all things occur in the order in which we see them to take place. It is certain to him, as it is to us, that if events are fixed, they must be fixed by the purpose and power of God. He denies the fixedness of things, therefore, to get rid of the purpose—that is, of predestination. But, upon the same principle, he must also rid himself of divine foreknowledge. If God foresees all His creatures, and their actions, it is positively certain that they will exist just as He foresees them. To suppose that there could be any change, so that a creature not foreseen might exist, or that a creature foreseen might not come into being—in short, to suppose a solitary variation in a solitary thing, from the perspective of God in His foreknowledge, would be to deny at once the perfection of that foreknowledge. Beings and events then must arise in the order and circumstances in which God sees them ages before to arise; there can be no addition, subtraction, or variation. Here then is certainty; a certainty equally fixed as if it had been decreed. Now, how it is that God can have so long a foresight, and yet so limited a purpose—how it is that He can perfectly see the exact order in which all things will arise, and yet exercise no influence to originate and direct that order, must be left to the disciples of this school to solve.

But how does this matter affect the preaching of the Gospel? for after all this is the great question. The Arminian asserts that the Calvinist cannot truly announce

the proffer of salvation to any but the elect. This, however, is a gross misrepresentation of the Gospel commission. Ministers are sent forth by God to preach the Gospel, not to the elect or non-elect, but to men considered as sinners. "Preach the Gospel to every creature," is the imperative command of Christ to all who undertake this calling. Who knows the elect or non-elect? Who, indeed, knows that even he himself belongs to the one or the other of these classes, save so far as his character and conduct agree with, or are contrary to, the revealed will of God? Preach to the elect only! Where would you find them? No; the Calvinist must preach, if he preach at all, to sinners—to perishing sinners. The great majority of even the elect are among the ungodly and unbelieving. He must, therefore, pour forth the terrors of Sinai, and exhibit the love of Calvary; he must "reprove, rebuke, entreat, with all long suffering and doctrine," to save even these. He is not left, however, in this work to his own strength, or to any goodness or wisdom in those to whom he ministers.* His dependence is where it ought to be, in God, who is able to make even the feeblest instrumentality richly effective of his purposes. He knows that there are those among his hearers to whom God will make His word effectual; some whom the Father will "draw to the Son," and who will thus believe unto salvation. He has in this work the *promise* of God; and what is such a promise but a *partial* revelation of the Divine purpose? The promises of God are based upon his purposes; so that if the latter be removed, the former become nugatory. Is not that minister then in a position of far higher advantage, who is sustained by both the purpose and promise of God, than he who is *certain* of neither? The error committed here by the advocates of the non-election

* While the Arminian admits, in a general sense, that salvation is of grace, he yet denies that the *specific act*, which introduces a sinner into God's favor, is gracious. Grace must bear the soul up to a certain moral level; but here it is left to its own choice whether to go forward or to recede. The act that decides the matter must be, in every case, the *unaided act* of the sinner himself. Now this act in Scripture is denominated *faith*, and is ascribed directly to God as its author. "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, *it is the gift of God.*" To contend, therefore, that while the preparatory work of salvation is of God, its *completion* is of man, ascribes to human nature a virtue which the Scriptures at least do not teach.

school is, that *universal contingency* is a stronger motive to action than *limited certainty*. But is this so? When Moses undertook the management of Israel, suppose there was an equal probability that the entire nation would perish in the wilderness, with that of their safe arrival in Canaan; would not that fact be far greater discouragement to their leader than if he had been assured that although many would perish, yet the great body would certainly be preserved? Amid their murmurings and rebellions, how would his heart have fallen even below hope under the former hypothesis, while under the latter not even their greatest madness could generate despair. This is a fixed law of our natures. Universal contingency is always a far inferior source of encouragement to the human mind in its struggles, than limited certainty. What, then, if the Calvinist believe that only a part of mankind will be saved; he believes that that part *will be saved*. He is certain that, so far as that part is concerned, the Gospel will have effect, and the preaching of the cross will not be in vain. All these in their time will be led to a Savior, and through Him will obtain eternal life. But remove the certainty. Establish universal contingency, and what then? Christ may have died in vain. The Spirit may have been sent in vain. The preaching of a Paul or a Whitfield may be wholly in vain! No man indeed can thus be certain of anything. All rests upon certain concurrences and combinations, which may or may not take place. And is this state of thing a motive to action, to zeal, to martyrdom?

And the power that here acts upon the mind of the preacher operates with corresponding influence upon that of the hearer. It is true that the doctrine of election, misrepresented and misunderstood, is often repulsive to the sinner's heart. But we venture to affirm, even in reference to him, that the certainty that some men will be saved, is a far stronger motive to action than the universal contingency of the salvation of all. There is a vague impression many have, that, if you remove the doctrine of election, the door of hope is at once open to all men. But this is by no means the case. By ridding mankind of election, we place them in a far worse condition for salvation. All certainty of the issue in any case whatever be-

comes a mere contingency—a mere chance—a hope floating upon straws. Would not, then, any man, in his sober senses, infinitely prefer the certainty and stability of God's electing grace, to the miserable whims of his own nature, or the absolute fickleness of all human things? When a man begins to feel a desire for salvation, and begins to put forth a few feeble efforts for securing it, is it not better, far better, for him to believe that he is under the drawings and teachings of *special* grace, than that all these desires and efforts proceed from his own will, and may end so soon as that will shall change? In other words, is it not a stronger motive to action, and does it not afford higher encouragement to the sinner's mind, during his struggle, to realize that his salvation is in the hands of God, than to hold that it is in his own? Our conclusion, then, is, that both to the preacher and the hearer—to the publisher of salvation, and to him to whom it is offered, the Calvinistic view of this subject is far superior in its *motive power* to the Arminian. It gives greater assurance—it presents a stronger hope—it far better sustains under discouragements and fears.

The objection, however, to the Arminian system, which we wish chiefly to notice, is, its atheistical tendency. Every philosopher knows that the entire system of nature is controlled by fixed laws. These laws, too, act with so much precision, that, in the lapse of ten thousand years, a world, apparently let loose in space, would not vary an inch from its original orbit! And even should there be that variation, the philosopher would at once look out for some disturbing force, that is, for some other fixed law, that produced the variation. Now, while the source of these fixed laws lies wholly beyond the grasp of the human mind, their operation is so regular and manifest as to become matters of the most certain mathematical calculation. No rules in common arithmetic, for instance, are stated with more absolute precision than those which astronomers lay down as governing that mysterious principle, attraction. How easy it is for a mind wholly employed in the contemplation of nature and its laws, to overlook altogether that unseen agency by which the whole is *infallibly* governed, the history of philosophy too plainly proves. Indeed, a certain class of philosophers have been at much

pains to teach not only how a Universe may be self-governed, but how it may be self-originated! Now, who does not look with even horror at doctrines of this kind? A vast and inconceivable system of worlds, revolving in space with far more accuracy than the motions of a clock or a watch, and yet without a controlling will—without an intelligent author! Not simply amazement, but *horror* is awakened by such a conception. Nor does any one yield to that horror with greater enthusiasm than the disciple of Arminius. In nature, in all physical nature, God and his predestination are stamped upon the mind of the Arminian as deeply as upon that of the Calvinist. He sees, he adores both. He loves to travel over the pathway of departed ages, and to read in the distant epochs of eternity the embryo outline of that mighty system which now fills all space. He sees in the decree of God not only the locality and form of a globe, but the tints of a rose and the brilliancy of a gem. To him, as to the Calvinist, Nature is what Nature was predetermined to be. Throughout the universe there is no accident or chance or blind contingency. Not only fixed laws, but an immutable God orders and governs the whole. But has it never occurred to our brother of the Arminian school that the same philosophy that has carried him in so much triumph over the fields of nature, must also conduct his researches amid the speculations of God's moral government? Has he taken a God with him all over the face of creation till he has approached the line of morality, and is he there to leave Him, or restrain Him? Is not God as much the author of mind as of matter? And has he not subjected to as vigorous a control the actions of an angel as the motions of a world? Can there be any more contingency or accident in the mental than in the material system? If the one were previously arranged and ordered in the Divine mind, has the other been left to contingency and chance? Has a man's body, simply because it is composed of matter, greater need of Divine superintendence than his soul? Is God's special providence exercised over a tree or a plant, and not over the spirit under whose wisdom and care it is made to flourish? Shall even the coldest and hardest rock be bound around by God's predestination, and yet the soul of man be turned loose upon the chilly pathway of atheism?

Shall every thing around, however low or mean, lie nearer the heart of God than the immortality that has emanated from his own Deity? Never, never, never. God's wisdom, love and goodness irradiate the moral equally with the material universe. The one, like the other, was pre-arranged. Each is subjected to fixed laws. Over both God exercises a minute and universal providence. The thought of the mind is aided by Him, equally with the expansion of the petal of a rose. True, God controls matter as matter, and mind as mind. The *method* of government is different, but its influence is as strong in the one case as in the other. Nor is this moral theism to be relinquished because there are inferential or even real evils connected with it. Who thinks of casting the material universe into the hands of either fate or chance, because there are such things as earthquakes, volcanoes, disease and death? What, if even worlds should come into collision, or whole systems be dashed to pieces—do these things demonstrate either that there is no God, or that He has ceased to control the order of nature in even its minutest parts? What, if sin exist—what, if all men are not saved—what, if we cannot comprehend the concurrent action of Divine efficiency and human free agency—what, if some allege that human freedom is destroyed; or others, that God is made the author of sin? What of all this? Shall we, for these mere scare-crows, deny the predestination, the presence and the control of God over the moral universe? Rather than admit a few dark clouds to exist in our horizon, will we blot out the sun, and involve all things in night? Rather than admit that human freedom is not entirely lawless, will we lay impious hands upon the free will of God, and limit its exercise towards the creatures He has made? Rather than confess our ignorance, will we deny the attributes and agency of God? But there are no real difficulties in the case. To God all is simple and plain and easy; and if to us there are points which we cannot comprehend, this fact is to be ascribed to the limited nature of our faculties. We do not now and we never shall comprehend "the Almighty to perfection." In eternity, as in time, there ever will be "clouds and darkness round about Him," through which our finite minds will never penetrate. The point of submission, not only of

the heart, but also of the understanding, must be reached somewhere. At some point in its approaches to its Maker the human soul must fall—must confess—must admit its ignorance. The teaching of wisdom is, that we should not approach too near to that Burning Glory, lest our organs of vision be eclipsed, and our partial light become extinguished in total darkness.

There is another point on which we must briefly touch in the consideration of this subject. It is to be feared that many, by too exclusive a contemplation of the Gospel as a system of grace, have rather overlooked that Divine sovereignty which both originated and controls its entire scheme. It is natural for those who receive a benefit to presume. The Gospel presents us with such glowing exhibitions of Divine mercy that we almost cease to gaze at that solemn back-ground of Divine justice on whose very bosom that mercy is permitted to be displayed. We look at Calvary with so fixed and tender a contemplation that we forget the more terrible manifestations of the God-head on the top of Sinai. Yea, more; God's compassion for sinners, especially as exhibited in the life of Christ—His willingness to forgive them—His high-colored anxiety for their salvation, as exhibited in some of the parables—all these present us with so amiable a view of the Divine character, that we overlook the sternness of that wrath and the fixedness of that purpose by which the ungodly are turned into hell. The *legal* administration disappears as that of free grace becomes more prominent. In this illusion (for an illusion it certainly is,) we are apt to form opinions of human freedom and of the *universality* of redemption that neither the Scriptures nor facts will warrant. One of these opinions, and by no means the least mischievous, is that which limits the sovereignty of God with the pious design of magnifying His mercy. This opinion seeks to overthrow the decrees of God; not excepting even those that *secure* the salvation of the great body of the human race! God, it admits, is the author of the Gospel; but then He must leave that Gospel to the depraved choice and corrupted free agencies of men. Or, should he aid at all, it must be only so far as to equipoise, not to *determine* the human will! The moment he transcends *that point* he invades the rights of human nature, and makes salva-

tion *necessary*—not chosen! And is this the return we make to God for the infinite depths of His grace in Christ Jesus? At the very moment that He is about to make redemption effectual to us, do we seek to turn off His hand, and to deny His right of action? Alas! if God were to treat us according to the tender mercies of this belief, not a man in a million would be saved—not a man in a whole generation would even prove his boasted free agency.

But if, after all, the Arminian turn upon us, and ask a reconciliation of free agency with predestination—if he inquire of us how God can be efficient, and yet man active in the performance of the same deed—if he would wish to see the point of actual coherence between man's will and that of God—we frankly confess our ignorance. That ignorance is based upon the fact that we know neither how man's spirit acts, nor God's. We are summoned to explain the *co-operation* of two mysterious agents, whose *single* operation, separately considered, we cannot understand. Here, however, as in all matters of sound philosophy, we must consider *facts*, not modes. There is that, not simply in a part, but in *every part* of conversion, which man himself *cannot* perform. There is that also in conversion, not in a part, but in *every part*, which cannot *immediately* be ascribed to God. Certainly man does not become God, nor God man in this work; nor are the specific acts of man to be ascribed to God, nor those of God to man. God acts as God, and acts freely; and man acts as man, and acts freely. The *change* of the human will in this work, which is consequent upon the change of the heart by Divine power, is not coercion, but freedom. The renewed soul, following the impulses of the new nature, as cordially chooses God and salvation, as the unrenewed soul, while under the power of sin, rejected both. Can it be true, then, that the application of God's agency to the human soul, in the work of its salvation, destroys, vitiates or harms, in any sense, any of its intellectual or moral powers? If that application gives light to the understanding, tenderness to the heart, and a *right choice* to the will, is human free agency destroyed by it? Are not light, emotion and the power of a right choice, the very things that the soul most needs? Were fishes without water, or birds without an atmosphere, would the furnishing of these elements destroy or

weaken in any way the physical capacities of either? Now, God's *efficient grace*—that grace which enlightens the understanding, purifies the heart, and gives a holy direction to the will and the life—*that grace* is the very element of freedom in which the soul luxuriates in bliss.

There is a strange inconsistency here on the part of the advocates of *resistible* grace. The double dominion of sin and Satan may control the soul for years, and yet the will be free. The yoke of the poor sinner may be made of brass, and his fetters of steel—his bondage may be an iron bondage—and yet it is admitted that he is free. The moment, however, that all-conquering grace approaches the soul—the moment that God undertakes not simply to *balance*, but to *determine* the will, all freedom is gone! The crushing, gloomy, dismal domination of hell cannot destroy human freedom; but the legitimate establishment of divine authority does! No satanic bondage can lead a man into captivity; but the grace of God—that grace that is outstretched for the soul's salvation—can! Surely, if any thing can enslave and fetter the will, it is sin—and if any thing can give it real freedom, it is grace! The more powerful, too, that grace, the higher the degree of freedom enjoyed; for although the will in a certain sense must *always* be free, yet an intelligent being is never so far removed from moral slavery as when, from the thorough sanctification of his nature, he *cannot* sin. This is the freedom of angels, and it is the freedom of God.

ARTICLE III.

The following article was presented as a report to the Synod of South Carolina, at its late sessions in the town of Winnsboro', and is now inserted in the Review, in accordance with a resolution of that body, requesting the same.
—[EDS. OF S. P. REVIEW.]

J. A. Thorne

REPORT ON SLAVERY.

It will be remembered that at the Sessions of this Synod in Columbia, in 1847, a series of resolutions was presented, setting forth the relations of the Church to slavery, and the duties respectively of masters and servants. After some discussion, it was deemed advisable to appoint a committee to take the whole subject into consideration, and submit a report, somewhat in the form of a circular letter to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the earth, explaining the position of Southern Christians, and vindicating their right to the confidence, love and fellowship of all who every where call upon the name of our common Master. The design of appointing this committee was not to increase, but to allay agitation. It was evident that a strong public sentiment, both in Europe and America, had been organized, and was daily growing in intensity, against institutions which we had inherited from our fathers, and against which we felt no call, either from religion or policy, to enter a protest. We felt it to be due to christian charity to make an effort, however unsuccessfully, to disabuse the minds of brethren, with whom we were anxious to maintain the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace, of prejudices and misapprehensions which we were confident had misled them. Events have taken place since the appointment of the committee, which invest the subject with additional importance. At that time the greatest danger immediately apprehended was a partial alienation, perhaps an external schism, among those who were as one in a common faith. But now, more portentous calamities are dreaded. The determined zeal, with which a policy founded, for the most part, in the conviction that slavery is a sin, is pressed upon the Federal Legislature, justifies the gloomiest forebodings in relation to the integrity of the Union and the stability of our free institutions. The question has passed from the Church to the State; it is no longer a debate among christian ministers and christian men, as to the terms of communion and the rights of particular communities to the christian name. It is now a question as to the equality of the States which compose this great commonwealth of nations, and the obligation of the charter which binds them

in federal alliance. The immense importance which, in this aspect, is given to the subject, has induced the Chairman of your Committee to present, upon his own responsibility, the following thoughts. He has been unable to consult the brethren who were appointed with him. And as he is deeply convinced that the position of the Southern, and perhaps, he may say, of the whole Presbyterian Church, in relation to slavery, is the only position which can save the country from disaster and the Church from schism, he is quickened by the double consideration of patriotism and religion to record opinions which, however hastily expressed, have been maturely weighed.

I. The relation of the Church to slavery cannot be definitely settled without an adequate apprehension of the nature and office of the Church itself. What, then, is the Church? It is not, as we fear too many are disposed to regard it, a moral institute of universal good, whose business it is to wage war upon every form of human ill, whether social, civil, political or moral, and to patronize every expedient which a romantic benevolence may suggest as likely to contribute to human comfort, or to mitigate the inconveniences of life. We freely grant, and sincerely rejoice in the truth, that the healthful operations of the Church, in its own appropriate sphere, re-act upon all the interests of man, and contribute to the progress and prosperity of society; but we are far from admitting either that it is the purpose of God, that, under the present dispensation of religion, all ill shall be banished from this sublunary state, and earth be converted into a paradise, or that the proper end of the Church is the direct promotion of universal good. It has no commission to construct society afresh, to adjust its elements in different proportions, to re-arrange the distribution of its classes, or to change the forms of its political constitutions. The noble schemes of philanthropy which have distinguished Christian nations; their magnificent foundations for the poor, the maimed and the blind; the efforts of the wise and good to mitigate human misery, and to temper justice with mercy in the penal visitations of the law; the various associations that have been formed to check and abate particular forms of evil, have all been quickened into life by the spirit of christianity. But still it is not the distinctive province of

the Church to build Asylums for the needy or insane ; to organize societies for the improvement of the penal code, or for arresting the progress of intemperance, gambling or lust. The problems which the anomalies of our fallen state are continually forcing on philanthropy, the Church has no right directly to solve. She must leave them to the Providence of God and to human wisdom, sanctified and guided by the spiritual influences which it is her glory to foster and cherish. The Church is a very peculiar society—voluntary in the sense that all its members become so, not by constraint, but willingly ; but not in the sense that its doctrines, discipline and order, are the creatures of human will, deriving their authority and obligation from the consent of its members. On the contrary, it has a fixed and unalterable constitution ; and that constitution is the word of God. It is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is enthroned in it as a sovereign. It can hear no voice but His ; obey no commands but His ; pursue no ends but His. Its officers are His servants, bound to execute only His will. Its doctrines are His teachings, which He, as a prophet, has given from God ; its discipline His law, which He as king has ordained. The power of the Church, accordingly, is only ministerial and declarative. The Bible, and the Bible alone, is her rule of faith and practice. She can announce what it teaches ; enjoin what it commands ; prohibit what it condemns, and enforce her testimonies by spiritual sanctions. Beyond the Bible she can never go, and apart from the Bible she can never speak. To the law and to the testimony, and to them alone, she must always appeal ; and when they are silent it is her duty to put her hand upon her lips.

These principles, thus abstractly stated, are not likely to provoke opposition, but the conclusion which flows from them, and for the sake of which we have here stated them, has unfortunately been too much disregarded ; and that is, that the Church is not at liberty to *speculate*. She has a *creed*, but no *opinions*. When she speaks, it must be in the name of the Lord, and her only argument is, *thus it is written*.

In conformity with this principle, has the Church any authority to declare slavery to be sinful ? Or, in other words, has the Bible, anywhere, either directly or indi-

rectly, condemned the relation of master and servant, as incompatible with the will of God?


We think there can be little doubt, that if the Church had universally repressed the spirit of speculation, and had been content to stand by the naked testimony of God, we should have been spared many of the most effective dissertations against slavery. Deduct the opposition to it which has arisen from sympathy with imaginary sufferings, from ignorance of its nature and misapplication of the crotchets of philosophers—deduct the opposition which is due to sentiment, romance or speculation, and how much will be found to have originated from the humble and devout study of the scriptures? Will any man say that he who applies to them with an honest and unprejudiced mind, and discusses their teachings upon the subject, simply as a question of language and interpretation, will rise from the pages with the sentiments or spirit of a modern abolitionist? Certain it is that no direct condemnation of it can anywhere be found in the sacred volume. A social element in all states, from the dawn of history until the present period, if it be the crying and damning sin which its enemies represent it to be, it is truly amazing that the Bible, which professes to be a lamp to our feet and a light to our path, to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work, no where gives the slightest caution against this tremendous evil. The master is no where rebuked as a monster of cruelty and tyranny—the slave no where exhibited as the object of peculiar compassion and sympathy. The manner in which the relation itself is spoken of and its duties prescribed, the whole tone and air of the sacred writers convey the impression that they themselves had not the least suspicion that they were dealing with a subject full of abominations and outrages. We read their language—cool, dispassioned, didactic. We find masters exhorted in the same connection with husbands, parents, magistrates; slaves exhorted in the same connection with wives, children and subjects. The prophet or Apostle gives no note of alarm—raises no signal of distress when he comes to the slave and his master, and the unwary reader is in serious danger of concluding that according to the Bible, it is not much more harm to be a master than a father—a slave than a child. But this is not all.

The scriptures not only fail to condemn—they as distinctly sanction slavery as any other social condition of man. The Church was organized in the family of a slaveholder; it was divinely regulated among the chosen people of God, and the peculiar duties of the parties are inculcated under the christian economy. These are facts which cannot be denied. Our argument then is this: If the Church is bound to abide by the authority of the Bible, and that alone, she discharges her whole office in regard to slavery, when she declares what the Bible teaches, and enforces its laws by her own peculiar sanctions. Where the Scriptures are silent, she must be silent too. What the Scriptures have not made essential to a christian profession, she does not undertake to make so. What the Scriptures have sanctioned, she does not condemn. To this course she is shut up by the nature of her constitution. If she had universally complied with the provisions of her charter, the angry discussions which have disgraced her courts and produced bitterness and alienation among her own children, in different countries, and in different sections of the same land, would all have been prevented. The abolition excitement derives most of its fury, and all its power, from the conviction which christian people, without warrant from God, have industriously propagated, that slavery, essentially considered, is a sin. They have armed the instincts of our moral nature against it. They have given the dignity of principle to the clamours of fanaticism; and the consequence is that many Churches are distracted and the country reeling under a series of assaults in which treachery to man is justified as obedience to God. According to the rule of faith which gives to the Church its being, the relation of master and slave stands on the same foot with the other relations of life. In itself considered, it is not inconsistent with the will of God—it is *not* sinful. This is as much a doctrine of Christianity as the obligation of obedience to law. The Church, therefore, cannot undertake to disturb the relation. The Bible further teaches that there are duties growing out of this relation—duties of the master and duties of the slave. The Church must enforce these duties upon her own members. Here her jurisdiction stops. As a *Church*—as the visible Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—she must venture to interfere no

further, unless it be to repress the agitations of those who assume to be wiser and purer than the word of God. Those who corrupt the Scriptures, who profanely add to the duties of the Decalogue, are no more entitled to exemption from ecclesiastical discipline than any other disturbers of the peace or fomenters of faction and discord. It is not a question whether masters can be received into the communion of the saints, but it is a question whether those who exclude them should not themselves be rejected. We are far from insinuating that abolitionists, *as such*, are unfit to be members of the Church. Slavery may evidently be contemplated in various aspects—as a social arrangement, involving a distinction of classes, like oriental caste, or European gradation of ranks—as a civil relation, involving rights, obligations corresponding to its own nature—as a political condition, bearing upon the prosperity, happiness and growth of communities. In any or in all these aspects, it may be opposed upon considerations of policy and prudence, as the despotism of Asia, the aristocracy of Europe, or the free institutions of America are opposed, without the imputation of sin upon the nature of the relation itself. The members of the Church, as citizens and as men, have the same right to judge of the expediency or in expediency of introducing and perpetuating in their own soil this institution as any other element of their social economy. But they transcend their sphere, and bring reproach upon the Scriptures as a rule of faith, when they go beyond these political considerations, and condemn slavery as essentially repugnant to the will of God. They then corrupt the Scriptures, and are exposed to the malediction of those who trifle with the Divine Testimony. The Southern Churches have never asked their brethren in Europe or in the non-slaveholding sections of their own land to introduce slavery among them—they have never asked them to approve it as the wisest and best constitution of society. All they have demanded is, that their brethren would leave it where God has left it, and deal with it where it is found, as God has dealt with it. We insist upon it that they should not disturb the tranquillity of the State by attempting to re-adjust our social fabric according to their own crotchets, when we ourselves, the only parties who have a right to meddle, are satisfied with our

condition. We do not recognize them as political apostles, to whom God has transferred from us the right inherent in every other people to manage their affairs in their own way, so long as they keep within the limits of the Divine Law. If we fail in our social and political organizations—if, by consequence, we lag behind in the progress of nations, we do not forfeit our right to self-government and become the minors and wards of wiser and stronger States. It is as preposterous in our Northern and European brethren to undertake to force their system upon us, or to break up our own in obedience to their notions, as it would be in us to wage a war upon theirs, on the ground that ours is better. Slavery, as a *political* question, is one in regard to which communities and States may honestly differ. But as a *moral* question, the Bible has settled it; and all we contend for is, that being a *matter* of liberty, we should not break fellowship for difference upon other grounds. If any man, however, is not content to stand by the word of God—if any Church will not tolerate the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free—that man and that Church cannot be vindicated from the charge of fomenting schism. They become justly exposed to censure. He who would debar a slaveholder from the table of the Lord upon the simple and naked ground that he is a slaveholder, deserves himself to be excluded for usurping the prerogatives of Christ and introducing terms of communion which cast reproach upon the conduct of Jesus and the Apostles. He violates the very charter of the Church—is a traitor to its fundamental law.

We have been struck with three circumstances in the conduct of what may be called the Christian argument against slavery. The first is, that the principles from which, for the most part, the conclusion has been drawn, were the abstrusest of all speculations upon the vexed question of human rights, and not the obvious teachings of the Scriptures. The second is, that when the argument has been professedly taken from the Bible, it has consisted in strained applications of passages, or forced inferences from doctrines, in open violation of the law that Scripture is its own interpreter; and the third is, that duties which the Bible enjoins are not only inadequately recognized, but forced into a system of morals whose fundamental principles exclude them.



The argument from philosophy, if the dogmas of sophists upon the nature and extent of human rights can be dignified with the title of philosophy, a Church Court cannot admit to be authoritative, without doing violence to her own constitution. It is not denied that truth is truth, whether found in the Bible or out of it, and it is not denied that there is much truth, and truth of a most important kind, which it is not the province of revelation to teach. But then it should be remembered that this is truth with which the Church, *as such*, has nothing to do. Neither should it be forgotten, that if human speculation conducts to a moral result directly contradictory of the Scriptures, faith convicts it of falsehood, the word of God being a surer guide than the wit of man. When the question is whether man is mistaken or the word of God deceitful, the answer to the Church cannot be doubtful. And yet how much of the declamation against slavery, in which Christian people are prone to indulge, is founded upon principles utterly unsupported by the Scriptures? One man very complacently tells us that every man is entitled to the fruit of his own labour; and that the master, in appropriating that of the slave, defrauds him of his right. It is then denounced as a system of robbery and plunder, which every good man should labour to banish from the earth. But where is the maxim, in the sense in which it is interpreted, to be found in the Scriptures? Where, even in any respectable system of moral philosophy? Where are we taught that the labour which a man puts forth in his own person is always his, or belongs to him of right, and cannot belong to another? How does it appear that what is physically his, must be legally his? Another insists on the absolute equality of the species, and can find no arrangement in harmony with reason, but that which shall reduce the race to a stagnant uniformity of condition. But where do the Scriptures teach that an essential equality as men implies a corresponding equality of state? And who is authorized to limit the application of this sweeping principle to the sole relation of slavery? It is as much the weapon of the socialist and leveller as of the abolitionist, and the Church cannot accept it without renouncing the supremacy of the Scriptures; neither can she proceed, upon it, to excommunicate the slaveholder, without fulminating her anathemas

against the rich and the noble. Another insists upon the essential and indestructible personality of men, and vituperates slavery as reducing human beings to the condition of chattels and of things, as if it were possible that human legislation could convert matter into mind or mind into matter, or as if slavery were not professedly a relation of man to man. The arguments from this and all similar grounds can be easily answered. It will be found, in every case, either that the principle assumed is false in itself or distorted in its application, or that the whole discussion proceeds on a gratuitous hypothesis in regard to the nature of slavery. But whether they can be answered or not, no deductions of man can set aside the authority of God. The Bible is supreme, and as long as it allows the institution, the Church should not dare to rebuke it. In a court of Jesus Christ we would not think of presenting any consideration as conclusive, but thus saith the Lord.

But when the argument is professedly conducted from the Bible, it is in violation of the great principle that Scripture is its own interpreter. It is notorious—it is indeed universally conceded, that no express condemnations of slavery have ever been produced from the sacred volume. The plan is, in the absence of any thing precise and definite, to demonstrate an incongruity betwixt the analogy and general spirit of the Bible, and the facts of slavery. Some general principle is siezed upon, such as the maxim of universal benevolence, or of doing unto others as we would have them do unto us, and brought into contrast with the degradation or abuses of bondage. Or specific precepts, such as this in relation to the family are singled out, with which it is supposed slavery renders it impossible to comply. The fallacy in these cases is easily detected. The same line of argument, carried out precisely in the same way, would make havoc with all the institutions of civilized society. Indeed, it would be harder to defend from the Scriptures the righteousness of great possessions than the righteousness of slavery. The same principle which would make the master emancipate his servant, on the ground of benevolence, would make the rich man share his estates with his poor neighbours; and he who would condemn the institution as essentially and inherently evil, because it sometimes incidentally involves the disruption

of family ties, would condemn the whole texture of society in the non-slaveholding States, where the separation of parents and children, of husbands and wives, is often a matter of stern necessity. But however the argument might be answered, it is enough for a Christian man, who compares Scripture with Scripture, to know that slavery is expressly excepted from the application of this or any other principles in the sweeping sense of the abolitionists. It is not a case left to the determination of general principles—it is provided for in the law. If the Scriptures were silent in regard to it, we might appeal to analogies to aid us in reaching the will of God; but as they have mentioned the subject again and again, and stated the principles which are to be applied to it, we are shut up to these special testimonies.

Those who have been conversant with works against slavery, cannot have failed to be struck with the awkward and incongruous appearance which in these works the commands of the Scriptures to masters and servants assume. They lay down principles which make slavery an utter abomination—treason to man and rebellion against God. They represent it as an enormous system of cruelty, tyranny and impiety. They make it a fundamental duty to labour for its extirpation, and yet will not venture directly and boldly, at least Christian abolitionists, to counsel insurrection or murder; they will even repeat the commands of the Bible, as if in mockery of all their speculations. Now we ask if these commands are not forced appendages to their moral system? Are they not awkwardly inserted? The moral system of abolitionists does not legitimately admit them; and if they were not restrained by respect for the Bible from carrying out their own doctrines, they would find themselves forced to recommend measures to the slave very different from obedience to his master. Those, accordingly, who prefer consistency to piety, have not scrupled to reject these precepts, and to denounce the book which enjoins them. They feel the incongruity betwixt their doctrines and these duties, and they do not hesitate to revile the Scriptures as the patron of tyranny and bondage. Admit the principle that slavery, essentially considered, is not a sin, and the injunctions of Scripture are plain,

consistent, intelligible ; deny the principle, and the Bible seems to be made up of riddles.

Such is a general view of the christian argument against slavery. We are not conscious of having done it any injustice. We have endeavored to study it impartially and candidly ; but we confess that the conviction grows upon us, that those who most violently denounce this relation, have formed their opinions in the first instance independently of the Bible, and then by special pleading have endeavoured to pervert its teachings to the patronage of their assumptions. They strike us much more as apologists for the defects and omissions of the Scriptures, than as humble inquirers, sitting at the feet of Jesus to learn His will. They have settled it in their own minds that slavery is a sin ; then the Bible must condemn it, and they set to work to make out the case that the Bible has covertly and indirectly done what they feel it ought to have done. Hence those peculiar features of the argument to which we have already adverted.

To this may be added a total misapprehension of the nature of the institution. Adjuncts and concomitants of slavery are confounded with its essence, and abuses are seized upon as characteristic of the very genius of the institution.

If this method of argument is to be persisted in, the consequences must ultimately be injurious to the authority of the sacred writers. Those who have not a point to gain, will easily detect the sophistry which makes the Scriptures subsidiary to abolitionism ; and if they are to receive it as a fundamental principle of morals that there can be no right to the labour of another, independently of contract, and this is the essence of slavery, they will be shut up to the necessity of denying the sufficiency and plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. Like Morell, they will take their stand upon the defective morality of the Bible, and scout the idea of any external, authoritative rule of faith. The very same spirit of rationalism which has made the Prophets and Apostles succumb to philosophy and impulse in relation to the doctrines of salvation, lies at the foundation of modern speculation in relation to the rights of man. Opposition to slavery has never been the offspring of the Bible. It has sprung from visionary theories of human nature and society—it

has sprung from the misguided reason of man—it comes as natural, not as revealed truth; and when it is seen that the word of God stands in the way of it, the lively oracles will be stripped of their authority, and reduced to the level of mere human utterances. We affectionately warn our brethren of the mischiefs that must follow from their mode of conducting the argument against us—they are not only striking at slavery, but they are striking at the foundation of our common faith. They are helping the cause of rationalism. We need not repeat that a sound philosophy must ever coincide with revelation, but what we insist upon is that in cases of conflict, the Scriptures must be supreme. Man may err, but God can never lie. If men are at liberty from their own heads to frame systems of morality, which render null and void the commandments of God, we see not why they are not equally at liberty to frame systems of doctrines which render vain the covenant of grace. If they are absolutely their own law, why not absolutely their own teachers? It is, therefore, a very grave question which *they* have to decide, who, in opposition to the example of the Apostles of our Lord, exclude masters from the communion of the saints, and from the hopes of the Gospel.

The history of the world is full of illustrations that the foolishness of God is wiser than man. There is a noble moderation in the Scriptures, upon which alone depends the stability of States and the prosperity and success of the whole social economy. It rebukes alike the indifference and torpor which would repress the spirit of improvement and stiffen society into a fixed and lifeless condition, and the spirit of impatience and innovation which despises the lessons of experience and rushes into visionary schemes of reformation. It is in the healthful operation of all the limbs and members of the body politic that true progress consists; and he who fancies that deformities can be cured by violent and hasty amputations, may find that in removing what seemed to be only excrescences, he is inflicting a fatal stroke upon vital organs of the system. Slavery, to those who are unaccustomed to its operations, may seem to be an unnatural and monstrous condition, but it will be found that no principles can be pleaded to justify its removal which may not be applied with fatal success to the

dearest interests of man. They who join in the unhallowed crusade against the institutions of the South, will have reason to repent that they have set an engine in motion which cannot be arrested until it has crushed and ground to powder the safeguards of life and property among themselves.

Deeply convinced as we are that the proper position of the Church in relation to slavery is that which we have endeavoured to present in these pages, we would earnestly and solemnly expostulate with those denominations at the North who have united in the outcry against us, and urge them to reconsider their steps in the fear of God and under the guidance of His word. We ask them to take the Apostles as their guide. We are solemn and earnest, not only because we deplore a schism in the body of Christ, but because we deplore a schism among the confederated States of this Union. We know what we say when we declare our deliberate conviction that the continued agitation of slavery must sooner or later shiver this government into atoms; and agitated it must continue to be, unless the Churches of Jesus Christ take their stand firmly and immoveably upon the platform of the Bible. The people of the South ask nothing more—they will be content with nothing less. Let the Churches take this position, and the people of the North will find their moral instincts rallying to the support of our Federal Constitution, and will give to the winds a policy founded on the profane insinuation that slavery is essentially a sin. Free-soilism is nothing but the application to politics of this unscriptural dogma. If slavery be indeed consistent with the Bible, their responsibility is *tremendous*, who, in obedience to blind impulses and visionary theories, pull down the fairest fabric of government the world has ever seen, rend the body of Christ in sunder, and dethrone the Saviour in His own Kingdom. What a position for Churches of Jesus Christ—aiding and abetting on the one hand the restless and turbulent designs of agitators, demagogues and radical reformers, and giving countenance on the other to a principle which, if legitimately carried out, robs the Scriptures of their supremacy, and delivers us over to the folly and madness of rationalism. Are our country, our Bible, our interests on earth and our hopes for heaven to be sacrificed on the al-

tars of a fierce fanaticism? Are laws to be made which God never enacted—doctrines to be taught which the Apostles have condemned, and are they to be propagated and forced on men at the peril of every thing that is dear and precious? We conjure our brethren—for such we shall still call them—we conjure our brethren to pause. We do not ask them to patronize slavery—we do not wish them to change their own institutions—we only ask them to treat us as the Apostles treated the slaveholders of their day, and leave to us the liberty which we accord to them, of conducting our affairs according to our own convictions of truth and duty. We ask it of them as Christians—as professed followers of Christ; and if this reasonable demand is refused, upon them and not upon us must rest the perilous responsibility of the disasters that must inevitably follow. We are not alarmists, but slavery is implicated in every fibre of Southern society; it is with us a vital question, and it is because we *know* that interference with it cannot and will not be much longer endured, we raise our warning voice. We would save the country if we could. We would save the Constitution which our fathers framed, and we would have our children and our children's children, for countless generations, worship in the temple which our fathers reared. But this cannot be, unless our whole people shall be brought to feel that slavery is no ground of discord, and that in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free. Would to God that this blessed consummation could be reached!

In the mean time Christian masters at the South should address themselves with earnestness and vigor to the discharge of their solemn duties to their slaves. We would stir up their minds, not that they have been inattentive to the subject, but that they may take the more diligent heed. The most important and commanding of all their obligations is that which relates to religious instruction. Food and raiment and shelter their interests will prompt them to provide; but as the labour of the slave is expended for their benefit, they are bound, by the double consideration of justice and of mercy, to care for his soul. We rejoice that so much has already been done in imparting the gospel to this class; and we hope that the time is not far dis-

tant when every Christian master will feel that he is somewhat in the same sense responsible for the religious education of his slaves as for the religious education of his children. The Church, too, as an organized society, should give special attention to the subject. There are many questions connected with it, which ought to be gravely and deliberately considered. We have no doubt that much effort has been uselessly expended, because injudiciously applied. Of one thing we are satisfied—their religious teachers should never be taken from among themselves. There is too great a proneness to superstition and extravagance among the most enlightened of them, to entrust them with the cure of souls. Their circumstances preclude them from the preparation and study which such a charge involves. There was wisdom in the statute of the primitive Church, which allowed none but a freeman to be a minister of the gospel. To say nothing of the fact that their time is under the direction of their masters, we would as soon think of making ministers and elders, and organizing Churches of children, as of according the same privilege to slaves. They would soon degrade piety into fanaticism, and the Church into bedlam. We rejoice that the Presbyteries of our own Synod have uniformly acted in conformity with this principle; and although our success may, by consequence, be slow, it will eventually be sure.

ARTICLE IV. *Ans. G. Shepperson*

SERMONS OF THE LATE REV. BENJAMIN F. STANTON.

*New York: Printed and published for the proprietor, by
D. Fanshaw, 575 Broadway. pp. 311, 12mo. 1848.*

There exists in many minds an inveterate and unreasonable prejudice against printed sermons. It is easy, no doubt, to write nonsense in the form of a sermon; and equally so to write nonsense in any other form. A discourse, admirably suited to the state of a particular con-

gregation, may be rendered unfit for publication by the very qualities which made it appropriate and forcible as delivered; and one quite destitute of literary merit may be interesting on account of the character or manner of the speaker, and powerful through the accompanying blessing of the spirit of Christ. But from these and similar considerations, the only legitimate inference is, that there are many sermons which ought not to be published—a truth readily admitted.

To make this the ground of dislike to printed sermons in general, is evidently unjustifiable. If the objection relates to the want of literary merit, its application is certainly not universal. The celebrated English poet, Dryden, was often heard to acknowledge that if he had any talent for English prose, it was owing to his having often read the writings of the great Archbishop Tillotson. The writings of Archbishop T. consist almost entirely of sermons. William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, it is well known, was accustomed to express enthusiastic admiration for Barrow's sermons; and his scarcely less celebrated son pronounced the latter part of Robert Hall's sermon, "SENTIMENTS PROPER TO THE PRESENT CRISIS," to be "fully equal in genuine eloquence to any passage of the same length that can be selected from either ancient or modern orators." Of the sermon on "MODERN INFIDELITY," by the same author, Sir James Mackintosh expressed himself thus: "This sermon, indeed, is in every respect entitled to rank among the first productions of the age."

Nor can it be plausibly alleged that printed sermons are, necessarily or universally, unfit for the purposes of religious instruction and edification. Preaching is intended for religious instruction; and it would be hard to prove that what is instructive when heard, is *necessarily* instructive when read. Many of the best books in our language—for one example, EDWARDS'S HISTORY OF REDEMPTION—were first preached, and afterwards reduced to their present form, by merely dropping those repetitions which were necessary in *delivering* a connected series of sermons.

The importance of devotional reading is universally acknowledged. For this purpose the Bible is unrivalled; but no intelligent Christian, we presume, voluntarily confines

his attention *exclusively* to the sacred volume. To what uninspired books, then, shall he turn? He who would excite devotional sentiments in others, must himself be devout; and, surely, if a man is ever devout, he will be so when preparing those discourses which he is to deliver in the name and presence of his God—discourses which have for their immediate object the salvation of souls, (perhaps the souls of those who are dearest to him,) and which he knows can be made successful only by the special interposition of the Almighty. Accordingly a very large proportion of the best devotional reading is to be found in the sermons (most of them posthumous) of able and devoted ministers.

We have known ministers who refrained from reading the sermons of others, through fear of unconscious imitation. If right in this respect, they were wrong in hearing others preach; for the danger, if it exists at all, is evidently greater in hearing than in reading. Every preacher, indeed, is in some sense an imitator; and the same is true of every man who exercises his skill in any art of which he himself is not the inventor. His performance will be influenced by his taste, and his taste by examples with which he is familiar. Servile imitation can originate from only two sources: the one is, the want of an extensive acquaintance with good models; the other a blind and excessive admiration for some one individual. Hence, the true preventive is an extensive knowledge and just appreciation of the best models. Servile imitation is ridiculous, whether in conversation or in the pulpit; but yet, he who would acquire graceful manners, must frequent good society; and he who would improve in the composition and delivery of sermons, must read good sermons and hear good preachers. The *unconscious* imitation of that which is not faulty in the original, is seldom if ever injurious; and even designed imitation, if executed with discrimination and good judgment, is always safe. It is scarcely possible to doubt that Samuel Davies was an intentional and even a laborious imitator of Richard Baxter, but we doubt whether any hearer or reader of Davies ever lamented the circumstances. We wish every minister in the Presbyterian Church would imitate Davies as he imitated Baxter.

In consequence of feeble health, protracted through the whole of his ministry, Mr. Stanton, we believe, was not very extensively known while living. But, in the deliberate judgment of many intelligent men, he was one of the first preachers of the age. And in this opinion we fully concur. On reading his posthumous sermons, some (perhaps many) of his admirers have experienced a sense of disappointment. This was to be expected. It is just what usually happens in such cases; nor is the fact difficult to be accounted for.

The editor of the volume before us (the Rev. P. D. OAKLEY,) is evidently a sensible man, and has executed his task, no doubt, to the best of his judgment. We do not know that he has made the best selection possible; but we do know he could not have made a selection that would have been universally acknowledged to be the best. The reason is, that men have different tastes, and all are fallible.

From the brevity of most and the abrupt termination of some of these sermons, it seems natural to infer that, in preaching, Mr. S. was accustomed to add much to what he had previously written. And having heard most of these discourses preached, we feel confident this conclusion is correct. They contained many striking passages, which are not printed. But this, it is probable, was never suspected by any of his hearers, not being indicated by any thing in either his diction or delivery.

Mr. S. was an attentive observer of the progress of theological speculation, and of the state of morals and religion both in the Church at large and in the particular community where his ministry was exercised. Hence, in many of his sermons, the vices of the times, the innovations in doctrine which, as he believed, threatened the peace and purity of the Church, the various forms of fanaticism, and those irregularities in the mode of conducting public worship, which are at once the fruit and the nutriment of fanaticism, were lashed with unsparing severity. Many, whose views accorded with his own, were of opinion that his usefulness would have been promoted by a less frequent introduction of such topics, and by a gentler method of presenting them. An apology—if he needed one—might easily be found in the disordered state of his nerv-

ous system, which naturally inclined him to take melancholy views of almost every subject. Of the wisdom of his course, there might be different opinions; of the strength of his intellect, or the purity of his motives, there could be but one. As to thought, composition and delivery, many of the discourses here alluded to evinced talents of the very highest order. All were convinced, too, that the preacher was doing what he deliberately and conscientiously believed to be his duty, and nothing more; that he spoke in solemn anticipation of his last account; and that he feared his God, and feared no other being. On these points, no one could doubt, who either heard him in public or had intercourse with him in private. Of many of our author's ablest sermons, the expediency of publication may, therefore, be fairly questioned, both on account of their relation to circumstances no longer existing, and which, at the time, he may possibly have viewed in too unfavorable a light; and because, by the severity of his strictures on many things that he disapproved, readers who did not know him might perhaps be betrayed into misapprehensions as to his character, and consequently provoked rather than edified. Yet, from this omission, many of his admirers will probably conclude that the volume fails to do him justice.

The skill of a minister, and especially of a pastor, appears less in the literary merit of his discourses than in their adaptation to the existing state of the congregation. But of this the readers of posthumous sermons cannot judge. Calomel, properly used, is a valuable medicine; but to decide on the propriety of administering it in a given case, is often extremely difficult. Hence, after the utmost effort of medical skill, a very ignorant man may be confident that nothing has been done to which he was not fully competent. Nothing has been given but calomel, and he could have given calomel as well as the physician. The situation of the pastor is much like that of the physician. A familiar truth may be proclaimed; the mode of presenting it may not be, in the opinion of critics, superior to what might have been expected from any man of common intelligence; and yet that simple statement may be the best possible means of correcting some popular error, or of removing a cloud that has darkened some cultivated mind,

for months—perhaps years. The truth stated may be known to every ordinary Christian; but to perceive its adaptation to existing circumstances, may be the highest effort of pastoral wisdom. In the excellence here alluded to, Mr. S. was eminent. Hence, an adequate idea of his preaching cannot be derived from his printed sermons; and hence, too, many, who heard him with delight, will read him with far less pleasure,—their circumstances and state of mind having undergone a change.

But this is not the only difference between hearing and reading. You can print the words; but you cannot print the voice, the look, the action, the nameless and innumerable manifestations of unutterable emotion. We have no reference to a system of gestures framed mechanically, and practiced before a mirror. Such means should be resorted to, *if at all*, with the utmost caution. *Possibly*, they may correct particular faults; but can they impart true excellence? As well might you expect rouge on the cheek to cure a pulmonary consumption, or an epaulet on the shoulder to transform a poltroon into a hero. Feeling is moral electricity; and an effective delivery is simply the conductor along which the fluid passes from the heart of the speaker to the hearts of his hearers. Mr. Stanton's manner was not remarkably *graceful*. It was free from awkwardness, but evidently unstudied; and some unimportant peculiarities, the effects of physical debility, might perhaps provoke a stranger to criticise. But he uniformly succeeded in gaining the undivided attention of every hearer, and in making all feel the force of every sentiment he uttered. In these respects he was excelled by no speaker that it has ever been our privilege to hear. No eccentric device was employed. Things of this sort were excluded alike by the correctness of his taste and the solemnity of his spirit. Attention was riveted by the popular excellence of his discourses—by a countenance expressive of a vigorous intellect and of profound thought—by unaffected dignity—by directness of address—by the unequivocal manifestation of perfect sincerity, absolute conviction, and the earnestness natural to a man who is conscious of standing in the presence of his God, and on the brink of eternity. No wonder if, in reference to the sermons of such a preacher, a wide difference be felt between reading and hearing.

But enough of Mr. Stanton's general character as a preacher. Let us examine the volume before us. It contains fourteen sermons; we give the subjects in our own language, as they are not indicated by the titles of the discourses respectively:

- I. *Constancy in religion.* (Heb. 10: 35.)
- II. *Glorifying God.* (1 Cor. 6: 20.)
- III. *Everlasting Punishment.* (Isaiah 33: 14.)
- IV. *Christ able to save to the uttermost.* (Heb. 7: 25.)
- V. *Agrippa, or the hesitating sinner.* (Acts 26: 28.)
- VI. *Believers a little flock, but beloved of God, and therefore safe.* (Luke 12: 32.)
- VII. *Truth as a Christian virtue.* (Phil. 4: 8.)
- VIII. *Christian honesty.* (The same text.)
- IX. *Christ altogether lovely.* (Song of Sol., 5: 16.)
- X. *The family of God.* (Eph. 3: 15.)
- XI. *The difference between things secret and things revealed.* (Deut. 29: 29.)
- XII. *The sovereignty of God in the distribution of his spiritual favors.* (Psalm 102: 13.)
- XIII. *The final judgment.* (Eccles. 12: 14.)
- XIV. *The Christian a stranger and a sojourner.* (Ps. 39: 12.)

The subjects, it will be readily admitted, are judiciously selected; and, in his manner of presenting each, the author has proved himself *a workman that needed not to be ashamed*. The reader will be at no loss as to his theological system. It was strictly orthodox, according to the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church. To the character of a discoverer in theology he never aspired. Pretensions of that kind he regarded not only with disapprobation, but contempt.

As to structure and arrangement, we think these discourses admirable. This is a subject of much importance, and we shall take the liberty of expressing our views at some length.

The principal danger to preachers is that of too strict an adherence to rules, perhaps arbitrary, certainly not of

universal application. The preacher ought to study his subject thoroughly, and to seek, by prayer and devout meditation, to have it made profitable to his own soul. Having done so, let him present the several parts of it to his audience, just in the order most natural to himself.

Rhetoricians tell us that the introduction should be interesting, but less so than what is to follow—a principle perfectly correct, and as perfectly useless. It affords us no information which we should not have possessed, had no rhetorician ever existed. It amounts simply to this: that every discourse ought to be interesting throughout, and each succeeding part more interesting than what preceded it. But how shall this desirable end be attained? The means may be easily discovered, though they are rarely pointed out by professors of rhetoric. They consist simply in a natural arrangement and strict attention to every part, without disproportionate or exhausting labor on any part. Every subject, if well studied, will naturally become more and more interesting as the investigation proceeds; and the mind, active, but not fatigued, acquires new vigor by exercise.

We say, and we wish to say with emphasis—*a formal introduction is not, IN ITSELF, necessary.* Time, especially the time spent in the sanctuary, is too precious to be wasted on mere technical formalities. Let the preacher consider what is called for by the text, its connection, the subject, and the occasion. If there is any thing needful to be said, which, on account of its relation to the other parts of the discourse, may best be said before the discussion of the subject commences, let that be the introduction: if not, let him enter immediately on his subject. Often has it been our misfortune to listen to an introduction that would have suited almost any other subject in the compass of revealed truth, as well as the one to which it was actually prefixed. And often have we known preachers reduce themselves to the alternative of either wearying their hearers by vain repetitions, or displacing important remarks from the place where they properly belonged. Such are some of the evils resulting from the supposed necessity of an introduction. In the sermons before us we find no useless or inappropriate introductions, no irrelevant matter, and no remarks out of place—none that could be transposed without injury.

The hearer ought not to be enabled to anticipate particular remarks; but he ought to be made to understand, as soon as may be convenient, what is the precise subject—what point or points he is to hear discussed. When a remark is made, we naturally wish to know its design. Few will listen, either patiently or attentively, to a train of reasoning, while they know not what it is intended to prove. And, when this method is adopted, we are never satisfied till we have re-examined the whole process, with our view fixed on the result. If the mode of preaching here alluded to displays ingenuity, the admiration it excites is but little in harmony with devotion.

The question has been sometimes debated, whether the heads of the discourse should be announced at the commencement of the discussion. In many instances a sermon is devoted to a single topic, and derives, we think, peculiar force and beauty from that circumstance. But it is neither desirable nor possible that all sermons should be composed on this plan. When, therefore, there are two or more leading topics to be discussed, we think it *ordinarily* expedient to announce them at the outset, unless they are sufficiently indicated by the successive clauses of the text. It is not very agreeable to a hearer to be surprised, at an advanced stage of a discourse, by the unexpected introduction of a new topic, and to find himself incapable of conjecturing how many topics more are to be discussed before the close of the exercise—besides, if interested in the latter topic, he will be in danger of forgetting the former. To the trite remark, that the expedient here recommended is rarely adopted at the bar, or in legislative assemblies, it is sufficient to reply that the hearers possess advantages which they do not enjoy in the sanctuary, for satisfying themselves as to the object the speaker has in view.

Mr. Stanton's opinion on this question, if we may judge from the sermons before us, accorded with our own. In most of them the introduction is followed by a distinct statement of the points intended to be discussed. When this is omitted, it is evidently because the nature of the subject renders it unnecessary or inconvenient. This, we think, has been the usual practice of the best preachers.

Much is sometimes said about the numerous subdivisions found in the printed sermons of old divines. But it is easy

to carry the censure too far; and the opposite extreme is, *at least*, equally dangerous. Subdivisions must occur in the performances of every public speaker; and their number ought to be determined neither by caprice nor by arbitrary rules, but by the nature of the subject. Two or more co-ordinate points must often be introduced, connected with each other only by their common relation to the same topic. This is precisely what we mean by subdivisions. Now unless notice is given of the transition from one to the other, an extremely confused impression will be left on the mind of the hearer. For this purpose we may employ either such terms as *again, besides, moreover, &c.*, or such as *first, secondly, thirdly, &c.* The difference is not, in itself, of much importance. The latter method may be judiciously used, when, for any reason, it is thought peculiarly important that the several particulars should be distinctly remembered. Accordingly, Mr. S. uses it in the second of the sermons before us, where he is pointing out some of the ways in which men may glorify God, and in the eleventh, where he is mentioning some of the secret things that belong to God. Whenever this method is not required by some consideration of this sort, we, *on grounds of taste*, prefer the other.

As to the conclusion of a sermon, several methods are in approved use. On reviewing what has been advanced, the preacher sometimes can think of nothing more impressive than the remarks that closed the discussion of the subject. In such cases, the sermon ought to terminate at that point. Sermons the fifth and fourteenth of this volume are examples.

It is often proper to conclude with an earnest exhortation, addressed either to all the hearers indiscriminately, or to the several classes of them successively. This was the method most commonly employed by Mr. S.

He rarely or never closed with a series of inferences. No example of the kind is found in the volume before us. This method is often, no doubt, highly proper, when the discourse has been distinctively doctrinal or exegetical in its character. But where the practical object in view has already been made sufficiently apparent, we prefer, *in general*, a different method.

A series of inferences at the close of a sermon, unless

required by some obvious reason, suggests the idea, that the preacher lacks matter, and resorts to new subjects in order to occupy the time. Thus, too, the memory of the hearer is often severely taxed, his attention divided between things but slightly connected, and the general impression exceedingly impaired.

Besides, in this way, great injury is done to the resources of the pulpit in respect to variety. Subjects are hastily sketched, each of which would afford ample matter for a sermon,—in many instances, a sermon of uncommon interest and power. But if this is afterwards attempted, the preacher must labor under the extreme disadvantage of having previously given his hearers a summary of what he intends to advance. When this practice is habitual, we may reasonably expect, the inferences will often be remote. But as our minds are feeble and our knowledge limited, remote inferences from revealed truth are rarely safe. The practice in question has, we believe, prevailed more extensively in New England, than in any other portion of our country; and its influence, as there developed, has not, there is reason to apprehend, been found favorable to orthodoxy. Some such apprehension seems to have been entertained by Dr. Dwight. (See his Theology, sermon 152.)

In further confirmation of our views on this subject, we might appeal to the practice of many of the best preachers. So far as can be determined, by reference to their printed sermons, the method in question was rarely adopted by either Davies or Robert Hall, and never, so far as we now recollect, by either Saurin or Chalmers.

Mr. Stanton's *style* is admirably adapted to the pulpit; perspicuous and forcible, correct without apparent elaboration, dignified without affectation, and animated without rant or extravagance. Rarely or never, do we discover marks of negligence, or find an expression for which a better could be substituted; and we look in vain for a sentence unnatural in its structure, or a passage which seems intended for fine writing. The writer's own ideas are uniformly definite and distinct; and in their exhibition, they are never obscured by conciseness, never enfeebled by undue expansion.

In the pulpit, the highest kind of *originality* is not to

be expected. The truths to be inculcated are all revealed in Scripture, and have called forth the best efforts of the mightiest minds, for centuries. The chief attention ought to be directed to those subjects which relate the most directly to the salvation of the soul; and with these, the people composing a Christian congregation are presumed to be, in general, familiar. Still, sermons ought not to be repulsively trite or common-place. They may manifest a most valuable kind of originality, perhaps it would be more accurate to say, *individuality* of mind. You may be familiar by description, with one of the grandest scenes in nature. You may yourself have visited the spot. Still, you listen with delight to one who has gazed upon it with a poet's fancy, and a poet's sensibility. You are in no danger of mistaking him for either a dull man, or one who merely repeats what he has heard. So it is with the preacher. He may say nothing different, *in substance*, from what we have often thought, and often heard; and yet the discourse may afford plenary evidence, that he has thought for himself, thought intensely, thought profoundly. This fact will show itself in the turn of thought, in the mode of expression, frequently in pointing out relations, not hitherto observed, between different truths; and sometimes in tracing the particulars comprehended in some trite generality. Every man's mind has its peculiarities; and these will be displayed as often as he really *thinks for himself*.

The following is an extract from the fifth sermon in the volume before us. The truth inculcated is new to none of our readers; but the passage could have been written by none but a vigorous thinker:

"*Not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble, are made subjects of Divine grace. We seldom see kings, like the four-and-twenty elders described in the Revelation, casting down their crowns before the cross, and saying to him that sits upon the throne, Thou art worthy, O Lord! to receive glory, and honor, and power. Coronets are not often set in with a crown of thorns. The cross is too humbling an instrument to be borne upon the backs of the nobility, or those in high life. Agrippa had been in the habit of receiving homage himself, and he could not render the same to another. Those before whom suppliants are accustomed to bend, are not easily brought themselves to bow the knee to Jesus Christ, and acknowledge him to be their*

superior. Many persons, (and it is a great evidence of the infirmity of our nature,) suppose that the Almighty will hardly dare to thrust emperors, and the great ones of the earth, from His kingdom. They put them upon a kind of par with God himself, and appear to consider their society as essential to His happiness and dignity. They suppose their Maker would be at a loss for entertainment without them; and indeed the great seem to fall in with this supposition. They fancy that they are composed of more choice materials, a finer sort of clay, than others, and that God will be a *respector of their persons*, in opposition to what he has expressly declared. Witness the rodomontade of Nebuchadnezzar, while walking in his palace: *Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?* It is no trifling matter, we say, to persuade persons whose heads are filled with such blustering ideas of self-importance, to become meek and humble Christians. It is difficult to impress them in the least with a sense of their impotence as creatures, and their vileness as sinners. They look upon themselves as a species of gods, and imagine that when their reign on earth shall cease, their departing spirits will be welcomed amidst the loud acclaims of the celestial hosts, to sumptuous palaces prepared for them in the skies. *Lift up your heads*, is the language of their hearts, *O ye gates! and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors*, and let us mighty nobles of the earth come in! God, however, will most assuredly disappoint these lofty hopes, and bring down these *high looks*, though apostles and preachers cannot do it." pp. 123—126.

This will serve as a specimen; nearly every page in the volume gives evidence of a highly original thinker. Mr. S. never preached a common-place sermon.

He was well qualified for his work, as one *set for the defence of the Gospel*. There was no parade of learning—no ostentation of ingenuity—no needless substitution of technical for common language—no argument so complicated as to require a painful effort to connect its parts and perceive its force. His was the logic of common sense—a logic, (as he generally employed it,) level to the most ordinary capacity, and irresistible by the mightiest intellect. For an example, we point to the third of these sermons. The subject, EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT, has been discussed often, learnedly and voluminously. Our author gives, in a part of a short discourse, an argument intelligible to every man who can read English; and yet, on this

brief and unpretending defence we are quite willing to rest our cause, before intelligent and impartial judges. We know it is easy to sneer; nor are we ignorant of the consummate ingenuity displayed by many Universalists, in advocating their favorite tenet. But we venture to predict the final conflagration will take place before the argument here alluded to shall have received a fair and satisfactory refutation. The following extract will, we imagine, be acceptable to the reader, though it will not convey an adequate idea of the argument.

"To suppose that the flames of hell can purify the soul from its pollution, is to attribute to them an efficacy superior to the blood of Christ, and the operations of the Holy Spirit, which are the means or agents that God has appointed to cleanse sinful men from their impurities, and prepare them for his presence. And, therefore, if any of the human race are fitted for heaven in consequence of their enduring the flames of hell, another song must be put into their mouth than that which is said to be sung by the redeemed. Instead of saying, "unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father, to Him be glory and dominion, for ever and ever, Amen," the only language that would be appropriate in their lips would be, not unto Jesus, that loved sinners, but unto the flames of hell are we indebted for our salvation; and, therefore, unto them be all the glory. This would make strange discord in heaven, for some to be ascribing their salvation to Jesus, and some to the torments of hell." (pp. 82—83.)

Perhaps Mr. Stanton never appeared to greater advantage than when explaining and enforcing the various branches of evangelical morality. Some idea, though an imperfect one, of this part of his ministerial character, may be derived from the seventh and eighth of these discourses.

The first sermon in the volume deserves special attention. It seems to have been preached to a congregation of which he had formerly been pastor; we presume in Hudson, N. Y. In the former part, he points out with great clearness and power, the causes of spiritual declension; the means of avoiding it, and the guilt and misery of the backslider. In order to encourage his hearers to constancy in religion, he gives in the latter part a description of the heavenly state, as graphic, perhaps, as the

present limits of our knowledge, and the incurable imperfection of human language, will admit. We give the conclusion. The extract is long, but none of our readers, we are sure, will wish it shorter.

"I find myself in danger, my friends, of trespassing on your patience, by exceeding the limits which are usually assigned to the public exercises of religion; but standing, as I do, once more in a place, and in the presence of a people endeared to me by so many tender and affecting associations, and indulged with a privilege which, when I last appeared before you, it is probable that neither you nor myself supposed would so soon, if ever again, be permitted me to enjoy, I cannot repress the desire which I feel to invite you to unite in magnifying the Lord with me, and in exalting His name together. He has been good, and His mercies have been great. He has been with us, and has protected us, both at home and abroad—in dangers, both seen and unseen, innumerable. He has been with us in six troubles, and in seven; in sicknesses, in infirmities and in perils, and has brought us together to-day in His temple, to offer to Him our thanksgiving. Bless the Lord, O our souls, and all that is within us, bless His holy name. Bless the Lord, O our souls, and forget not all His benefits; who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; who redeemeth thy life from destruction, who crowneth thee with loving kindness and tender mercies; who satisfyeth thy mouth with good things, so that thy strength is renewed, like the eagle's.

"At this interview my thoughts involuntarily recur to the scenes of former times—through which, with some of you, I have passed—scenes which, in retrospect, now seem as the visions of the night, and the recollection of which, as it rushes on my mind, fills me with emotions that are unutterable. I recollect, (and the scene presents itself to my imagination as if it were but yesterday,) when, over the assembly convened in this sanctuary, the windows of heaven seemed to be opened, and the Holy Spirit, descending, seemed to fasten on the mind of every worshipper the impression, and to prompt the exclamation—how dreadful is this place! Surely this is none other than the house of God, and the gate of heaven. I recollect, and some of you will doubtless recollect the same, those crowded aisles: those rejoicing converts that thronged them; those countenances lighted up by the hope of the Gospel; and those still and solemn spectators who witnessed their making a good profession before many witnesses. Happy season of grace! The remembrance of it is still refreshing to the soul. I would address the exhortation, count not yourselves to have

apprehended—but forgetting the things that are behind, reach forth unto those that are before. Cast not away, therefore, your confidence, which hath great recompense of reward. But be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your labor is not in vain in the Lord. On this occasion, too, I am forcibly and affectingly reminded that all are not here to-day who once came to worship with us in this house of prayer. Some of them are dispersed in different and distant places, and others are fallen asleep. How mutable and transitory is everything below! How changable and fleeting are all the scenes and objects of human life! But a few years have gone by, and this pulpit has thrice changed its preachers; these seats have new occupants, and this temple of grace has other worshippers. I cast my eyes around this assembly, and am met with the look of strangers; with most of these countenances I am not familiar. I extend my view a little forward, and perceive that soon all who are in this assembly to-day will leave these seats and this dwelling to another generation, and sink in that wide and whelming vortex that is fast engulfing the busy, short-lived tribe of men. One generation follows another in rapid succession, like shadows that flit across the plain, which come, are quickly gone, and seen no more. To changes and dissolution everything visible is liable and tending; and as a vesture, when worn out, is folded up and laid aside, it shall be changed. The material universe is waxing old, as doth a garment. The sun itself is burning out its fires, and is to be darkened; the moon is to be turned into blood; the stars are to withdraw their shining, and to fall from their places; the planets are to be thrown from their orbits, and to reel as a drunken man; the heavens, being on fire, are to be rolled together as a scroll, and to pass away with a great noise; the elements are to melt with fervent heat; and this globe of earth, which is kept in store, reserved unto fire, with all it inherits, is to be dissolved—and like the baseless fabric of a vision, leave not a wreck behind. Nothing! nothing on which we can fasten our eyes, or fix our hearts, is enduring, but the eternal and the recompense of reward.

“The seas shall waste, the skies in smoke decay,
Rocks fall to dust, and mountains melt away!
But fix'd His word, His saving power remains;
Thy realm, O! God, forever lasts, thy own Messiah reigns.”

For this Church we cherish the hope that there are still blessings in reserve. Over it we believe the Holy Spirit is still hovering—and on it, we trust, is silently distilling the dew of His blessing. I am happy, my brethren, and can rejoice in the pros-

pect of your prosperity; and though I am absent from you in body, yet am I present with you in spirit, joying and beholding your order and steadfastness in the faith of the Gospel. Distinguished, as I hope you ever will be, by the prevalence of harmony, and a sincere devotion to the cause of the Redeemer; and blessed with the ministrations of a pastor who deserves, and who, I doubt not, enjoys your affections, we bid you God speed. And the prayer for you, which goeth not out of feigned lips, is that you may go and prosper. May the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, rule in your minds. May the holy comforter be the guide of your steps and the joy of your hearts; and at last, when you shall have finished a long and useful life, and you shall arrive at the confines of the dark valley of the shadow of death, in the exercise of an assured hope, with the rod and the staff of the good shepherd to comfort you, and with the song of exultation upon your tongues, as you are passing it, may the bright visions of the heavenly world burst upon your enraptured sight, and your happy spirits mingle with those that are around the throne, and who raise to Him that sitteth thereon, their ceaseless anthem of praise, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." pp. 36—43.

Such is the conclusion of a sermon concerning which we doubt whether, as an example of pulpit eloquence, it is excelled by any sermon of the same class in our language.

In the preface to this volume, the editor observes, "Two reasons have induced the publication of these sermons. A desire to gratify the repeated requests of friends who long sat under his ministry, and a hope to benefit those to whom, though dead, he may yet speak. This, we trust, will disarm criticism, and claim indulgence."

For ourselves, we see very little need for disarming criticism. No doubt these sermons are inferior to what they would have been had they been prepared by the author for publication. But as they are, they need no special indulgence. Candid criticism—and no other deserves attention—will pronounce that their excellencies are various, and of high order; their faults such only as must be expected from the incurable imperfection of human nature in the present state. They are not faultless; no uninspired composition is so. We have found a few passages not quite worthy, we think, of the high commendation

which the book, *as a whole*, so richly deserves. On one of these we take the liberty of offering some observations. In sermon the eleventh, the following passage occurs :

“ Concerning the future condition of those who die in infancy, too, it is not unfrequently asked, will all or any of them be lost? Will *all* or *any* who die at that tender age be lost? If this is the interrogatory which any are disposed to put to us, we have only to reply to them, we cannot tell. Your inquiry respects the secret things which belong unto God, and of which we have no right to be informed. The revelation which God has given, He has designed specially for adults, who have arrived at years of discretion, and who are, therefore, to be treated and addressed as moral agents. God has told us what He will do with them, but He has not explicitly informed us what He will do with infants. For the consolation of pious parents, He has, however, given us to understand, as we think, that to their infant seed the seal of the everlasting covenant is to be applied ; and has kindly and graciously said : Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven ; that is, such are to compose a part of the visible Church ; and if fit subjects for the visible Church on earth, it is presumable that *some*, at least, of them, will be admitted to the kingdom of heaven above. Possibly this may be the destiny of most (especially of those) who are descended from believing parents, and are early given to God in baptism ; and possibly this may be the destiny of all who die in infancy.” pp. 220—230.

Now, in this confession of ignorance, we fully concur ; but these remarks, especially the distinction hinted between the infant seed of believers and the infant seed of unbelievers, are, we think, adapted to excite painful apprehensions ; and we see no propriety in cherishing such apprehensions in reference to a subject lying wholly beyond the sphere of our agency, and on which God has given us no cause of alarm.

The subject certainly lies beyond the sphere of our agency. The sacred writers say nothing about any means to be used by us for the salvation of those who die in infancy ; and as the design of revelation is entirely practical, we need not be surprised that it does not gratify our curiosity. In such a case we are called on for the exercise of pious resignation ; fear is consonant with the dictates of neither reason nor piety. Many of our friends have died after coming to years of discretion ; of the sal-

vation of not one of them are we infallibly assured. Why, then, should we expect such assurance with regard to infants? One minute hence, for aught I know, my habitation may be swallowed up by an earthquake, and myself and family buried beneath its ruins; but should I, on account of that uncertainty, yield myself up, the victim of anxious forebodings, all mankind would agree in pronouncing me insane. *In matters that bear no relation to our conduct, the mere possibility of evil, or the absence of infallible assurance, is no just ground of alarm.*

Do the Scriptures, then, give us any reason to think, that any of those who die in infancy are lost? If they connect the salvation of the infant with the piety of the parent, the answer is certainly in the affirmative. But such, we are confident, is not the fact. To infant-baptism, we may safely apply what Paul says of the corresponding ordinance of the former dispensation: *What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.* Its utility, so far as its subjects are concerned, consists in this, that in consequence of it, on coming to years of discretion, they find themselves placed in circumstances favorable to piety. There is no consistent middle ground between this view and the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, a doctrine we are not now called on to discuss, but which, we need not say we utterly reject, and which leads more directly to the idea of the eternal perdition of countless multitudes of infants, than any other theory now under the consideration of the Christian public. Besides, the right of an infant to baptism depends on the relation of his parents to the visible Church, and not on their personal piety. Suppose their hypocrisy afterwards fully ascertained, the circumstance would not invalidate his baptism, or justify its repetition, when he should himself become a believer. Will, then, the hypocrisy of the parent secure the happiness of his dying infant? This will hardly be asserted.

Of the promises addressed to pious parents, as such, in reference to their children, there is not one which does not evidently contemplate the event of those children living to years of discretion. Take the following as examples: *Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he*

is old he will not depart from it. I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments. Who would think of applying such texts to the case of dying infants?

If dying infants are lost, it is evidently on the ground of their federal relation to Adam. Now, do the Scriptures teach that any are lost simply on that ground, and without having themselves committed actual sin? The question, let it be observed, relates, not to the original ground of condemnation, but to the actual execution of the sentence; and the answer is undeniably in the negative. Condemnation through Adam is more largely asserted in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, than in any other portion of the word of God; but it is introduced, not to account for everlasting misery, but to illustrate the way of salvation through Christ. When those are described who shall be for ever miserable, it is in such language as the following: *I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink, &c. To them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil.* The sacred writers, then, when they speak of future punishment as actually inflicted, never place it on any ground that can apply to infants. This single consideration we deem sufficient to justify the assertion, that they give us no reason to fear that any who die in infancy are lost.

They, like others, need redemption, and to them, as well as to others, redemption is applicable. Let us not presume to limit its application without warrant. They need regeneration, but if they are regenerated, the evidence of that fact, from the nature of the case, cannot come under our observation. That we do not see the evidence, therefore, proves nothing against the fact. We do not know that any perish in circumstances so analogous to theirs, as to afford ground for an unfavorable conjecture. Those who remain unconverted under the light of the gospel, perish; but it is because they reject offered mercy. The heathen who perish, have committed actual sin; besides, ignorance

of the gospel may occasion their destruction, just as ignorance of the proper remedy may occasion the death of a sick man. It is not so with infants. To them the command *to believe* is not applicable; as it supposes in those addressed greater maturity than *they* have attained.

But we have something more to say, than that there is no evidence of the final ruin of dying infants. It seems natural to understand David as expressing a persuasion of the happiness of the child he had lost, when he said, *I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me*; nor does it appear that he had any ground for this persuasion, that is not common to all parents in like circumstances. We will not undertake to affirm that, in this instance, he spoke by inspiration; but it is surely something, that God has caused the opinion of an eminent saint to be recorded in His holy word, and has given us no intimation that it was erroneous. To this may be added, the evidence of Divine compassion for infants, as such. *And should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six score thousand* PERSONS THAT CANNOT DISCERN BETWEEN THEIR RIGHT HAND AND THEIR LEFT HAND, *and also much cattle?* Especially, we must not forget, that the Redeemer expressed a tender interest in little children; and *that* not simply as a man, but officially, as Mediator, and Head of the Church. The reason assigned was, OF SUCH IS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN. We cannot infer less than this, that infants are not cut off by their tender age, from a participation in the everlasting blessings which he came to purchase, and is exalted to bestow. These Scriptures, it is admitted, do not amount to a *proof* that all who die in infancy are saved; but they furnish an additional reason for not indulging groundless fears on the subject.

The following sentence has been made the subject of much unfair criticism: "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth." (Confession of Faith, chapter x; section iii.) The phrase *elect infants*, it is often said, implies that there are non-elect infants; whence it follows, that some who die in infancy are lost. This is most illogical. We readily admit the premises, and utterly deny the conclusion. No

doubt, there are non-elect infants. If there is a non-elect man in the world, he was once a non-elect infant; for God does not reverse his purpose. But do any of the non-elect die in infancy? Our doctrinal standards make not the most distant approach to such an idea. What, then, is asserted in the sentence just quoted? Just this, that infants need an interest in the Redeemer, and regeneration by the Holy Spirit; nor does the fact of dying in infancy necessarily preclude them from receiving these blessings. The former part of the proposition must be admitted by all who acknowledge the depravity of our nature; and if the latter is not true, infant salvation is impossible. Whether all who die in infancy are saved, our confession does not undertake to determine. The reason is obvious; *that*, being a point revealed, is not an article of the faith.

Calvinism is often represented as extremely unfavorable in its bearing, on the future prospects of such as die in infancy. We view it in a widely different light. To them the idea of *conditional election* is utterly inapplicable. If they are saved, election, in the Calvinistic sense, is evidently true in their case. It must be that God chose them unto salvation, "*without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes, moving him thereunto.*" Moreover, if by nature depraved, they must be regenerated; and their regeneration must precede all holy acts and exercises on their part. We suppose, too, it will be admitted, that in consequence of their regeneration, they will infallibly continue perfectly holy for ever; in other words, that in the heavenly state, the ransomed of the Lord are not liable to apostacy. Here, then, we see sovereign grace securing the perfect and everlasting holiness of free agents; for, undoubtedly, this character belongs to glorified spirits in heaven. Why deny, then, that the same grace can secure the persevering obedience of free agents on earth? It would be easy to pursue this topic much farther, but the length of our article forbids. It must, we think, be manifest, that the leading principles of the Calvinistic system are true in their application to all that die in infancy and are saved.

To return to the sermons before us. We offer no apology for the freedom of our strictures. To speak freely was

our right and our duty ; but we have said nothing, we trust, that can be thought inconsistent with profound veneration for the memory of our departed friend ; nor have we forgotten, that if the preacher was fallible, his reviewer is, *at least*, equally so. The volume was published by subscription ; and we think no more copies were printed, than were called for by subscribers. We hope it will be often reprinted. We know of no posthumous sermons, published since those of President Davies, more richly deserving an extensive circulation. If we may judge of others by ourselves, he who has read a page, will wish to read a sermon ; and he who has read a sermon, will not rest till he has read the volume ; and he who has read the volume once, will delight to read it again. We lament, however, the numerous errors of the press, with which this edition is disfigured. One mistake which we are disposed to refer to that cause, may *possibly* have been made by Mr. Stanton, through a momentary inadvertence. If so, it ought to have been corrected by the Editor. In the first sentence of sermon the fifth, Herod who caused the infants of Bethlehem to be slain, is confounded with the Herod by whose order John the Baptist was beheaded. Every one at all familiar with the New Testament, knows they were different men.

One suggestion more will close this tedious article. We do not know how many of Mr. Stanton's sermons remain unpublished, nor how fully written, nor in what condition the manuscripts are. But we know, that his ministry was evangelical, laborious, marked with great ability, and extended through a period of about 30 years. We ask, then, with no common emotion, does this little volume contain all that he has left, adapted to benefit posterity ? This is not probable, and we hope that one, two, or more additional volumes will be called for, with an importunity that will not be resisted.

ARTICLE V.

Prof. R. T. Brown

EVIDENCE OF THE DEGRADATION OF ANIMALS.

1. *The Foot-Prints of the Creator, or the Asterolepis of Stromness.* By HUGH MILLER, Author of the *Old Red Sandstone*, &c. Boston: 1850.
2. *The Epoch of Creation. The Scripture Doctrine contrasted with the Geological Theory.* By ELEAZOR LORD. With an Introduction. By R. W. Dickinson, D. D.; New York: 1851. 1 vol. 8vo, pp. 311.
3. *Course of Creation.* By J. ANDERSON, D. D., of Newburgh Manse. Cincinnati: 1851. pp. 384.
4. *Indications of the Creator; or Natural Evidences of Final Cause.* By GEORGE TAYLOR. New York: 1851. 1 vol. 8vo, pp. 282.
5. *The Ancient World; or Picturesque Sketches of Creation.* By O. T. ANSTED, M. A., F. R. S., F. G. S. London: 1847. 1 vol. 8vo, pp. 408.

It is not our purpose to review critically the works at the head of this article. We mean simply to use them as the last we have perused, that bear directly on a subject in which we have been deeply interested, and which has, we think, most important relations to theology;—*the evidence of the degradation, in past periods of geologic time, of certain types of animals, from a higher to a lower rank in the great system of organic existence.*

In the July number, we gave an outline of that part of the Foot-Prints, in which Mr. Miller met, with signal success, the challenge of the author of the "Vestiges of Creation." This ingenious champion of the Theory of Development, after he had been driven, by Sedgwick and others, from all other periods of time, of which geology furnishes a distinctly legible record, boldly planted his standard on the oldest fossiliferous strata, the Lower Silurian and Cambrian systems of rocks, and said, in his volume of "Explanations," "I fix my opponents down to the consideration of this fact, THE EARLIEST FORMATIONS CONTAIN NO FISH."

In that article, we accompanied Mr. Miller to the very bottom of the earliest fossiliferous formations. In these he demonstrated the existence of the remains of families and genera of large fishes, (*Placoids*, fishes like existing sharks,) which must, according to all principles of classification, rank high in organization. In size, brain, organs of circulation and generation, and efficient means of offence and defence, the first known fossil species were not inferior to the most perfectly organized existing fishes.

Having vanquished the challenger, and forced him to retire from the fossiliferous strata, Mr. Miller did not permit him to occupy even the lower and older crystalline, metamorphic rocks, though most geologists believe that in them "not only life, but the conditions of life, are at an end." He knew well the character of the advocates of the theory of development, and that they would attempt the defence of their dangerous doctrines by such arguments as these:

We admit now, as the result of recent palæontological discoveries, the existence of several species of placoid fishes, in the first Silurian ocean. This fact, however, does not demonstrate the falsity of the theory of development. It proves merely that vertebrate animals inhabited the planet—were developed—earlier, far earlier, than has hitherto been supposed. The fishes, whose bones have been found, were the descendants, by a long process of development by law, of points of vitality—monads, the lowest forms of animal life—that began their career in remote periods of past duration, and inhabited the oceans in which the crystalline stratified rocks were slowly deposited. These rocks have an aggregate thickness of several miles. All geologists admit that they are composed of the fragments of pre-existing rocks, and that the oldest were spread out on the beds of oceans long anterior to those of the Cambrian and Silurian periods. Their crystalline character was caused by the protracted influence of agencies—heat, pressure, chemical affinity, electric attraction, crystallographic forces—which may have effaced all traces of organic existence. Besides, it must not be forgotten that the theory supposes the first living beings to have been very small and low in organization. All visible traces of their existence were, therefore, more easily obliterated than those of the more fully developed beings of subsequent periods. Moreover,

before a final decision of the question can be made, on scientific grounds, a more thorough and extended examination of the rocks must be had, especially with the microscope; for your learned and ingenious arguments against the law of development are based on the recent discovery of a singularly interesting series of facts, which show that the bones of fish abound in rocks more than a mile, perhaps two miles, in thickness, below the lowest geological point at which such remains had been found ten years ago. Your facts and arguments prove only that highly organized beings swarmed in oceans and beautified continents during periods in the history of the planet inconceivably far back in past duration. Those facts, however, though they may modify, cannot subvert our beautifully simple theory. Future discoveries in science, especially relative to the enormously thick beds of gneiss, mica-slate, slate, quartz-rock, hornblend slate, and other stratified rocks, which underlie the fossiliferous strata, will enable philosophers to demonstrate the reality of a great unbroken chain of vitality, beginning "at a point of immeasurable remoteness in terrestrial antiquity," and linking together, in one common brotherhood, the successive stages of vegetable and animal development, up to man himself, "who has not been created, but developed." And very few geologists deny that, during the deposition of successive series of fossiliferous formations, both plants and animals became more and more complex and perfect; or, as Sir H. Davy expressed it, that there has been, from the earliest geologic eras, "a gradual approach to the present system of things."* And though we may admit, with Cuvier, that "life has not always existed on the globe," we deny the correctness of Lyell's inference, from geologic phenomena, that each existing species "was endowed, at the time of its creation, with the attributes and organization by which it is now distinguished;"† and that of De La Beche, that fossil species appear to have been created "as the conditions arose, the latter not causing a modification in previously existing forms productive of new species."‡

* *Consolations in Travel.*

† *Principles of Geology*, 8th London Edition, p. 589.

‡ *Geological Researches*, 1st Edition, 8vo., p. 239.

These objections to the positive evidence of geology can easily be spread out, by such learned and ingenious writers as Oken and the author of the "Vestiges," over hundreds of pages, so as to mislead not merely young men and mechanics, but even statesmen and philosophers, who have not given special attention to geology and various branches of physical science. "Strange and beautiful, yet imperfect and dangerous theory; how many noble minds have stumbled over thee into the unknown future! Wise in every thing but the one great essential—in that foolish."*

To answer these objections, and to drive the advocates of the theory of transmutation and development from the non-fossiliferous strata also, is one object of the latter half of the "Foot-Prints." To effect this purpose, the author appeals "to the test of what may be termed homological symmetry of organization." In the discussion of this test he unfolds and sustains, with an irresistible array of facts and arguments, his striking and deeply interesting Theory of Degradation.

We are aware that, by many highly cultivated minds, all theory is regarded with distrust. Geological theories, especially, are viewed by them as vain and groundless assumptions—dangerous, often, in their tendency; and such minds are apt to ask:

"Where is the consistency of geological theories? If Smith may conflict in his geological views with Buckland, and Lyell with Lamarck; or, if the author of the 'Foot-Prints' may oppose the development theory of the author of the 'Vestiges,' with what propriety, we ask, can either demand that we shall substitute his understanding of the Mosaic record of the creation in the place of our own, or forfeit the respect of *scientific* men?"†

This passage is a fair specimen of the many sweeping and undistinguishing denunciations of scientific theories, which are still made by men obviously ignorant of science. Smith and Buckland, as any one knows who has read their works, agree in all essential points. Both defend ably a literal interpretation of the Mosaic record of creation. Both believe the plenary inspiration of Scripture; and they differ chiefly in regard to the meaning of the word *earth* in Genesis—the former believing that it

*Indications of the Creator, p. 109. †Epoch of Creation.

may be limited to a portion only of the planet—"a large part of Asia"—which God, at the human era, "was adapting for man and the animals connected with him." Lyell proposed several theories in explanation of geological facts, but not certainly in that part of the *Principles of Geology** in which he disproved the Lamarckian hypothesis of transmutation, by an appeal to scientific facts and principles, which show that "species have a real existence in nature," and "that the varieties of form, color, and organization of different races of men are perfectly consistent with the generally received opinion, that all the individuals of the species have originated from a single pair." And Hugh Miller met the challenge of the author of the "*Vestiges*," not with ingenious speculations, but with numerous facts, which prove that bones of large fishes are abundant in strata, which the adversary of revealed truth had said did not contain any.

A more philosophical view of the nature and value of geological theories is presented by the Rev. J. Anderson, D. D., an eminent Scotch clergyman, whose late work† shows him to be profoundly acquainted with geology in all its scientific and theological relations. Having traced the progress or course of creation through successive cycles of unknown duration, as exhibited in the rocks of Scotland, England, France and Switzerland, all attesting the great antiquity of the planet, and the recent creation of our race, he discusses calmly the several modes or theories that have been proposed for reconciling the science with the Mosaic account of creation, and says:

"These are some of the methods, by which the geologist aims to bring the conclusions of his science within the scope of the Mosaic record, and to free his speculations from all their incumbrances and responsibilities. There is still a great deal to be accomplished, even with all these approximations, toward a right and full and literal comparison with the sacred text. There is indeed no real conflict between the discoveries of geology and the declarations of the divine oracles; and with so many doors of retreat from, or avenues of approach into, the inviting fields of its research, no friend of the truth need be afraid of an excursion through the most intricate depths of creation's works. Mean-

* Eighth London Ed., p. 544 to 589.

† *Course of Creation.*

while, the metaphysicians have all been driven from the field, with all their untenable dogmas about the eternity of matter. Geologists repudiate the doctrine, and their science refutes it."

Indeed, even the authors of the Epoch of Creation, though their acquaintance with any science is obviously very limited, could not deny that no science is so full of theory as metaphysics; nor has any given birth to so many ingenious hypotheses, adverse to the theology of the Bible. Will any one, on that account, denounce the science of metaphysics as a mass of infidel speculations? Every philosophic inquirer knows that all science, psychological or physical, is necessarily incumbered, in its present immature state, with assumptions, hypotheses and theories;—for we are finite, and can know in part only; and it is a law of our minds, as Humboldt says, that "besides the pleasure derived from acquired knowledge, there lurks in the mind of man, and tinged with a shade of sadness, an unsatisfied longing for something beyond the present—a striving towards regions yet unknown and unopened." We can no more cease to theorize, than to think and investigate. Indeed, if what Herschel said be true, "that all human discoveries seem to be made only for the purpose of confirming more strongly the truths contained in the sacred writings," then scientific speculations may be regarded as a religious duty; for it is very certain no real advance in science can be made without using theories as means of discovery. The subject is so elegantly discussed by Dr Harris, in the "Pre-Adamite Earth," that we extract the entire paragraph:

"As surely as the mind is one, the truth to which the mind is pre-configured is one. On this ground it is that we argue from the known to the unknown; approach a subject of inquiry, under the guidance of an antecedent probability, as to what we shall find in it, and employ analogy and hypothesis as instruments of scientific discovery. 'How,' inquires Plato, 'can you expect to find, unless you have a general idea of what you seek?' 'The mind,' says Lord Bacon, 'must bring to every experiment a 'precogitation,' or antecedent idea, as the ground of that *prudens questio*,' which he pronounces to be the prior half of the knowledge sought, '*dimidium scientiæ*.' Indeed, is not the *Novum Organum* itself of hypothetical origin? 'When Newton said '*Hypothesis non fingo*,' he did not mean that he de-

prived himself of the facilities of investigation afforded by assuming, in the first instance, what he hoped ultimately to prove. Without such assumptions, science could never have attained its present state; they are necessary steps in the progress to something more certain; and nearly everything which is now theory was once hypothesis. Even in purely experimental science, some inducement is necessary for trying one experiment rather than another.* These hypotheses, as the language implies, are only provisional. They must be of a nature to admit of verification, and be actually subjected to a test which shall confirm or explode them."

No one will deny, we presume, that a theory, evil in general design and tendency, may be productive of much good, by establishing more firmly the foundations of truth, and causing that truth to be more generally and earnestly studied, and more clearly and fully comprehended. It requires something striking to arouse to mental activity the sluggish masses of mankind; and, in exposing error, even the learned are led to scrutinize carefully—to examine in all possible lights—the foundations of their opinions. And often, in eager controversies on theoretical questions, while error is refuted, the sharp concussions of excited intellects evolve unexpected scintillations of truth. Thus, Hume's *Essay on Miracles* caused the laws of evidence to be re-examined, restricted and amended, and the miraculous evidence of Scripture to be more generally studied and thoroughly understood. And the startling character of the Lamarckian hypothesis of transmutation, aroused both the enemies and friends of the Bible to a most earnest, laborious and protracted investigation of Nature's works, organic and inorganic, with a special reference to the bearing of the results on the inspired record; and hence, in part, the accumulation of an immense mass of evidence, which is now being employed successfully in demonstration of a wonderful connexion between "the truths of revelation and the discoveries of science;"—showing "that the book of revelation and the book of nature were written by the same infinite and unerring hand;—and each day adds some new proof of their divine origin. As science interprets the sacred record, its truths are better understood, and their in-

* Mills's System of Logic, vol. 2, p. 18.

fluence more deeply felt. The two voices—the one from above, the other from beneath and around us—seem to unite; but, notwithstanding all space and all matter are full of their eloquence, man has been slow to understand their language, and reluctant to acknowledge the truths which they unitedly teach.”*

Both teach that the created material universe is a divinely established plan of manifestation, to created moral intelligences, of the infinite perfections of Deity,—infinite in resources, in power, in wisdom, in benevolence, in duration,—a plan which can never, by any possibility, approach its termination. Such a plan must consist of an infinite number of connected, dependent, active, continuous, analogous parts, in ever varying progress,—some, having accomplished the purpose for which they were designed, giving place to others. This is precisely what the theory of degradation assumes. It supposes that while the animal kingdom, viewed as a whole, has been steadily advancing, in all geologic time, to perfection in organization, certain minor divisions of it—parts of the great terrestrial whole of sentient existence—have, in each period of the earth’s eventful history, accomplished the object of their creation, and undergone extinction and degradation, in order to admit of a further unfolding of the plan of manifestation by the introduction of new forms of life.

All naturalists admit the reality of symmetry of organization, and that it has an important relation to animal rank. Cuvier recognized it as “a principle peculiar to Natural History,” and termed it “the conditions of existence.” “On it,” he says, “are based the fundamental relations” and “the essential resemblances of beings.” From these are derived “the surest means of reducing the properties of beings to general rules,” and of establishing “the principle of the subordination of characters,” which may be employed successfully, on many occasions, in the classification of animals. “The incorporation of the laws of observation with the general laws, either directly or by the principle of the conditions of existence, would complete the system of the natural sciences, in rendering sensible, in all its parts, the mutual influence of every being.

* *Indications of the Creator*, p. 279.

To this end should those who cultivate these sciences direct all their efforts.

Naturalists have not yet fully ascertained the character and extent of this principle, nor the relative importance of its results, in different parts of the complex system of organic existences. Mr. Miller's view of its character and of its effects, in the different periods of geologic time, on the rank of the ichthyic class especially, is peculiarly important and interesting. He contends that "homological symmetry of organization is the proper ground on which the standing of the earlier vertebrata should be decided." The fundamental principle of his theory is not based on groundless hypothesis or ingenious speculation. It comes within the strictest rules of logic, and being of "a nature to admit of verification," it may "be actually subjected to the test" of such a multiplicity of palæontological facts, as must either confirm or explode it."

Nor must the reader infer that the principle of the gradual *degradation*, during the successive eras in the immeasurably protracted periods of geologic time, of whole classes of animals, from higher and more perfect to lower and less symmetrical types of organization, was first ascertained and applied by Mr. Miller, in the work before us. True, geologists have been eagerly employed in collecting facts relative to extinct races; and zoologists and comparative anatomists have been as earnestly occupied in studying, classifying, and describing existing beings. The progressive state of these sciences has, till within a few years, militated against the formation of theory of the soberer character. Facts were comparatively limited, and those who were best acquainted with them were too intent on adding to them, to give much attention to the chronology of organized existence, with a view to deduce principles applicable to earth's tenants, in all periods of past duration. Still, the principle which Mr. Miller has so forcibly illustrated, and which gives to his work the charm of novelty, has long been known to palæontologists. It was distinctly stated by Dr. Buckland, fifteen years ago, in the Bridgewater Treatise on Geology and Mineralogy.*

* Vol. 1, p. 293-4, Second Edition, London.

"From no kingdom of nature does the doctrine of gradual development and transmutation of species derive less support, than from the progression we have been tracing in the class of fishes. The Sauroid fishes occupy a higher place in the scale of organization, than the ordinary forms of bony fishes; yet we find examples of Sauroids of the greatest magnitude, and in abundant numbers in the carboniferous and secondary formations,* whilst they *almost disappear, and are replaced by less perfect forms in the tertiary strata, and present only two genera among existing fishes.*

"In this, as in many other cases, a kind of *retrograde* development, from complex to simple forms, may be said to have taken place. As some of the more early fishes united, in a single species, points of organization which, at a later period, are found distinct in separate families, these changes would seem to indicate in the class of fishes *a process of division, and of subtraction from more perfect, rather than of addition to less perfect forms.*

"Among living fishes, many parts in the organization of the cartilaginous tribes, (e. g. the brain, the pancreas, and organs subservient to generation,) are of a higher order than the corresponding parts in the bony tribes; yet we find the cartilaginous family of squaloids co-existing with bony fishes in the transition strata, and extending with them through all geological formations, unto the present time.

"In no kingdom of nature, therefore, does it seem less possible to explain the successive changes of organization, disclosed by geology, without the direct interposition of repeated acts of creation."

So, Ansted, speaking of the whole animal kingdom, said correctly, "a general advance in point of organization is, in one sense, a method observed by nature;" yet, he qualified this general law of "progression,"† and recognized distinctly a co-ordinate law of retrogradation, by which classes of animals, types of organization, were, at various periods, reduced gradually in the scale of being. In closing his description of the inhabitants of the Silurian seas, he says of the Cephalopoda, the highest class of the Mollusca, that they "at once assumed an importance, which hardly increased, though it varied, for a long period,

* We have seen that they have since been found in the Devonian, upper Silurian, lower Silurian and Cambrian systems. See July No., p. 136.

† Ancient World, p. 102.

and at length actually became less."* In grouping the fishes of the carboniferous era, he says:

"Innumerable sharks (Placoids) of all sizes, and perhaps of many forms, rapid and powerful swimmers, fiercely and insatiably carnivorous, were associated with huge, monstrous fishes, (Ganoids, similar to the sturgeon,) *more resembling reptiles* than any of their own class at the present day, and incredibly powerful and voracious. *The fishes at this time had attained, it would seem, their maximum of development in point of vigor, and in some respects (though in some respects only, and by analogy) in structure; and it is not a little interesting to find that, at this point, so far as we can tell, the true reptiles were actually introduced.*"†

Lest this should be misunderstood and supposed to favor the theory of development—that fishes were employed as agents, in introducing a higher reptilian group—he asserts that these first reptiles were less analogous to the sauroid fishes of the carboniferous and Devonian periods, than the reptiles which appeared at a much later period:

"The reptiles thus appearing were not, however, members of that group through which the passage from sauroid fishes to true saurians takes place, but belonged to a *higher form, and to a complicated type of that form.*"

"It is very curious and interesting," he remarks in another place, "to watch the progress of the transition. The fishes in the carboniferous rocks include many shark-like and reptilian groups. In the sandstone, above the coal, and in the magnesian limestone, are many nearly allied fishes, although of much smaller size, *but all the more advanced types seem to fail.* In the same newer beds, however, (of rocks of the first epoch) appear true reptiles, not indeed of large size, but of complicated dentition, and the representatives of a high bird-like group; while in the beds of the secondary period, (second epoch) the reptiles *at first* exhibit high analogies, and then pass off into a magnificent series, including true representatives, *both of the earlier sauroid fishes and the later aquatic mammals.*"‡

In Ch. XI. on "General Considerations concerning the Second Epoch, and the Circumstances of its Termination," he uses very definite language relative to the types of vertebrate animals, that successively appeared during that long "reptilian period," which succeeded the first or

* Id., p. 55.

† Id., p. 102.

‡ Id., p. 114.

palæozoic epoch, called the "reign of fishes." And as, at the close of the first, fishes retrograded in organization, though their numbers were multiplied; so, in the second, reptiles *declined* in perfection of type, while first birds and then mammals appeared:

"One thing is perfectly clear in the midst of all this change, introduction, and substitution of species—namely, that there was, on the whole, no true advance in the perfection or even the complication of organic reptilian forms, between the commencement and close of the epoch; for, at the outset, we find evidence of the existence of reptiles of the *two extremes of organization*; in the middle we have merely a vast multiplication of reptilian species, exhibiting very interesting and remarkable modifications, but no new type; while toward the close *these all cease, and we revert to the same, or nearly the same, modifications of lacertian structure as at first*. Neither in size, number, or affinity to higher forms, nor, indeed, in any conceivable point, can we trace systematic advance in organization in the reptiles of this great *saurian period*."

"Nor do we find any different result if we examine the other groups. The birds exhibit indications of their existence by a few foot-steps in the new red sandstone, *at the commencement of the epoch*, and a very few isolated bones obtained from the chalk give evidence of their presence scarcely more distinct at its close. No such remains at all have yet been found in any of the intermediate deposits. Just so it is with the mammals. In the lower beds of *the middle part of the series* we have a few but distinct traces of their presence; these, however, are totally lost in the newer beds, and even in the weald, a fresh-water deposit, we are still without a single fragment that can be supposed to have belonged to any quadruped, the companion on land of the gigantic dinosaurs."*

Ansted's design, in the work from which we have cited the preceding passages, was to present to the general reader, as the great results of geological investigations, "picturesque sketches of creation"—"groups of animate beings"—characteristic of each period. To accomplish this object, he restricted himself to facts; and, of course, in his exposition of facts, gave merely a summary of the conclusions arrived at by geologists and palæontologists.

* Id., p. 258.

He simply stated facts, and the principles deduced from them.

One of these principles asserts that, from the earliest period, of which any records are found in the rocks, to the living creation, the animal kingdom, like the mineral and vegetable, affords indubitable evidence of modification, substitution, enlargement, and advance. Hence, if we examine the relics of either radiate, articulate, or molluscos animals, we find those of no two periods identical. Thus, the orthoceratite preceded the goniatite, as the latter did the ammonite. So the trilobite preceded the order (Malacostraca) to which the crab belongs. And fishes, reptiles, birds, mammals and man, appeared in succession. This is called the law of *progression*, and does not teach that there ever has been any real advance in organization in *any one type* of organized existence. The first fish, reptile, bird, mammal, or man, was as perfect in symmetry of structure *as any successor of the same type*. For a clear, full, and fascinating illustration of this law, in all its aspects, as well as for a learned, candid and able exposition of its relations to the Christian religion, we refer the reader to the Pre-Adamite Earth, by the Rev. John Harris, D. D.

The second principle is sustained by evidence of the same kind, and equally conclusive. It asserts the simultaneous retrogradation in organization of whole classes of animals, even while they increased in size, were varied in structure, and multiplied in countless numbers. A single order of fishes (Placoids, like sharks,) first appeared, high in organization. The forms of the class were afterwards varied by the gradual addition of three other orders, Ganoid, Ctenoid and Cycloid;* and though fishes ultimately became monsters in bulk, and swarmed in incredible numbers in every sea, so far from advancing in organization, they obviously retrograded, especially after a few species of a single order of the class of reptiles, and allied to lower rather than

* Fishes form a *class* of the vertebrate division. The class is divided by Agassiz into the four *orders* named above; these orders into families; families into genera, and genera into species. The orders take their names from the scale: Placoids, whose scales are irregular enameled plates; Ganoids, whose scales are bony plates covered with enamel; Ctenoids, with scales like a comb; and Cycloids, with circular scales. These orders were not created at once. The Placoids, like sharks, appeared first; next came the Ganoids, like the sturgeon, but much larger.

to higher fishes, came on the stage of action. Without any advance in organization, the reptiles, too, exhibit, in the next epoch, numerous modifications of form, size, habits and structure; and it is a curious and instructive fact, that when a few small genera of marsupial mammals first inhabited the Oolitic continents or islands, a small and anomalous saurian genus, (*Pterodactyl*) having striking affinities to both birds and bats, was so singularly constituted as either to swim in the sea, crawl on the land, or fly in the air. And surely no geologist can fail to see, in the alligators, toads, turtles, snakes and lizards of the present era, a degraded class of beings—degraded in organization as well as in size. This is the principle of *degradation*, so ingeniously and learnedly employed by Mr. Miller in defence of revealed truth. And, in penning the preceding pages, it has not been our purpose to detract aught from his fame, by showing that he did not first perceive and apply the principle. It has been our aim to convince the reader that his demolition of the last stronghold of the defenders of development by law, was effected by the skilful use of weapons, which geologists—Lyell, Buckland and Ansted—and palæontologists—Agassiz and Owen—had laboriously prepared for him. Mr. Miller himself must smile at the ignorance of science displayed by such writers as the authors of the “Epoch of Creation,” how learned soever they may be in theology, when they speak of the degradation of certain types of animals as an assumption, and of him as the assumer.

Having shown that theory is an indispensable means of advancing science, and that retrocession, retrogradation in parts of the animal creation, is a fact proved long since by palæontologists, and recognized now by geologists, we proceed to examine Mr. Miller’s explanation of it in determining the rank of the earliest vertebrata—fishes especially—*his theory of degradation*, as it is now called, though he professed to write merely “*the history and progress of degradation*.” The principle was established by others. He has ingeniously applied it as a principle of classification. In this sense only is he the author of a theory.

Divisions, classes, orders and families of animals, are not arbitrarily formed. They express, each, the opinions of naturalists, as to certain principles of organization, more

or less comprehensive, according to which each group is constructed, and from which each derives its rank in the great scale of being.

What the principle is, in the ichthyic class, has been matter of doubt; for, as we have seen in a former article, naturalists have not agreed fully in their systems of classification; some regarding one organ, and others another, as entitled to preponderance, in determining the rank of fishes. Mr. Miller has sought it in those organs, and we think successfully, which give man decided superiority of organization,—the nervous masses, head, spine and extremities. On the position of the limbs, relatively to the other parts of the skeleton, depends, Mr. Miller thinks, the *homological symmetry of organization*; and this test, united to that of brain, intelligence, he employs in determining the rank of the earliest fishes. We will allow him to explain it to the reader in his own felicitous way; and as we cannot agree with the authors of the Epoch of Creation, that “the mysteries of God’s works are as far above our conceptions as the mysteries of His nature,” we think the christian world will thank Mr. Miller for a most lucid scientific illustration of a principle, which at once overthrows infidelity, and imparts new interest to the Mosaic account of the fall of man. Mr. Miller says:

“Though all animals be fitted by nature for the life which their instincts teach them to pursue, naturalists have learned to recognize among them certain aberrant and mutilated forms, in which the type of the special class to which they belong, seems distorted and degraded. They exist as the monster *families* of creation, just as among families there appear from time to time monster *individuals*—men, for instance, without feet, or hands, or eyes, or with their feet, hands or eyes grievously misplaced—sheep with their fore legs growing out of their necks; or ducklings with their wings attached to their haunches. Among these degraded races, that of the footless serpent ‘which goeth upon its belly,’ has been long noted by the theologian as a race, typical in its condition and nature, of an order of hopelessly degraded beings, borne down to the dust by a clinging curse; and, curiously enough, when the first comparative anatomists in the world, give *their* readiest and most prominent instance of the degradation among the denizens of the natural world, it is this very order of footless reptiles that they select. So far as the geologist

yet knows, the ophidians (an order of reptiles including serpents) did not appear during the secondary ages, when the monarchs of creation belonged to the reptilian division, but were ushered upon the scene in the times of the tertiary deposits, when the mammalian dynasty had supplanted that of the Iguanodon and Megalosaurus. Their ill-omened birth took place when the influence of their house was on the wane, as if to set such a stamp of utter hopelessness on its fallen condition, as that set by the birth of a worthless or idiot heir on the fortunes of a sinking family. The degradation of the ophidians consists in the absence of limbs; an absence total, in by much the greater number of their families, and represented in others, as in the boas and pythons, by mere abortive hinder limbs concealed in the skin; but they are thus not only *monsters through defect of parts*, if I may so express myself, but also *monsters through redundancy*, as a vegetative repetition of vertebra and ribs, to the number of three or four hundred, forms the special contrivance by which the want of these is compensated. I am also disposed to regard the poison-bag of the venomous snakes as a mark of degradation; it seems, judging from analogy, to be a protective provision of a low character, exemplified chiefly in the invertebrate families—ants, centipides and mosquitos, spiders, wasps and scorpions. The higher carnivora are, we find, furnished with unpoisoned weapons, which, like those of civilized man, are sufficiently effective, simply from the excellence of their construction, and the power with which they are wielded, for every purpose of assault or defence. It is only the squalid savages and degraded boschmen of creation that have their feeble teeth and tiny stings steeped in venom, and so made formidable. *Monstrosity through displacement of parts* constitutes yet another form of degradation; and this form, united, in some instances, to the other two, we find curiously exemplified in the geological history of the fish—a history which, with all its blanks and missing portions, is yet better known than that of any other division of the vertebrata. And it is, I am convinced, from a survey of the progress of degradation in the great ichthyic division, a progress recorded as “with a pen of iron in the rock forever,” and not from superficial views, founded on the cartilaginous or the non cartilaginous texture of the ichthyic skeleton, that the standing of the kingly fishes of the earlier periods is to be adequately determined. Any other mode of survey, save the parallel mode, which takes developement of brain into account, evolves, we find, nothing like principle, and lands the enquirer into inextricable difficulties and inconsistencies.”

"In all the higher non-degraded vertebrata, we find a certain uniform type of skeleton, consisting of the head, the vertebral column, and four limbs; and these last, in the various symmetrical forms, whether exemplified in the higher fish, the higher reptiles, the higher birds, the higher mammals, or in man himself, occur always in a certain determinate order. In all the mammals, the scapular bases of the fore limbs begin opposite the eighth vertebra from the skull backwards, the seven which go before being cervical or neck vertebrae; in the birds a division of the vertebrata that, from their peculiar organization, require longer and more flexible necks than the mammals; the scapulars begin at distances from the occiput, varying according to the species, from opposite the thirteenth to opposite the twenty-fourth vertebra; and in the reptiles, a division which, according to Cuvier, "presents a greater diversity of forms, characters and modes of gait, than any of the other two," they occur at almost all points, from opposite the second vertebra as in the frog, to opposite the thirty-third or thirty-fourth vertebra as in some species of plesiosaurus. But in all, whether mammals, birds, or undegraded reptiles, they are so placed that the creatures possess *necks*, of greater or less length, as an essential portion of their general type. The hinder limbs have also, in all these three divisions of the animal kingdom, their typical place. They occur opposite, or very nearly opposite, the posterior termination of the abdominal cavity, and mark the line of separation between the vertebrae of the trunk (dorsal, lumbar, and sacral) and the third and last, or *caudal* division of the column—a division represented in man by but four vertebrae, and in the crocodile by about thirty-five, but which is found to exist, as I have already said, in all the more perfect forms. The limbs, then, in all the symmetrical animals of the first three classes of the vertebrata, mark the three great divisions of the vertebral column—the division of the *neck*, the division of the *trunk*, and the division of the *tail*. Let us now inquire how the case stands with the fourth and lowest class—that of the fishes.

The four orders of fishes—Placoids, Ganoids, Ctenoids and Cycloids—occur in succession in the rocks, in the order in which we have named them. Remains of Placoidians only have been found in the earliest formations, the Silurian and Cambrian. These first fishes have been ascertained by Agassiz and Egerton to belong to the Cestraciont family. Of this family, which exhibits, according to Sedgwick, Egerton, Wilson, and other naturalists, "the highest type," the Port Jackson shark, is "the *sole survi-*

ving species." "With this (cestraciant) family, so far as is yet known, ichthyic existence first began. It does not appear that on the globe which we inhabit, there was ever an ocean tenanted by living creatures at all, that had not its cestracion—a statement which could not be made regarding any other vertebrate family." They alone, Agassiz has shown,, "sweep across the entire geological scale." Hence, as only one species still lives, and that of small size, it is of great importance to ascertain its rank.

The Ganoidians, of which we have living examples in the sturgeon, cat-fish and pike, came on the stage of action in the Devonian period; and afterwards both Placoids and Ganoids were multiplied through all the succeeding palæozoic and secondary depositions, many of the latter being monsters in size, till reptiles of enormous magnitude were commissioned to restrain excessive multiplication of the tenants of the deep. Near the close of the secondary periods, the Ctenoids, of which the perch is a living example, appeared; and finally, during the deposition of the tertiary strata, the Cycloids were created. Since that time the four orders have existed in every sea, the two latter having true bony skeletons, and greatly preponderating in numbers. Hence, the Placoids and Ganoids "were naturally looked on as of comparatively small importance, so long as only the existing species of fishes were known—for they contain, with the exception of the sharks and Rays, but very few species, and these are neither abundant nor widely spread.*

If the development hypothesis be true, the most perfectly organized existing fishes should be Ctenoidians and Cycloidians. Is this the case? Their bony skeletons, vast numbers, and other minor circumstances, seemed, at first, to require an affirmative answer. If, however, brain, intelligence, organs of circulation, and weapons of defence, and not bone, be made the test of ichthyic rank, as in other vertebrate creatures, the Placoidians, though few in number, and possessed of a cartilaginous skeleton, the bone being on the skin, must be regarded as exhibiting the highest type. The question was beset with many perplexing difficulties, and the arguments on opposite sides seemed to

* Ancient World, p. 61.

be nearly equal—Agassiz himself having, at one time, regarded a cartilaginous skeleton as a mark of inferiority—a stage in embryonic development. To remove all doubt on the subject, Mr. Miller applied “the test of homological symmetry of organization” to existing and extinct fishes, and found the results to correspond with those of the test of brain, organs of generation, and means of defence.

In existing sharks of the highest type, the anterior and posterior fins (*pectoral and ventral*) occupy the places, relative to the vertebral column, of the limbs “in symmetrical mammals, birds and reptiles.” They have a neck consisting of from twelve to fourteen cervical vertebrae. The ventral fins are nearly opposite the base of the abdomen. The caudal vertebrae extend into the tail fin, and are not abruptly cut off, as in the salmon, trout, perch, and an immense majority of existing species. The mouth, too, in the Port Jackson shark, opens “in a broad, honest-looking muzzle, very much resembling that of the hog.” In all these respects they approach nearest to the standard of perfection in man—and such was the type of all the earliest fishes. No example of monstrosity of misplacement, defect or redundancy of parts, can be predicated of any of them. All present “the homological symmetry of organization, typical of that vertebral kingdom to which they belong.”

In the Rays, however, Placoids also, and which did not appear till a much later period, the pectoral fins, fore limbs, are attached to *one* long cervical vertebra; and in the Chimeridæ, which first appear about the same time, there is a still greater departure from symmetry—for the limbs or fins corresponding to the human arms are attached to the “hinder part of the head,” there being no neck at all.

But we must return to the Ganoids; for various remarkable genera of that order,—*Asterolepis*, *Coccosteus*, *Pterichthys*, and several others,—were abundant in the Devonian oceans, long before the Rays and Chimeridæ appeared as degraded families of Placoidians. In the Ganoid genera are found the first examples of “monstrosity through displacement of parts.” In all except two, “the fore limbs are brought from their typical place, opposite the base of the cervical vertebrae, and stuck on to the oc-

capital plate. The whole order presented from the first "such a departure from the symmetrical type, as would take place in a monster example of the human family, in whom the neck had been annihilated, and the arms stuck on to the back of the head." Now this fact is worthy of particular notice, that misplacement or retrogradation began, not in the first but the second order of fishes. If the second were developed from the first, it is strange that some of the parts, the vertebrae of the neck, on which the symmetry of all animals of a higher type depends, were obliterated by the process.

Nor is this all. Mr. Miller finds in two of the earliest Ganoid genera the first examples "of degradation through defect." Though thousands of individuals have been examined, no trace has been found in the *Pterichthys* of "hinder limbs;" none in the *Coccosteus* of fore limbs. One is compared to a human monster without legs—the other, to one without arms.

The progress of ichthyic degradation, in later periods, is given so succinctly by Mr. Miller, that we cite the entire passage:

"Ages and centuries pass, and long unreckoned periods come to a close—and then, after the termination of the palaeozoic period, we see that change taking place in the form of the ichthyic tail, to which I have already referred, as singularly illustrative of the progress of degradation. Yet other ages and centuries pass away, during which the reptile class attains to its fullest development, in point of size, organization and number; and then, after the Cretaceous deposits have begun, we find yet another remarkable monstrosity of displacement introduced among all the fishes of one very numerous order, and among no considerable proportion of the fishes of another. In the newly introduced Ctenoids, (*Acanthopterygii*), and in those families of the Cycloids which Cuvier erected into the order *Malacopterygii sub-brachiati*, the hinder limbs are brought forward, and stuck on to the base of the previously misplaced fore limbs. All the four limbs, by a strange monstrosity of displacement, are crowded into the place of the extinguished neck. And such, at the present day, is the prevalent type among fishes. Monstrosity through defect is also found to increase—so that the snake-like *Apoda*, or feet-wanting fishes, form a numerous order, some of whose genera are devoid, as in the common eels and the congers, of only the hinder limbs—while in others, as the genera *Muraena*

and Synbranchus, both hinder and fore limbs are wanting. In the class of fishes, as fishes now exist, we find many more evidences of monstrosity, which results from the displacement and defect of parts, than in the other three classes of the vertebrata united; and knowing their geological history better than that of any of the others, we know, in consequence, that the monstrosities did not appear *early*, but *late*—and that the progress of the race, as a whole, though it still retains not a few of the higher forms, has been a progress, not of development from the low to the high, but of degradation from the high to the low.”

In many fishes, as the flounder, plaice, halibut, and turbot, degradation of distortion is superadded to that of displacement and defect. The creature is twisted half round and laid on its side. All the fins are misplaced, and the dorsal and anal have changed places and functions with the pectoral and ventral fins. The tail has not the vertical position of other fish tails, but is horizontal. The head partakes of the general twist. Half its fractures are twisted to one side, and the other half to the other—causing such a change as would occur in the human cranium, should “the eyes be drawn toward the left ear and the mouth to the right.” The eyes are squint, the mouth wry, and the jaws so asymmetrical, that “scarcely in the entire ichthyic kingdom are there any two jaws that less resemble one another, than the two halves of the jaw of the flounder, turbot, halibut or plaice.

Moreover, the *bilateral symmetry*, so invariably characteristic of all the higher vertebrata, scarcely has a place in the asymmetrical head of the flounder. In nearly all fishes, the two bones that compose the anterior half of the lower jaw, are as much alike as the right hand of man is to the left. In the flounder, on the contrary, one is a short, broad, nearly straight bone, with from four to six teeth only, while the other is longer, narrower, bent like a bow, and contains from thirty to thirty-five teeth:

“There exists,” says Mr. Miller, “in some of our north country fishing villages, an ancient apologue, which, though not remarkable for point or meaning, at least serves to show that this peculiar example of distortion the rude fishermen of a former age were observant enough to detect. Once on a time the fishes met, it is said, to elect a king, and their choice fell on the herring. ‘The

herring king! contemptuously exclaimed the flounder, a fish of consummate vanity—'where then am I?'—And straightway, in punishment of its conceit and rebellion, 'its eyes turned to the back of its head.' Here is there a story palpably founded on the degradation of misplacement and distortion, which originated ages ere the naturalist had recognized either the term or the principle."

This view of the subject, novel and striking, as all naturalists will admit, must shake to its foundation the principle assumed by some distinguished comparative anatomists, and even by Owen, though it is rejected by Agassiz, that the attachment of the fore-limbs and the scapular arch to the occipital bone is the normal one, and that the removal of these limbs further down, as in all reptiles, birds and mammals, is a *natural dislocation of them*;—some regarding the dislocation as the result of the slow operation of the law of development—others, as the gradual enlargement, by divine agency, of the great plan of the vertebrate creation. These comparative anatomists take, as their starting-point, that form or peculiarity of structure which is *lowest* in the vertebral skeleton, and thence deduce the higher types and their relations and homologies. Beginning at the lowest in the scale of being, they pass upwards through the intermediate forms to the other extreme. The geologist assumes a different principle. He confines his attention to one class of animals, as fishes, and traces the changes of that class in the successive periods of geologic time. Mr. Miller says:

"It is with *time*, not with rank, that he has to deal. Nor is it in the least surprising that he should seem at issue with the comparative anatomist, when, in classifying his groups of organized being, according to the periods of their appearance, there is an order of arrangement forced upon him, different from that which, on an entirely different principle, the anatomist pursues. Nor can there be a better illustration of a collision of this kind, than the one furnished by the case in point. That peculiarity of structure which, as the lowest in the vertebral skeleton, is to the comparative anatomist the primary and original one, and which, as such, furnishes him with his starting-point, is to the geologist *not primary, but secondary, simply because it was not primary but secondary in the order of its occurrence*. It belongs, so far as we yet know, not to the *first* period of vertebrate existence, but to the second."

We will conclude this part of the subject with a quotation from the Foot-Prints, which opens to the reader, in a few sentences, a clear synoptical view of the progress, simultaneously, in the whole vertebrate creation, of both great laws, *progression* and *retrogradation*, during the immeasurably protracted periods of past duration, in which the Creator has already been displaying to moral intelligences His infinite power, wisdom and benevolence—All Sufficiency. The philosophic mind is overwhelmed with reverence, awe and humility, in contemplating the subject: for vast as may seem the number and variety of beings inhumed in the rocks; endlessly multiplied as have been the changes both of advance and retrocession discovered in their organization; and protracted as must have been the periods required for their creation and extinction, our knowledge is limited to one of the smallest of myriads of worlds, and to a mere point of time; for infinite duration still remains, in which the Divine manifestation will proceed, after our race shall have become extinct, to give place, in turn, to higher types of organization:

“This fact of degradation, strangely indicated in geologic history, with reference to all the greater divisions of the animal kingdom, has often appeared to me a surpassingly wonderful one. We can see but imperfectly in those twilight depths to which all such subjects necessarily belong; and yet at times enough does appear to show us what a very superficial thing infidelity may be. The general advance in creation has been incalculably great. The lower divisions of the vertebrata preceded the higher; the fish preceded the reptile, the reptile preceded the bird, the bird preceded the mammiferous quadruped, and the mammiferous quadruped preceded man. And yet, is there one of these great divisions in which, in at least some prominent feature, the present, through this mysterious element of degradation, is not inferior to the past? There was a time in which the ichthyic form constituted the highest example of life; but the seas during that period did not swarm with fish of the degraded type. There was, in like manner, a time when all the carnivora and all the herbivorous quadrupeds were represented by reptiles; but there are no such magnificent reptiles on the earth now as reigned over it then. There was an after time, when birds seem to have been the sole representatives of the warm-blooded animals; but we find, from the prints of their feet left in the sandstone, that the tallest men might have

‘Walked under their huge legs, and peeped about.’

"Further, there was an age when the quadrupedal mammals were the magnates of creation; but it was an age in which the sagacious elephant, now extinct, save in the comparatively small Asiatic and African circles, and restricted to two species, was the inhabitant of every country of the Old World, from its southern extremity to the frozen shores of the Northern Ocean; and when vast herds of a closely allied and equally colossal genus occupied its place in the New. And now, in the times of the high-placed human dynasty—of those formally delegated monarchs of creation, whose nature it is to look behind them upon the past, and before them, with mingled fear and hope, upon the future—do we not as certainly see the elements of a state of ever-sinking degradation, which is to exist forever, as of a state of ever-increasing perfectibility, to which there is to be no end? Nay, of a higher race, of which we know but little, this much we at least know, that they long since separated into two great classes—that of the elect angels, and of angels that kept not their first estate."

In all these passages, and, indeed, throughout the work, the word *degradation* is used in its literal sense, and means more than retrogradation or retrocession, as employed by Buckland, Ansted, and other geologists, to whom we have referred. They employ it to denote the *fact* of "subdivision," "subtraction," "reduction," "diminution," "distortion" in the successive species of a class of animals; and this fact is certainly sufficient to overthrow the theory of transmutation and development, with all its ingenious qualifications and disingenuous subterfuges—for neither Maillet, Lamarck, Oken, nor the author of the *Vestiges*, was a geologist. Indeed, like the authors of the "Epoch of Creation," they were ignorant of the science; and hence, misunderstood and perverted its facts and principles. And we believe the latter treatise, in which many material facts in the history of theologic science seem to have been intentionally concealed, especially with regard to the exegesis of the first chapter of Genesis, and also with regard to Biblical Chronology, is more dangerous than the "*Vestiges*" itself in the hands of the young student of Geology, (and all educated young men and many mechanics and others now study the science.) Assuming that the common (and we may say *modern*) interpretation of the Mosaic account of creation is alone compatible with faith in revelation, Messrs. Lord & Dickinson treat all as secret enemies to the Sacred Volume, who adopt a different inter-

pretation,—who maintain that the material universe is not said by Moses to have been created out of nothing, about six thousand years ago, but at some indefinite period of the past, termed “the beginning.” Nor do they, in any part of the “Epoch,” ever allude to the fact, that that interpretation has been maintained by Christian writers in all periods of the Church—by many long before geology was known as a science. Are Messrs. Dickinson & Lord ignorant of the fact that their interpretation of Genesis was rejected by Theodoret, Augustine, Rosenmuller, Bishop Patrick, Bishop Berkley, Bishop Horsley, Bishop Whately, Milton, Dathe, Doederlin, Knapp, Faber, Keith, Dr. Chalmers, &c. &c.?

Mr. Miller means, as he tells us, “not only reduction but also degradation.” And descanting on the *fact*, that fishes, reptiles, and even mammals, dwindled in size and sank lower in other important characters, though species and genera may have been greatly increased in number, just anterior to the human era, he asks why these classes, especially the first two of them, “should have become the receptacles of orders and families of a degraded character, which had no place among them in their monarchical state.” “Nor did the hand that makes no slips in its workings, ‘form the crooked serpent’—footless, groveling, venom-bearing—the authorized type of a fallen, degraded creature, until after the introduction of the mammals. What can this fact of degradation mean?” “What reason, what *final cause* can be assigned for it?”

This question cannot be answered by saying, that degradation is merely one of the modes of filling voids in the chain of being; for geologists all reject this absurd hypothesis of Bolinbroke, their science having made them familiar with the truth, that the chain has been too repeatedly broken by the extinction of species, genera, families and orders of animals—the links of the assumed “graduated chain of Bolinbroke” having sunk, in all geologic ages, “fractured and broken into the rocks below.” Besides, the mere filling up of blanks could have been as readily effected by elevation—by the interpolation of links from the lower end of the chain. Mr. Miller thinks, therefore, degradation “is associated with certain other great facts in the moral government of the universe.” He says:

"The special lesson which the adorable Saviour, during his ministry on earth, oftenest enforced, and to which all the others bore reference, was the lesson of a final separation of mankind into two great divisions—a division of God-like men, of whose high standing and full orbéd happiness man, in the present scene of things, can form no adequate conception; and a division of men finally lost, and doomed to unutterable misery and hopeless degradation. There is not in all Revelation a single doctrine which we find oftener, or more clearly enforced, than that there shall continue to exist, throughout the endless cycles of the future, a race of degraded men and of degraded angels.

"Now, it is truly wonderful how thoroughly, in its general scope, the revealed pieces on to the geologic record. We know, as geologists, that the dynasty of the fish was succeeded by that of the reptile; that the dynasty of the reptile was succeeded by that of the mammiferous quadruped; and that the dynasty of the mammiferous quadruped was succeeded by that of man, as man now exists—a creature of mixed character, and subject, in all conditions, to wide alternations of enjoyment and suffering. We know, further, so far at least as we have yet succeeded in deciphering the record, that the several dynasties were introduced, not in their lower, but in their higher forms; that, in short, in the imposing programme of creation it was arranged, as a general rule, that in each of the great divisions of the procession the magnates should walk first. We recognize yet further the fact of degradation specially exemplified in the fish and the reptile. And then, passing on to the revealed record, we learn that the dynasty of man, in the mixed state and character is not the final one, but that there is to be yet another creation, or, more properly, *re-creation*, known theologically as the Resurrection, which shall be connected in its physical components, by bonds of mysterious paternity, with the dynasty which now reigns, and be bound to it mentally by the chain of identity, conscious and actual; but which, in all that constitutes superiority, shall be as vastly its superior as the dynasty of responsible man is superior to even the lowest of the preliminary dynasties. We are further taught, that at the commencement of this last of the dynasties, there will be a re-creation of not only elevated, but also of degraded beings—a re-creation of the *lost*. We are taught yet further, that though the present dynasty be that of a lapsed race, which at their first introduction were placed on higher ground than that on which they now stand, and sank by their own act, it was yet part of the original design, from the beginning of all things, that they should occupy the existing plat-

form; and that redemption is thus no after-thought, rendered necessary by the fall, but, on the contrary, part of a general scheme, for which provision had been made from the beginning; so that the Divine man, through whom the work of restoration has been effected, was in reality in reference to the purposes of the Eternal, what he is designated in the remarkable text, '*the Lamb slain from the foundations of the world.*' "

This new and striking view of the subject is a bold and ingenious hypothesis, which must lead to important results, by causing a more profound examination of palæontological phenomena, on the great principle of the conditions of existence, in their relation to what Mr. Miller terms "the chronology of organized existence." His speculations may be false; but the facts of retrogradation, on which they are founded, are incontrovertible. The reasons assigned, why the four classes of vertebrate animals came on the stage of action at certain periods, and in ascending series,—fish, reptiles, birds, mammals, man, some being degraded and others elevated—may be set aside by future investigations. The facts, however, already known, form unquestionably an outline of the chronology of the events of the natural history of the planet; and future discoveries can have no other effect than to elucidate and improve—to add distinctness and connexion to—the stony record. Degradation in some sense, and for some reason, has been proved. This drives the advocates of the theory of development by law from the oldest stratified non-fossiliferous rocks; for if it be true, that the class of fishes most highly organized in the earliest Silurian period, has gradually retrograded in all subsequent geologic ages, we may safely admit that animals existed in the first oceans in which strata were deposited, and that their remains have been obliterated by various causes. Even the advocates of development must admit, that the earliest known fishes were not developed from any of their Silurian contemporaries. And if the first appearance of fishes was indefinitely, not infinitely, remote in past duration—coeval with the first of the long periods of metamorphic deposition, the facts in regard to the retrogradation of the class lead irresistibly to the conclusion, that their remains, should we procure any, would prove them to have been more elevated in the scale of being than those whose re-

mains have been found. Just as the secondary rise in rank above the tertiary fishes, the Devonian above the secondary, and the Silurian above the Devonian, so would those of the oldest rocks take precedence of all in organization.

The facts to which our attention has been directed have another important bearing. They force on the philosophic mind the conviction, that geologists have nearly or quite ascertained the era in past time, when organic existence began. The four orders of fishes appeared in a succession corresponding nearly to the appearance of the four classes of the vertebrata. The Silurian period, during which Placoid fishes alone seem to have existed, must have been immeasurably protracted. It must have been quite as long as that which intervened between the first Ganoid and the first Ctenoid fish; between the first fish and the first reptile, the first reptile and the first bird, the bird and the mammal, the mammal and the creation of Adam. These and numerous other facts in geology, induce us to infer that geologists have nearly or quite reached the terminus—the dawn—of organic existence.

Columbia, S. C.

R. T. B.

ARTICLE VI.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Living or Dead? A series of home truths.* By the Rev. J. C. RYLE, B. A., Rector of Helmingham, Suffolk. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1851. pp. 360, 12mo.

Under the following titles, "Living or Dead," "Consider your Ways," "Are you Forgiven?" "Are you Holy?" "Only one Way," "Christ and the two Thieves," "Faith's Choice," and "Remember Lot," the writer has addressed his readers, in the most faithful and pointed manner, respecting their eternal interests. From

the directness and earnestness of his appeal there is no escape. His style is extremely simple and lively, and if not always dignified and stately, is generally effective. The sentences are brief, the periodic style of Johnson and the rich periphrasis of Chalmers being alike the author's abhorrence. But he uses the short dagger, in close engagement with the sinner's heart, with great effect. Our young preachers may take a lesson from this writer, in that directness which contributes so much to success in the ministry. We know nothing of the man—but this is plain, his aim is to save men's souls, "plucking them out of the fire."

2. *The Life and Times of John Calvin, the great Reformer.* Translated from the German of PAUL HENRY, D. D., Minister and Seminary Inspector in Berlin. By HENRY STEBBING, D. D., F. R. S. Vol. the 2d. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1851. pp. 454, 8vo.

We chronicle the completion of the American edition of this important work. Our estimate of it has been expressed in a preceding number. Every one who wishes to obtain a complete view of the life, labours, and character, of the great reformer, will resort to the pages of this able biographer. No one can read them without having a far more exalted view of the intellectual activity and vigour, the immense labours, the exhaustless power of endurance, the private virtues, and the public influence of that wonderful man, who was raised up to complete what Luther and Zuingli had so nobly begun. This volume gives an account of the closing scenes of his toilsome life. It is affecting to see him laboring on in the midst of pain and weakness to the very last. His commentary on Joshua he finished while dying. So tender was his conscience, that he would no longer receive his scanty stipend when he became unable to perform the duties of his office; and yet in his last will he has but 225 dollars to dispose

of. His final interview with the Syndics and Council of Geneva, and his parting with the ministers of the Genevese territory, are full of unaffected dignity and tenderness.

3. *The Typology of Scripture.* By Rev. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, Salton. Edinburgh: 1847. Philadelphia: Daniels & Smith, 1851. 2 vols., 12mo.

This is a well considered and able work on the difficult subject of types and typical interpretation. It takes a middle ground between the school of Cocceus, Glass, Witsius, Vitringa, Mather, Guild, and the school of Marsh, Vanmildert, Chevalier, Horne and Stuart. The author has been thorough in his researches; has gleaned on every side, making himself acquainted with the best works of the Germans, and with all which has appeared on the subject in our English literature. The learning and evangelical tone of these volumes will commend them to the favorable opinion of those who may differ in some of the many particulars on which he has expressed his opinion, from the conclusions to which the author has come.

4. *A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus, expository and practical, with critical notes.* By the Rev. ANDREW A. BONAR, Collace. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1851. pp. 513, 8vo.

The Rev. Mr. Bonar is the author of several valuable productions, among which are the *Memoirs of McCheyne*; *Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jews*, and other smaller volumes. He here ventures into the department of commentary. The reader will not expect it to be of the close exegetical character which

the critical scholar seeks for. The tastes of the author are practical rather than scholastic. And he follows on in the spirit of Romaine and Berridge, as disclosed in those brief descriptions of the book of Leviticus, which they give—when one calls it “The Gospel according to Leviticus,” and the other says “It is the clearest book of the Jewish Gospel.” The book before us is an explanation of the types and ceremonies of the ancient covenant, revealing what the author judges to be the spiritual import of each part of the ritual service. There is much room here for conjecture, and for imagination to run riot. But all will no doubt be thankful for any attempt, wisely conducted, to find “marrow and fatness” in what to most are the dry and uninteresting services of the Mosaic ritual. We need to have a more intelligent view of the tabernacle and its service, which was ordered by Moses according to the pattern shown him in the Mount, and through which the gospel was preached to those who lived under the covenant of Sinai. The book of Leviticus, like the rest of Scripture, was “given by inspiration of God;” and here is an attempt to show that it “is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.”

5. *Memoir of the Rev. W. H. Hewitson, late Minister of the Free Church of Scotland, at Dirleton. By the Rev. JOHN BAILLIE, Linlithgow. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1851. 12mo., pp. 374.*

This is one of the comparatively few biographies which should have been written, and which being written, the Church will not willingly let die. It is a portraiture of one of those characters which are elevated far enough above us to incite to the imitation of which they are worthy, but not too far to be beyond our sympathies—felt to be real, yet approximating the ideal. The subject of it was truly great, if not in the eyes of man, at least in the

sight of God. Talents of a superior order; attainments far above mediocrity; the intense enthusiasm of true scholarship, stamp it with a high intellectuality, which, coupled as it is with high spirituality, peculiarly adapts it to the large class of educated young men, in whom true piety takes a peculiar type from their mental training.

As a record of religious experience, it is characterized by a spiritual analysis uncommonly searching and discriminating, such as to a reflecting mind invests the memoirs of Halyburton, Chalmers, and others, with their peculiar charm. In Mr. Hewitson, as depicted in his own letters by his biographer, we discern much of the decision, enthusiasm and devotion of Chalmers; the self-abasement of Martyn; the tranquil energy of Payson; the heavenliness and passionate love to Christ of his friend and contemporary Robert McCheyne. As an illustration of christian experience, we should say that the special inference deducible from it is the exact correspondence between the objective truth and the subjective experience of its power; and in particular, free justification, (of which Mr. H. had an unusually full appreciation,) as the spring of sanctification. As an exemplification of ministerial character, it must leave on the reader's mind a strong impression of the necessity and almost magical power of high-toned piety in the ministry, and a clear conception of the way to attain it—a life by faith in the Son of God—Christ in the creed, the heart, and the life. As a Premillenarian, he is a favorable illustration of the spiritual tendency of a tenet now so current among our Scottish brethren.

No less interesting is the public history of his bright but brief career—run, like that of many sainted ones before him, through a protracted and progressive decay of the vital powers, but terminating in peaceful triumph. Whilst still a Probationer, though in the retirement of an invalid, he watched and sympathized with the Free Church movement, and was “anxious to make known his adherence to the ‘Protest,’ by adding his name to the 200 Probationers already enrolled.

Having been sent in 1844, as a Missionary, to Madeira, he arrived just in time to water the seed so successfully sown by Dr.

Kalley, and reap abundantly of the harvest. The great work itself, which led to the fiery trials of their faith, inflicted by jealous Antichrist, is "here exhibited in its inner history for the first time." The record of his labors among them is full of interest, as touching both him and them.

He closed a life full of happiness and usefulness in Dirleton Kirk, at the early age of 38.

The author's part is, for the most part, well performed. His style is sprightly and fresh—adorned here and there with gems of thought not the less apt for being borrowed, and but seldom marred with such barbarisms as "wilderness sojourn," (p. 15,) "God-implanted," (p. 19,) "God-alienated," (p. 22,) and "reformation worthies."

On the whole, we have read this memoir with a deep and sustained interest, and risen from its perusal refreshed, instructed, stimulated. We therefore cordially recommend it to all who love the image of Jesus, and especially to our rising ministry, as worthy of a place on the shelf, and in the heart, beside the cherished memoirs of Martyn and Brainerd, Payson and McCheyne.

-
6. *Earnest Words to Young Men, in a series of Discourses* by E. P. ROGERS, *Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Augusta, Ga.* Charleston: Walker & James. 1851. pp. 288, 12mo.

We do not doubt that the staple of a preacher's instructions should consist of the great doctrines of salvation through Christ, the disease and the remedy of sin, the guilt and the misery of man, and his redemption from it. And if, in each discourse, he follows the shaping of truth which his text presents, and has his sermons penetrated with its very spirit, he need not fear that his ministrations will lack variety or interest. He need not preach upon "vaccination," "the beauties of a New England autumn, and the charms of its Indian summer," "the system of militia musters," nor on the question "whether Abel was slain with a club,

and with what species of wood?" in order to secure the interest of novelty to his pulpit performances. The old truths of the gospel are ever new. But it is right for him to vary his performances, addressing them to the different classes of which his congregation is composed, and warning them against the vices which especially assail them. And of no class of persons are the temptations greater than of the young men, whose residence is cast in the towns and villages of the South. Mr. Rogers has spoken to such in the language of affectionate admonition and remonstrance. With a graphic pen he has described the sins of Intemperance, Profaneness, Sabbath-Breaking, Gambling, Infidelity, Idleness, and the wages of death with which they reward their votaries. There are *hopeful* youth in all our towns who may have sat for this picture or that, found in these pages. And though in the effort to paint to the life there are some expressions hardly rising to the dignity of the pulpit, the language of the preacher is often beautiful, and sometimes eloquent. We hope his book will have a wide circulation, and be exceedingly useful among that class of persons for whom it was especially designed.

7. *The Dead of the Synod of Alabama: A discourse by* ROBERT NALL, *Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Mobile. With an Appendix. Published by order of the Synod. Mobile: 1851. pp. 52.*
8. *Man his brother's Keeper: An Address delivered in the Chapel of the Presbyterian Female Institute, at Talladega, Alabama, at the close of the Annual Examination, August 22d, 1851, by* REV. SAMUEL K. TALMAGE, D. D., *President of Oglethorpe University, Ga. Published by request of the Board of Directors. Philadelphia: 1851.*
9. *The responsibilities of American Youth! An Address delivered at Orrville Institute, June 26, 1851, by* REV. W. T. HAMILTON, D. D., *of Mobile, Alabama. Mobile: 1851.*

The discourse of Mr. Nall, "The Dead of the Synod of Alabama," has a historic value which very few documents possess. After a brief statement of the formation of the first Presbytery of Alabama, by the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, in 1821, it proceeds to commemorate the lives, labours, and death of twenty-four ministers of the Synod of Alabama, who lie buried beneath her soil, beginning with the venerable Andrew Brown, who died in 1823, and ending with Rev. Junius B. King and Richard B. Cater, D. D., in 1850. The reverend author of the Address must have enjoyed singular facilities and have used great diligence to have rendered it so complete. It is an affectionate and pious tribute to the memory of those brethren and fathers in the ministry who have gone before to their reward, by those of this generation who have been their cotemporaries, or have entered into their labours. Had such discourses been prepared and delivered once in thirty years in our older Synods, the history of the Church from the beginning would have been effectually preserved. It must have been salutary and instructive to the hearers of this discourse to have brought before them, in solemn procession, those of their fellow servants and brethren, the prophets, who have entered into rest.

"Man his brother's Keeper." Characterised by the author's usual appropriateness and good sense, and shewing the influence of man over man; illustrated especially in the case of the magistrate, the legislator, the parent, the teacher, the man of wealth, the man of genius and learning, the Christian and the Christian Church, and woman—especially in her relation as mother.

"The Responsibilities of American Youth." We extract from this Address the following declarations of Mons. D. M. J. Henri, in his work entitled "L'Egypt Pharaonique."

"The cosmogony of Moses, simple, clear and natural, is evidently the result of learned research. The author of this system respecting the origin of the earth and the heavens, must necessarily have devoted himself to profound meditations on the history of the globe: and it is certain that *geology must in his days have reached an extraordinary point of perfection.*" [L'Egypt Pharaonique, vol. 1, p. 143-144]

Again this author remarks:

"No mortal man assisted at the work of the Creator; no human eye, then, could have penetrated the mystery, and reported to us that which took place at the grand epoch of the origin of the world. *And yet Moses recounts all that the hand of God wrought to form the Universe; and what Moses relates, exhibits an exactitude and an accuracy so complete, that the progress which the sciences have made in our days, lends the support of their irresistible testimony to each one of his narrations.* Since, then, what these ancient writings teach us, is precisely that which science, as it now is, demonstrates to be true, how did Moses learn all this?" [p. 145-146.]

Our learned French author does not believe in the *inspiration* of Moses; although he maintains that Moses was one of the most profoundly learned men that ever lived. He thus continues his argument:

"Since, then, no person could have assisted at the creation as a witness and historiographer, and since God did not reveal these several steps and acts of the creating process,—it is inevitable that the grand secret of these operations must have been discovered (*surpris*) by the meditations of man. The inevitable consequence flowing from such a fact is, that *the science of geology must have been cultivated with the greatest success by those who could, from an acquaintance with the phenomena of nature, construct the entire system of cosmogony, in its admirable perfection and accuracy, as given in the writings of Moses.*" [Vol. 1, p. —.]

"Mark well, young gentlemen," says Dr. Hamilton, "this learned writer admits, and indeed he very conclusively proves, the perfect accuracy of the history of creation, given in Genesis, as judged by the rigid rules of science now. He rejects the idea that Moses was inspired; he ascribes the science of Moses to the instructions given him by the priests in Egypt; for it is recorded, '*Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians!*'"

To account for this wonderful knowledge at that early period, he is compelled to resort to the bold hypothesis that the Egyptians were an antediluvian race, who, in settling in Egypt after it had been left free from the waters of the deluge, brought with them an amount of scientific knowledge, not even yet surpassed—hardly again equalled—and this their knowledge was the result of geological research, and mathematical calculations, and astronomical observations, and chemical experiments and discoveries, that had been going on for ages upon ages among men who lived before the flood. And to this wild hypothesis this learned writer is driven, because he will not admit that *Moses was inspired of God!*—and because he takes for granted what each one of you can see is not necessarily true, nay, cannot possibly be true, viz.: that because Moses had got all the learning which the Egyptians could teach him, therefore he had obtained knowledge from no other source! Because Moses knew all that the Egyptian priests could teach, therefore those priests knew every thing that Moses knew and taught. To illustrate this point: suppose that Sir Isaac Newton was taught his letters, and taught to read lessons in English, by some kind-hearted dame, in a village school. Then Newton was learned in all the knowledge of that good dame. That is true! But certainly it does not follow, that all the learning and the science embodied in Newton's great work, *the Principia*, were obtained by Newton solely from this good Madam! I think, young gentlemen, you will agree with me, that as Newton's works show he had means, by his genius and industrious study, or exploring depths of wisdom, of which his first dame teacher never dreamed—so, also, the sublime truths and wonderful doctrines, found in the books of

Moses, compared with all that ancient history and the modern interpretation of the hieroglyphics of Egypt discover to us of their boasted wisdom, show conclusively, that of such wisdom as the books of Moses abound in, his early teachers, the Egyptian priests, had no more conception than Newton's dame instructor, in his days of A, B, C, had a knowledge of the profound science exhibited in his Principia. And, therefore, the only rational and admissible solution of the difficulty is,—Moses wrote on those obscure matters in a manner simple, clear, truthful, and consistent with the highest achievements of science, because he was guided and directed in his writing by that glorious mind that planned the universe, and originated all science."

The attention paid by Dr. Hamilton to the modern skeptical objections to the Scriptures, as exhibited in various of his recent writings, entitle him to the thanks of the Christian Church. The present Address is eminently healthful in its tone, and well adapted to the occasion which drew it forth.

10. *The necessity of continued self education. An Address to the Graduating Class of S. C. College, at Commencement, on the first of December, MDCCCLI. By FRANCIS LIEBER, of the French Institute. Printed by order of the Governor. Columbia, S. C.: Steam-Power Press of A. S. Johnston. 1851.*

Among the many addresses to graduating students it has been our fortune to read, this appears to us one of marked excellence. And this not so much from any profound reasonings or elaborate eloquence displayed in it—for this would not be expected in an almost extemporaneous effort—as for its simplicity and truthfulness, and because its very diction marks it as coming from a full and overflowing mind. The slight transfusion of foreign idiom, too, into our vernacular English, a pouring again out of the old Saxon urn into our Normanized and Latinized style, is not devoid of force and beauty. May the young men to whom it was addressed long remember that jewel from the old casket, "Take fast hold of instruction, keep her, let her not go, for she is thy life."

11. *Smithsonian Reports. Notices of Public Libraries in the United States of America. By CHARLES C. JEWITT, Librarian of the Smithsonian Institute. Printed by order of Congress. Washington. D. C.: 1851. pp. 207.*

This is to us an interesting pamphlet, as giving us full information of the Libraries of our country. From it we learn that there are 3,753,964 volumes in the public libraries of the United States. One of the largest of these, the library of Congress, to the great regret, no doubt, of our whole people, has recently been two-thirds destroyed by fire. This is the second time it has suffered. In its beginnings, in 1814, it was destroyed by the British army, who signalized their visit to the Capitol, like Omar the Caliph, by this war upon literature. The preservation of books is one of the points in which we have felt an interest. We find but three references to the subject in the several reports presented in these pages. "In answer to the question, Have the books been injured at any time by insects?" Mr. Herrick, Librarian of Yale College, remarks: "The *Lepisma saccharina* is common—brought in, probably, by old books. I cannot discern that it eats much. In my own library at home, two books have been injured by some boring beetle or its larva, (probably a species of *arnobium*,) so that I cannot doubt that books in our public libraries need examination once a year, at least, with reference to this matter." The Librarian of the Apprentices's Library in Charleston, Wm. Estell, says, "The old books, and those not often consulted, unless bound with Russia leather, are apt to be injured by insects. They may be saved by taking them out every week or two, and striking the backs together; also by clippings of Russia leather scattered about on the shelves." The following quotation appears from the report of the Librarian of the Theological Seminary in this town: "The books have been much injured by a small shiny moth, (qu. The *Lepisma saccharina* of Mr. Herrick, and of Cuvier, iii. 256?) which eats off the pasted titles of cloth-bound books, and sometimes by a blackish worm of the caterpillar kind, the product of a brown miller or moth, which eats leather binding. It is found that in this climate except in the driest situations, and occasionally even in these, leather-bound books suffer much from mould—English leather-bound books less than American, and French, perhaps, less than English. One gentleman amongst us has suffered so much from this cause, that he will only have books bound in cloth; and these, if the letters are stamped on the back, without

being on a title which is pasted, are injured less by mould and insects than any other." We have quoted the preceding because we have been anxious to direct the attention of naturalists to these pests of our libraries, especially in these Southern latitudes, that the means of preventing their ravages may be discovered.

12. *Minutes of the Presbytery of Harmony.* Charleston, S. C.: 1851.

13. *Minutes of the Presbytery of South Carolina. Fall Session.* Anderson, S. C.: 1851.

We are glad to see the minutes of our Presbyteries printed and circulated among our Churches. This is as it should be; and in the increased energy and intelligence of the Churches, the slight expense thus incurred is abundantly repaid. We had intended to make large extracts from the Pastoral letter of the Presbytery of South Carolina appended to its minutes, which proceeded from the pen of one of our intelligent elders, but our limits forbid. Happy those churches and Presbyteries blest with an intelligent and working eldership, who, on many points, can speak with even more authority than the ministers themselves.

14. *Guicciardini and the Popes. An Address delivered before the Adelpbian Society of the Furman Institute, at the Commencement, on Monday, June 16, 1851.* Greenville, S. C.: 1851.

15. *The Claims of Science. An Address delivered before the Euphemian and Philomathean Societies of Erskine College, S. C. By WILLIAM C. RICHARDS, A. M.* Charleston, S. C., 1851.

16. *Inaugural Address of Rev. E. F. ROCKWELL, Professor of Natural Science, before the Board of Trustees of Davidson College, N. C., August 13, 1851. Salisbury, N. C.*

17. *Hints on Female Education. By ELIAS MARKS, M. D., of Barhamville, S. C. Columbia, S. C., 1851.*

Professor Furman shows the base corruption of the Papacy before and at the Reformation, by the impartial testimony of Guicciardini, the prince of Italian Historians. On the pages of this faithful son of the Church of Rome, the mother of harlots, the corruption, avarice, lust, debauchery and poisonings of the Pontiffs of that day stand confessed. By the admissions of the Italian, the measures taken by Luther for the reformation of the Church, were in part justified by the infamous lives of Alexander VI. and Cæsar Borgia, his son, who prepared the poison by which his father, taking by mistake the chalice designed for another, met his fate, and by the prodigality, unscrupulousness and irreligion of Leo the Xth.

The pamphlets lying on our table, consisting chiefly of Addresses delivered before various educational institutions, are very numerous. We cannot notice all of them with particularity. They show the increasing interest with which the education of our youth is regarded. Mr. Richards is enamoured with the beauty and utility of physical science. Professor Rockwell has in his interesting discourse gone over the same subject in a more simple, but an engaging style, yet not without some marks of haste in the composition of his address. There is promise in these few pages, of a successful career in the new office upon which he has entered. The importance of natural science in the circle of college studies, and its value to those destined to the several professions, every day more and more demonstrates.

Dr. Marks's "Hints on Female Education," is from the pen of one of our most veteran and most successful teachers—one who counts his pupils by thousands, and finds them presiding in the families of every State of the South. The views he has ex-

pressed on female education are eminently just, and are less the deductions of mere theory than the result of extensive observation and long practice.

18. *A Commentary on Ecclesiastes.* By MOSES STUART, lately Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass. New York: George P. Putnam. 1851.

This book of Professor Stuart's should have been noticed in our last issue. It is an acceptable help to the Biblical scholar, in understanding a portion of the Scripture, many expressions in which "are hard to be understood." It is the most critical commentary on Ecclesiastes in our English literature, and it is well known that its author has had access for long years to all that has been written on it by others. His long experience in exegetical labours will give it authority; and yet, there are portions on which, did our space allow, we would be free to differ from him. He ascribes the authorship of the book to a later writer than Solomon, and would on the whole assign its composition to the period between the first return of the Jews from exile (535 B. C.) and the time of Ezra, about 83 years afterwards. We have never thought the arguments, for the comparatively late composition of the book, unanswerable; and notwithstanding the difference of style between it and the book of Proverbs, and the Aramæisms it contains, still think it could have been written by Solomon. It has always been to us one of the most interesting books of the Old Testament scriptures, and viewing it as written by Solomon in his old age, we have regarded it as the main proof we enjoy, that he sincerely repented of the sins and follies of his earlier days.

19. *The Royal Preacher. Lectures on Ecclesiastes.* By JAMES HAMILTON, D. D., F. L. S., Author of "*Life in Earnest*," &c. pp. 353, 12mo. Robert Carter & Brothers, New York. 1851.

The key by which Dr. Hamilton interprets the book of Ecclesiastes, is to consider it "a monologue, in which Solomon stands before us, by turns, the man of science and the man of pleasure, the fatalist, the materialist, the skeptic, the epicurean, and the stoic." He describes it as "a dramatic biography, in which Solomon not only records, but re-enacts the successive scenes of his search after happiness—a descriptive memoir, in which he not only recites his past experience, but in his improvising fervor becomes the various phases of his former self once more."

Having furnished this key, the author does not apply it to the exegetical interpretation of Ecclesiastes, but, in a series of lectures, sketches the scenes of Solomon's varied history. His own book may be described in the language which he applies to that of the Inspired Preacher: it is a succession of *tableaux*, in which the characters and experience of Solomon are vividly presented. This will appear from the quaint titles prefixed to the lectures: "The Vestibule of Vanity," "The Museum," "The Clock of Destiny," "Borrowed Lights for a dark Landing-Place," "Dead Flies," "Blunt Axes," and the like.

We cannot say that we admire the book. It does not quite satisfy us to have a book of so much difficulty as Ecclesiastes expounded in a sentence or two, without an effort to apply the clue of interpretation, which is thus briefly stated. But this may be pardoned in a book which is designed to be popular, rather than critical. Yet the style of this book offends us on every page. In the effort to attain piquancy and vivacity of style, the author's metaphors pant like so many hounds after a long chase; and his tropes run into allegories. We like to walk with a friend who has a brisk step, and a lively, cheerful face—but not with one who, in the exuberance of his gaiety, is eternally piroetting like a dancing dervish. It is an offence against taste, to say the least, when a writer's thoughts are smothered by his style.

-
20. *Daily Bible Illustrations*: By JOHN KITTO, D. D., F. S. A. *Solomon and the Kings*. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1851.

This volume completes the Illustrations founded upon the Historical Books of the Old Testament. The interest of the series is kept up to the end. The author proposes, with the Divine blessing, a second series of four volumes, on Job and the Poetical Books, Isaiah and the Prophets, The Life and death of our Lord, The Apostles and the Early Church.

21. *Geology of the Bass Rock.* By HUGH MILLER. *With its civil and ecclesiastic history, and notices of some of its martyrs, by Dr. McCrie and others.* New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1851.

The Bass Rock stands in the mouth of the Frith of Forth, about a mile and a half from the shore, and rises to the height of 420 feet above the level of the sea. It has on it the remains of an ancient chapel, which is associated with the early introduction of Christianity into Scotland, and there are historical recollections of it as a religious spot which ascend to the beginning of the seventh century. It was early fortified as a stronghold, and mention is made of it as such early in the fifteenth century. It was the prison-house of Fraser, Blackadder, Peden, Dickson, Gillespie, Ross, Hog, and others who suffered for their adhesion to the Covenant when the Protestant Church of England became the cruel persecutor of the Protestant Church of Scotland. The able and popular writers whose contributions make up the present volume are too well known to need any recommendation of ours.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER IV.

APRIL, 1852.

ARTICLE I. *Rev. L. M. Green*

THE HARMONY OF REVELATION AND NATURAL SCIENCE.

NUMBER III.

THE FINAL CONFLAGRATION.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 315.]

It is a remarkable fact, that wherever the assaults of infidelity have been most confident and most contemptuous, with the loudest flourish of trumpets, and the boldest tones of defiance, *there* the progress of scientific enquiry has most completely unmasked her pretensions. and confirmed the credibility of the Sacred Scriptures. Especially is this true, in regard to that permanent topic of Infidel derision,

"THE FINAL CONFLAGRATION."

Whatever may be our theory of the earth's "Internal Heat," whether we believe in a great ocean of central fire, increasing, as we descend, to an intensity of heat far surpassing that of melted iron, with Sir W. Herschell, and all the bolder theorists; or attribute all the phenomena, with Lyell and Sir Humphrey Davy, to the influence of chemical agencies, to the combination and decomposition of various elements, beneath the constant play of

subterranean currents of electricity, the earth being as one vast voltaic pile; whether we consider Geology and Astronomy as complementary parts of one great comprehensive science, founded upon wide cosmical relations; and observe the numerous analogies between our own sun and planet, and the other central suns and planetary worlds around us, with the modern followers of La Place and Herschell; or, with Mr. Lyell, divorce these cognate sciences, and eschewing these wider analogies, build up Geology upon the basis of its own independent and separate phenomena; *on any theory, and with any process of investigation, the facts remain the same*; and the conclusion, not the result of doubtful disputation, but of scientific and almost irresistible deduction, is openly proclaimed by every competent authority, and Mr. Lyell with the rest: *that the termination of our present system, by a terrific conflagration, is an extremely probable—according to Mr. Lyell—AN INEVITABLE CATASTROPHE.* The facts on which this conclusion has been based, are so numerous—so various in their character—and derived from quarters so different and remote, that it would be impossible to enumerate them all within the limits assigned to this whole discussion. They are derived from mines, from artesian wells, from earthquakes and volcanoes, from hot springs,—from the elevation of mountain ranges—the overflow of igneous rocks, covering vast regions of the earth; and taking a wider range, look to the condition of other worlds, to the moon, the sun, the planetary globes, the comets, and the fixed stars.

We must confine ourselves to the statement of results generally admitted.

“The observation made by Arago in 1821, that the *deepest artesian wells are the warmest*, threw great light,” says Humboldt, “on the origin of Thermal Springs—and *on the establishment of the law, that terrestrial heat increases with increasing depth.*”

A vast variety of experiments have since been made, with the greatest precision, by distinguished philosophers, in the mines of various regions of the globe: in France, England, Switzerland, Peru, Saxony and Mexico; and with the same general result. The average ratio of in-

crease as you descend from the surface to the centre, is (over all measured distances) about 1° fahrenheit, to 44 or 54 feet.

"If this increase can be reduced to arithmetical relations, it will follow that a stratum of granite would be in a state of fusion at a depth of nearly twenty-one geographical miles; or between four and five times the elevation of the Himalaya Mountains," "and the water from the Hot Springs between Porto Cabello and Nueva Valencia, at 205.5° of temperature, would issue from a source 7140 feet, or above two miles in depth."—(*Cos. vol 1, pp. 174, 221.*)

"Observations have been made," says Mr. Lyell, "not only on the temperature of the air in mines, but on that of the rocks, and on the water issuing from them. The mean rate of increase, calculated from the results obtained from six of the deepest coal mines in Durham and Northumberland, is 1° fahrenheit, for a descent of forty four English feet." "M. Cordier announces, as the result of his experiments and observations on the temperature of the interior of the earth, *that the heat increases rapidly with the depth.* He is of opinion that the increase would not be overstated at 1° cent. for every twenty-five metres; or about 1° fahr. for every forty-five feet." "If we adopt M. Cordier's estimate of 1° fahr. for every forty-five feet of depth as the mean result, and assume that the increasing temperature is continued downwards, we should reach the ordinary boiling point of water at about two miles below the surface, and at the depth of about 24 miles should arrive at the melting point of iron—a heat sufficient to fuse almost every known substance."—(*Principles, vol. 2, pp. 433-45.*)

This calculation proceeds upon the supposition of a progressive increase of heat in the unobserved depths of the earth; a theory adopted by the great majority of modern philosophers.

But this internal heat, FROM WHATEVER SOURCE DERIVED, reaches to vast unfathomable depths, and is of universal extent, far beneath the outer surface of our globe. TO THIS, HOWEVER GENERATED, are attributed all the great changes in the condition of the earth; those huge mountain ranges, the Alps, the Appenines, the Pyrenees, the Himalaya, the Ural, the Allegheny and the Andes; those thermal springs of unvarying temperature which burst from the ground in every climate and on every continent; those igneous rocks, once in a state of

manifest fusion, which underlie all our more superficial strata, and burst upward from the depths below, deluging whole regions many hundred thousand square miles in extent, till the earth is covered "many hundred feet in depth" beneath the fiery inundation, and its whole "surface roughened and mottled by these plutonic masses, as thickly as the skin of the Leopard by its spots."—(*F. Prints.* 312.)

The magnificent extent and terrific energy of this internal power—if not infinite, at any rate absolutely immeasurable and irresistible—is manifested in those mountain ranges of 4000 miles in extent, (as the Andes,) where a solitary giant Cotopaxi lifts his head 19000 feet above the level of the ocean; the flames from his crater rising full half a mile above his summit, and the scoria and huge rocks thrown out by his explosions, and scattered over many leagues around, "WOULD FORM, WERE THEY HEAPED TOGETHER, A COLOSSAL MOUNTAIN." (*"Humboldt's Researches, vol. 1, pp. 115, 125."*) It will assist us to form some approximate conceptions of the illimitable energy employed in these stupendous upheavals, to contemplate a slight elevation over a comparatively limited area, which has been reduced by Mr. Lyell, within the compass of human calculation. In the year 1822, an extent of country in Chili, equal, perhaps, to one hundred thousand square miles, was elevated by a single earthquake *three feet*—(not 19000)—on an average; and Mr. Lyell gives us, in the following words, the result of his calculations:

"The whole thickness of rock, between the subterranean foci of volcanic action and the surface of Chili, MAY BE MANY MILES OR LEAGUES DEEP. Say that the thickness was *only two miles*, even then the mass which changed place and rose three feet, being 200,000 cubic miles in volume, *must have exceeded in weight 363 MILLION PYRAMIDS*."—(*Vol. 2, pp. 305-6.*)

He adds immediately,

"It would require seventeen centuries and a half before the river Ganges could bear down from the continent into the sea a mass equal to that gained by the Chilian earthquake." A pyramid presents some definite object to our conception. Three hundred and sixty three million, are but one million daily for a year. When, however, we begin to calculate the mass thrown

out in only two of those overflows of igneous trap—those, namely, in Hindoostan and Southern Africa, covering an area, double in extent, and on an average 200 feet in thickness; our pyramids are multiplied by 145,200,000,000—and arithmetical numbers become the vague symbols of a power which transcends imagination. But when we attempt to calculate the amount of force necessary to heave up those mountain masses, varying from 3000 to 25,000 feet in height, and stretching over several thousand miles in extent; when we seek to pile Vesuvius upon Etna, and Etna upon Atlas, and Atlas upon Cotopaxi, and this upon Chimborazo, and Chimborazo on the loftiest of the Himalaya, we are lost amidst magnitudes, which arithmetic indeed might calculate and language might imperfectly express, but the human mind is totally unable to comprehend.

What shall we say of those earthquakes which not merely shake the largest mountains to their base, and engulph whole cities with their myriad inhabitants, but rock the solid globe from continent to continent, and heave the deep ocean from its bed; as that of Lisbon in 1755, which was felt from Lapland to Martinique in the West Indies, and from Greenland, across the continent to Africa, while the sea rose from 15 to 60 feet on different coasts, and the land rose and fell in rapid undulations, as if tossed by the billows of an agitated ocean.—(*Lyell, vol. 2, pp. 266-8.*)

In the second volume of “*The Principles*,” commencing with the 254th page, we have the record of a terrific eruption of lava from Skaptar Jokul, one of the volcanoes of Iceland.

“On the 11th of June, 1783, Skaptar Jokul threw out a torrent of lava, which flowed down into the river Skapta, and completely dried it up. The channel of the river was between high rocks, in many places, from four hundred to six hundred feet in depth, and near two hundred in breadth. Not only did the lava fill up this great defile to the brink, but it overflowed the adjacent fields to a considerable extent. The burning flood, on issuing from the confined rocky gorge, was then arrested for some time by a deep lake, which formerly existed in the course of the river—which it ENTIRELY FILLED.” On the 18th of June, another ejection of liquid lava rushed from the volcano which flowed down with amazing velocity over the surface of the first stream. By the damming up of some of the tributaries of the Skapta, many villages were completely overflowed with water. The lava after flowing for several days, was precipitated down a tremendous cataract called Stepafoss, where it filled a profound abyss, which that great waterfall had been hollowing out for

ages; and after this the fiery current again continued its course. On the third of August, fresh floods of lava still pouring from the volcano, a new branch was sent off in a different direction, for the channel of the Skaptar was now so entirely filled up, and every opening to the west and north so obstructed, that the melted matter was forced to take a new course, so that it ran in a southeast direction, and discharged itself into the bed of the river Hverfisflot, where a scene of destruction, scarcely inferior to the former, was occasioned. These Icelandic lavas are stated by Stephenson to have accumulated to a prodigious depth in narrow rocky gorges; but when they came to wide alluvial plains, they spread themselves into broad burning lakes, sometimes from 12 to 15 miles wide, and one hundred feet deep. When the "fiery lake" which filled up the lowest portion of the valley of the Skapta, had been augmented by new supplies, the lava flowed up the course of the river to the foot of the hills from which the Skapta takes its rise. More than twenty villages were destroyed, besides those inundated by water, and more than nine thousand human beings perished, together with an immense number of cattle. But the extraordinary volume of melted matter produced in this eruption, deserves the particular attention of the Geologist. Of the two branches which flowed in nearly opposite directions, the greatest was fifty, and the lesser was forty miles in length. The extreme breadth which the Skapta branch attained in the low countries, was from twelve to fifteen miles, that of the other about seven. The ordinary height of both currents, was one hundred feet; but in narrower defiles, it sometimes amounted to six hundred." (P. 254-5-6.)

It has been calculated that this mass of lava would have covered an area of 1800 square miles, to the depth of 150 feet, and seven thousand square miles, to a depth of near 40 feet, producing, of course, a corresponding vacancy beneath the surface. Two thousand of these eruptions occur, as Mr. L. supposes, during each century, and in view of these and other equally important facts, he announces the deliberate conviction, that

"*Vacuties must also arise from the subtraction of the matter poured out by volcanoes, and from the contraction of argillaceous masses, by subterranean heat; and the foundations having been thus weakened, THE EARTH'S CRUST SHAKEN BY REITERATED CONVULSIONS, MUST IN THE COURSE OF TIME, FALL IN.*" (P. 478.)

Indeed, if that theory be true, which was propounded by Sir Humphrey Davy, and adopted by Mr. Lyell, that

the earth is a great "voltaic pile," carrying on a perpetual process of combination and decomposition, and thus feeding perpetually its own inward fires; and if, as he asserts, the water of the sea resolved into its component elements, oxygen and hydrogen, (P. 454-6); and even the atmospheric air, (P. 460,) rushing in upon the volcanic foci, be the principal sources of their tremendous energy, then, when that great predicted day of conflagration shall arrive, and air and earth and sea shall be on fire, the sublime and terrible catastrophe will be but the result of laws and agencies intensified and variously combined, which are now in operation all around us. "The earth's crust shattered and rent by reiterated concussions, falling in," the atmospheric air, and the waters of the agitated ocean, rushing into the yawning chasm, and feeding the fury of the flames, which they are unable to extinguish; and well may Mr. Lyell exclaim, (vol. 2, 451,) quoting the words, and sharing the wonder of Pliny, "*It is the greatest of all miracles, that a single day should pass WITHOUT AN UNIVERSAL CONFLAGRATION.*"*

Nay, so firm is Mr. Lyell's conviction that all the most fearful elements of revolution, which, from the earliest Geologic ages have rent the earth, or deluged it with fiery ejections, are still existing, and will continue to operate with undiminished energy to the end of time, that he supposes the Geologist who remains unconvinced by his terrible array of convulsions which have occurred even within the memory of man, might stand unterrified and unconvinced amidst the scenes of that final catastrophe itself!

* The words of Mr. Lyell are so remarkable, and so distinctly to our purpose, that the reader will be pleased to find them in the following quotation: "Principles of Geology, vol. 2, p. 451."

"When we consider the combustible nature of the elements of the earth, so far as they are known to us, the facility with which their compounds may be decomposed, and enter into new combinations; the quantity of heat which they evolve during these processes; when we recollect the expansive power of steam, and that water itself is composed of two gases, which, by their union, produce intense heat; when we call to mind the number of explosive and detonating compounds, which have been already discovered; we may be allowed to share the astonishment of Pliny, that a single day should pass without a general conflagration: "*Excedit profecto omnia miracula, ullum diem fuisse, quo non cuncta conflagrarent.*" *Hist. Mundi, Lib. 2, c. 107.*

"Before we leave the consideration of those (catastrophes) already enumerated, let us pause," says he, "for a moment, and reflect how many remarkable facts of geological interest are afforded by the earthquakes above described, THOUGH THEY CONSTITUTE BUT A SMALL PART OF THE CONVULSIONS EVEN OF THE LAST FORTY YEARS." "Yet with a knowledge of these *terrific catastrophes, witnessed during so brief a period by the present generation*, will the Geologist declare with perfect composure, that the earth has at length settled into a state of repose? If in the face of so many striking facts, he persists in maintaining this favourite dogma, it is in vain to hope, that by accumulating the proofs of similar convulsions during a series of antecedent ages, we shall shake his tenacity of purpose."

*"Si fractus illabatur Orbis
Impavidum ferient Ruinæ."*

(*Principles*, vol. 2, p. 319-20.)

Such are the conclusions which we are forced to draw, when we confine our attention to phenomena, visible upon and beneath the surface of our globe. But there is, in our day, a bolder and more comprehensive philosophy, which considers Geology and Astronomy as branches of one great science, and our earth not as an isolated world, but as the member of a vast family of worlds, bound together by one common relationship, and under the control, at every stage of their onward developement, of great cosmical laws; and when we come thus to connect the phenomena of this our globe, with the mysterious change going on, even now, in the universe above us, and the evidence of past revolutions, which the telescope affords, our astonishment, which we had shared before with Pliny, is converted into a loftier and holier emotion, of awed sublimity, and devout and reverential adoration. In the sun, in the moon, in the planets, in the comets, and in the distant stars, are evidences manifold,—and more clear, in proportion as we can better examine them, of mysterious and portentous changes, springing in all human probability, (as their ordinary phenomena indisputably do,) from the same inscrutable forces, which have produced similar revolutions on our earth. The sublimest portion of our modern Astronomy, is that which is devoted to the study and elucidation of these extraordinary phenomena. Here, too, it may be said, as was said before, that whatever may

be the theory, the facts and the legitimate conclusion are the same.

The moon, which, from its near vicinity is best known of all the heavenly bodies, has been daguerreotyped, and the mutual relation of its various regions perhaps more distinctly apprehended, than that of the several portions of our own larger world. It is—on the only side exposed to human observation—an extinct volcano, with its giant mountains, its abrupt precipices, its deep and cavernous abysses, a world in preparation, probably, to be inhabited. (“*Outlines*, 251.”)

“Fortunately,” says Mr. Nicholl—Professor of Astronomy in the University of Glasgow—“Fortunately for the successful pursuit of researches alike arduous and engrossing, the moon is so situated, that her surface can be examined with peculiar facility. Besides the smallness of her atmosphere, and that absence of clouds, which preserves her face always unobscured, unless by impediments connected with the ærial envelope of the earth, she is removed from us only by the comparatively trifling space of 240,000 miles; a number great indeed when laid beside our ordinary terrestrial distances, but which the application of a telescope bearing a magnifying power of 3000, at once reduces to the manageable space of *eighty miles*.”

“Not less than *three-fifths* of the surface of our satellite are studded with vast caverns, or rather *circular pits*, penetrating into its mass, and usually engirt at the top with a high wall of rocks, which is sometimes serrated and crowned by peaks. These *caverns*, or as they are termed *craters*, vary in diameter, from fifty or sixty miles, to the smallest space visible, probably 500 feet, and the numbers increase as the diameter diminishes, so that the number of the smaller ones becomes so great, that we cannot reckon it. These curious objects are *so crowded*, in some parts of the moon, that they seem to have pressed on each other, and disturbed, and even broken down each other’s edges.”—(“*Planetary System*, p. 290–1.”)

He then proceeds to describe one of these craters, *Sycho*. Supposing a visitant to have ascended the “wall of rock,” which encircles it, he proceeds:

“On the edge of a dizzy cliff, passing down by one unbroken leap for 13,000 feet, the traveller gazes below him in terror and bewilderment. At the base of the cliff, several low parallel terraces creep along, but a little onwards, the depth of the chasm is revealed; and it descends from the top of the ridge, no less than

17,000 feet, or 2,000 feet more than the summit of MONT BLANC rises above the level of the sea. It is quickly perceived, too, that this huge barrier encloses a vast circular area of the moon's surface, *an area fifty-five miles in diameter*; so that if the spectator were at the chasm's centre, he would find around on every side, at the distance of twenty-seven miles, a gigantic and unbroken wall, unbroken by gap or ravine, or pass of any description, rising into the air 17000 feet, and forbidding his return to the external world."

Alluding to certain phenomena, apparently connected with Sycho, he continues :

"They proceed from SOME MIGHTY FORCE, whose seat is clearly at the point which they converge, viz. Sycho himself, *the force that blew out, or otherwise originated that stupendous crater*. And if so, how fearful the convulsion. No gradual operation. No final sum of countless successive shocks. But *sudden as terrific*, driving from the surface of the moon, the thousands of cubic miles of rock that once occupied the cavern of Sycho, and *shivering to that marvellous extent the body of our satellite!* A cavern fifty-five miles in breadth, and 17,000 feet deep; a cavern into which, even now, one might cast Chimborazo and Mont Blanc, and room be left for Teneriffe behind! But why should the notion of such energies be incredible? Have not actions of corresponding magnitude signalized the progress of terrestrial change, at innumerable points of time? Nor among those countless pits, is Sycho the most appalling. There are some of nearly equal depth, whose diameter may not exceed 3000 feet; nay, towards the polar regions of the moon, caverns probably exist, whose depths have never yet been illumined by one beam of solar light."—(*Planetary System*, 293-9.)

We have hitherto employed the eloquent language of Nicholl; in the vividness and accuracy of his descriptions, the Hugh Miller of Astronomy. But the calm, sober, didactic style of Herschell conveys, essentially, the same indisputable facts, and involves the same general principles.

"The physical constitution of the moon," says Herschell, "is better known to us, than that of any other heavenly body. By the aid of telescopes, we discern inequalities in its surface, which *can be no other than mountains and valleys*. From micrometrical measures of the lengths of the shadows of the more conspicuous mountains, taken under the most favourable circumstances, the heights of many of them have been calculated. Messrs.

Beer and Madler, in their elaborate work, entitled "Der Mond," ("The Moon,") have given a list of heights, resulting from such measurements, for no less than 1095 lunar mountains, among which occur all degrees of elevation up to 22,823 British feet, or about 1400 feet higher than Chimborazo in the Andes." "The generality of the lunar mountains, present a striking uniformity, and *singularity of aspect*. They are wonderfully numerous, *occupying, by far, the largest portion of the surface*, and almost universally of an exactly circular or cup-shaped form, foreshortened, however, into ellipses, towards the limb; but the larger have, for the most part, flat bottoms within, from which rises centrally, a small steep, conical hill. *They offer, in short, in its highest perfection, the true volcanic character*, as it may be seen in the crater of Vesuvius," &c.—"but with this remarkable peculiarity, viz: that the bottoms of many of the craters are very deeply depressed below the general surface of the moon, the internal depth being often twice or three times the external height. In some of the principal ones, decisive marks of volcanic stratification, arising from successive deposits of ejected matter, and *evident indications of lava currents, streaming outwards in all directions*, may be clearly traced with powerful telescopes. In Lord Rosse's magnificent reflector, the flat bottom of the crater called Abbategnius is *seen to be strewn with blocks*, not visible with inferior telescopes, while the exterior of another (Aristillus) is all hatched over with deep gullies, radiating towards its centre." ("Outlines, p. 251-2.)

Those radiant lines extending in all directions, from the central volcanic crater, and supposed by Herschell to be "lava currents streaming outward, in all directions," are believed by others, and, we think, with greater probability, to be the results, not of present, but of ancient volcanic action; resembling our terrestrial trap-dykes, shot up from below, and filling the huge fissures which former convulsions have produced. Which of these opinions may be true, is not at all important to our argument. Those radiant lines, whether the result of more ancient, or more recent action, may be traced distinctly, sometimes over 1700 miles from the volcanic focus, and indicate alike, on any theory, the amazing extent, and prodigious power of the original upheaving cause.

Here then we find that each improvement of our telescopes, discovers new facts, and each new fact adds fresh confirmation to the analogic argument; and may we not

adopt, in this connexion, the language employed by Sir John Herschell, when contemplating another phenomenon?

"The proportion between the planetary distances, and their periodic time?" "When we contemplate the constituents of the planetary system, from the point of view which this relation affords us, it is no longer mere analogy which strikes us, no longer a general resemblance among them as individuals independent of each other, and circulating about the sun, each according to its own peculiar nature, and connected with it, by its own peculiar tie. The resemblance is now perceived to be a true *Family Likeness*; they are bound up in one chain, interwoven in one web of mutual relation, and harmonious agreement, subjected to one pervading influence, which extends from the centre to the farthest limits of that great system, of which all of them, the earth included, must henceforth be regarded as members."—(*Outlines of As.*, p. 286.)

We have thus discovered one feature of this "Family Likeness," the "pervading influence," of *an attractive power*. Are we not almost prepared to *proclaim another*, the wide diffusion of its *antagonist*, *an upheaving force*? Both inscrutable in their cause, both undeniable in their effects? And need we hesitate to advance yet another step; to include the sun himself in that common BROTHERHOOD OF WORLDS; and on the strength of this loftier and wider generalization, attribute to him too, a community of nature and of laws, and believe, with the most eloquent follower of La Place, in our day, that

"Thus forever is broken down *that supposed distinction*, which seemed to place our central luminary APART IN SPECIES, to an immeasurable extent, from the humbler worlds that roll around him?" "*Planetary System*, p. 337."

It were useless to encumber our argument, at this stage of its progress, with any speculation as to the nature of this fearful power, manifested in the earth, and the body of the moon;—or its supposed connexion or identity with that mysterious and omnipresent agency, to whose varied manifestations (it is said) we give the names of light, or heat, or electricity. Sufficient for our purpose is the broad, palpable fact; to a higher philosophy belongs, whether true or false, the ingenious and plausible speculation.

The conclusion, suggested by the analogies of Nature, has thus been established by the facts of observation.

The utterance of our Geology is re-affirmed by our Astronomy, and in that individual member of the great family of worlds, most intimately related to our own by proximity in space, and reciprocal influence; and thus most accessible to the observation of our telescopes, do we actually discover existing and operating, with equal, and perhaps superior energy, the same terrific power, whose presence is manifested now by the volcano, and the earthquake, and which has left its indelible memorials along the whole tracks of Geologic history.

THE SOLID BODY OF THE SUN is concealed from our view by the impenetrable brightness of the luminous atmospheres that encircle him; but the internal agency which escapes our direct observation, may be revealed indirectly, by its effects upon the outward envelope. Surely something may be taken for granted, in the middle of the nineteenth century, and we need not pause to refute the visionary conjectures of Malapertius, in 1533, and of the canon Tarde, in 1620, that the spots upon the sun are to be ascribed to small cosmical bodies revolving around it and intercepting its light. It is too late for the culmination of the "Austrian and Bourbon Stars" in the Political or Astronomic spheres. Already, in the early part of the seventeenth century, these spots had been observed minutely by Galileo, and other philosophers; had been seen to vanish and re-appear; been traced in their apparent passage over the sun's disk, changing their form and dimensions, as they approached the edge; had been distinctly recognized as belonging to the constitution of the sun himself; and from these phenomena, Galileo had deduced the rotation of the sun upon his axis, which, before the discovery of the spots, had been conjectured by the sagacious Kepler. Since the more accurate observations, and philosophical reasonings of Dr. Wilson, and the Elder Herschell, there seems little room for diversity of sentiment in regard to the nature and origin of those truly remarkable phenomena,

"*The play of sudden, tremendous and evanescent forces*, either connected with the solid body of the sun, or generated within his atmosphere, and made apparent by the surging and bursting of those atmospheres, has become AN ABSOLUTE FACT. Now, whence and what are these?" "The phenomena which have

led to some knowledge of the structure of this orb, are those curious spots, that appear and disappear so frequently on his surface, and which, by their regular progressive motion across the disc, revealed to their first discoverer, Galileo, the remarkable fact, that the sun rotates on his axis like the planets, carrying the spots along with him." (Nichol.)

"The scale on which their movements take place," says Sir John Herschell, "*is immense*. A single second of angular measure, as seen from the earth, corresponds on the sun's disc to 461 miles; and a circle of this diameter, (containing therefore 167,000 square miles,) is the least space which can be distinctly discerned on the sun as a visible area. Spots have been observed, however, whose linear diameter has been upwards of 45,000 miles; and even, if some records are to be trusted, of very much greater extent. That such a spot should close up in six weeks time, (for they seldom last much longer,) its borders must approach at the rate of more than 1000 miles a day." ("*Outlines*, 222-3."

"The light, however, which they cast upon the nature of the substance of this orb," proceeds Nichol, "was not recognized until the times of Dr. Alexander Wilson and Sir W. Herschell. It was daring, at the time, to pronounce an opinion, that these hitherto puzzling phenomena are really *holes in the surface of the sun's mass, pits opened in it, revealing his internal constitution*. It followed at once, from Wilson's capital achievement, that our magnificent luminary is no chaotic conflagration—as had been hitherto supposed by all men—and to the investigation of what he really is, the singular powers of the elder Herschell came quickly in aid of the efforts of his friend. It seemed to that penetrating genius, (Herschell,) and no other theory will yet resolve the fact—that the sun consists mainly of a dark mass, like the body of the earth and other planetary globes, which is surrounded by two atmospheres of enormous depths—the one nearest him, being like our own, cloudy and dense—while the loftier stratum consists of those phosphorescent zephyrs, that bestow light and heat upon so many surrounding spheres. By some unknown force from below—these atmospheres disturbed and opened—the phosphorescent zephyrs being flung aside, we descry the dark clouds, or shelving edges, reflecting somewhat of the light beaming on them, from above, *which is the umbra*; and below, the darker and more sombre, because more sheltered, body of the great globe, as the central spot. Nor is there aught in all the annals of discovery, that more stirs thought and raises more strange questions than this." "*Planetary System*, 324-5."

Is not the sun himself, we may now enquire, a member of this great family of worlds ; with his own individual features, yet wearing the broad "family likeness;" reciprocally attracting and attracted ; revolving, *as they do*, on his axis ; moving onward, though in a wider orbit ; and bearing in his bosom, and manifesting in "the tumultuous agitation" of his only visible surface, the same mysterious element of convulsion and of change, whose existence and irresistible agency are so distinctly manifest on the earth and its attendant planets ? Are not those stars the centres of other systems, likewise suns ? And if so, may not the constitution of our sun cast some probable light on their's ; and events in them cast back some light reciprocally upon questions that relate to him ? *Those suns* that are kindling now, beneath the gaze of our telescopes, into five fold brightness—those other suns that are fading slowly away—one of them losing, *in six weeks, (the precise period of our sun's partial obscuration,)* ONE HALF OF ITS RADIANCE—those that have wholly disappeared from the Heavens—"passing through the hues of a dying conflagration"—(*Nichol*)—and becoming apparently extinct ! May not *these ascertained revolutions* in their "luminous atmospheres," ranging through every variety of hue, and every degree of increasing and decreasing brightness, from *the sudden outburst of unparalleled magnificence, to the absolute and total darkness of centuries*—indicate the existence and agency of a cause, similar in kind, though different in the intensity of its operation, from that which has been observed to darken our own sun's disk, over the whole extent of a surface, whose diameter is six times that of our earth, and whose area, in square miles, must be expressed by hundred millions ?

It will, perhaps, appear, before the close of this discussion, that these questions and many similar, are not based upon mere gratuitous or visionary assumptions, but are irresistibly suggested to every thoughtful mind by the present condition of physical science ; and have, at once, their origin, their vindication, and their answer in its most recent discoveries, and profoundest speculations.

Let us turn from the consideration of the two worlds with which we are most intimately connected ; that which revolves around our globe, and that around which we re-

volve, and which, by their proximity or magnitude, are most accessible to our scrutiny ; and direct our attention to that family of worlds of which our's is a member. Mercury, by its vicinity to the sun, and Venus from her excessive and dazzling radiance.—Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune, from their great distance, (while some of them present distinct analogies confirmatory of our argument,) cannot be expected to offer phenomena so striking or decisive as those to which we have already referred. We pass on to another series of facts, as singular in their own character, as they are astonishing in the circumstances and mode of their discovery.*

The present century has witnessed the successive discoveries of several extraordinary bodies, and under circumstances as extraordinary as the bodies thus discovered. As in the case of the planet Neptune, so in that of the "Asteroids"—*the search and the discovery* were preceded and directed by the hypothetical assumption, based upon broad and bold analogies. As in the case of Neptune, the distance had been previously calculated, the quarter of the Heavens pointed out, the telescope directed to the spot ; the star discovered. That there is SOME LAW in regard to the inter-planetary distances, as in every other department of creation, could hardly be doubted by any devout or any philosophic mind. Now, it was long since discovered that this *law* was apparently suspended, and the harmony of the universe interrupted, in the amazing interval between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter. More than two hundred years ago, with that strong faith in the analogies of Nature which characterizes all real genius, and when wisely directed, leads to all philosophical discovery, old Kepler had predicted the future discovery of a planet in this apparently unoccupied space. Long derided as the daring speculation of a great but visionary mind, the discovery of Uranus, by re-establishing the in-

* Schroeter, indeed, is said to have discovered in Venus, "mountains, *probably* in ridges, *certainly* much higher than any on the earth." And as to Mars, their existence is universally admitted. "Venus, then," says Nichol, "is related closely to the earth. As in Mars, a law has operated in this planet, evolving continents and oceans ; and that mighty upheaving cause which raised our Alps and Cordilleras from the bosom of our own Globe, has likewise broken up and variegated her plains."—P. 104.

interrupted harmony, directed the minds of Astronomers to the old prediction of Kepler, and to the search after the undiscovered world. Three years had scarcely passed, after the discovery of Uranus, when, in 1784, the Baron De Zach computed the distance and the period of the now generally suspected planet. In 1800, a Congress of Astronomers met, and gravely discussed, and ultimately adopted the apparently chimerical enterprise of discovering a world, whose existence was announced by faith alone in the harmonies of nature. On the first day of January, 1801, the telescope, directed to the appointed spot, discerned the star and justified the calculation, both as to distance and actual period. But as to magnitude? Ceres—the newly discovered star—was 163 miles, at most, 1,000 in diameter. Soon, another was discovered. Then came the boldest hypothesis, and based upon it, the boldest prediction, recorded in the annals of human science. Olbers suggested the opinion, that these diminutive asteroids were fragments of a larger world, long since exploded; and predicted the discovery of many other fragments in a particular portion of the heavens, at the point of mutual intersection of their orbits. The very suggestion of such an hypothesis, and its wide acceptance by philosophers, would be sufficient for our argument. It involves **A FACT, and a supposition.** *The fact* is, the existence of actual forces in our earth, analogous to those required by the hypothesis in the exploded planet. *The supposition* relates to the existence of similar forces in other worlds. *Without the reality here, the supposition there* WOULD BE INCREDIBLY ABSURD. But the test of an hypothesis is its conformity to the facts. Telescope after telescope was directed to the spot, which the hypothesis indicated. Asteroid after asteroid twinkled visibly in the vault of heaven, until fourteen, with constantly recurring new additions, were discovered.

“The theory of Olbers,” writes Prof. Mitchell, in 1848, (*two years after the discovery of Iris*,) “receives new accessions of strength from the discovery of every new asteroid”

SIX HAVE BEEN ADDED SINCE.

“The same theory,” says Prof. Loomis, “would lead us to anticipate the discovery of numerous other fragments;” and adds

in a P. S., "since the preceding was in type, it has been announced that a new asteroid was discovered, May 11th, at Naples Observatory."

"Whatever may be thought of such a speculation as a *physical hypothesis*," writes Sir J. Herschell, in 1849, "this conclusion has been verified to a considerable extent, AS A MATTER OF FACT, by subsequent discovery—the result of careful and minute examination, undertaken with that express object."*

As to the supposed impossibility or incredibility of such an event, the following language of Prof. Loomis, of New York, may be considered as expressing the general views of the scientific world :

"No doubt then," speaking of the division of Biela's comet into two distinct parts, "no doubt then, Biela has been separated into two parts. *When, and how?* Was it caused by an explosion, arising from some internal force? Forces of this kind we see in operation in our own globe, ejecting liquid mountains from the bowels of the earth. The surface of the moon bears marks of similar agency. The sun appears agitated by powerful forces, perhaps the expansion of gaseous substances; and it has been conjectured, that a planet was once split into numerous fragments. If we knew that Biela's comet was a solid body, *we might easily suppose it to have been divided by some force similar to volcanic agency.*"—"His. of Astr.," pp. 105-6.

"I have long since learned," says one of the most distinguished mathematicians and physical philosophers of our country, whose letter to a common friend we are permitted to quote—"I have long since learned to attach to scientific theories only the value of means to attain ends—ideas to suggest and guide research—the scaffolding to erect a building, rather than the building itself. And therefore, do I hold my faith in them free to vary, ad infinitum.

"Yet, it *must be admitted*, that the coincidences, or analogies, amongst the asteroids, establish a *very great probability* of their common origin.

"They all, (Irene and Hygeia included,) approximate to a common point of intersection in orbit, and what is *strange*, this *region of condensation* is intersected by the orbit of Halley's comet!

* See "Edinburgh Encyclopædia"—an article by Sir David Brewster; "Astronomy, Chap. 1, Sec. X;" "Plan. & Stellar Worlds," Lecture 7th; "Outlines," p. 297—Prof. Alexander; "Asteroids and Comets,"—Astron. Jour. No. 23; Dr. B. A. Gould, in Silliman's Journal, 2nd Series, vol. 6. pp. 28-36.

"The orbit of Hygeia does not vary so much from the *mean position* of the orbits of the asteroids, (especially at their point of nearest approach,) as some of them vary from each other; or as, in my opinion, to require the abandonment of the hypothesis of Olbers."

Indeed, we may say, that the objection recently urged with so much confidence against this theory, when viewed in its greatest force, seems to involve its own refutation; for the *thing objected* against *as fatal to the theory, is, in reality, essential to its truth*, viz:

"That if these bodies are fragments of a larger planet, this explosion must have taken place at a very remote epoch."—(*His. Astr.*, p. 69.

Surely, if such an occurrence did take place, it must have been at a period indefinitely remote; at an early stage of its history as a planet! But what would be thought of an objection against any asserted terrestrial revolution—"that such a result could not have taken place within a *million of years*?" "A million of years," may bewilder unthinking minds, but, unless all our Astronomy and Geology be the idlest illusions, (and if so, the objection is abandoned,) then "*millions*," whether applied to our estimates of distance, time, or space, are not very overpowering numbers. *One period of our sun's revolution* around its central sun has been estimated at 1,800,000,000 of years.—(Maedler.) One million would bear to this, the relation of a single year to the whole Christian era! And this single revolution of our sun! what proportion does it bear to eternity! The eternity past, or the eternity to come! And who shall say that he has not already made one, or even many, such revolutions? The change in our earth's annual orbit, from the ellipse to the perfect circle and back again to the original ellipse, involves *many—many millions of years*; yet, who doubts its reality? Surely we need not still to learn that millions, in human calculations, are but as units in the arithmetic of immensity and eternity!

We are well aware, that argument, such as this, is, from its very nature, not demonstrative, but probable—nor would we assert with dogmatical assurance, what may yet be matter of rational belief. There are degrees of probability, varying from the lowest presumption up to full

conviction, and on the very verge of absolute assurance. In discussing scientific objections, it is, however, legitimate to accept scientific theories at their estimated value—to take demonstration as demonstrated—and probabilities as probable. A solitary phenomenon, whether simple or complex, or a series of isolated facts, may not be of itself sufficient basis for an argument; or furnish, even, the slightest probability; yet, when connected with other facts, analogous or similar—all pointing in the same direction—converging to a single point—it may give and receive reciprocal support; as the single link may contribute to constitute the chain; and the solitary stone, which could not have supported its own weight, self-poised, yet, when sustained on either side by others aptly adjusted, may increase the strength and enlarge the dimensions of the majestic arch, which bears the busy commerce and multitudinous population of a crowded city. Now, the system of the asteroids, viewed as an isolated phenomenon, would simply present an inexplicable anomaly, from which, of course, nothing could be legitimately deduced. But surrounded, as they are, on every side by evidence of an explosive agency of apparently illimitable power, to assume its operation here, is but to suppose the presence of a cause known to exist, and to be adequate to the asserted effect. Grant the operation of this known power, and the interrupted harmony is restored. Nor is there any other plausible hypothesis, except the nebular, which, modestly suggested by La Place, at first, was seized by his followers and eagerly proclaimed as an established theory; but deprived at length, by Lord Rosse's telescope and the discoveries and reasonings of H. Miller, of its Astronomical and Geological support, seems almost ready to be generally abandoned. Should any be disposed still to adopt this brilliant and fascinating speculation, it would only add new confirmation to our argument; since, of all human theories, it asserts "the most unconfined analogy and relationship amidst things;" and finds in all worlds only the same common elements, in various stages of development, and offering, successively, similar manifestations under the same all-pervading laws. Nor is it a question of the slightest interest to us, as Christian apologists, which of these theories may be true, or whether both be false. If true,

they equally confirm the Christian argument. If false, they prove the uncertainty of human science in her loftiest speculations. But, whether true or false, the facts remain the same; nor can any rational theory be devised which shall disconnect these singular phenomena from the general system, of which they form a part, and the mysterious powers, which, under the guidance of Eternal Wisdom, pervade and control the universal system. But science has at last come forth, after long centuries of laborious investigation, with these highest speculations of her highest minds; and now, when religion accepts her theory as probable, and appropriates her speculation, shall she recoil from her own conclusions, and renounce her sublimest theories of nature, because they are found to coincide with the revelation of the God of Nature? Is not their harmony a mutual confirmation?

Passing from these more familiar denizens of our planetary system, we meet a class of celestial bodies, which by the eccentricity of their movements, the immensity of their orbits, the vastness of their volume, and the startling suddenness of their appearance, with other singular phenomena, which they often present, have ever been the source of superstitious terror to the ignorant, and perplexing wonder to the scientific world.

“The wonderful characteristics which mark the flight of comets through space; the suddenness with which they blaze forth; their exceeding velocity, and their terrific appearance; their eccentric motions, sweeping towards the sun from all regions, and in all directions, have rendered these bodies objects of terror and dread, in all ages of the world. They come up from below the plane of the ecliptic, or plunge downwards towards the sun from above, sweep swiftly around this their great centre, and with incredible velocity, wing their flight far into the fathomless regions of space, in some cases never to reappear to human vision.”

“In the year 1580, a most wonderful comet made its appearance, which, by its splendour and swiftness, excited the deepest interest throughout the world. It came from the regions of space immediately above the Ecliptic, and plunging downward with amazing velocity, in a direction almost perpendicular to this plane, it appeared to direct its flight in such a manner, that it must inevitably plunge directly into the sun. This was not however the case. Increasing its velocity as it approached the sun,

it swept around this body with the speed of a million of miles an hour, approaching the sun, to within a distance of its surface, of a sixth part of the sun's radius. It then commenced its recess, throwing off a train of light, which extended to the enormous distance of 100,000,000 of miles. With the swiftness of thought almost, it swept away from the sun, and was gradually lost in the distant regions of space, whence it came, and has never since been seen."

"The comet of 1811, having a period probably three thousand times greater than that of our earth, must revolve at a mean distance from the sun, of more than 80,000,000,000 of miles; and in consequence of its very near approach to the sun at its perihelion, its greatest distance can not fall below 160,000,000,000 of miles. Great as this distance is, it is perfectly certain, that there are many comets which revolve in orbits far more extensive than the one described by the comet of 1811. Indeed there seems to be no limit to the distance to which these bodies may sweep outward from the sun."* "For the most part it is found, that the motions of comets may be sufficiently well represented by parabolic orbits; that is to say, ellipses whose axes are of infinite length. The parabola is that conic section, which is the limit between the elliptic on the one hand, which returns into itself, and the hyperbola on the other which runs out into infinity. A comet, therefore, should its orbit be of the Hyperbolic character," (and several such have been observed,) "could never return more within the sphere of our observation, but must run off to visit other systems, or be lost in the immensity of space"†

Each new observation of their extraordinary phenomena, awakens profounder interest, and invests them with more impenetrable mystery, so that Sir J. Herschell more than suggests the doubt, "*If we have here to do with matter such as we conceive it, viz. possessing inertia—at all.*" (P. 350.) He proposes a hypothetical solution of the difficulties; then fairly acknowledges that the hypothesis, even if adopted, would scarce touch the case, and would explain

'None, in short of innumerable other facts which link themselves with almost equally irresistible cogency to our ordinary notions of matter and force.' "There is, beyond question," says he, "some profound secret and mystery of nature concerned in the phenomenon of their tails. Perhaps it is not too much to hope, that future observation, may, ere long, enable us to pen-

* Mitchell. † Herschell, p. 332.

etrate this mystery, and to declare *whether it is really matter*, in the ordinary acceptation of the terms, which is projected from their heads with such extravagant velocity."*

Yet dissimilar as they are, in so many other respects, from the rest of our solar system, it is precisely here, where our argument demands it, that we discover the most minute and astonishing coincidences. In these strange, eccentric, erratic worlds, now sweeping off into the immensity of space, now plunging down toward our sun, bearing 47000 times the heat that radiates upon our earth, and almost exhaling into vapour, we behold the same all pervading energy which we have traced in other worlds, now kindling them into vivid conflagration, now bursting forth into transient and irregular radiance, now dividing them into separate fragments. One hundred and thirty years before the Christian era, a comet was seen to blaze up in our sky, and surpass the sun in splendor. The same comet, in all probability, (Halley's) has often been since observed, and exhibited, with diminished intensity, analogous phenomena—

"Becoming suddenly much brighter—throwing out a jet, or stream of light from its anterior part—meanwhile undergoing singular and capricious alterations—the different phases succeeding each other with such rapidity, that on no two successive nights, were the appearances alike."†

"MOST ASTONISHING!" says Sir J. Herschell, as he observed this comet at the Cape of Good Hope.

"There are long irregular tails in various directions. The nucleus is now no longer a misty speck, but a sharp brilliant point. The light comes on *so suddenly*, it is like a planetary nebula."

The record of the night closes thus :

"So ended a most remarkable night. I can hardly doubt that the comet has fairly evaporated, in perihelio, by the heat," &c.

Describing the same comet Struve writes :

"Soon the heavens were again covered with light clouds, through which all the parts of the comet were concealed, except the nucleus and flame, which remained distinctly visible. The

* Outlines, p. 357. See much more from p. 348 to 357.

† Outlines, p. 335.

appearance of the flame was wonderful. It resembled a ray of fire shot out from the nucleus, as from some engine of artillery. Nearly in the opposite direction, a second flame, more faint than the first, was visible."

We have already alluded to the division of Biela's comet, into two fragments perfectly distinct.

"This comet," says Herschell, "is small and hardly visible to the naked eye, even when brightest. Nevertheless, as if to make up for its seeming insignificance, by the interest attaching to it, in a physical point of view, it exhibited, at its last appearance in 1846, a phenomenon which struck every astronomer with amazement, as a thing without previous example, in the history of our system." ("Perhaps not quite so," he adds in a note, and quotes Kepler and Hevelius.) "*It was actually seen to separate itself into two distinct comets*, which, after thus parting company, continued to journey along amicably through an arc of 70°, of their apparent orbit, keeping all the while within the same field of view of the telescope, pointed towards them." "On the 10th of February they were nearly equal. On the 14th and 16th, the new part had gained a decided superiority over the old. On the 18th, the old comet had regained its superiority, being nearly twice as bright as its companion."

Thus they moved on together, with this singular interchange of light, and manifest signs of some mysterious communication, each in its turn, throwing out a faint arc of light toward the other, which Herschell compares to a "BRIDGE BETWEEN THEM." (See p. 342-3.)

We might hesitate to believe these extraordinary accounts of changes in the celestial worlds—the *birth of a new star* of extraordinary brilliancy, recorded by the Greek Astronomer, Hipparchus, and others still more wonderful in the Chinese records, had not modern observation swept completely and conclusively away, the fabled "immutability of the starry spheres;" and proven, that *all above, around, beneath*, to the remotest parts of the visible creation, is motion, progress, incessant change; new suns bursting with sudden and startling brilliancy upon our skies; suns, long observed, fading utterly away, and other suns, passing (as Sirius, for instance, from the "Red Dog Star" of ancient times, to the beautiful white orb, of our day) through astonishing revolutions, in the quantity and the colour of their light. When the Astronomer beholds

these astounding changes ; comets dividing into separate fragments ; and kindling into vivid conflagration, beneath the very gaze of his telescope ; one star robbed, in the period of a few passing weeks, of half its former radiance ; another growing gradually into five-fold brightness ; another bursting instantaneously forth with surpassing lustre, and shining on for months with declining light, until it gradually fades away, having passed through all the "changes of a dying conflagration ;" he is forced to exclaim "What mean these mighty revolutions, where all had appeared so permanent and stable?"

He has proposed his theory, and we believe it to be extremely probable. But whatever be the theory, the fact remains indisputable. "*Mutability*" is written on *all created things*, GOD ONLY IS THE ETERNAL AND UN-CHANGING ONE ! And the voice which comes to us from these worlds of light, as they kindle and fade away, is but the deep chorus to the majestic and solemn melody of the inspired Hebrew poet, as he sang of old, "Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest, and they shall all wax old, as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed, but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail."

It is truly humiliating to be forced, in such an age as this, and in the midst of an enlightened community, to sustain these general views, based as they are upon the simplest principles, and best established facts, by an appeal to scientific authority, or a minute indication of particulars. But we have had occasion recently to know, by personal experience, that there is no principle, however elementary in its nature, or however clearly established ; no fact, however distinctly ascertained, or universally acknowledged in the scientific world, which may not be denied and derided by the ignorance or the effrontery of our modern infidelity. Our readers will therefore bear with us, while we adduce a specimen, (for it can be, at best, only a very slight and imperfect specimen) of the kind of evidence, upon which the general views briefly suggested above, have been almost universally adopted.

We make our extracts, designedly, from works that are,

or ought to be, in the library of every educated gentleman, and confine ourselves to facts, discoveries and principles, which are level to the capacity of the ordinary reader, are so purely elementary, that they may be considered, now, as having passed already from the sphere of higher science, into that of popular instruction, and entered, as an essential element, into the general atmosphere of human thought.

"The appearance of hitherto unseen stars in the vault of heaven," says Humboldt, "especially the sudden appearance of strongly scintillating stars of the first magnitude, is an occurrence in the realms of space, which has ever excited astonishment. This astonishment is the greater, in proportion as such an event as the sudden manifestation of what was before invisible, but which nevertheless is supposed to have previously existed, is one of the very rarest phenomena in nature. Before I proceed to general considerations, it seems not inappropriate to quote the narrative of an eye-witness, and by dwelling on a particular instance, to depict the vividness of the impression produced by the sight of a new star. "On my return to the Danish Islands, from my travels in Germany," says Tycho Brache, "I resided for some time with my uncle, Steno Bille, (*ut aulicæ vitæ fastidium lenirem,*) and here I made it a practice not to leave my laboratory until the evening. Raising my eyes, as usual during one of my walks, to the well known vault of heaven, *I observed with indescribable astonishment*, near the zenith in Cassiopeia, A RADIANT FIXED STAR OF A MAGNITUDE NEVER BEFORE SEEN. IN MY AMAZEMENT, I DOUBTED THE EVIDENCE OF MY SENSES. However, to convince myself that it was no illusion, and to have the testimony of others, I summoned my assistants from my laboratory, and enquired of them and of all the country people that passed by, if they also observed the star that thus suddenly had burst forth. I subsequently heard, that in Germany, wagoners and other common people had first called the attention of Astronomers to this great phenomenon in the heavens. This star I found to be perfectly like all other fixed stars, *with the exception, that it scintillated more strongly than stars of the first magnitude.*" (The *uniform* and most important characteristic of NEW STARS.) "Its brightness was greater than that of Sirius, Alpha Lyræ, or Jupiter. For splendor, it was only comparable to Venus, when nearest the earth. Those gifted with keen sight, could discern the new star in the day time, and *even at noon*. At night, when the sky was overcast, so that all other stars were hidden, it was often visible, through the clouds. Its distances

from the other stars in Cassiopeia, which throughout the whole of the following year I measured with great care, convinced me of its perfect immobility." (Another *universal, and most important characteristic* of these stars, and along with the suddenness of their appearance, absolutely decisive, as to their true character.) "Already, in December, 1572, its brilliancy began to diminish, and the star gradually resembled Jupiter, but by January, 1573, it had become less bright than that planet. Successive photometric estimates gave the following results: for February and March, equality with stars of the first magnitude; for April and May, with stars of the second magnitude." And thus gradually decreasing in brightness, we are told, that "The transition to the fifth and sixth magnitude took place between December, 1573, and February, 1574. In the following month the new star disappeared, and, after having shone seventeen months, was no longer discernible to the naked eye." (The telescope was not yet invented.) "The gradual diminution of the star's luminosity was, moreover, invariably regular; it was not interrupted (as η Argus at the present day) by several periods of rekindling, or by increased intensity of light. Its colour also changed with its brightness. The circumstantial minuteness of these statements," proceeds Humboldt, after having given still minuter particulars, "is of itself a proof of the interest which this natural phenomenon could not fail to awaken, in an epoch so brilliant in the history of Astronomy. For similar phenomena, accidentally crowded together, within the short space of thirty-two years, were thrice repeated within the observation of European Astronomers, and consequently served to heighten the excitement."*

At the risk of appearing tedious to those of our readers, who may well consider the facts and principles in question, as beyond dispute, we will venture to cite the authority of Sir J. Herschell, who, if not equal to Humboldt, in that amazing variety of acquired knowledge, which renders his cosmos a prodigy of learning, is incomparably superior in philosophic genius.

"The phenomena alluded to," writes Sir John, "are those of TEMPORARY STARS, which have appeared from time to time in different parts of the heaven, blazing forth with extraordinary lustre; and after remaining a while apparently immovable, *have died away and left no trace*. Such is the star, which suddenly appearing about the year 125, B. C., and which was visible in

* Cosmos, vol. 3, p. 151-4.

the day time, is said to have led Hipparchus to draw up a catalogue of stars, the earliest on record."

After mentioning those of A. D. 389, 945 and 1264, he speaks of the star of 1572.

"The appearance of the star of 1572, was so sudden that Tycho Brache, returning one evening from his laboratory to his dwelling house, was surprised to find a group of country people gazing at a star, *which he was sure did not exist half an hour before*. Similar phenomena, though of a less splendid character, have taken place more recently; as in the case of the star discovered in 1670, which, after becoming completely invisible, re-appeared; and after undergoing one or two singular fluctuations of light during two years, *at last died away entirely*, and has not since been seen."*

Humboldt enumerates twenty-one of these new stars which have been observed and recorded within the last two thousand years—from 134 B. C. to the discovery by Mr. Hind in 1848, "of a new yellow reddish star of the fifth magnitude in Ophinchus—at the present time (1850) scarcely of the eleventh magnitude, and it will most likely soon disappear." Besides these new stars which have thus burst suddenly upon our skies, and then gradually disappeared, there are many others long familiar to Astronomers, which "are likewise found to be missing," and concerning which Herschell says:

"IT IS CERTAIN that there is no mistake in the observation or the entry; and that the star has been really observed, and has as really disappeared from the heavens."—*Outlines*, sec. 832. In addition to which we have a list of thirty-six variable stars, observed within the last two hundred and fifty years, which are known to pass through every conceivable variety of change in the quantity and colour of their light—extending over calculable and incalculable periods, and often with an irregularity which defies all law.—*Sec.* 825. "The alterations of brightness in the star Eta [η] Argus, which have been recorded, are very singular and surprising. In the time of Halley, (1677,) it appeared as a star of the fourth magnitude. Lacaille, in 1751, observed it of the second. In the interval from 1811 to 1815, it was again of the fourth; and again from 1822 to 1825, of the second. On the first of February, 1827, it had increased to the first magnitude, and was equal to Alpha Crucis. Thence again it receded to the second, and so

* *Outlines of Astronomy*, pp. 525-6.

continued until the end of 1837. *All at once* in the beginning of 1838, it suddenly increased in lustre, so as to *surpass all the stars* of the first magnitude, except Sirius, Conopus and Alpha Centauri. Thence it again diminished until April, 1843, when it had again increased so as to surpass Conopus, and nearly equal Sirius in splendour."—*Sec. 830.*

This intensity of light was continued with very slight variation up to the commencement of 1850, extending over a period of twelve years, if we calculate from its first brilliant illumination in 1838, when it became a star of the first magnitude.

"A strange field of speculation," remarks Sir J. Herschell, "is opened by this phenomenon. The temporary stars, heretofore recorded, *have all become extinct.* But here we have a star fitfully variable to an astonishing extent, and whose fluctuations are spread over centuries—apparently with no settled period, and no regularity of progression. What origin can we ascribe to these sudden flashes and relapses?" While this process of rapidly increasing illumination was going on in one world, a revolution, equally rapid, though in the reverse direction, was progressing in another. Sir J. Herschell beheld the star, Alpha Orionis, sustain the loss of *nearly half its light in six weeks.*—*Proc. Roy. Astr. Soc'y, January, 1840.*

"All these phenomena," says Humboldt, "are most probably intrinsically related to each other. If, for instance, the self-luminosity of all the suns in the firmament is the result of an electromagnetic process in their photospheres, we may consider this process of light as variable in many ways. It may either occur only once, or recur periodically; and either regularly, or irregularly. Since all is motion in the vault of heaven, and every thing is variable both in space and time, we are led by analogy to infer, that as the fixed stars have not only an apparent, but a proper, motion of their own, so their surfaces or luminous atmospheres are generally subject to changes, which occur, IN THE GREAT MAJORITY, IN EXTREMELY LONG, AND THEREFORE UNMEASURED, *and probably, undeterminable periods.* What we no longer see is not necessarily annihilated. The idea of destruction or combustion, as applied to disappearing stars, belongs to the age of Tycho Brache. The apparent, eternal cosmical alteration of existence and destruction, is not annihilation. It is merely the transition of matter into new forms; into combinations that are subject to new processes. *Dark, cosmical bodies* may, by a new process of light, again become luminous."—(*Cos. vol. 3, pp. 161-4.*)

That this is a real change in the luminous condition of the body, in its "Light—process," or the intensity of those unknown causes, which lead to the developement of light and heat, and not *merely apparent*, the result of rotation on an axis, or revolution in an orbit, is held with unhesitating confidence by La Place, Bessel, Madler, Herschell, Humboldt, Arago, and the highest authorities in this department of science. But their reasoning is still more convincing than their authority:

"Those stars," says La Place, "that have become invisible, after having surpassed the brilliancy of Jupiter, have not changed their place during the time of their being visible." (The luminous process in them has simply ceased.) "The circumstance that almost all these new stars burst forth at once, with extreme brilliancy, as stars of the first magnitude, and even with still stronger scintillation; and that they do not appear, at least to the naked eye, to increase gradually in brightness, is, in my opinion, a singular peculiarity, and one well deserving consideration. There are only three stars, (which may be looked upon in the light of exceptions,) that did not shine forth at once, as of the first magnitude."—[*Cosmos*, vol. 3, p. 361.]

The remark of Sir J. Herschell will be remembered here, that—

"The appearance of the star of 1572. was so sudden, that Tycho Brache, was surprised to find a group of country people gazing at a star, which HE WAS SURE DID NOT EXIST HALF AN HOUR BEFORE. This was the star in question."

These extraordinary phenomena bring us at once, amidst the sublimest and most startling discoveries of our modern astronomy, to the contemplation of stupendous changes—past, present, and future—which have occurred, which are occurring—which may be legitimately anticipated in the remoter heavens. And thus do they link together in harmonious union, those two great sciences, Astronomy and Geology, as complementary portions of one still sublimer and more comprehensive science; and show us, that while this earth has been the theatre of many revolutions, in its progressive preparation for its destined occupants, the same great law of change and progress pervades the universe around; and revolutions still more magnificent, by agencies equally mysterious, terrific, and irre-

sistible, have marked, and are marking still, the history of those upper worlds.

The preceding facts and principles lead us, likewise, by irresistible deduction, to two additional conclusions, of great importance in this argument :

FIRST. THE CREDIBILITY OF A FORMER CHAOTIC CONDITION OF OUR GLOBE, AS ASSERTED IN THE MOSAIC HISTORY. If, from the evidences of revolution every where around us, and the explosive elements within its bosom, there be reason to believe that a future conflagration is extremely probable, then the argument is equally applicable to the past as to the future, and to our own globe as to any other of the worlds in space. This antecedent probability becomes absolute certainty, if we receive the testimony of geology in answer to her own objection. The Bible records *one such era in the history of our globe*, at the termination of a former, and before the commencement of our present system; when the "earth was emptiness and desolation," without inhabitant, and waiting to be re-peopled by a new act of creative power. *Geology professes to record several precisely similar*—one at the termination of each of her great eras, when every living thing is said to have been destroyed by the same revolution in the economy of our planet, which prepared it for its new inhabitants.

Each new formation indicates a decisive crisis—"an entirely new era in the earth's history."—[Agazzis.]

"Between the youngest of the primary, and the oldest of the secondary, strata, there is *not one species in common*. An *entirely new* creation had succeeded to *universal decay and death*."—Murchison.

"The old creation, in the secondary strata, had *nothing* in common with the existing order of things, in the tertiary strata. Two planets could scarcely differ more in their natural productions."—Mrs. Somerville.

"Upwards of eight hundred extinct species have been described in the earliest, or Protozoic period, and *not one extends* to our era."—Ansted. H. Miller.

"The present epoch succeeds to, but is not a continuation of, the Tertiary. These two epochs are separated by a great geological event, traces of which we see every where around us. This great geological event, we are told, destroyed all species of ani-

mals, marine and terrestrial, and left the earth and sea a total desolation."—*Agazzis*.

Second. The entire credibility of the sun's temporary obscuration, and subsequent re-illumination at the commencement of our present economy. If the fixed stars be suns, and our sun one of the fixed stars, then what has occurred frequently amongst them, may have occurred once with him. The Mosaic record, (literally interpreted,) asserts one such occurrence within the last six thousand years. The astronomical record contains many, within the last three hundred. This variability of our sun's light, and its probable variation, have been often asserted by the most eminent philosophers on purely scientific principles.

"No more is light inherent in the sun, than in Tycho's vanished star," says Nicholl; "and, as with it and other orbs, the time may come when he shall cease to be required to shine." "No reason exists," says Bessel, the greatest Astronomer of our day, "for considering luminosity as an essential property of these bodies," fixed stars.

Sir J. Herschell, having discovered that the large and brilliant star, called Alpha Orionis, had, in the course of six weeks, lost nearly half its light, remarks—

"This phenomenon cannot fail to awaken attention, and revive those speculations which were first put forth by my father, Sir W. Herschell, respecting the possibility of a change in the lustre of our sun himself. If there be really a community of nature between the sun and fixed stars, every proof that we obtain of the extensive prevalence of such periodical changes in those remote bodies, adds to the probability of our finding something of the same kind nearer home.—*Proc R. Astr. Soc. Jan. 1840.*

"The question cannot fail to suggest itself here," remarks Nicholl, "whether the sun is now as he ever will be, or only in one state or epoch of his efficacy, as the radiant source of light and heat?" Having alluded to several phenomena, already mentioned above, he proceeds: "Is it not likely, then, that the intrinsic energies, to whose developement these phenomena must be owing, act also in our sun—that he also may pass through phases, filling up myriads of centuries?" "DARK COSMICAL BODIES may, by a renewed process of light, again become luminous."—*Humboldt*.

That such a sun, which had lost its light for centuries,

and perhaps for myriads of years, may be re-illuminated and shine on again, as it did before, is practically proven by a star now shining in our sky, called 34 Cygnus. It appeared, for the first time since the commencement of Astronomical records, in the year 1600, and still remains a star of the sixth magnitude. Was it created in 1600? Or was it only invisible till then? Had it been always invisible? Or, like the stars of Flamsteed's catalogue, observed by the Herschells, had it disappeared for an "unmeasured, and probably undeterminable period," to reappear in its appointed time? If the latter be the reasonable supposition, then it furnishes, "*mutato nomine*," the history of our sun. It is impossible to convey, by individual instances, the strong conviction which results from all combined, or the vivid impression made by them, upon the most philosophic minds. They are not solitary occurrences, but are spread over the whole range of Astronomic observation during the last two thousand years; often recurring, in rapid succession, after intervals of less than a single decade, and must therefore be the result of some general and comprehensive law. Hence, Herschell and Humboldt believe that "*variability*," and not *uniformity* of light, is the common characteristic of suns; and La Place, Bessel, Madler and Lambert, going still farther, assert, with absolute confidence, that

"There exist, in celestial space, dark bodies of equal magnitudes, and probably in as great numbers, as the (visible) stars."
La Place Sys. du Monde, 1824, p. 325.

We close with a third proposition. According to the latest speculations of our modern philosophy, the last geologic revolution in the history of our globe, which destroyed all previously existing animals, and prepared the earth for man and his contemporary species, coincides with the period of the last revolution in the condition of our sun, in its "light-process," "viewed as a fixed star." That is, the chaotic period which immediately preceded the present economy, was, as the Bible represents it, *one of universal darkness, as well as universal death*; and to prepare it for the abode of man, demanded, not only a re-modification of the earth, but a correspondent change in our central luminary.

"The grand phenomena of Geology afford, it appears to me," (we quote Sir J. Herschell's 'Astromical Observations,' 1847,) "THE HIGHEST PRESUMPTIVE EVIDENCE, of changes in the general climate of our globe. I cannot otherwise understand alternations of heat and cold, so extensive, as at one period to have clothed high northern latitudes with a more than tropical luxuriance of vegetation, at another, to have buried vast tracts of middle Europe, now enjoying a genial climate, and smiling with fertility, under a glacier crust of enormous thickness. Such changes seem to point to some cause more powerful than the mere local distribution of land and water, (according to Mr. Lyell's views,) can well be supposed to have been. In the slow secular variations of our supply of light and heat from the Sun, WHICH, IN THE IMMENSITY OF TIME PAST, MAY HAVE GONE TO ANY EXTENT, AND SUCCEEDED EACH OTHER IN ANY ORDER, without violating the analogy of sidereal phenomena, which we know to have taken place, we have a cause, not indeed established as a fact, but readily admissible as something beyond a bare possibility, fully adequate to the utmost requirements of Geology. A change of half a magnitude *in the lustre of the sun, regarded as a fixed star*, spread over successive Geological epochs—now progressive, now receding, now stationary, according to the evidence of warmer or colder general temperature, which Geological research has disclosed, or may hereafter reveal, is what *no Astronomer would now hesitate to admit*, as in itself a perfectly reasonable and not improbable supposition."—As. Obser. p. 351.

Again, (Outlines, sec. 830,) "We are compelled to admit a community of nature, between the fixed stars and our own sun, and Geology testifies to the fact of extensive changes, at epochs of the most remote antiquity, in the climate and temperature of our globe, changes which would find *an easy and natural explanation* in a slow variation, in the supply of *light and heat*, afforded primarily, *by the sun itself*."

These views, suggested originally by Sir W. Herschell and LaPlace, and thus adopted by Sir J. Herschell, in his "Astronomy" and "Astromical Observations," seem to have secured a wide, if not universal approbation.

"The probably great physical similarity in the process of light, in all self-luminous stars, (in the central body of our own planetary system, and in the distant suns or fixed stars,) has long, and justly, directed attention to the importance and significance, that attach to the periodical or non-periodical variation, in the light of the stars, the varying temperature which our planet has derived, in the course of thousands of years, from the radiation

of the sun. Supposing that our sun has passed through even a very few of these variations, in the intensity of light and heat, either in an increasing or decreasing ratio, (AND WHY SHOULD IT DIFFER FROM OTHER SUNS?) such a change, such an augmentation or weakening of its light-process, may account for far greater and more fearful results for our own planet, than any required for the explanation of all geognostic relations, and ancient telluric revolutions."—Cosmos, vol. 3, p. 181–2.

Whether we refer these indications of prodigious changes in our climate, to the "Glacier Period" of Agazzis, or to an earlier era, is unimportant to our argument. If they be confined to this imagined era, then, they coincide with the "great geological event, which separated the tertiary period from the present;" *the period of universal darkness, universal death, and (according to the glacial theory,) of ice almost universal.* If we refer them to an antecedent era, or several eras, then, besides the observed revolutions in the distant stars, and the "tumultuous agitation in his luminous atmospheres" now visible in our sun, we have traced upon our own globe the indelible memorials of several successive variations, precisely analogous in nature, and probably equal in extent, to any which the revelations of the Bible, or of the telescope, would lead us to anticipate in the future, or have recorded in the past.

ARTICLE II.

PRONUNCIATION OF GREEK.

History of the Greek Alphabet, with remarks on Greek Orthography and Pronunciation. By E. A. SOPHO-CLES. Cambridge, 1848. Pp. 136.

It is not our present purpose to go into an extended analysis of the above work. Its learned and acute author deserves the thanks of the University with which he is

connected, and of the American public, for having given in it a mass of information, on the subject of which he treats, hitherto almost entirely inaccessible to our students. His diligence also in collecting and arranging his authorities, and the clearness with which he has exhibited them, are deserving of all praise.

From the practical result at which Professor Sophocles appears to aim, viz : the restoration of the pronunciation which prevailed in the *golden age* of Greek literature, (viz. according to his division, p. 86, from Homer to Aristotle,) we entirely dissent. Even if it could be known with certainty what that pronunciation was, we are not sure but there would be insuperable objections to its reproduction in our schools, arising from subsequent modifications in the language itself, and from other causes. And it will appear below, that we differ from the Professor in regard to the question, what was the sound of some of the letters. This, however, does not prevent us from strongly recommending his book to all those who would be in a position to form an intelligent judgment of their own, on the subjects of which he treats; and with this recommendation, we take leave of Professor S., and proceed to offer freely our own remarks and suggestions on the *Pronunciation of the Greek Language*.

The student who undertakes to learn Turkish, Arabic or Sanscrit, bends his first efforts to acquiring the pronunciation. No matter how difficult, irregular or complex it may be, the pronunciation he must get, and until he has gotten it he feels that he has not passed the threshold of the new language. And, were we not familiar with the fact, it would certainly seem surprising, that the pronunciation of Greek should be treated as a matter of indifference, by any who regard the study of that language as an essential part of a liberal education.

And yet our professors and our grammars, when introducing us to the rudiments of that noble tongue, gravely tell us that the *pronunciation* is a matter of no consequence, or is irrecoverably lost, or both; and then as gravely set about teaching us *a* pronunciation, which it would be easy to prove has no claim to be regarded as the genuine and original one, were we not relieved of the labor

of this demonstration, by the circumstance, that no such claim is even advanced on its behalf.*

What would be thought of the application of such a principle to French, or German, or any other living language? Doubtless one might acquire a correct knowledge of French construction, and even appreciate in some measure, the beauties of French composition, and yet read *comment vous portez-vous?* as if the letters were sounded precisely as in our own tongue. But who would be contented to pursue such a course? The idea would be treated as simply ridiculous.

And yet the Greek *is not a dead language*. Its tones have never ceased to live and breathe over the hills and plains, and among the islands of its fatherland, from the days of Hesiod until now. True, as at present spoken it has lost much. The Dual number, and the Middle voice have disappeared. The use of the Dative case is rare. The Syntax has been modernized; and many words anciently used are now obsolete. But the stock of words is, on the whole, the same. The same nouns and verbs, the same prepositions and adverbs, are employed at the present day, as were employed by Plato and Xenophon, to express the same ideas. Terms borrowed from Turkish or Italian are used to some extent in conversation, but no good writer of the present day allows himself to employ them.

Now, let the reader be told that one uniform pronunciation of this language prevails throughout insular, peninsular and continental Greece, Asia Minor, Thrace and Macedonia,† and he will at once exclaim, surely that uniform pronunciation should be the standard.

* The current pronunciation of our schools is not even conformed, as it professes to be, to English analogy. Take for instance, the infinitive of the verb *to be*, εἶναι. The pronunciation of the first syllable has but two words in our language to sustain it; that of the last, not one. There are other anomalies almost equally glaring, which the attentive student of Greek will easily call to mind.

† The only exception worth naming, is a tendency among some of the islanders to soften the sound of the letter χ before ϵ and ι into that of *ch* as in *church*. In respect to all the other consonants, to all the vowels and diphthongs, and to the use of the accent, the most complete agreement prevails; so that the Greek language is spoken with far greater uniformity than the French, Italian, German or English.

And so it would have been, but for the misdirected genius and influence of one great man. The learned Greeks, who, on the triumphs of the Turkish arms in the 15th century, were scattered through Europe, were every where hailed as the teachers of a language, acknowledged to contain the master-pieces of human genius. As a matter of course they introduced their own pronunciation. They knew no other; and the whole world of letters knew no other, for no other existed. It ought to be known that the prevailing European pronunciation of Greek was a pure invention of Erasmus.

It will freely be admitted, that in some particulars, the *original* pronunciation of the Greek language has been corrupted in the course of more than thirty centuries. But of what language cannot a similar remark be made with truth? Besides, it can be satisfactorily shown that these changes are ancient, having taken place chiefly, if not entirely, before the christian era; and that the pronunciation of the Greek language, was substantially the same in the days of Paul and Plutarch, of Justin Martyr and Pausanias, that it is in Greece at the present day. However, Erasmus, observing these variations from the *original* pronunciation, and still more influenced by the difficulty to Europeans in general, of acquiring the true pronunciation of the letters γ , δ , ϑ and χ , (no precise equivalents to which exist in their own languages,) proposed a system of his own, restoring, conjecturally, the sounds of those vowels which he supposed to have been changed, and *accommodating* those of the consonants to the unpliant organs of his countrymen. The *convenience* of this system, together with the personal influence of its author, rendered it acceptable to Europeans, among whom it has prevailed to the present day. English and American scholars, while (under the influence of the pronunciation of their own tongue) they have restored the sounds of η and ϑ to the Greek national standard, have swerved both from that standard and from Erasmus in respect to the vowel ι , and to some of the diphthongs.

But it is time to state briefly what the modern Greek pronunciation is.

A is uniformly sounded as *a* in *father*.

B “ “ as *v*, never as *b*.

Γ is *gh* guttural before *a* and *o*, but softer and more like *y* before *ε*, *ι* and *υ*.

Δ *th* in this.

Ε *a* in *mane* or *e* in *men*.

Ζ *z*, never like *dz*.

Η *ee*, same as *ι*.

Θ *th* as in *thin*.

Ι *i* as in *machine*.

Κ *k*.

Λ *l*.

Μ *m*.

Ν *n*.

Ξ *x* as in *wax*.

Ο *o* as in *whole*.

Π *p*.

Ρ *r* somewhat stronger than in English, but not so strong as in Scotch.

Σ *s* as in *say*.

Τ *t*.

Υ *y* as in *ruby*, same as *ι*.

Φ *f*.

Χ *ch* guttural as in German.

Ψ *ps*.

Ω *o*, same as omicron.

The only vowels which appear to have changed their pronunciation since the most ancient times, (except that the distinction between long and short vowels is confessedly lost,) are *η* and *υ*; the former having doubtless originally had a sound resembling that of *ε*, and the latter a sound corresponding to *u* French and *u* German. Both are now pronounced precisely like *ι*. With the change of the former, compare that which the letter *e* has undergone in our own language (from its original Roman sound,) and with that of the latter, the similar change in the pronunciation of *y* German, in the greater part of the countries where that language is spoken, and of *u* among the common people in Southern Germany.

The *consonants* which have in our schools a pronunciation different from that of the Greeks, are *ε*, *γ*, *δ* and *χ*. Beside these we deprive *ξ* and *ψ* of half their power, when they appear at the beginning of words, while the Greeks

sound them fully wherever they occur. Probably no one will attempt to justify the variations in respect to the χ , ξ and ψ , except on the ground of the difficulty to our organs of pronouncing them accurately.

But why should it be supposed, (as Prof. S. is inclined to admit,) that the first three consonants of the Greek alphabet have lost their original sound? Prof. S. concedes this point, simply on the ground of the strict definition of a *mute*, given by Aristotle and Sextus; ἄφωνον, as the former remarks, “καὶ αὐτὸ μὲν οὐδεμίαν ἔχον φωνήν, μετὰ δὲ τῶν ἔχόντων τινὰ φωνήν γινόμενον ἀκουστόν.” But are *b*, *g* hard and *d* absolute mutes? Certainly not in the same strict sense as the smooth mutes *p*, *k* and *t*. The main argument in favor of the supposed change in the pronunciation of ξ , γ and δ , will doubtless be that the corresponding letters in the Roman alphabet have different sounds.

But, in the first place, the testimony in respect to these letters, afforded by the languages descended from the Latin, is not uniform. The Spanish, in many cases, pronounces *b* nearly like *v*, and *d* like *th* in *this*, (in other words, like the Greek ξ and δ) and gives to *g* a guttural sound; while all the languages of the Latin stock vary the sound of *g*, according to the vowel by which it is followed.

In the second place, it may be asked, where is the proof that ξ , γ and δ were pronounced by the ancient Greeks precisely as were *b*, *g* and *d*, by the Romans?

In Latin words, derived from the Greek, ξ is represented not only by *b*, but by *v*; e. g. $\xi\alpha\iota\alpha$ *vis*, $\xi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ *vita*, $\xi\alpha\delta\iota\zeta\omega$ *vado*; and *vice versa*, Latin names transferred to the Greek change *v* into *b*; e. g. *Octavius* Οκταβίος , *Severus* Σεβήρος , *Flavius* Φλάβιος , &c. This use of *b* appears on coins and in inscriptions.

That γ was originally a soft letter, is proved by the fact that even as early as the time of Homer, it was employed, like the Digamma, as an aspirate; thus $\gamma\delta\omicron\upsilon\pi\omicron\varsigma$ for $\delta\omicron\upsilon\pi\omicron\varsigma$, $\gamma\eta\delta\omega$ i. q. $\eta\delta\omega$; and by its insertion or omission in such words as $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$; $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$, $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\acute{\nu}\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$; also by its use in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament to represent the Hebrew translation of *Ayin*; as in $\Gamma\acute{\alpha}\zeta\alpha$, $\Gamma\acute{o}\mu\omicron\rho\acute{\rho}\alpha$, &c. Prof. S. (p. 112,) after inferring “from Aristotle’s and Sextus’s definition of a mute consonant,” that γ was sounded like *g* hard, says, “in later times, it had

the sound of the Romaic γ ; hence, in the Septuagint, it sometimes represents the Oriental *Ain*: as Γάζα, Γαιβαίλ, Γόμορρα."

But when were these *later times*? Some ancient authors say that the translation of the Seventy was made in the time of Ptolemy Lagus; others, that this work was accomplished under the auspices of his son, Ptolemy Philadelphus. Now, Ptolemy Lagus commenced his reign *the year before Aristotle died*. Even if we assign the later period to the translation, no sufficient time remains for the supposed change. Besides, Sextus, the other author whose definition is relied on, lived some centuries later.

Respecting δ , the fact of its being interchanged with the Latin *d*, proves nothing; for, on the supposition that its pronunciation was the same in ancient times as at present, and that the Latin *d* was the same as ours, the Romans had no exact representative of it, and would naturally employ *d* as the letter most nearly resembling it; precisely as the Europeans do at the present day, in representing modern Greek names. We have, however, the testimony of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who says that it was pronounced, "τῆς γλώσσης ἄκρῳ τῷ στόματι προσερεϊδομένης, κατὰ τοὺς μετεωροτέρους ὀδόντας, ἔπειδ' ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑποῤαπιζομένης, καὶ τὴν διέξοδον αὐτῷ περὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας ἀποδιδούσης," *by resting the tongue against the upper teeth at the extremity of the mouth, and pressing the breath upon it, (the tongue,) which thus gives utterance to this letter by the teeth*. Now this is a plain description of the sound of *th*, as in *the*, and can by no means be made to signify that of *d*.

In regard to all three of these letters, ϵ , γ , δ , it is a strong proof that they had anciently the sound which they now have in Greece, that they were classed as μέσα or *medial*, (in respect to aspiration,) between ψιλὰ, *smooth mutes*, π , κ , τ , and the δασεα, *rough ones*, ϕ , χ , θ . Let the reader make the experiment with his own organs, and he will be satisfied that, as pronounced in our schools, they have no claim to such an appellation; while according to the pronunciation of the Greeks, no term could have been more appropriate.

Add to all this, that these letters are pronounced with perfect uniformity throughout all the countries where Greek is spoken, and the argument approximates to a de-

monstration that that pronunciation has never been changed.

The proper limits of an article like the present forbid a minute investigation of the pronunciation of the diphthongs. The result of such an examination would doubtless be that, although they have varied from their *original* pronunciation, yet, their present pronunciation was attained long before the date of the oldest Greek manuscripts which have come down to our times, and probably before the Christian era. Thus *αι* was often employed by the Seventy to express the sound of the Hebrew *tseri*, as in the names *Elam*, *Ethan*, *Heman*, Αἰλάμ, Αἰθάν, Αἰμάν; *ει* to represent that of *hireq*, as in *Elim*, *Dina*, *Seir*, Αἰλείμ, Δείνα, Σηείρ; *αυ* and *ευ* to represent the sounds *av* and *ev*, as *David* and *Levi*, Δαυίδ, Λευί, &c.

The only serious objection to the universal adoption of the pronunciation existing in Greece, is the fact that the vowels *η* and *υ*, and the diphthongs *ει*, *οι*, and *υι*, are all sounded like *ι*.* But after allowing this objection its full force, we will venture to inquire, whether it is not much more than balanced by the following advantages:

1. *Uniformity* seems very unlikely to be attained in any other way. There can be no other *standard*. However ingenious the speculations of an individual may be, or however accurate his researches, it seems highly improbable that any newly proposed scheme of pronunciation would meet the unanimous approbation of the learned in a single country, much less in all countries where the study of Greek forms a regular part of a liberal education. But by reverting to the pronunciation of the Greeks themselves, we have a standard which may fairly and reasonably be admitted by all other nations.

2. There is a *familiarity* and *naturalness* arising from the adoption of a pronunciation actually in use among a people of our own day, which greatly facilitates the progress of the learner. That modern languages are ordinarily acquired with greater rapidity than ancient, and are more familiarly treasured up in the memory, is owing, we apprehend, not mainly to any difference in their structure,

* Great as is this variety of means for expressing the *e* sound, we can rival it in English. Witness the orthography of such words as *me*, *thee*, *plea*, *reheve*, *perceive*, *machine*, *valley*; not to speak of *quay*, *people*, *Cæsar*, *æcumenical*

but to the method pursued in their acquisition. Treat Latin and Greek as *living* languages, and they will *live* in your habitual regard and in your memory. This is a matter of experience, and we can only recommend to our readers to make the experiment for themselves, believing that they will be satisfied with its results.

3. The adoption of the modern Greek pronunciation would naturally lead the learned of other countries to take increased interest in the literati of Greece, to maintain more intercourse with them, (an intercourse which it might be hoped would, in many ways, prove mutually beneficial,) and to pay more attention to their publications. Many a classical scholar visits Greece and finds himself cut off from intercourse with those who surround him, simply because he has studied their ancient language with a pronunciation which makes him a barbarian to them, and them barbarians to him. The rapid advance of higher education in Greece, gives promise that its rising university will ere long be a resort for students from other countries, who wish to perfect themselves in the knowledge of the ancient Greek. The advance to which we refer does not, however, relate so much to the study of Greek, as to the combining of other branches with that. The Greeks have never neglected the study of their ancient language. The writer has often listened, with astonishment, in their grammar schools, to the exercises of boys, from ten to fifteen years of age, whose promptness and skill in grammatical analysis would put to shame many of our college graduates. An increased acquaintance of learned foreigners with the schools of Greece, could not fail to advance the cause of classical learning universally. We commend the subject of these remarks to all admirers of the language of Homer and Demosthenes, of Paul and John, of Gregory and Chrysostom.

W. M. J. Sumner ~~Esq.~~ ARTICLE III.

THE CHARACTER OF MOSES.

The result of the latest researches among the monuments of Egypt, compared with the data furnished in the most carefully revised chronological tables, would lead us to conclude that Moses, the great Jewish lawgiver and leader, was born in the 15th or 16th century before Christ. Dr. Nolan places the Exodus in the time of Thothmes iv. B. C. 1492. Wilkinson places the birth of Moses, B. C. 1571, under Amosis Chebron, the 1st King of the 18th dynasty. The Exodus he places under Thummosis, or Thothmosis, or Thothmes iii., the 6th King of 18th dynasty, B. C. 1491. Osburn seems to place the birth of Moses, B. C. 1847, under Amosis. Champollion Figeac places the Exodus at B. C. 1528, page 340.

Moses was, unquestionably, long anterior to all the records of authentic history, saving only the books furnished by his own pen. The reputed annals of China, of India, and of Chaldæa, are demonstrably of much later origin: some few hieroglyphic inscriptions on the monuments of Egypt, may possibly antedate him; though even this is not beyond the reach of doubt. Certain it is that society was yet in its infancy, saving only in Egypt, and possibly in the far east. Homer, the father of Grecian song, was long posterior; and even the Trojan war of which Homer sung, occurred only in the time of Solomon, many centuries after Moses. The Grecian, the Persian, and even the Chaldæan empires, whose history is to us of the remotest antiquity, sprang into being many ages after Moses lay sleeping in the dust. The countries where those nations afterwards flourished, where the kingdoms of modern times arose, were either a wilderness yet unreclaimed from their original solitude, or at least, the seat of hordes of barbarians.

Egypt was indeed already occupied by a people numerous and powerful—a people subjected to a government well organized and vigorously administered; a people too, far advanced in knowledge of the arts and sciences; as the still extant monuments of their greatness demonstrate.

But the Egyptians stood alone. The territories adjacent seem to have been occupied, as Palestine unquestionably was, by numerous petty tribes mutually jealous and hostile towards one another, and engaged in frequent bloody wars. In such a state of society civilization cannot advance, men remain for a long time rude, unpolished and ignorant—and it is passing strange that in such a state of things such a man as Moses should have arisen; and such writings as those constituting the Pentateuch should have been produced!

Therefore, whether we consider the age in which he lived, the condition of society around him—the disposition of the people with whom he had to do—the difficulties with which he had to contend, or the triumphs he achieved in arms, in arts and in literature—in ethics, in legislation and in government, Moses must be pronounced the most extraordinary man that ever lived.

Of the race of Abraham, in the line of Levi, the son of Jacob, Moses first saw the light in Egypt, where his countrymen had resided for several generations, and were now suffering cruel oppression from the powerful Egyptian monarch. The date of the birth of Moses, cannot be fixed with absolute precision, but according to the ordinary computation it was about A. M. 2433 or B. C. 1600. Usher make the Exodus B. C. 1490. It was certainly during the period when the cruel policy of the Egyptian Court required the destruction of all male Hebrew infants. From this fate Moses was rescued by very extraordinary means. Maternal tenderness had secreted the child for three months; when further concealment becoming unpracticable, he was placed by his mother in a kind of cradle or basket of bulrushes carefully prepared, so as to render it impervious to water; and in this frail vessel he was placed near the water's edge, on the bank of the Nile, where he was found by Thermothis, (according to Nolan Amense,) the daughter of Pharaoh*—moved by pity, and struck by his rare infantile beauty, the princess rescued the foundling, and adopted him for her own son; and by a strange but happy coincidence, he was by her confided to

* The Hebrew Rabbins relate wonderful stories of the infancy of Moses—among others they aver that the princess was a leper: that the mere touch of the ark containing the infant cured her; and hence her determination to adopt the child it contained.

the care of his own mother as nurse. From the manner of his preservation he was called Mou-she (Heb. Mosheh) Moses i. e. *drawn from water*. For it is found that the Egyptian names, given in the books of Moses, are genuine Egyptian, as is proved from the monuments.

How long Moses remained in the family of his own parents, we know not ; but it was certainly long enough for him to become thoroughly imbued with the true national feeling of a Hebrew. At a suitable age, he was claimed by the princess, and educated with all the care due to one openly acknowledged as the heir to the most powerful throne in the world !

Josephus tells us that when only 4 years old, Moses was presented by the princess to the reigning Pharaoh as her son and heir, and that to gratify his daughter, the monarch took the child in his arms, and placed the royal crown upon his head ; but that he cast it indignantly to the ground and trampled upon it. Whereupon several of Pharaoh's most revered counsellors advised the immediate destruction of the child, as of one certain, should he live, to bring dire calamities on the kingdom, the emblem of whose sovereignty he thus early treated with indignity. This cruel policy, providence suffered not to be carried into effect.

His position in the Court of Pharaoh must have ensured to him the best possible education ; and as the royal family of Egypt were connected with the priesthood, (the monarch himself being often, of the sacerdotal order.) Moses must have had access to all the varied stores of knowledge in history, natural science, philosophy and government—to all the monuments of their antiquity and the secrets of their religion, for which that ancient people were distinguished. And thus it is recorded "*Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians !*"

An apt scholar he was unquestionably, for the writings he has left behind him, and the records of his vast achievements show, that he far transcended his instructors in true wisdom and in sober practical learning.

In the Court of Pharaoh, Moses held his distinguished position till he had reached full maturity. About the age of 40, Josephus assures us, he headed the Egyptian armies in an expedition into Ethiopia, where he

subdued the city Saba; he also won the affections of Tharbis, the Princess of the people whom he had vanquished, and married her. If this tradition be true, we know not that he had any issue by this marriage.

It must have been after his return from this successful military expedition, that the circumstance occurred, which, by reviving an instinctive and indomitable love for his own peculiar and oppressed race, gave a new and unexpected turn to the current of his life, and altered the entire complexion of his destiny.

Distinguished in rank, high in favor at Court, and honored for his brilliant success in arms, Moses could not forget that he was of the stock of Abraham, and that the oppressed Hebrews whom he beheld toiling in cruel bondage, were his brethren!

The merest accident, seemingly, roused these latent feelings into sudden and decisive action. Going out one day for the express purpose of observing the condition of his countrymen, his indignation was aroused by the spectacle of an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew. Glancing hastily around, to assure himself that he was not observed, he vindicated his Hebrew brother, by killing the Egyptian on the spot. The body he hid in the sand. Attempting on another occasion, soon after, to reconcile two Hebrews, whom he found quarrelling, his interference was resisted by the aggressor, accompanied by a bitter taunt against him as the killer of the Egyptian so recently. Justly concluding that the deed was known, that investigation must take place, and punishment follow, unmitigated by royal favor, (which must now be lost to him,) Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh, who (as he had surmised) sought to slay him. The old Jewish Rabbins have here a singular story. They tell us that Moses was actually apprehended for this act, and condemned to death; but that God caused his neck suddenly to assume a preternatural hardness, so that the sword of the executioner not only left Moses uninjured, but by its rebound killed the executioner himself. At such fables we can only smile; certain it is that Moses left the country and retired to Midian, where he, who had dwelt in Courts, and had led powerful armies to conquest, engaged himself to Jethro, a priest of the country, in the humble capacity of herdsman or keeper of his flocks. In

this obscure retreat he remained many years, having married Zipporah, daughter of Jethro, by whom he had two sons. This entire and long continued seclusion, furnished Moses with abundant leisure for reflection on the condition and prospects of his countrymen, and for maturing plans for their relief.

Here, also, we may well suppose, he reviewed the studies of his early youth, and explored those fields of knowledge, to reap which those studies had qualified him. Here, doubtless, he rendered himself familiar with the traditions, and the imperfect records then in existence, of the history of mankind since the flood; and possibly in antediluvian times; and here, in all probability, he wrote the book of Genesis—and revised (perhaps translated) the book of Job for the use of his countrymen; certain it is that here he claims to have received his commission from the Almighty Jehovah, to act as His representative, in the deliverance of the Hebrews from Egyptian bondage, and in their safe conduct to the promised land! The project of such an enterprize seems to have been brooding in his mind for many years. The dying Martyr Stephen, represents Moses as entertaining this idea, even at the time he killed the Egyptian, previously to his flight into Midian "*for he supposed his brethren would have understood how God, by his hand, would deliver them.*" Acts 7, 25. Not improbably the supineness, the tame serf-like spirit, evinced by his countrymen on that occasion, had chilled the fervour of patriotic feeling in the breast of their illustrious defender, and long suppressed the spirit of heroic daring that was glowing within him. Repressed it was, and held in check for years, but eradicated it could not be; and amid the shady retreats around Horeb, where he tended his flocks, the wrongs of his countrymen, and the means and mode of redress, were oft and deeply pondered!

The season for action at length arrived. The strange phenomenon of a bush on Mount Horeb burning, apparently, with brilliant blaze and intense heat, yet still unconsumed, caught his attention, and arrested his steps. A voice addressing him from the burning bush, satisfied him that he stood in the presence of Jehovah—Abraham's God. Then and there it was that Moses received his heavenly commission as the deliverer, the legislator, the prophet

and the leader of Israel ; he was clothed with full authority, and invested with all necessary powers to achieve the magnificent enterprize. He promptly obeyed. He made immediate arrangements to pass with his young family into Egypt, there to enter upon the discharge of his new functions. On his journey from Midian to Egypt, occurred a singular incident. By some unexplained means—probably a malignant disease—Moses was placed in imminent peril of his life ; rightly interpreting this as a proof of heaven's displeasure, for the neglect of the sacred Jewish covenant in his own family, he caused both his sons to be circumcised. The peril passed away, and he resumed his journey with this impressive lesson : “ *that no public commission, no official arrangements, can be lawfully allowed to interfere with private personal or social duties.*” Ere he reached Egypt, Moses was joined by his brother Aaron, whom, by divine direction, he associated with him, as his coadjutor and spokesman. They summoned the leading men of Israel, detailed to them their plans, and opened their commission. The hope of national deliverance was awakened, and the people agreed to submit to Moses, as the leader and the prophet—duly commissioned of Jehovah. Speedily thereafter Moses appeared at Court, obtained an audience of the reigning Pharaoh, and boldly demanded the release of the whole Hebrew people, for the avowed purpose of their passing beyond the Egyptian frontier, there to serve the God of their ancestors, with rites, which, to the ox-worshipping Egyptians, would have seemed an impious abomination. This demand, earnestly made and urged in repeated audiences before the monarch, was long and resolutely refused, until a series of prodigies unprecedented and unparalleled in the world's history, wrung from the proud Pharaoh a reluctant consent.

The further details of the matchless career of Moses, we shall not minutely pursue,—they constitute the historical portion of the books of Moses, chiefly of Exodus, and are familiar to all.

Under the guidance of this illustrious leader, the whole body of the Hebrews, with their wives and their little ones, their flocks and their herds, and greatly enriched also by liberal largess from their late oppressors, left the Egyptian frontier behind them. At the shores of the Red

Sea they were overtaken by the disciplined hosts of the repentant Pharaoh's armies, in hot pursuit. Through the Red Sea—miraculously divided before them—Israel's bands safely passed, whilst the pursuing Egyptians were therein drowned beneath its returning waters. During their long sojourn of many years in the desert regions of Arabia, the Hebrews were led, directed, provided for, and protected from every foe, by the matchless skill, the sleepless vigilance, and the untiring energy of this renowned commander. He fed them with food, that fell daily like the dew; he supplied them with water, that gushed at his bidding from the sterile rock; and at Sinai's rugged mountain, near which they lay encamped about a year, he delivered to them, as the immediate enactment of the mighty Jehovah, whose servant he avowed himself, that inimitable document, that matchless code of morals, *the decalogue, the two tables containing the ten commandments.*

At length, when he had brought the Hebrews, after a sojourn of nearly 40 years in the Arabian desert, to the borders of the promised land, this distinguished man pronounced his farewell discourse in the hearing of the people. He delivered in their presence a copy of all the annals which he had written, and which also embodied the entire system of laws he had enacted, into the hands of the ecclesiastical officers, to be by them sacredly preserved in the Ark, the palladium of their religion, and their national hopes. He resigned the government into the hands of Joshua, whom he had carefully trained to act as his successor; and then this venerable prince, this matchless lawgiver, retired to die in privacy—in the presence only of the God whom he had so long served. At the age of 120 years, while yet "*his eye was not dim nor his natural force abated,*" Moses died, deeply lamented; and to this day by his whole nation he is revered as the greatest as well as the first of their prophets, and the most distinguished man of all their race!

The character of Moses presents a brilliant assemblage of excellencies, rarely found combined in any one individual!

As a man, his conduct was most exemplary. He discharged all the duties of private life with uniform propriety. As a son, a brother, a husband and a father, his life

was a pattern of propriety, and his reputation without a stain. The kind fraternal intercourse he ever maintained with Aaron, his brother, and with Miriam, his sister, was every way becoming; while the respect with which he treated Jethro, the father of Zipporah, his wife, and the readiness with which he adopted the discreet suggestions Jethro made respecting the appointment of subordinate Judges, (see Exod. 18, v. 17-27,) evince the beauty of reverence for virtuous age, the courtesy of the kind *kinsman*, and the policy of the sagacious statesman. The conduct of Moses furnishes a beautiful exemplification of that regard for the claims of age, of kindred, and of one's country, so emphatically enjoined in his writings.

He was evidently a good man, and sincere. Moses was no impostor—he devoutly believed in the divine origin of the commission under which he acted, and in the truth and importance of the doctrines he inculcated. This, his whole life showed. In prosecution of his extraordinary mission, he hazarded his lofty position at the Egyptian court. He vindicated his oppressed countrymen, at the risk of his life; and, after he had entered on the public duties of his great enterprise, he braved every danger. He fearlessly presented himself before the powerful Pharaoh—the deadly enemy of his race—and, in the presence of the scoffing court, he vindicated his own commission, the majesty of the God in whose name he acted, and the rights of the oppressed Israelites, for whom he pleaded.

Neither murmurings among his own people, nor threats nor insults from the Egyptian court, could deter him or cause him to waver for an instant. He carried his point—he led the Hebrews forth from under the yoke of Pharaoh, and saw them encamped in safety near the foot of Mt. Sinai, after a series of prodigies unheard of in the history of the world till then.

Of these prodigies, a minute account is given in his writings. In memory of them, rites, peculiar and most expressive, were by him incorporated into the religious system of the Hebrews; and he appeals to their knowledge of these very events, as containing the reason for the appointment, and sufficient motives for the conscientious observance, of these very rites.

Imposition here, would have been impracticable. Had

these assertions of miracles and prodigies performed by Moses on their behalf, and before their own eyes, been false, the Jews must have known it, and they never could have been induced to favor and to perpetuate the shameless lie, by observing those rites, and enjoining on their children, the sacred observance of them in all time to come. But, observe them they did, with great reverence, and they have perpetuated this observance among their descendants in every age, to the present day.

The Jews, who had every advantage for ascertaining the truth in this case, firmly believed in the sincerity of Moses, and in the truth of his narration of prodigies by him performed. And to this day their descendants believe the same, and revere the memory of Moses, as of a man pre-eminently *wise, sincere, and good*.

Moses was also a man of great firmness and self-control.—In many ways this was shown. It is apparent, in the steadfastness with which he adhered to his one great purpose of emancipating Israel, and habituating them to the novel institutions he felt himself commissioned to establish. The frowns of power and the clamours of the mob were alike incapable of shaking his settled purpose, or of turning him from it for a moment.

When the people gathered together in tumultuous assemblies, loudly clamouring against his rule as unauthorized and irksome, he calmly faced the angry multitude and reproved them for their folly and impious rebellion against the God he served. When he saw the multitude sunk in licentious indulgence, and thus inviting speedy destruction, Moses hesitated not to apply the severest remedies. He rallied his faithful adherents around him, and sword in hand, he reduced the multitude to reason and submission, even though it cost the lives of thousands. It was the only price at which a return to virtue and good order could be purchased. It is impossible to contemplate Moses, in the midst of scenes like these, (and they were, alas, too frequent,) without being struck with the dignity of his character as pre-eminently *firm, calm, and self-possessed*.

As a patriot, Moses was yet more distinguished.—No man that ever lived accomplished more for his countrymen, and secured less to himself. Contemplate but what Moses achieved, and at what cost to himself, and his character

will stand forth beaming with the glory of the purest patriotism.

Himself trained in a court, surrounded with its pleasures, and loaded with its honors, he beheld the spectacle of a people enslaved, degraded, and cruelly oppressed. Those wretched victims of a relentless policy, he could not forget, were his countrymen and his brethren. Most men, in the position of Moses, would have shunned them; ashamed of his origin, and desirous to eradicate the remembrance of it from his own mind and from the minds of the courtiers around him. But so far from this, the noble-minded Moses felt and yielded to the claims of consanguinity. He clung to his people the more tenaciously, for the misery in which he saw them sunk. He identified himself with them by one daring act, as if to shew his determination to rescue them or to perish in the attempt.

The ignorance of his countrymen, their degradation of character, (an inevitable fruit of long years of servitude,) and their strong yearnings after the idolatrous usages, and licentious pleasures, prevailing around them, presented formidable difficulties. Nothing deterred at the prospect, Moses met these difficulties patiently and resolutely, and by a discreet perseverance, he overcame them all.

The sacred functions of the priestly office he assigned to Aaron, his brother, to be perpetuated in his family; for Phinehas, the son of Aaron, had shown himself every way equal to this high dignity. His own sons, Moses left in the inferior rank of Levites, subordinate to the priesthood.

During his own natural life, it is true, Moses was the leader and the Judge of Israel. But, after giving them a pure religion, national independence, and a government strongly imbued with a generous democratic spirit, since the most important offices were elective, he appointed Joshua, a man unconnected with his own family, to succeed him as leader of Israel, and to settle the tribes in the promised land of Canaan. The whole life of Moses is replete with genuine patriotism, noble and pure as that of the immortal Washington. Moses was to the oppressed Israelites, what Alfred was to England, what William Tell was to the Swiss!

As a scholar, and an accomplished writer also, Moses still stands pre-eminent! He was educated under all the

advantages to be found at the seat of power, and the fountain head of learning in the ancient world; and it is asserted he was "*learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.*" No ordinary commendation this; for Egypt was the cradle of ancient learning. Nor can a careful reader of the Books of Moses fail to perceive, from the familiar acquaintance he displays with the position, the customs, the history, and the mutual relations of the several nations around Palestine; with the origin of those nations; of the arts generally practised among them; the productions of their countries; the nature, extent and materials of their commerce; and with the various traditions prevailing amongst them, respecting occurrences connected with the remotest antiquity; that Moses possessed a mind active, well trained, accustomed to research, and richly stored with the fruits of research, among all the various departments of human inquiry.

Even in a scientific point of view, the writings of Moses are, to this day, invaluable. The explorations and measurements made in Egypt by the French expedition in 1820, furnish data to shew that some great convulsion must have altered the whole aspect of that country, at a period not more remote than about 4,000 years before Christ; which is much about the period Moses assigns to Noah's deluge; so that science herself furnishes evidence of the accuracy of the Jewish law-giver, and of the worthlessness of the claims now so boldly advanced for enormous antiquity to Egypt and her monuments. Those monuments could not have been erected before the soil on which they stand, and from which their builders must have obtained their sustenance, was formed.* Moreover, in the first chapters of Genesis, Moses gives a concise history of the origin of this earth and of its living occupants. Now a diligent comparison of the several steps in the creative process, as detailed by Moses, with the most approved theories of cosmogony now in vogue among the learned, and especially with the order which geological researches show that the great Architect of the Universe did actually observe in the production of the several occupants of our globe, from the first breaking up of chaos, has satisfied

* See M. Henri's "*Egypte Pharaonique*," vol. 1, pp. 40, 41.

many among the learned that however it may have been obtained by the writer, the scientific knowledge embodied in the books of Moses is so varied, so profound, and so accurate, that the noblest results of modern scientific research are only an approximation to a recovery, in our times, of scientific knowledge perfectly familiar to Moses.

The erudite and candid author of *L'Egypte Pharaonique* remarks on this subject :

"The cosmogony of Moses, simple, clear, and natural, is evidently the result of learned research. The author of this system, respecting the origin of the earth and the heavens, *must necessarily have devoted himself to profound meditations on the history of the globe ; and it is certain, that in his day Geology must have reached an extraordinary point of perfection*, for the historian to follow, as Moses has done, step by step, all the mysteries of that creation."

Again he writes—

"No mortal man assisted at the work of creation ; no human eye could have penetrated the mystery and reported to us that which took place, at the grand epoch of the origin of the world. And yet, Moses recounts all that the hand of God wrought to form this universe ; and what Moses relates, exhibits an exactitude and an accuracy so complete, that the progress which the sciences have made in our days, lends the support of their resistless testimony to each one of his narrations ;" so valuable are the writings of Moses, as embodying the first principles of science."

To quote the language of a distinguished French writer, who rejects the idea of inspiration :

"The history of the creation, as given by Moses, which is the system of Egypt in the first or learned age of its existence, can be only regarded as the result of the long continued study of a great number of countries, of different geological formations compared one with another ; and the application of principles deduced from laborious geognostic explorations. It evinces consequently a very advanced state of the sciences, chemical, and consequently of mathematics, also."—*Henri Egypte Pharaonique*, vol 1, pp. 155, 156.

Another writer, in the same language, remarks—

"So many things would prove Moses to be a wise Geologist of our age, if he did not learn the facts which he relates from some other source than the study of the formation of the globe, that it is only a mind in which great frivolity of character is

joined to deplorable ignorance, that can perceive any flagrant contradictions between Holy Scriptures and the profane sciences." *Am. Sainte's History of Rationalism in Germany, Eng. Trans. Lond. 1849, p. 265.*

In another passage, in the same work, M. Saintes remarks—

"The sciences in our days, display in their teachings, notwithstanding the assertions to the contrary, more and more harmony with biblical facts." He here refers to the first part of Genesis 3d, p. 67.

A mind of the highest order, then, Moses unquestionably had. A mind well disciplined, richly cultivated, and thoroughly conversant with the profoundest philosophical views of the age; while he soared far above those views, immeasurably outstripping his contemporaries!

The simple majesty in which he presents the idea of God—the one Being uncreated, and the all powerful Creator of all things—the directness with which he states his lofty doctrines, and the perfect clearness and precision with which he lays down the several duties of morality; and that too, in an age of idolatry, superstition, and licentiousness, sanctioned under the venerable name of religion—discover in the Jewish leader, a mind of transcendent powers, of surpassing vigor and clearness, far reaching in its views, and deep, penetrating and accurate in its conclusions.

In the vast expanse of ethics and philosophy, Moses was the morning star that ushers in the day. He was the Columbus, who explored unknown deeps—the revealer of the certain and the solid.

As to his writings, Moses is distinguished for the simplicity of his diction, the clearness with which he conveys his ideas, and the purity of the style in which those ideas are clothed. Occasionally he rises to the loftiest heights of eloquence; as in the Triumphant Anthem, sung on the destruction of the Egyptian hosts in the Red Sea, (Exod. 15, 1—20;) in the prophecies he attributes to Balaam; and in the beautiful description he gives of the care of Jehovah over his people, like a majestic eagle hovering over, guarding and directing her young—(Deut'y. 32, 1—14.) In the pathetic, too, the history he gives of Joseph, is to this day unrivalled for a touching simplicity, true to nature.

To the pen of Moses we may certainly ascribe the first five books of the Hebrew Scriptures, i. e. *Genesis*, *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, *Numbers* and *Deuteronomy*. Besides these, books known as "the Pentateuch," the Jews generally reckon as the product of Moses eleven Psalms, i. e. from xc to c. Of this, however, we have no absolute certainty.

By not a few distinguished men, it has also been believed, that Moses is the author or the book of Job. The celebrated Origen, who flourished about the 3d century of the Christian era, maintained that Moses translated the book of Job, out of Syriac or Arabic, into Hebrew. By many, this opinion is still held; nor is it altogether improbable, although there is certainly a great difference, remarked by learned men, between the style in which the book of Job and those of the Pentateuch are written.

The author of writings such as these, which have outlived so many ages and centuries, which have come down to us through thousands of years, and which still command the veneration of the most enlightened portion of mankind, as treasures of knowledge and oracles of wisdom, is surely entitled to the very foremost place on the records of fame, as a scholar, a thinker, and a writer—he *is all original, from first to last*. Before all others in time, he still stands unsurpassed in accurate science, unequalled in simplicity, clearness, sublimity and touching pathos; as such, he is still universally admired and used.

But, *in the tumultuous scenes of public life*, as well as in private—in the camp and in the field, as well as in the closet—the conduct and the achievements of Moses command our respect. He was a brave warrior and a successful General, no less than a profound scholar. Like Cæsar, he could conduct an army to victory in the face of an immensely superior enemy; and then exchange the sword for the pen, and furnish interest and instruction both, in the modest narrative he wrote of deeds, achieved by his skill and prowess. Tradition represents Moses as waging successful war in Ethiopia, in command of the Egyptian armies; and acquiring distinction, power, and renown, before he abandoned the court, of which he was an adopted son. Of these earlier exploits, however, we have received no authentic records. But from the hour when he stepped forth as the advocate and leader of the Hebrews, his mili-

tary talents were called into requisition, and their exertion was signally successful. The *bare fact* that he could arouse to a sense of their wrongs, a vast but miserable horde of task-driven serfs; that he could inspire them with a desire for freedom, and keep that desire alive; that he could unite this undisciplined rabble in one body, and keep them so; that he could lead them forth in safety, encumbered as they were with their women, their children, their cattle, and all their possessions; and that, too, in the face of a powerful monarch, their oppressor, backed as that monarch was, by a numerous, disciplined, and well appointed army, bent on arresting their departure, and riveting upon them again the yoke of bondage; the fact that Moses could so arrange this vast multitude, embarrassed by so many encumbrances, as that, in the midst of a sterile and inhospitable desert, they should move in safety and be furnished with ample sustenance; and that this successful leadership, notwithstanding all these difficulties, should be continued through the long period of 40 years, until he saw them on the borders of a fertile and populous country, eager to take possession, and now fully qualified to do so, by the discipline to which they had been so long subjected; all this must ever suffice to place Moses in the first rank of military leaders. However this skill might have been obtained by him, certain it is, that Moses had it; and Moses exercised it, not for the purpose of self-aggrandizement, but exclusively for the good of his nation. He used this skill for the elevation of a tumultuous rabble of slaves to the character and standing of a brave people, determined on national existence, independence and honor, and competent to win it for themselves.

We know, indeed, that throughout the whole of his splendid and trying career, God himself sustained and directed Moses; and we know, too, that God directed and sustained Cyrus and Alexander. On the pages of history these men stand prominent, as great military leaders. Viewing all the circumstances of the case, Moses is yet more deserving of honor, as the most daring, skilful, and successful General of the age in which he lived.

It would be strange if, amid the multiplicity of monuments commemorative of the exploits of Pharaohs and Satraps, vastly his inferiors in daring and success, no mon-

ument proclaiming the prowess of Moses should have survived. Already the rocks of Sinai have found a voice attesting, (somewhat hesitatingly as yet, it may be, yet still attesting,) the prodigies wrought for Israel in the deserts of Arabia. And if the tradition of the earlier exploits of Moses, in his Ethiopian campaigns, should be authentic, it were no wonder if yet, when the mists of obscurity that still enshroud these Nile valley monuments, shall have been more fully dispersed, it shall be found, that among those remotest and most ancient monuments in Nubia, appear the records of military conquests achieved by Moses for the Egyptian crown;—achievements, the glory of which could not be tarnished, nor the proud recollection of them be willingly obliterated among the Egyptians, even though the champion who had gleaned these honors for Egypt had subsequently abandoned the court and the country; and had, by a series of exploits not less splendid, founded a rival kingdom in Asia.* Among the monuments of the several Rameses, (chiefly of the 18th dynasty—the very aera of Moses,) it is at least possible, that the Ethiopian conquests of Moses may yet be found commemorated. Ra, or Phre, is a prefix to many Egyptian names, and is of import equivalent to that of our phrase, *the royal*. Rameses, is explained as meaning, by others of Phre, the offspring of the sun or of heaven. But as in Egyptian, the vowels are often, indeed usually, omitted; as in Hebrew, without the points—Ra-meses presents the very name Moses—with the prefix Ra, indicating royalty. Of these several Rameses figuring on the monuments in the extreme territory of Upper Egypt, why may not some one yet prove—the designation of the Hebrew-born, adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter—the conqueror of Saba and of Ethiopia—the accepted spouse of Ethiopia's queen Tharbis—and designated, both from his adoption at the court of Pharaoh, and from his royal nuptials in Ethiopia, *Ra-meses*—the royal Moses.†

* See the testimony of celebrated ancient writers, to the distinguished position held by Moses, as adduced by Mons. Champollion Figeac, in his *Egypte*, (l'Univers Pittoresque,)—pp. 121, 122.

† It may interest the reader to consult on this point *Monumens de l'Egypte and de Nubie*, by Champollion le Jeune; vol. 7, of the *Plates*, and *Plates xi. and xiii. and xv.*, in which the Pharaoh is styled again and again Meses—beloved of Amoun. See also Osburn's *Anc't. Egypt*, p. 14, Rosel-

Not to dwell on this, which is offered but as a conjecture, certain it is that we may add :

As a statesman, Moses ranks among the greatest.—He found his people oppressed, enslaved, and consequently degraded. For, helpless subjection to the power of others, speedily deteriorates the whole man, and self-reliance dies. A generation brought up in slavery are unfitted for freedom. To them, independence would be fraught with curses as much as with blessings. Their children may be trained to a nobler destiny, but the race that has itself grown up in servitude, can be elevated, if at all, only by slow degrees. The experience of centuries, and that in all countries, has taught mankind this lesson. But Moses saw this, as by intuition, and he laid his plans accordingly, and made his arrangements on the dictate of a masterly policy, which was, indeed, essential to the success of his noble scheme.

The original race of slaves that left Egypt adults, under Moses, ever showed themselves restless, turbulent, impatient of the wholesome restraints of law and regular government, and incapable of appreciating the advantages of such government. This race passed away in the wilderness, and by the time they reached the borders of the promised land, their sons constituted the nation; a race, trained under the institutions that had been gradually established, and that were to distinguish them above all other nations, they yielded a cheerful obedience to those laws, and fully carried out the plans of their great prophet.

To accomplish such a task, to control the discordant elements with which Moses had to work, and, by his tact and management, to raise a band of emancipated serfs and their children, in intelligence, civilization and self-respect, until they could be safely settled in a country of their own, and be formed into a community,—the first in the world to be the depository of a free government, under

lini, B. 6; Plate C. 1; Plate 32-4, 164-3; and Dupense, xxx., where the cartouch of Sesostriis or Ramses III is given, whose name and title Osburn thus renders, (Pharaoh, vigilant in justice, $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\eta\epsilon$ Sesostriis—i. e. approved of the sun—[the beloved of Amoun Ramses.] There is here no *Ra*, it is merely *Meses*—beloved of Amoun. See also the last line of royal names in Table of Abydos, Champollion Figeac, Pl. 47.

a written constitution, which distinctly prescribed the duties, and secured the privileges of all, religious and political, public and private,—those of magistrates and of citizens—and to effect all this *in one generation*, was a work accomplished *but once* in the history of the world. It was a statesman-like work, to which the genius of Moses alone, of all men that ever lived, has been found equal!

The institutions established by Moses were preeminently judicious, and admirably adapted to the character of the people, their peculiar position as the sole depositary of a pure religion; a people to be kept separate and distinct from all the rest of the world! These institutions were designed to endure, and they have endured. For several thousands of years they have been maintained by the Jews, and that too, even since the dispersion of that people into all countries on the globe, and they still retain a vigour that promises perpetuity. Nor is it certain that, even should the whole Hebrew race embrace christianity, every rite that distinguishes them as Jews, must absolutely cease and determine.

A mind that could form the conception of a government embodying such institutions, so peculiar and unique, and yet so influential in their character, and so durable in their nature; a mind that could and did devise the details of this system, and the means for carrying it out into full and practical operation, with materials such as were presented in the Hebrews just emerging from Egyptian bondage, a system that should raise them from barbarism to civilization and refinement; that should suit their condition when settled in a land which Moses never visited; a system that should be still appropriate in the height of their growing prosperity, to be witnessed only in the far off future; and a system that revolutions, dispersion and wretchedness cannot overthrow, yea, that time itself neither wears out, nor renders obsolete; a mind which conceived and executed this system in all its vastness, and with all its minute details, must have been preeminent for an exuberance of all those great qualities, which, when found even in a moderate decree, stamp their possessor as an able statesman, and *a man of genius*.

But it is *when viewed as a Lawgiver that the true greatness of Moses is seen*.

Law is the slow growth of ages, 'tis the index of public intelligence, the standard of civilization !

All history shows, that the advance from barbarism to that condition in which government is administered in strict accordance to written law, is very gradual. It requires a long course of years. Laws are usually enacted cautiously, one after another, as the exigencies that call for them arise ; and the alteration, amendment, or repeal of old laws, is constantly taking place.

Law is the concentrated experience of ages, rendered durable by record !

Moses alone was blessed with a mind so capacious, views so enlarged, and political sagacity so keen and so profound, that he produced, at once, a system of laws, civil and ecclesiastical both, which settled the entire government of a new people, one about speedily to become great and powerful, and settled it on a durable foundation.

Very little prepared could the Jews have been to appreciate the institutions of Moses. They had, indeed, long dwelt in Egypt, and in daily contact with the most enlightened people then on earth ; but they had held among that people an inferior position. A race of hard worked, despised, and sorely oppressed serfs, they had but just burst their bonds. Whatever the civilization around them in Egypt, the Jews had had but little opportunity to derive benefit from it. On the great subject of religious opinions and moral conduct, all nations and all tribes of that period were in deplorable error. Polytheism and gross idolatry everywhere prevailed, and even the Egyptians were notoriously addicted to gross superstition, paying religious homage to beasts, and birds, and reptiles.

Of the state of morals among the Egyptians, we have no very definite accounts ; but among the Canaanites, and all other adjoining countries, it was wretched in the extreme. This universal degradation, the Hebrews could not have entirely escaped. Everything in the people for whom he planned, and in the condition of society around him, was, therefore, adverse to the magnificent designs of Moses.

And yet Moses matured those plans, and accomplished those designs. The basis of his whole system was, *reverence for the one only God—the Supreme Ruler !* God

was the head of the Jewish government. The worship of God was, also, homage to the sovereign; and idolatrous practices were, not impiety merely, they were *treason against the State!* Hence the severity of the laws Moses enacted against heathenish practices! A severity necessary to the continued existence of Israel as a distinct nation, amid surrounding heathenism; but a severity which gives no sanction to religious intolerance now! By the Mosaic code, the priesthood was assigned to the family of Aaron alone, while the whole tribe of Levi was devoted to the subordinate duties of waiting on the priesthood in their sacred services, caring for the sacred vessels, the music, and all the requisites for public worship.

In the tribe of Levi, also, sacred literature was more especially cultivated; the law was diligently cared for—copies of it were multiplied and preserved—its statutes were interpreted and taught to the people. The duties of all these several ecclesiastical officers were minutely prescribed, and the maintenance of these officers was carefully provided for by law. For the due administration of public affairs, ample provision was made. Each one of the 12 tribes was, in some respects, an independent community, administering its own internal affairs, by a government composed of officers of its own selection; while a *general council of the nation*, composed of delegates from each of the tribes, guarded the interests of the entire confederacy.

The Jewish commonwealth, as constituted by Moses, was a confederacy of republics, strongly resembling the complex government of these United States.

The trials conducted before the several law courts, were usually held at the gate of the city, an unencumbered space of public resort. In order to ensure openness, and due deliberation, no capital case could lawfully be tried at night. Hence, courts were usually held in the morning. Nor was it lawful to examine a cause, pass sentence, and put that sentence in execution, the same day. In the trial of Jesus Christ, all those wise legal precautions were disregarded!

These several institutions were admirably adapted to the character and the circumstances of the Jews, and were well calculated to accustom them to the government of

established law, the only guarantee for order and freedom.

There is, however, one institution, established by Moses, which discovers a wonderful tact in turning apparently formidable obstacles in the way of the rule of law, into a means for establishing it the more effectually. I refer to the *Cities of Refuge*.

From time immemorial, it had been deemed the duty of the man next of kin to a person slain by violence, to avenge his death on the slayer. He was called the *Blood-Avenger*. If he failed to punish the killer of his kinsman, he was accounted *infamous*.

In a rude state of society this custom must be highly useful. But it is obviously liable to great abuses. Homicide is not always murder. It is the province of established tribunals of justice, to ascertain not only the fact of the slaying, and the person of the slayer, but also the intention, criminal or otherwise. If the slaying was accidental, or necessary to self defence, then it was not criminal. But of this the blood avenger could not judge impartially. His kinsman being slain, his part it was to avenge him; and infamy covered him, if he slew not the slayer. The fact of the slaying was all he looked at: of its justifiableness, he was not and he could not be a competent judge. The person of the slayer once known, *he must slay him*, or live in infamy.

To remedy the fearful abuses to which this custom must always be liable, Moses resorted to a singular expedient. He appointed six cities of refuge, three on each side of the Jordan; to these cities straight roads were to be opened from every part of the country. A man who had slain any person, must flee to the nearest of these cities of refuge, which were all placed under the control of the priests and Levites. If found by the blood-avenger outside of the city, he could be lawfully slain; but so long as he remained within the city of refuge, he was safe from the immediate stroke of the blood avenger. In that city he must abide, until duly tried before a legal tribunal, and guilt or innocence determined. If proved guilty of wilful murder, he was forthwith surrendered to the blood-avenger, to be by him slain. In such case, the death of the convicted murder was inevitable. No sanctuary could shelter

the *convicted* murderer, and no commutation was admitted.

If, on trial, acquitted of *intentional murder*, he was still required to dwell in the city of refuge during his whole life, unless the High Priest should die; on the occurrence of that event, the homicide might fearlessly return to his own home, the blood-avenger having no longer any legal right to molest him.

Thus, by this singular institution, Moses extended no shield to the guilty. He did not aim to crush, at once, the spirit of private vengeance; but he sagaciously availed himself of that spirit, and of the custom to which it had given birth, to induce the criminal murderer, and the homicide, alike, to throw themselves *on the protection of law*, for security from immediate pursuit and destruction, and for a fair and open trial afterwards.

The very custom, and those deep feelings which would seem to threaten insuperable opposition to the empire of law, and to the action of regular tribunals, were thus skillfully turned into important auxiliaries to ensure the influence of law, and to establish the authority of its tribunals.

The Mosaic law respecting the cities of refuge, was a masterly stroke of legislative policy!

But it is the *moral law*, briefly expressed in the 10 commandments, *the decalogue*, as recorded in the 20th chapter of Exodus, *that yields to Moses the palm of matchless legislative wisdom!*

The teaching of sages and philosophers on the subject of human duty, have usually, in every age and country, been prolix and obscure, and so shrouded in mystery, as to be nearly unintelligible to the great mass of mankind; but in the moral law, first promulgated by Moses, we have quite the reverse of all this. In this inimitable document, we find the range of human duties comprised in a compass so brief, that a child may commit the whole to memory in a few hours; and yet so comprehensive is this brief law, that it covers the entire field of duty. No one duty, towards God or man, is here omitted. No one is there, of the many forms of vice, or gradations in crime, which is not herein unequivocally condemned. Brief though this wonderful document is, it is yet perfectly intelligible to all.

Each duty is herein so clearly defined, and so fully set forth, that the little child, the superstitious idolator, and the rude barbarian, as well as the philosopher and the man of science, may hence learn to whom he owes his being, the service appropriate to that Great Maker, and all the duties towards his fellow men, which spring from his relation to them, and to God our creator.

This peerless document, while it developes principles which may amaze and charm the strongest intellect, and the most cultivated mind, does also lay down its positions so distinctly, and detail duty so clearly and definitely, that its meaning is perfectly obvious to the humblest capacity, and the most ordinary attention. Moreover, this law accords, in all respects, to the convictions of right, inherent in every human breast. It is a law adapted not to any one age of the world, exclusively, nor to any one race of men, nor to any one class in society ! It is preeminently **THE LAW FOR MAN**, for the whole human family, in all ages, in all countries, and in every condition of life !

No revolutions in the political world, no rise or fall of powerful dynasties, no change in the aspect of society, can either add to the force, or impair the authority of this noble law. It is based on principles, and it deals with relations that appertain to human nature, and are unchangeable ! To the white man and to the black, to the monarch on his throne, and the beggar in his hovel, to the exalted leader of a nation of freemen, and to the slave at his meanest drudgery, to the statesman loaded with the cares of government, and to the obscurest of the multitude whose political destiny he controls, to the profound philosopher, to the applauded author of brilliant discoveries in science, and to the most illiterate peasant that plods thoughtlessly at his daily toil, this law is invariably and alike applicable. No lapse of ages can render it obsolete ; no advances in science can impair its lustre or weaken its force ; no change of circumstances can make it inapplicable, or inappropriate. So long as man is man, dependant as a creature of God, and a member of the social body, this law must retain its force, and be always appropriate ! So based in truth are the principles on which it rests, that it never can lose its authority over a single human being !

✍ And yet, some writers there are, who would have us believe that Moses did not originate, but that *he borrowed from the Egyptians*, his code of morals, his pure Theism, and his most important regulations; and this, forsooth, because we are told "*Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians!*"

This position is demonstrably false! That Moses was a perfect master of all the wisdom of Egypt, is true; and so the bible asserts; but it does not follow that he possessed no other knowledge besides that he derived from Egypt. It is no unheard of thing, for a scholar to master all the knowledge that his teacher can impart, and afterwards to accumulate upon this, much larger and more valuable knowledge, by his own independent researches! This we know Moses did; and for this, his long retirement in Midian, furnished time and ample opportunity. Moreover, the boasted wisdom of the Egyptians has been much exaggerated; for, whether we judge of that wisdom, by the report of it furnished in the classical writings of ancient Greece, or from the testimony yielded by the records of the Egyptian sages themselves, as now opened to the world in the interpreted hieroglyphics of their gorgeous temples, palaces and tombs, and in their ritual of the dead, we find nothing to sustain this assertion. Some important moral duties are there recognized; a future life *seems* to be there shadowed forth. (See Wilkinson's 2d series, Plates 87 and 88, and the description, vol. II. p. 442-448. See also the magnificent Plate of the Judgment of the Soul, as given by Rosellini, Dispensa. XXXVIII. M. d. C., Plate LXVI, and Champol. Monum. &c., Plate 272, vol. 3, the scene is depicted at Thebes, Beban-al-moluk.)

But the soul of the Mosaic system, i. e. the existence of one sole supreme God, a pure spirit, and the common brotherhood of all mankind, as the creatures of one God, the children of one Heavenly Father,—*that* is not found there. Over all the acres of surface covered by the hieroglyphic writing, and the brilliant picturing of the ancient Egyptians, which still exist in wonderful preservation among her monuments, you look in vain for a recognition of the *one only God!* No sign, no symbol, no token of this one fundamental truth, is there found. See Sir J. G. Wilkinson's Man. and Cust., 2d series, vol. I. p. 178.

On this subject, the testimony of the celebrated Dr. Pritchard, is clear and explicit. In his learned work, the "Analysis of Egyptian Mythology," p. 406, he says :

"With respect to *theology*, no two systems can be more directly opposed to each other, than the Mosaic doctrine was to that of the Egyptians."

Again, p. 468, Dr. P. remarks :

"In the most striking features in the whole system of *civil regulations*, the plan adopted by the Hebrew lawgiver, stands in direct opposition to the polity of the Egyptians."

Dr. Redford, in his useful book, entitled "Holy Scripture Verified," remarks, p. 60, (Lond. edit. 1837,)

"No sort of analogy can be traced between the theory (of cosmogony) which Moses has left us, and any of the speculations which the Egyptians indulged."

The doctrine of the Egyptians as to the continued existence of the soul after death, was not that of immortality, properly speaking, but that of metempsychosis, i. e. a fresh birth into another body, and then another, &c. After it has gone through all the terrestrial, marine and winged animals, it again enters a human body. (See Herodotus, ii. 123. See also Wilkinson, Rosellini and Champollion, as quoted above.) This circuit was supposed to occupy 3000 years, like the doctrine of the Indian philosophy. (See Faber's Pagan Idolatry, vol. I. p. 111.) That it might be ready to receive the returning soul, at the end of the 3000 years, the body was embalmed with so great care. What resemblance does metempsychosis bear to any idea presented in the books of Moses ?

Moses has been charged with borrowing the idea of the Urim and Thummim in the breast-plate of the High Priest, from the Egyptians. See Diodorus, Sic. 1. 65. 5. Bk. 1. ch. 48. Gesenius refers to this.

Grotius turned the tables, by charging this imitation upon the later Egyptians. He maintains that they borrowed this from the Jews. "Imitati sunt hoc, (i. e. the breast-plate of the Jewish High Priest,) sed ut pueri virorum res imitantur Egyptii.* Grot. De Veritate. 1, 16.

* See an able examination of this charge, in Tompkin's Hulsean Prize Essay for 1849, p. 80-92.

Now it is obvious, that an imitation of the doctrines or the rites of the Egyptians, introduced by Moses in the institutions he gave to the Jews, would have been next to impossible; because it would have tended to destroy their confidence in him as an inspired prophet. On the conviction felt by them, that he was a prophet inspired of Jehovah, rested entirely the authority of Moses over the Jews. He strongly denounced the customs of the Egyptians. An inspired prophet could not, consistently, borrow religious observances, or doctrines, from a people whom he denounced as impious idolaters. Sir Wm. Jones also, the great oriental scholar, has remarked :

"There is no shadow of foundation for the opinion, that Moses borrowed the first part of Genesis from the literature of Egypt." Id. p. 60.

He adds :

"Still less can the adamantine pillars of our christian faith be moved, by the result of any debates as to the comparative antiquity of the Hindoos and Egyptians, or of any inquiry into the Indian theology." Id.

Mr. Tompkins, in his Hulsean Prize Essay, 1849, says, (p. 79,)

"The sublime truths of Revelation have as logical a connection with the abominations of Egypt, as they have with the nebulous theory of Hegel."

And even Bunsen, in speaking of the sacred books of the Egyptians, says, (p. 49, vol. 1,)

"These contain no history of the Egyptian people, as do the books of the old Testament. The idea of the people, and still more, that of the *people's God, the creator of heaven and earth, is wanting.*"

The ancient Egyptians were, undoubtedly, a people ingenious, refined and luxurious in their manners. But, of originating the ideas with which, as its living spirit, its pervading essence, the Mosaic moral code is replete, Egypt with all its splendor, and with all its wisdom, was, (for all that has yet been brought to light,) as utterly incapable as would be the savage warriors, the aborigines of our own American forests, or as one of the Caffres and the Hottentots of South Africa ! That the sublime doctrines, the comprehensive views, the pure morality, and the wonder-

fully accurate science,* with which the books of Moses are replete, could have been obtained by him from the ingenious authors of the mythological delineations, still found adorning the magnificent temples, the splendid palaces, and the elaborately wrought tombs, now standing in the valley of the Nile, is merely and simply *an utter impossibility!* How wonderful then, must have been the mind of him who first arranged and embodied the ideas, that go to make up this great law. This law has withstood the revolutions of time, the shock of determined opposition, and the scrutiny of jealousy. The cavils of objectors, and the reflections and researches of the learned, have failed to discover in the moral precepts of this law, any one defect, or to make upon it any improvement. It has been the admiration of the ablest legislators in all subsequent ages, and it has been used as the model, after which the most approved and successful laws have been framed. It embodies the substance of all sound legislation, and it presents *the essential germ of all true religion*. As it was the earliest, so it has been found to be the wisest, the noblest, the completest of all laws. Issuing as it did, in a remote, a superstitious, and a barbarous age, it presents an embodiment of wisdom never since surpassed, never, even, equaled, in any age. Great discoveries are usually made gradually. A glimpse, only, of some great truth, is at first obtained. It is conjectured, rather than known, and time, and thought, and labour must perfect the discovery. But in this instance, the discovery was made at once. The great truths of morality and religion, burst forth upon mankind, in all their glory, like the sun rising brightly in the morning sky. The system was given to the world by Moses, at once, clear, well defined, perfect. 'Twas no rude conjecture; 'twas a complete discovery; it evinced itself, instantaneously, to be immutable truth, by its universal applicability at all times, and to all men, of all races, everywhere. *'Twas a heavenly birth!* 'Twas the prototype of that beautiful old fable of classical Greece—

* The learned Adrien Balbi has said "No monument, either historical or astronomical, has yet been able to prove the books of Moses false; but with those books, on the contrary, agree in the most remarkable manner, the results obtained by the most learned philologues, and the profoundest geometricians." "Atlas Ethnographique du Globe," Mappemonde Eth. 1.

Pallas—the embodiment of wisdom, springing forth, quick, matured and armed at all points, from the brain of Jupiter,—i. e. from the supreme intellect. Plain it is, then, the decalogue is a monument of wisdom, unparalleled in the annals of mankind!

Hence, it may be safely affirmed, *such was the genius of Moses, that he, more than any other man, has influenced the destiny of mankind.* Every now and then men have appeared in human society, endowed with minds so vigorous, active and commanding, as that they have moulded the opinions, and controlled the intellectual movements of their own age, and succeeding generations. These were the master spirits of their age. Such were Homer and Socrates and Plato, Aristotle, Demosthenes and Cæsar, each in his peculiar sphere of influence; such were Confucius and Zoroaster in the east; such also was Charlemagne; such were Bacon and Luther and Newton, and but lately, Napoleon, each in his own department of action. But Moses stands forth as the great master spirit, not of one age, but of all ages, and of nearly all nations. His institutions did, unquestionably, mould the character and shape the destiny of the entire Jewish nation. The pure religion he taught, and the admirable moral precepts he laid down, were, indeed, shut up for ages among that one people. But they have gradually spread abroad among mankind, and have proved most influential in furthering the progress of civilization, and human happiness. Christianity—the religion embraced by the most intelligent and most enterprising nations on the face of the earth—is founded upon the religion of Moses.

From Moses, also, Mohammed borrowed his distinguishing religious tenets, and all of his ethics that are valuable; and Mohammedanism is the religion of a large portion of Asia, and of many tribes and nations of Africa; while the laws enacted by Moses, and especially the decalogue, constitute the acknowledged basis of all wise and effective legislation, in every civilized country under heaven.

Nor must we overlook the *Spirit of Liberty*, pervading the government established by Moses, with its officers and its magistrates, all selected by the suffrages of the people, over whom, when chosen, they ruled.

On this point the erudite Pritchard has remarked, (see Analysis of Mythol. Egypt. p. 408,)

"The founders of the Egyptian civil regulations, made it their chief endeavour *to depress the masses* in society, and to elevate the few, in wealth and power. On the contrary, the system of society established by Moses, was one of perfect equality; not the casual result of circumstances; but this was the object which Moses purposely contrived a great part of his civil institutions to uphold."

The Hebrews were all required to regard each other as brethren. By these institutions, a spirit of freedom was awakened in the hearts of the Jewish nation, which never perished, and which rarely slept. It led to deeds of heroic daring, and of surpassing endurance in resistance against the oppressions of tyranny, when the rights of conscience were invaded. The reiterated and daring struggles of the Jews for religious freedom, have, in almost all ages, presented to mankind an impressive spectacle. Christianity perpetuated this spirit, and raised it yet higher. Popular elections, and popular representative assemblies, were introduced, from the synagogue, into the church. Oppression—when it was attempted—was resisted unto the death. And who shall determine how far the freedom now enjoyed among many nations, and which is extending more widely every year, may be the offspring of that very spirit of liberty that has ever animated the church, and the Jewish nation before it.

The task of fully tracing out the influence exerted on the world, and the benefits conferred on man by the Jewish nation, in true religion, pure morals, sound legislation, and in extending the spirit of religious independence and of political freedom, has yet to be performed.

Trace their entire history, and the Jewish nation will be found to exhibit claims to the admiration, and to the *gratitude* of mankind, as the earliest and the most unyielding advocates of the rights of conscience, and the boldest champions of freedom, the world has ever beheld. Its obligation to the Jews has never yet been acknowledged by the world, nor even appreciated. And I, for one, count it an honour to the American republic, and to the age in which we live, that an act of tardy justice has, at length, been done to this long oppressed, but noble race,

in that the Secretary of State (Mr. Webster,) has recently set a proud example to the nations of the earth, in refusing to ratify a treaty with a foreign power, on the sole ground, that that treaty made invidious distinctions, adverse to the race of Abraham.

"All honor to the name of Daniel Webster, therefor!"

Nor can we forget that all the good conferred on the world by, and through the Jews, is a direct result of the institutions established, and of the truths promulgated by the *Jewish Lawgiver, MOSES!*

View this man in what light you may, and he presents the most splendid character on record. As an individual, he was virtuous and pure; a genuine patriot, zealous, untiring, firm and self-possessed; a profoundly learned man, and an accomplished writer; a successful general, and a pre-eminently able statesman; a wise lawgiver, and a man of commanding genius, beyond all that ever lived. Moses has done more than any one man, and more than any combination of men ever did, to influence the condition, and to improve the character, not of his own peculiar nation only, but of all nations!

Thus distinguished, Moses stands forth to view, as a man of pre-eminent worth—of incomparable mind—of matchless attainments—of wisdom unexampled! How suitable it was then, that such a man should have been selected to act as the mouth-piece of heaven, to proclaim to men their duties, and prepare them to receive the higher gift of salvation, afterwards made known in the Gospel of Christ. And in fact, (to adopt the language of another, Dr. Bedford, Hol. Scrip. Verif. p. 16):

"The brief statements given in the first few paragraphs of the books of Moses, imply a knowledge which *could not* have been acquired by any of those means which men possess. They display an insight into the laws and acts of nature, which it is impossible to ascribe to the individual writer, or to the people among whom he received his education. So far as great truths and universal principles of nature can be discovered by human effort, we know perfectly well, that great labour, cautious investigation, patient research, and *much time* are demanded. They require a large induction of particulars, and a great accumulation of facts, before they can be securely and confidently asserted. It is a rare (we might say a totally unheard of) case, for such principles

or truths to be brought to maturity by a single mind." In fact it never has been done. "The first, in general, merely suggest them. Others, and usually in a long succession, verify and prove them in all their bearings.

"When, therefore, we perceive how slowly great principles and general laws are discovered, even by the most comprehensive and accomplished minds in the present day, it must appear *altogether incredible*, that Moses should have ascertained all the great natural truths which he records, by his own researches; or that he should have derived them from the wisdom of the Egyptians."—*p.* 17.

The information imparted to us by Moses, upon these recondite subjects, is of so peculiar a character, it is so accurate, so comprehensive, and it so entirely anticipates all that has been brought to light by science, even down to this very hour, that *it is impossible to attribute it to the ordinary sources of human knowledge!* Moses was, beyond denial, a man of transcendent genius! But, *no mere genius* could possibly have accumulated the knowledge his writings embody. There is, to this day, no theory extant, as to the origin of the world, that is even plausible, which does not assume as its basis the very principles first laid down by Moses alone! Add to this, his theology, so simple, so sublime, so rational; add also his inimitable code of morals, *and the evidence is complete!* There is no possible way of accounting for this vast, this amazing, this superhuman wisdom of Moses, but by acceding to his own statement—a statement sustained by other direct, varied, and overwhelming proofs—*Moses was a prophet*: he wrote, just as he was inspired of God to write?

How fully entitled, then, to our cordial reception, and our implicit confidence, are the precepts of a religious teacher, so pre-eminently endowed and gifted of heaven, as was Moses! How puny are the efforts, and how contemptible in comparison, are the teachings of the pigmy opponents who, in our day, would seek to subvert the authority of Moses.

By every competent and impartial investigator, Moses must be acknowledged, (and that even independently of his divine commission,) as the Father of history, and the Founder of literature. And how our reverence for his character, and our esteem for his writings, should rise,

when we are assured also that Moses was, under God's own guidance, the promulgator of the only true religion, the originator of all sound jurisprudence—the great teacher of pure morals! Yea, that Moses was also, the planner and the author of the first truly popular government among the nations of the earth. If George Washington is, by a great nation, justly honoured as the Father of his emancipated Country, much more should Moses be honoured by all men, not only as the *first* and the *most distinguished* of all the prophets of God, but also as the Instructor, and the *Benefactor of the whole Family of Mankind*.

W. T. HAMILTON.

MOBILE, March 5, 1852.

Rev. S. G. Cassels
ARTICLE IV.

REMARKS UPON THE WILL, WITH SOME STRICTURES
UPON THE OPINIONS OF McCOSH.

The soul is a simple, spiritual essence. The term essence refers to that which constitutes, or is its being. The spirituality of the soul is that which distinguishes it from matter. Its simplicity refers to the fact, that it is not compounded of any other spiritual elements, into which it can be resolved.

The soul, as a spiritual essence, possesses such properties as the following: Susceptibility, or the power of being acted upon; activity, or the power of acting; intelligence, or the power of knowing; reason, or the power of comparing and judging; conscience, or the power of feeling moral approbation or disapprobation.

These capabilities of the soul are not to be considered as so many distinct and separate faculties, each acting independently of the rest; nor are they to be regarded as mere mental states or conditions. Wherever there is spiritual action, there is a concurrence at least, and often a

close co-operation, of all the various powers of the soul. In other words, where the soul acts, it acts as a soul, as one indivisible spiritual essence, and not as if it were composed of parts or divisions, whose operations are distinct from each other. Nor yet are these properties of the soul its mere temporary states or conditions. A soul, under the influence of error, or prejudice, or sorrow, or joy, is in a certain state or condition. But such states or conditions are very different from those essential qualities of the soul by which it can be duped by error or prejudice, or is sensible of sorrow or joy. While then, we do not consider the properties of the soul as so many distinct and separate faculties, neither do we regard them as certain conditions in which the soul is placed by the operation of certain causes. They are qualities or attributes of the spirit God has given to man; they inhere in the essence of that spirit, and constitute it what it is.

No one can survey the list of these mental and moral qualities of the soul, without perceiving the admirable and perfect adaptation of man to the condition in which he has been created. He is, so to speak, in the centre of an infinite universe, created by God, and consecrated by his presence. His susceptibility of receiving impressions from this universe and from its glorious Author, yields him advantages of knowledge, of pleasure, and of virtue, that must continue coeval with his immortality of being. His capability of acting, of reciprocating, so to speak, the influences exerted upon him, renders him a co-worker with all other intelligent beings, and with God himself, in carrying forward and completing those mighty ends for which the universe was created. Intelligence enables him so to perceive the beings and facts around him, as to act towards them, not at random, but under the control of a sound discretion. Reason, occupying a sphere beyond simple intelligence, reveals to him the two great kingdoms of philosophy and Divinity—the one canvassing the laws of the created universe, the other the being and attributes of its Infinite Author. But there is one attribute more, that man needs to perfect his nature—conscience, or the moral sense. By this, he is enabled to see that God is at the head of an infinite government—that that government has laws—that these laws are “holy, just and good,” and that

in the observance of them, the interests, not of himself alone, or of a part simply, but of the whole universe of created beings, are promoted. Moral relations and moral duties now come up before the mind, and the distinctions between right and wrong are established on an immutable basis.

Three of the above mental qualities, though in a far superior degree, man possesses in common with brutes; two are peculiar to himself. That the lower animal natures around us possess intelligence, susceptibility and activity or will, is evident. Their field of observation, it is true, is very limited; yet, within that field many of them exhibit a remarkable sagacity. They are, too, acted upon by various objects of sense, and exhibit very decisively the powers of an active and energetic will. In the higher provinces of mind—in reason and conscience—the animal creation exhibits an utter destitution. In all such mental processes as associate cause and effect, right and wrong, and as judge of the relations of things, brutes manifest an utter incapacity. Hence, they are as unfit to establish or receive systems of philosophy or of religious belief, as the very clods and blades on which they tread.

We have introduced this comparison, not for the sake of idle curiosity, but to advert to a fact that seems very much to have been overlooked. Many writers on mental and moral philosophy have given such a prominence to the will, as to leave the impression, not only that it is a sort of soul within a soul—an existence by itself—but that the very essence of responsibility and *virtue* is to be found in it. McCosh, in his late work on the Divine Government, uses such language as the following:

“It is the will which determines what is to be preferred or rejected—what is good and what is not good.” “The will, no doubt, does prefer the pleasurable in itself to the painful; but it is because it wills to do so.”

Again he says:

“These laws, which are just the rules of the action of the will, *the rules which it adopts (!)* do in no way interfere with the freedom of the will.”

Not satisfied with even such an hypostasis of an actual being as all this, he applies the pronoun I, to this faculty:

"The will assumes this form—I choose this; I resolve to obtain it—this object is good, I wish it and desire it."

Now, according to this language, we must conceive either that the entire soul is but will, or that will, as a sort of vicegerent and governor, controls and determines all the other faculties of the soul. How humiliating to such speculators on the almost divinity of the human will, must appear the fact, that the ox that grazes in the valley, or the mule that struggles in the street, has a *will* as well as himself! If will chiefly be the groundwork of responsibility and the essence of virtue, why, we must divert our observations from the higher walks of humanity, and fix them upon the inferior creatures around us, as so many examples of these noble qualities! Look, too, at the maniac; by some cause or other, his *reason* has been upset. This, however, does not destroy his *will*; which often becomes even more obstinate and perverse after derangement than before. This poor madman imbues his hand in the blood of another; he is not, however, considered as guilty, but innocent. Why? For the lack of *reason*, not of will.

We strongly suspect, after all that such writers have said of the independence and sovereignty of the will, that the culpability in any case of crime is to be charged, not so much to this faculty, as to something existing anterior to it, and which is the cause of its action. McCosh has involved himself, here at least, in perplexity if not in contradiction. He admits that volitions are effects, but denies that they are the effects of motives:

"But still these facts conduct us to the important truth, that the law of cause and effect reigns in the will, and in regard to the responsible acts of man, as it does in every other department of the mind, and indeed, in every other department of God's works."

But if volition be an effect, what is its cause? Motive, says Edwards—

"It is that motive which, as it stands in the view of the mind is the strongest, that determines the will."

But hear McCosh—

"There are persons who tell us that the will cannot be independent, for it is swayed by motives." "And when we ask what the motive is? it is answered, all that sways the will! We are

making no progress; we are swinging on a hinge in advancing and re-advancing such maxims."

So lightly does this new candidate for metaphysical fame toss aside one of the strongest bulwarks of the illustrious Edwards; of whom the venerable Dr. Chalmers, while treating on the same subject, says:

"His is by far the highest name which the New World has to boast of, and that he distanced immeasurably all the speculations of all the schools in Europe."

But McCosh does Edwards great injustice, by a partial quotation. Motive, says Edwards, sways the will; and, then, in defining motive, he says as a *general* statement—

"By motive, I mean the whole of that which moves, excites or invites the mind to volition, whether that be one thing singly or several things conjunctly."

He then proceeds *in extenso* to particularize all those things which act as motives on the will. Is there any turning on a hinge here? Suppose we were asked, what sets a body in motion, and should reply, force. We are then asked, what is a force, and our answer should be, that which sets a body in motion; proceeding, however, forthwith to specify steam, water, muscles, &c., as so many examples of force. Is there no progress here? The truth is, McCosh, who has written well on other subjects, has handled this one badly; and this he proves by setting Edwards so unceremoniously aside.

But let us see what is the result of his own investigation after the cause of volition. Cousin, whom he here follows, places the cause of volition in the will itself:

"Above my will, there is no cause to be sought; the principle of causality expires before the cause in the will."

This would seem to be a just conclusion from the premises. If the will is not determined by motives, surely it must be either wholly given up to caprice, or governed by itself. But from both of these conclusions, McCosh dissents—

"If it be said that the cause lies in the human will itself, we go back to that human will, and insist that it too, as a phenomenon, must have a cause of its operation and the mode of it."

And when he finds out that cause, what is it?—*the laws which the will adopts for its own government!!*

“ We discover laws in the department of the will, as we discover laws every where else. Not only so, but we find the will regulating itself by laws even in regard to actions that are moral and immoral.”

Who, then, we ask, is swinging on the hinge ; Edwards, who affirms that the will is governed by motives, or McCosh, who insists that it is controlled by laws of its own adoption ? McCosh should certainly have run his doctrine to the terminus that Cousin reached—the self determining power of the will itself. The French philosopher tells us plainly, that the will is the cause of its own volitions ; McCosh declares this to be false, but that the will is the author of a set of *laws* that are the causes of volition ! Apprehensive that some might question the conclusion at which he arrives, he says in a note, that

“The power of the will and the universal reign of causation are ultimate facts, attested by primary principles, in our constitution.”

By “the power of the will,” here, he doubtless means its independence or sovereignty ; for on the very next page he employs the following language :

“We believe man, morally speaking, to be as independent of external control, as his Creator must ever be, as that Creator was, when in a past eternity, there was no external existence to control him !”

This is certainly rhetorical enough ; and proves that its author had a soaring fancy, whatever may be thought of his judgment and modesty. Now, so far from acquiescing in the statements here made, our own mind teaches us, that *experience*, universal experience, has established our belief in a general system of causation ; and that as to any consciousness of having a will as unrestrained as that of God, we have none at all. We feel perfectly sure, that while the will is free in its ultimate action, there are nevertheless innumerable causes, both within and without the mind, that do perpetually direct and determine that action. So that whether this writer refer us to the self-made laws of the will, as the causes of its volitions, or to primary principles in our nature, we consider him in either case to be extremely unfortunate.

But we have intimated, that in moral enquiries, an importance has been attached to the will which is not due, and which has led into error in estimating the moral quality of actions. Our impression decidedly is, that volition is *that which gives existence to the soul's action*, but not that which imparts *moral character* to such action. Volition is not simply an action of the will, but the soul's entire affirmative or negative, to every question submitted to it for determination. And it is in these adjuncts to volition—the result of the reasoning thus expressed, and the affirmation or negation of the passion thus embodied—it is chiefly in these moral exercises and reasonings that precede volition, and of which volition is the authoritative announcement—it is in these prior elements, that we find the virtue that brightens, or the vice that blackens every volition and deed which the soul performs. “The tree is known by its fruits;” the fountain by its streams; and a man by his acts. But what are the acts of a man, save the doings of the spirit that is in him? These are the deeds for which he will be judged in the last day. Now, the mere fact, that muscular action follows, or does not follow the volitions of the soul, does not destroy the action of the soul in the case. He who takes his stand by the road-side with the purpose to shoot a fellow man, although some unforeseen circumstance may prevent the execution of his design, is as truly a murderer in the eye of morality, as he who succeeded and actually shed another's blood. *In volition the soul acts.* Previously to this, the moral elements and reasonings were arranging themselves to the business of acting. But in forming a will—in giving birth to a volition—the matter is completed, and the *deed* becomes perfect. Volition thus gives *being* to spiritual action, but it does not determine its *character*. Let the following suffice as an illustration: a man is found dead on the road-side; the first enquiry relates to the author of the crime—the individual man who has destroyed life; the next subject of inquiry is, was the man, who has been proved to be the author of the deed, in his right mind when he performed the act? Should this be decided affirmatively, it is then asked, whether he did it voluntarily or by accident, or in some other exculpatory manner? Should this interrogatory also be settled in the affirmative,

the highest point at which the investigation thus far reaches is to this fact, *that the deed is in every sense the deed of the accused*. The action is now fastened upon the agent—the destruction of human life upon him who destroyed it. But even this does not establish criminality. The dead man may have been killed wholly in self-defence. If so, the action was justifiable, and the prisoner is to be released. But if all the circumstances and the testimony go to prove, that the deed was one of malice, that there was in it not simply volition, but hatred, then does a criminality become attached to it, that renders it definitely and positively murder. Volition is thus essential to *personal action*, but it does not of itself determine the *moral quality* of such action.

The doing of the soul, however, may refer to something within as well as to something without itself. It may refer to a process of reasoning, or to the exercise of an affection, or to the indulgence of a desire, or the entertainment of an imagination. The truth of the position presented above, however that volition is essential to action, holds as good in reference to the exercises of the soul within, as it does in relation to objects that are without. An external object, or a transient recollection, may awake in the soul certain desires, or trains of thought. Now these desires or trains of thought become a part of the soul's acting when they receive the concurrence of the will. The mere awaking within of an involuntary desire is not sin, nor does any one conceive it to be such. It is when such an emotion receives the sanction of the will that it *may* become either virtuous or vicious. Nor even then, is its moral character determined, but arises wholly from the nature of the desire or thought, which the will has sanctioned. The primary desire which Eve exercised for the forbidden fruit *as fruit*, was not criminal; it was a perfectly natural feeling, and probably *must* have arisen under the circumstances; but when that act was assented to by the will, when she voluntarily indulged the desire, then it became criminal, and even had she abstained from it afterwards, she had nevertheless sinned—her abstinence being wholly the result of *fear*, and not of a spirit of obedience to God. Now, what the will did in this case, was to put forth an action of the soul in reference to a *forbid-*

den object ; a desire which could only have been innocent by an instantaneous expulsion from the soul was cherished, and by being cherished, even in the first degree, became sinful. So we hold in reference to every other mental exercise, it becomes an act of the soul when the will concurs, still, however, it derives its moral character from its own nature.

Now, if the affirmation or negation of the will—its “yes” or “no” to every question of truth and duty presented to it—be that which gives *personality* simply but not morality to its actions, those philosophers who give this faculty such great independence, who represent it as the supreme arbiter of the soul, and as deciding upon all questions of morality brought before it, if our positions be true, then have such philosophers separated the will from the whole domain of virtue and vice altogether. They concatenate its infinite number of deeds, and press them upon the soul as its responsible acts ; but whether those deeds be right or wrong, virtuous or vicious, *their* systems of philosophy can never determine. Why, no tribunal on earth or in heaven could either condemn or acquit an arraigned criminal on this ground. It is not enough that the will be determined in any case whatever—it is not enough that it act, *the cause* of that action must be ascertained ; its action may make the deed a matter of *accountability*, it may fasten it upon one man rather than another, but it never can decide whether the action were right or wrong ; suppose the act to be in *itself* good or evil, virtuous or vicious, the question then occurs, what is it *in the agent* whose act it is ? In other words, neither the volitions nor deeds of a man can be righteously adjudged, until the *motives* that produced them are considered. The will merely as will never can determine the moral character of its acts. This character is derived wholly from the virtuous or vicious principles which lie in the nature of the soul itself, and of which the will is merely the agent or executive.

The question, then, whether the will be under control, or whether it revel in absolute freedom, is one of the gravest ever presented to the mind for contemplation.—Some philosophers there are, who in discoursing on this subject, are so bent on establishing the dependence of the

will, that they deprive it of its *nature*. Others again, by over-magnifying that nature, deprive it of its *government*. The one class destroy it ; the other isolate it in a sort of independent sovereignty. Truth is with neither party.

Willing is the very nature of the will. Its acts, *so far as itself* is concerned, are, and must be, and can be nothing else, but free. Deprive it of this *mobility in itself*, and you destroy its nature. We will illustrate this by allusion to a physical substance. *Liquidity* is essential to water—make it a solid, and it becomes ice, but is no longer water—so, in reference to the will, spontaneous spiritual action is essential to its existence ; and were you to take this away, it is no more will, but necessity. The personality, and therefore the *responsibility* of an act of volition would be forever destroyed, and there could be no government in the universe.

But while spontaneity or self-activity constitutes the nature of the will, its operations are the results of causes as fixed and efficient, as any thing in nature. On this point, McCosh is entirely sound, save that in referring to the *causes* of volition, he specifies the will itself, and the laws it adopts for its speedy government, as the most efficient of all others :

“If by motive is meant the sum of all the causes producing the final volition, it is evident that the motive ever determines the volitions ; but then in the sum of causes *the main element is the will itself*. If by motive is meant merely the causes acting independently of the will, then we hold that they do not determine the volition, they merely call the will into exercise *as the true determining power*.”

We must conceive that in specifying *the causes of volition*, this author flatly contradicts himself. How does the above, for instance, agree with the following ?

“According to what Cousin holds to be a universal and necessary principle, every particular act of the will, as a phenomenon commencing to exist, must have a cause. If it be said that the cause lies in the human will itself, we go back to the human will, and insist that it too, as a phenomenon, must have a cause of its operation, and the mode of it.”

Here it is stated, on the one hand, that in reference to one class of motives, the will is the “*main element*” of the causes that produce volition ; in reference to another,

that it alone "is the true determining power!" There is such a confusion here of our author's language, that we really confess we do not understand him. So far as we do comprehend his meaning, it seems to be this, the will is controlled by motives in part, and in part by the laws of its own adoption; in either case, however, it is supreme, and may yield assent or not as it pleases! Now, how it is that volition can be a fixed and necessary *effect*, and yet the *cause* of that effect be wholly contingent, we cannot conceive. The truth is, that McCosh, in attempting to thrust a new theory concerning the will between that of Calvinists and Arminians, has made himself obnoxious to both, and satisfactory to neither. We think, however, that by far the most of his positions are decidedly Arminian. Even when he fastens the will to the moral nature, or maintains the fixedness and certainty of its operations, he spoils all by making the will *causal* of its own volitions. He certainly ascribes to it a sovereignty and power, not often heard from the lips of true Calvinists.

But we have said, that the operations of the will are subject to causes, that act with positive certainty in every case whatever. These causes are both internal and external to the mind. No one can for a moment doubt, but that there is in man, both a physical and moral adaptation to the beings and things around him. Now, the power of the external universe, to exercise a controlling influence over the human will, is to be found in this very adaptation of man to the creation around him. Has that creation light? He has eyes to enjoy it? Is that creation clothed with rich harvests and luscious fruits? He has appetites to desire them. Does that creation exhibit everywhere the signs of Divine wisdom and benevolence? He has an understanding and heart to appreciate both. Are there in that creation the morally good and the morally evil? He has a nature so endowed, as to distinguish between them, and to see the consequences of pursuing the one in preference of the other. The power, therefore, of all beings and things external to the soul, to control the action of the soul, depends upon certain fitnesses and adaptations in the soul itself to be controlled. The physical universe makes certainly a very different impression upon the mind of a brute, from what it does upon the mind of

man. And again, among men themselves the impressions are infinitely various, as their mental organizations and tastes differ. The same principle holds true in the moral world. The power of moral considerations to influence the conduct of men, is to be found in the adaptedness of men to admit those considerations. Where sin reigns and depravity is supreme, they can have little or no influence ; but where the spirit of man is in harmony with such considerations, they are not only cordially received, but exercise an absolute control. The very same law, therefore, of cause and effect that exists universally in the physical creation, has an equal ascendancy in the world of mind. And if it be true, that the strongest conceivable motives often fail of producing effect upon obdurate and hardened natures, equally true is it in physics, that there are bodies that the most powerful agents cannot dissolve. The will being the faculty of choice, and that choice depending upon the physical and moral constitution of the soul itself, its habitual inclination must be in the line of the nature to which it belongs. If that nature be lofty and aspiring, the will will fix its desires and aspirations upon the noble and the great. But if a man's nature be grovelling and vile, his will will crawl in the dust, amid things that are base and mean. This is a universal law of our natures. It is utterly impossible for a man's moral nature to be one thing, and the habitual inclination of his will to be the opposite. Nor is it the will that controls the nature in this case, but the nature the will. It is too, just at this point, that a *sort* of force is sometimes placed upon the will—an influence is brought to bear upon it not in harmony with its habitual inclination ; the consequence is a *temporary departure* from that inclination, followed it may be, either by remorse or a subsequent sense of great personal frailty.

While then we consider the will in its *nature* as free, we yet hold, that it is under the constant pliances of influences and principles, that control it with as much certainty, as any cause in nature does the effect it produces. True, a physical cause might not produce a mental effect, or a mental cause a physical effect. Both causes and effects are different in the moral, from what they are in the physical world. But what we maintain is, that the

certainty and regularity of operation is as fixed in the one case as in the other. With the same certainty that physical causes produce physical effects, do moral causes produce moral effects.

Probably nothing will give a fuller illustration of the points we are here discussing, than the system of moral training or education, to which man is subjected in this life. As it seems to us, the great object to be accomplished by that education, is *to secure the action of the will on the side of virtue*. External acts are but the muscular expressions of the acts of the will; these last being the true and real acts of the soul. It is matter then of supreme importance, that the rectitude of the will be established upon an immoveable basis. But how is this done? By training the will *as will*? By seeking to develop its energies by the frequency of its exercise? Not at all. There are two senses in which the action of the will may be wrong; it may be wrong in the violation of truth, or it may be wrong in the transgression of some principle of duty. In other words, it may err both in belief and practice. But how are these errors of the will to be corrected? Not by any pliances of education, pressed directly upon the will, but by inculcating the lessons of truth upon the understanding, and by seeking to infuse a love for it into the heart. Let the educator of the human soul fasten his principles immovably deep in the mind, and let him assiduously cultivate the moral principle; and if at all successful, he will find the will of his subject as naturally follow the bias of his teachings, as do physical bodies the law of gravitation. The will under the influence of error is erroneous; and under the control of depravity is vicious. If then, we would remove these misdirections of that faculty, we must dissipate that error, and eradicate that depravity. Now the whole object of moral training in this life, whether conducted by parents, teachers, ministers of the gospel, or God himself, is to produce these very results. In the child, where the convictions of duty and the principles of morality are not firmly established, nothing is more capricious than the will. We must think, too, that this was the case with our first parents at the time of their fall; they had not that *experience* which was necessary to confirm the will in the choice of that alone

which was right. We do not mean by this remark to apologise for their transgression, but simply to assign a reason for its occurrence. As the child becomes the man, his will assumes much more pertinacity and strength. If he has been well trained, that firmness of will is on the side of virtue; if otherwise it is the dupe of vice. Thus the work proceeds onward through life, the will acquiring a marble stability, an iron-like hardness, as virtue or vice has taken possession of the soul. Who thinks of effecting a change in the character and conduct of the veteran transgressor? And who ever calculates that the avowed apostle of virtue should decline from his integrity, and thus reverse at three score years and ten, the principles by which his whole has been governed? And that educational course, which in this life attains to such maturity, will be conducted infinitely farther in the life that is to come. It will probably be more rapid there than here; so that if after the flight of some millions of years, a comparison should be made between some heir of life and some child of hell, the fixed opposition of their wills would almost be like that between Gabriel and Apollyon. In such a condition at least, the advocates of the will's sovereignty, must admit, that no exercise of that sovereignty whatever can cause the sanctified saint in heaven to consent to a crime, or the lost soul in perdition to choose a deed of virtue.

There is one point in the training of a soul for eternity, which no education whatever can reach—*its moral renewal*. The Scriptures, as well as our own experience teach, that there is *a vice of nature* in man, that man himself can never eradicate. As long as this innate vitiation remain, the inclination and action of the will are always wrong. Indeed, such is the power that this depravity exercises over the will, that its wrongness or misdirection is, in a moral and philosophical sense, necessary. The will, as will, cannot possibly be different from what it is, the moral elements of the soul continuing what they are. Now, the remedy for this evil, as taught by Christ himself, is not any peculiar sovereignty which the will has to throw off this oppression; nor yet any power of mere motives and inducement to effect a change—it is *a regeneration of the soul itself*—"Marvel not that I said unto thee,

ye must be born again." This work of omnipotence upon the soul, changes its entire moral condition; hence, a change of the will necessarily follows; and with these new elements of moral power to control it, the will can no more now prefer a life of sin, than it could previously choose one of holiness. And yet even this mighty moral revolution, that has effected an entire change in the bias of the will, has in no sense destroyed even a particle of its essential liberty. It is now in its physical nature, just what it was before the change took place—it is *will*. Nor has a disruption taken place between it, as a sort of executive of the other faculties of the soul, and those faculties themselves. It is controlled by the inner powers of the mind now, just as truly as it was formerly. The change throughout has been a *moral*, not a physical one. A bad nature has been made virtuous—a dynasty of evil powers has been transformed into an administration of love and purity—"old things have passed away, and all things have become new."

Our last remark on this subject is, that most of the errors concerning the freedom of the will, have arisen from not distinguishing between the nature of the will itself, and the laws of control to which its actions are subject. Water is essentially a fluid. This fact, all who deal with it must ever keep in mind. To manage it as you would a solid, would be egregiously to err. But are there no laws which control this element *as a fluid*? If we cannot manage it as a solid, can we not manage it at all? Surely we can; and with as much certainty, as we do the harder substances around us. Just so, we say of this faculty, it is will—and its exercises are volitions—*the free preferences and choices of the soul*. But are there no methods established by God, for determining and controlling this free element of being? Has the creator established a most positive and fixed administration over all other creatures and things, and left this anomaly of existence an absolute *outlaw* from his government? So much did McCosh feel the necessity of such laws for the government of the will, that, overlooking the fact that God had enacted them, *when he created the will*, he even sets the will forth as an intelligent agent, to originate a code for itself! We hold it as a truth as fixed as any other

whatever, that the human will essentially free in itself, is under as absolute a control from causes both within and without the mind, as any other creature or thing that God has made. He, therefore, who would seek a change of will in himself or in others, must not accost directly the faculty of volition as a power by itself, and as capable of itself to determine its own acts. *This would be to force the will ab extra!* He must approach the will by those avenues that God, nature, and universal experience have indicated; he must enlighten the understanding; he must appeal to the heart; he must arouse the conscience. Set these agencies at work, and your end is forthwith accomplished. But should you ply the will, as will—should you expect the change to begin with it, in it, and by it, the general state of the mind and heart remaining what it was, your endeavours would be not only abortive, but absurd. Complaining, possibly, of the *force-work* employed by necessarians about the will, you are seeking to *necessitate* it in a way against which it must forever rebel. Indeed, the mis-named system of freedom that Arminians and others advocate, concerning the will, is the only system that subjects it to *force*, and which by *revereing* the modes of its operation, destroys the only freedom that it possesses. Even if such freedom existed, what is it worth? It is but caprice at best, a mere thing of chance and uncertainty. What, separate the control of reason and conscience from the operations of the will! Dislodge it from all the foundations of virtue and holiness; yea, separate it even from God himself, and yet expect it to be worth any thing! The human will is down-trodden enough already—it is abased by the control of evil lusts and passions; but verily, if the doctrine of these philosophers could hold, its friends would be its worst enemies, and hands extended to give it aid, would only sink it into a deeper abyss of degradation.

There is one practical suggestion, which we must beg leave to offer, for the sake of our younger class of divines. A pretty long experience has taught us, that the holding forth from the pulpit of man's *dependence*, is far more effective in promoting his conversion, than the empty laudation of his vainly imagined sovereignty, and greatness. Humanity is already too much exalted, the work of the

preacher should be to *abase it*, that it may have a true exaltation. Yet, when abased by the convictions of truth, when humbled by a sense of its guilt and *helplessness*, it must not be left in that condition. Let not the preacher, however, aim at the work of resuscitation, by accosting simply the will, by magnifying its freedom and self-agency, and by thus transferring the sinner's trust from God to himself, from grace to the energies of his own nature. Let, on the contrary, God's co-worker (which every true preacher is) do as God himself does—level such an array of argument and appeal at the understanding, the conscience and the heart, as to lead, through grace, the will captive, according to God's established laws for its government. He who attempts, primarily, to find his way into the soul by the *door of the will*, will discover, both to his defeat and mortification, that he has been attempting an entrance, where there is and can be *none*. But he who seeks such admission by the reason, the conscience and the heart, will find himself master of the spiritual citadel, often, even ere he is aware of it. Some truth or motive lodged in these potent pre-agencies of volition, will so remain, and so act, that even that stern keeper of the soul—that faculty by which its full action is expressed—will yield; and another trophy will thus be added to the triumphs of the cross.

Mr. V. H. Manget

ARTICLE V.

ANALOGY OF THE SOUTHERN LANGUAGE
OF EUROPE WITH THE LATIN.

BY V. H. MANGET.

In a former number we spoke of the first inhabitants of France, Spain and Portugal; of their different dialects, of the invasion of their country by the Romans, and its effects upon their customs, religion and language; finally, we traced, step by step, the origin and progress of the present languages of Southern Europe and their literature.

Those general remarks were made as introductory to the analogy which we intend to present in this number between them, the English and the Latin. Before, however, we begin to show that analogy, we hope we may be excused for recapitulating, briefly, what we said in the first article.

Two languages were spoken in Gaul at the time of its invasion by the Romans: the Celtic in the North, and the Greek in the South. After its conquest, the Latin became the language of the palace, the cloister, the tribunal, and the school. But, according to the Fathers of the Church and the Latin writers of that time, it was only introduced by a gradual change, both among the common people and the higher classes of some provinces; and even then, its introduction did not prevent, for several centuries, the use of the Greek, and especially that of the Celtic, which was not even abandoned in the 11th century.

According to Cicero, the Latin already began to change, 60 years after the first colonization of the Romans in Gaul, and the Latin writers tell us that its alteration continued more and more; so much so, that the ministers were obliged, in order to be understood by the people, to preach in what is called "*Lingua-Rustica*." The Frank invasion hastened still more its corruption; each province had its own idiom, but the language of France could be divided into two principal dialects, called *Romanza*: that of the South, spoken south of the Loire, and that of the North, spoken north of that river, and which finally became the French language. Under Louis XIV, it became the universal language of the higher classes and of men of science all over Europe. It was then that it acquired that ease, clearness and precision, that refinement and elegance, which, since that time, made it the first of living languages and the medium of conversation and epistolary intercourse in the European courts and diplomacy.

The beauty, rich mines, fertility, and sea-ports of Spain, attracted the attention of the early navigators. That charming country, inhabited first by the Iberi, was successively invaded and colonized by the Celtæ, Phenicians, Rhodians, Phocians, and Carthaginians, who introduced there, their different dialects. But, under the dominion of the Romans, they all gave place to the Latin language,

except in the Basques provinces. In the 5th century, the invasion of Spain by the Suevi, Alans, and Vandals, soon followed by the Visigoths, had the same effect which the Frank invasion had in Gaul. It was changed into a Roman dialect. The Moors, who were the next invaders, established over all Spain, except in the Asturias, their sway, language, and religion. But as the Goths gained ground over the Moors, so did the Spanish Romanza, but divided into as many branches as there were States. One of the principal ones, the Castilian dialect finally became the language of Spain, as the Northern Romanza of Gaul had become that of France.

The history of Portugal is almost the same as that of Spain. The Portuguese was formed from the Gallician, which was one of the four principal dialects of Spain. It is not so rich as the Castilian, but it is more concise, easy and simple, and is superior as a conversational language.

The Latin language, radiating from one common centre, became not only the language of all Italy, but also successively of the whole Roman empire. However, the Latin spoken by the common people, was far from being the language of Cicero; and the more distant the common provinces were from Rome, the more numerous the idioms were, and the more corrupted they became, by the invasion of the barbarians. This is the reason why almost all the Italian states have a living idiom or dialect, spoken both by the uneducated and the educated people; for what is called the Italian language, is the written language. It is spoken only in Tuscany and in Rome. The educated classes of the other parts of Italy, however, speak it, but they learn it as a branch of education.

Valachian or Moldavian Language.

There is in Europe another idiom which might be reckoned among the languages of Latin Europe. We mean the Valachian or Moldavian idiom. Our acquaintance with it is, however, too limited, to try to show here its analogy with the Latin; we shall only state that Roman colonies having been sent into the countries which com-

pose at this present time Valachia and Moldavia, they there established the Latin language ; but being surrounded by different nations, who often mingled with them, and direct intercourse ceasing with the mother country, the Latin could not long retain its purity, and must have soon become corrupted and modified.

Before we show the analogy of the different parts of speech of the languages of Southern Europe with that of the Latin, we shall speak of the principal changes, additions, and suppressions of letters which take place in words derived from that language.

The Portuguese, Spanish, and especially the Italian, are almost entirely derived from the Latin, for nearly nine-tenths of the words are of Latin origin. They were introduced by the Romans, or borrowed from Latin authors since the revival of letters. Thousands of words of the latter are preserved in the former, either entire or only with a small alteration ; and a great many others, by changing, adding or suppressing letters. In Italian and Spanish, the most part of the mutilated words can be recognized ; but it is different in Portuguese, and especially in French. In the first, a consonant between two vowels is often suppressed, and the word is becoming therefore entirely unrecognizable. In the latter, the additions, and especially the suppressions of letters have been so great, that very often it is with the greatest trouble that the best etymologists can find their derivations.

The English, although not included among the Roman languages, has with them a great affinity, for it possesses over 6,000 Latin words, which it received through the medium of the French and Italian. We advise the reader to look carefully over the part which treats of the changes, additions or suppressions of letters ; it will enable him to recognize, especially in Portuguese, a great number of words, which otherwise he would not be able to do.

Changes of letters in Italian.

The Italian changes, in many words, l into i :

<i>Italian.</i>	<i>Latin.</i>	<i>English.</i>
Piacere,	placere,	to please,
Pieno,	pleno,	full,
Fiamma,	flamma,	flame.

Cl is often changed also into chi :

Chiudere,	cludere,	to close,
Chiaro,	claro,	clear,
Chiarita,	claritas,	clearness.

C, followed by t, is changed into t:

reflettere,	reflectere,	to reflect,
dottrina,	doctrina,	doctrine,
rispettabile,	respectabile,	respectable.

There are many other changes, such as d into v, when followed by v ; p into t, when followed also by t ; d into m, when before m.

Portuguese :

This language has more suppressions of letters in the middle of words than the Italian or Spanish, and unless the reader is acquainted with them, it will be impossible for him to recognize those mutilated words when he sees them.

Often n and l, and sometimes d, are suppressed in the middle of words ; pl and cl are changed into ch.

<i>Portuguese.</i>	<i>Latin.</i>	<i>English.</i>
Raa,	rana,	frog,
lua,	luna,	moon,
mcsa,	mensa,	table,
mao,	malo,	evil,
ceo,	cœlo,	heaven,
vigiar,	vigilare,	to watch,
chantar,	plantare,	to plant,
chorar,	plorare,	to weep,
chave,	clave,	key.

The other principal changes are u into o ; c into g ; t into d ; l into r ; c into v ; q or qu into g ; au into ou ; c into i ; oc into ou, &c., &c.

As some of our readers may not be acquainted with the Latin, we generally give the Latin word which has the greatest analogy, without any regard to its case.

Spanish :

The principal changes in Spanish are, o into ue, and t into d ; and the principal addition, much in use, is i before e, in the middle of words.

<i>Spanish.</i>	<i>Latin.</i>	<i>English.</i>
Muerte,	morte,	death,
fuelle,	fonte,	fountain,
puerta,	porta,	door,
cadena,	catena,	chain,
nadar,	natare,	to swim,
tierra,	terra,	earth,
cielo,	cœlo,	heaven,
miel,	mel,	honey.

C, q or qu, are changed sometimes into g; pl, cl, fl, into ll.

Amigo,	amico,	friend,
digo,	dico,	I say,
agua,	aqua,	water,
lluvia,	pluvia,	rain,
lleno,	pleno,	full,
llave,	clave,	key,
llama,	flamma,	flame.

All Spanish and Portuguese verbs, derived from the Latin, reject the e final, but the Italian always retain it.

All verbs ending in English, by ate, ute, ose, ess; almost all those in fy, uce, olve, are regularly formed in the following languages, thus:

<i>Latin,</i>	are,	uere,	onere,	ficare,	ucere,	imere,	olvere,
<i>Italian,</i>	are,	uire,	orre,	ficare,	ucere,	imere,	olvere,
<i>Span.</i>	ar,	uir,	oner,	ficar,	ucir,	imir,	olver,
<i>Por.</i>	ar,	uir,	oner,	ficar,	uzir,	imir,	olver,
<i>French,</i>	er,	uer,	oser,	fier,	uire,	imer,	oudre,
<i>Eng.</i>	ate,	ute,	ose,	fy,	uce,	ess,	olve.

These are the terminations which must be added to the radical letters of verbs such as: moderate, contribute, compose, purify, produce, impress, absolve, &c.

The Italian verbs, derived from those terminated in Latin by onere and ucere, have contracted these terminations into orre, urre, as is seen in the above examples.

There are many other verbs which are also regularly formed in all the preceding languages, but we omit them here, because ending in English in different ways, each class does not contain words enough to be worth mentioning. They cannot, however, present any difficulty to the classical scholar, especially if he should pay attention from what Latin conjugation they are derived. The Italian is

like the Latin ; the Spanish and Portuguese drop the e final, and the French change the termination into er.

This rule stands good for all verbs, derived from the 1st conjugation in Latin. We subjoin a few examples :

<i>Latin.</i> —	Armare,	administrare,	confirmare,	continuare.
<i>Italian,</i>	are,	trare,	are,	are
<i>Spanish,</i>	ar,	trare,	ar,	ar
<i>Portu.</i>	ar,	trar,	ar,	ar
<i>French,</i>	er,	trer,	er,	er
<i>English,</i>	arm ,	ter,	confirm ,	continue

In the conjugation of Spanish and Portuguese verbs, the t of the Latin is omitted in all the three persons singular, and in the second and third plural ; m is also suppressed in the first person of the imperfect, indicative, and of the present and imperfect subjunctive, and u is changed into o in the 1st person plural.

<i>Latin,</i>	<i>Spanish,</i>	<i>Portuguese.</i>
Amo,	amo,	amo,
as,	as,	as,
at,	a,	a,
amus,	amos,	amos,
atis,	ais,	ais,
ant,	an,	ao.

In all third persons plural the Portuguese ends by ao, except in those of the tenses of the subjunctive which are terminated by em. Ao final, (a having an accent called til,) is equivalent to an.

The greatest difference between the Spanish and Portuguese, consists in the structure, and principally in the pronunciation, which abounds in nasal sounds. The Portuguese words are the same, or nearly the same, as those of the Spanish, or if they differ, it is only by the suppression or the change of a consonant into another one, as is often the case in words coming from the Arabic. The Spaniards have preserved the aspirations and guttural sounds of the latter, whilst the Portuguese have softened them, by changing the aspirated h into f and the jota, into lh : almohada, Sp. ; almofada, Port. (pillow) ; aguja, Sp. ; agulha, Port. (needle.) They changed c into z, and x into ch : aceite, Sp. ; azeite, Port. (oil.) Other Arabic words are written with the same letters, and pronounced nearly

the same, whilst others, although having the same orthography, have quite a different sound. The two above languages are so nearly alike, that Sismondi wittily remarked, that the Portuguese was a Castilian desosse, (boneless Castilian.)

French.

There is no language derived from the Latin, which has more suppressions or changes of letters than the French, and as we said before, they have been so great, that in many cases it is difficult to see at first sight the derivation of some French words. We give below only the principal suppressions and additions :

I is often placed before a, followed by m, n, r, ct, and the Latin termination is suppressed.

<i>French,</i>	<i>Latin,</i>	<i>English,</i>	<i>French,</i>	<i>Latin,</i>	<i>English.</i>
Faim,	famis,	hunger.	vain,	vanus,	vain.
pain,	panis,	bread.	sain,	sanus,	healthy.
grain,	granum,	grain.	saint,	sanctus,	holy.

Some words reject the termination, but do not take i before a, as : an, sang, ocean, tyran. Others ending in Latin by a, arium, orium ; or adjectives in arius, orius, take i, and change the terminations a, ium, ius, into e mute.

I is placed before e, or a ; en is changed into ein, and the Latin termination is suppressed, except in some feminine nouns ending by a, which letter is changed into e mute.

Ciel,	cœlum,	heaven.	frein,	frœnum,	bit.
miel,	mel,	honey.	plein,	plenus,	full.
fiel,	fel,	goal.	serein,	serenus,	serene.

V in the middle of words is changed into f ; o into eu, or œu, and the Latin termination is suppressed. The change of o and v, takes place sometimes in the same word, as seen in the last two words of the following example :

Cerf,	cervus,	deer.	seul,	solus,	alone.
nerf,	nervus,	nerve.	sœur,	soror,	sister.
bref,	brevis,	breef.	neuf,	novus,	new.
vif,	vivus,	alive.	œuf,	ovum,	egg.

H is often put after c, to which it gives a soft sound ; l is changed into u, p into v, a into e in the middle of words. The latter is always changed into e silent when final.

<i>French,</i>	<i>Latin,</i>	<i>English.</i>	<i>French,</i>	<i>Latin,</i>	<i>English.</i>
Champ,	campus,	field.	faux,	falsus,	false.
chaleur,	color,	heat.	sauf,	salvus,	save.
chant,	cantus,	singing.	rive,	ripa,	bank.
chaud,	caldus,	warm.	savon,	sapo,	soap.
mer,	mare,	sea.	sel,	sal,	salt.

Many words in um, or us become French, by suppressing that termination, others by dropping the ending of the accusative.

Mur,	murus,	wall.	part,	partem,	part.
nid,	nidus,	nest.	dent,	dentem,	tooth.
vent,	ventus,	wind.	pont,	pontem,	bridge.
vin,	vinum,	wine.	mal,	malum,	evil.

C and g are sometimes suppressed in verbs ; n changed into s, ce into i, as may be seen in the terminations of verbs, which we gave a little before.

These are the principal changes, suppressions or additions which occur in the preceding languages. As to the others, we shall only observe that letters are sometimes added and sometimes taken off from the Latin roots.

Articles.

The articles of the languages of Southern Europe present too striking an affinity to one another, not to denote a common origin, and their terminations are so like those of Latin nouns and pronouns, that they must be derived from that language, although it possesses no such part of speech. To be convinced of it, it is only necessary to compare them with the Latin pronouns, ille, illa, &c.

<i>Latin.</i> —Ille,	illo,	illa,	illi,	illos,	illas,	illa.
<i>Italian,</i> il,	lo,	la,	li,			le.
<i>Spanish,</i> el,	lo,	la,		los,	las,	
<i>French,</i> le,		la,		les,	les,	
<i>Portu.</i>	o,	a,		os,	as,	

At first sight, the Portuguese articles seem different from those of the other languages, but that difference only consists in the suppression of the letter l, which takes place regularly in several words as seen in the preceding pages.

The Spanish article *el*, seems also different, but there can be hardly any doubt that like the French pronoun *il*, it is derived from the first syllable of *ille*, as well as the Italian article *il*. *Lo* is used now in Spanish, only before adjectives used substantively.

Lo and *li* have also been used in the French, but *o* and *a* having been changed into *es*, as we have explained before, produced *le*, *les*.

La has been retained in French as a feminine article.

Substantives.

The most part of substantives have been formed from the Latin, some retaining the termination of the substantive, others suppressing that of the cases. A great many nouns which to-day end with *o* and *e*, in Italian, Spanish and Portuguese, were terminated before by a consonant, which is still the case now with some Italian idioms.

All nouns and adjectives are terminated in Italian, by *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*. *Lapis*, (a pencil,) and a few other foreign words are the only exceptions.

This may be said not only of nouns and adjectives, but of all parts of speech. We know of but five exceptions, which are: *il*, *in*, *con*, *per*, *non*. One meets often with words ending with a consonant, but it has either been added, or the vowel suppressed for the sake of euphony. All Italian, Spanish and Portuguese nouns derived from those of the first declension in Latin, have the same termination; and the French, and generally the English, end by *e* silent.

<i>Latin.</i> —	<i>Agricultura,</i>	<i>doctrina,</i>	<i>prudencia,</i>	<i>academia.</i>
<i>Italian,</i>	<i>ura,</i>	<i>ina,</i>	<i>za,</i>	<i>ia.</i>
<i>Spanish,</i>	<i>ura,</i>	<i>ina,</i>	<i>cia,</i>	<i>ia.</i>
<i>Portu.</i>	<i>ura,</i>	<i>ina,</i>	<i>cia,</i>	<i>ia.</i>
<i>French,</i>	<i>ure,</i>	<i>ine,</i>	<i>ce,</i>	<i>ie.</i>
<i>English,</i>	<i>ure,</i>	<i>ine,</i>	<i>ce,</i>	<i>y.</i>

English nouns in *y* used to end like the French, by *e* or *ie*, as is the case still in the plural: *comedy*, *comedies*.

All Italian, Spanish and Portuguese nouns derived from those of the second declension, in *us*, *um*, *er*, change *us* and *um* into *o*, and *er* into *ro*; or in other terms, they are the same as dative or ablative cases.

<i>Latin.</i> —	Refugium,	sacrificium,	momentum,	minister.
<i>Italian,</i>	gio,	cio,	ento,	tro.
<i>Spanish,</i>	gio,	cio,	ento,	tro.
<i>Portu.</i>	gio,	cio,	ento,	tro.
<i>French,</i>	ge,	ce,	ent,	tre.
<i>English,</i>	ge,	ce,	ent,	ter.

Nouns in us of the third and fourth conjugation, except *mano*, do not follow the above rule. No regular rules can be given for their formation.

<i>Latin,</i>	<i>Italian,</i>	<i>Spanish,</i>	<i>Portuguese,</i>	<i>French,</i>	<i>English.</i>
<i>Virtus,</i>	<i>virtu,</i>	<i>virtud,</i>	<i>virtude,</i>	<i>vertu,</i>	<i>virtue.</i>
<i>tribus,</i>	<i>tribu,</i>	<i>tribu,</i>	<i>tribu,</i>	<i>tribu,</i>	<i>tribe.</i>
<i>grus,</i>	<i>gru,</i>	<i>grulla,</i>	<i>grou,</i>	<i>grue,</i>	<i>crane.</i>
<i>fructus,</i>	<i>frutta,</i>	<i>fruta,</i>	<i>fruta,</i>	<i>fruit,</i>	<i>fruit.</i>

All Italian nouns which do not have the preceding terminations, or do not end by *i*, are terminated by *e*, as may be seen a little farther by the table of substantives and adjectives.

Adjectives.

What we have said about nouns, can mostly apply to adjectives, for they have been formed in the same way.

All Italian adjectives end by *o*, *e*, *a*. The first two terminations are changed into *i* for the plural, and the other into *e*.

Adjectives in Spanish and Portuguese end by *o*, *e*, *a*, or a consonant. Those which end by *o* are derived from the Latin ones in *us*, and *er*; they are the same as dative or ablative cases.

<i>Latin.</i> —	Gloriosus,	sincerus,	[prosper,	tener.
<i>Italian,</i>	oso,	ro,	ro,	ero.
<i>Spanish,</i>	oso,	ro,	ro,	ero.
<i>Portu.</i>	oso,	ro,	ro,	ro.
<i>French,</i>	eux,	re,	re,	dre.
<i>English,</i>	ous,	re,	rous,	der.

Those which end in *a* are formed from the masculine, by changing *o* into *a*.

Spanish and Portuguese adjectives derived from those which in Latin have but one or two terminations for the three genders, are terminated by *e*, except those which end by *alis*, *ilis*, *aris*.

Latin.—Clemens, elegans, tristis, brevis, mediocris.

Spanish, ente, ante, tē, ve, cre.

Portu. ente, ante, te, ve, cre.

Those ending by alis, ilis, aris, drop the termination *is*.

Latin.—Civilis, talis, utilis, singularis, generalis.

Spanish, il, tal, il, ar, al.

Portu. il, tal, il, ar, al.

Adjectives in ibilis, abilis, change bilis into ble for the Spanish, French and English, and into vel for the Portuguese.

Latin.—Admirabilis, terribilis, flexibilis.

Italian, abile, bile, bile.

Spanish, able, ble, ble.

Portu. avel, vel, vel.

French, able, ble, ble.

English, able, ble, ble.

By following the preceding rules, the classical scholar, can easily form in any of the Southern languages of Europe, all nouns and adjectives of Latin origin, especially if he pays the least attention to their Latin gender and terminations, and to what we said about the changes, additions and suppressions of letters.

Some of the principal and regular terminations of nouns and adjectives.

	ion,	ure,	ce,	my,	al,	ty,	favor
<i>Latin.</i> —Religio,		agricultura,	prudentia,	academia,	animal,	dignitas,	ore
<i>Italian.</i>	ione,	ura,	za,	mia,	ale,	ta,	or
<i>Spanish.</i>	ion,	ura,	cia,	mia,	al,	dad,	or
<i>Portu.</i>	iao,	ura,	cia,	mia,	al,	dade,	our
<i>French.</i>	ion,	ure,	ce,	mie,	al,	te,	or
<i>English.</i>	ion,	ure,	ce,	my,	al,	ty,	
	ce,	ent,	ent,	ege,	ent,	ant,	ile
<i>Latin.</i> —Sacrificium,		momentum,	torrens,	collegium,	prudens,	elegans,	docilis
<i>Italian.</i>	cio,	ento,	ente,	gio,	ente,	ante,	ile
<i>Spanish.</i>	cio,	ento,	ente,	gio,	ente,	ante,	il
<i>Portu.</i>	cio,	ento,	ente,	gio,	ente,	ante,	il
<i>French.</i>	ce,	ent,	ent,	ge,	ent,	ant,	ile
<i>English.</i>	ce,	ent,	ent,	ge,	ent,	ant,	ile
	al,	ary,	ous	ble,	obligatorius,	superior,	activus
<i>Latin.</i> —Generalis,		militaris,	gloriosus,	terribilis,	orius,	ore,	ivo
<i>Italian.</i>	ale,	are,	oso,	bile,	orio,	or,	ivo
<i>Spanish.</i>	al,	ar,	oso,	ble,	orio,	or,	ivo
<i>Portu.</i>	al,	ar,	oso,	vel,	orio,	eur,	if
<i>French.</i>	al,	aire,	eux,	ble,	oire,	or,	ive
<i>English.</i>	al,	ary,	ous,	ble,	ory,	or,	

Nouns ending by uge, ige, ency, dy, ine, ance, cle, ory, ary, ude, ate, etc.; adjectives ending by ar, ary, id, ic, ain, an, ere, etc. etc. are formed in the same way.

Numeral Adjectives :

There is no part of speech which bears so striking an analogy to the Latin as numeral adjectives do, especially the ordinal. These last, in Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese, are entirely the same as dative and ablative cases. The only difference is the change of one or two letters into another, and that in two or three cases only.

Cardinal Numbers :

<i>Lat.</i>	<i>Ital.</i>	<i>Span.</i>	<i>Por.</i>	<i>Fr.</i>	
Tres,	tre,	tres,	tres,	trois,	3
quatuor,	quattro,	cuatro,	quatro,	quatre,	4
sex,	sei,	seis,	seis,	six,	6
mille,	mille,	mil,	mil,	mille,	1,000

Ordinal :

quarto,	quarto,	quarto,	quarto,	4th,
quinto,	quinto,	quinto,	quinto,	5th,
sexto,	sesto,	sexto,	sexto,	6th,
nono,	nono,	nono,	nono,	9th
decimo,	decimo,	decimo,	decimo,	10th

Possessive Pronouns.

<i>Lat.</i>	<i>Ital.</i>	<i>Span.</i>	<i>Por.</i>	<i>Fr.</i>	<i>Eng.</i>
Meus,	mio,	mi,	meu,	mon,	my,
mea,	mia,	mi,	minha,	ma,	my,
tua,	tua,	tu,	tua,	ta,	thy,
sua,	sua,	su,	sua,	sa,	his, her, it,
nostra,	nostra,	nuestra,	nossa,	notre,	our,

The Italian is the same as the Latin, with the exception of the change of e into i; and the addition of e and o in the plural of my and thy, as *tuoi, miei*.

In *vester*, the e is changed into o in Italian, Portuguese, and French; and in Spanish, the o of *noster* and e of *vester*, are changed into ue.

In *meus, tuus, suus*, etc., the Spanish suppresses the last syllable; and the French drops the u in the feminine. These pronouns follow the same rule as the Latin, and al-

ways agree with the thing possessed, and never with the possessor, as in English.

Demonstrative Pronouns.

The following pronouns which denote, in Spanish, Portuguese and Italian, an object near the person speaking, are the same as the Latin pronouns, *iste, ista, etc.*, with only the exception of the change of *i* into *e*, for the Spanish, Portuguese and Italian, and the addition of *qu* to the latter.

<i>Latin.</i>	<i>Span.</i>	<i>Por.</i>	<i>Italian.</i>
<i>Iste, (isto)</i>	<i>este,</i>	<i>este,</i>	<i>questo, this, or this one ; mas.</i>
<i>ista,</i>	<i>esta,</i>	<i>esta,</i>	<i>questa, this, or this one ; fem.</i>
<i>istos, isti,</i>	<i>estos,</i>	<i>estes,</i>	<i>questi, these, these ones,</i>
<i>istas, ista,</i>	<i>estas,</i>	<i>estas,</i>	<i>queste, these, these ones.</i>

We do not give the French, as it does not seem to present, any analogy to the other languages.

Pronouns, désignating an object near the person spoken to :

<i>Iste, etc.,</i>	<i>ese,</i>	<i>esse,</i>	<i>cotesto, that, or that one ; mas.</i>
	<i>esa</i>	<i>essa,</i>	<i>cotesta, that, &c., fem.</i>
	<i>esos,</i>	<i>esses,</i>	<i>cotesti,</i>
	<i>esas,</i>	<i>essas,</i>	<i>coteste,</i>

In the above pronouns, the *t* has been suppressed in Spanish, but changed into *s* in Portuguese, and the Italian is preceded by *cot* or *cod*.

They may be made also to be derived from *ipse, ipsa, etc.* ; but we think they bear a greater analogy to *iste, ista, etc.*

The following, which designate an object distant both from the person speaking and the person spoken to, show also a great analogy to the Latin, although it may not seem so at first sight. There is hardly any doubt that they have been derived like the article, from the pronouns *ille, illa, illos, etc.*, which are preceded in Spanish and Portuguese by *aqu*, and in Italian by *qu*.

<i>Ille, illo,</i>	<i>aquel,</i>	<i>aquelle,</i>	<i>quello, quel, that, that one,</i>
<i>illa,</i>	<i>aquella,</i>	<i>aquella,</i>	<i>quella, that, that one,</i>
<i>illos, illi,</i>	<i>aquellos,</i>	<i>aquelles,</i>	<i>quelli, those.</i>
<i>illas, illæ,</i>	<i>aquellas,</i>	<i>aquellas,</i>	<i>aquella.</i>

Relative Pronouns :

<i>Lat.</i>	<i>Span.</i>	<i>Por.</i>	<i>Ital.</i>	<i>French.</i>	<i>Eng.</i>
Quis, qui, } que, quem, }	quien,	quem,	chi,	qui, que,	who, whom,
qui, quæ,	que,	que,	che,	qui, que,	which, that,
qualis, quale,	cual,	qual,	quale,	quel, quelle,	which, what,
cujā,	cuya,	cujā,	di cui,	dont de qui,	whose.

Whenever qu has the sound of k, it is replaced in Italian by ch. Formerly the Spanish and Portuguese used qui.

Indefinite Pronouns :

These pronouns present a great analogy between the Spanish and Portuguese ; but as it is not so perfect in the other languages, we subjoin only a few examples :

Talis, tale,	tal,	tal,	tale,	tel,	such,
altero,	otro,	autro,	altro,	autre,	other,
aliguīs,	alguno,	algum,	alcuno,	quelqu'um,	some one.

Personal Pronouns :

Almost all the Latin pronouns are found in all the languages of Southern Europe ; some with modifications, or very light ones, others with greater ones ; but never great enough not to have their Latin origin immediately recognized, or easily traced.

<i>Latin.</i>	<i>Ital.</i>	<i>Span.</i>	<i>Por.</i>	<i>French.</i>	<i>Eng.</i>
Tu,	tu,	tu,	tu,	tu,	thou,
illa,	ella,	ella,	ella,	elle,	she.
me,	mi,	me,	me,	me,	me,
te,	ti,	te,	te,	te,	thee,
se,	si,	se,	se,	se,	himself, etc.

The Italian has changed nos and vos into noi, voi, but they are still in use when joined to the preposition co, (with,) as may be seen a little farther.

Nos and vos, first used in French, were afterwards changed into nous and vous.

The Portuguese and Spanish retained them, but to the latter were added otros, otras, meaning others.

The other languages use the same form also, but only when the speaker or speakers wish to give to those two pronouns a signification more restrained.

These preceding remarks apply to the above pronouns only when they are subjects, as they are different in Italian and Spanish, when objects.

The pronouns of the third persons, used as direct regimen, are the same in all the preceding languages as the articles which we have compared with the pronouns ille, illa, etc.

We subjoin the following ones on account of their great affinity :

<i>Ital.</i>	<i>Spanish.</i>	<i>Por.</i>	<i>French.</i>	
Selo,	se le,	selo,	se le,	it, him, or her,
sela,	se la,	sela,	se la,	to himself, etc.
seli,	se los,	selos,	se les,	
sele,	se las,	selas,	se lcs,	

The union of the personal pronouns with the preposition with, takes place in the following ones in Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese, as it does in Latin :

Cum,	con,	con,	com,	
mecum,	meco,	connigo,	comigo,	with me,
tecum,	teco,	contigo,	comtigo,	with thee,
secum,	seco,	consigo,	comsigo,	with himself,
nobiscum,	nosco,			with us,
vobiscum,	vosco,			with you,

The Italian, like the Latin, is followed by the preposition, but loses n final. The Spanish and Portuguese are followed by the particle go.

There are in Italian, Spanish and Portuguese, only three conjugations. In the former language, the 2nd and 3rd Latin conjugations are included in one ; but the verbs are divided into two classes : those in ere, long, and ere, short. There used to be in French also but three conjugations ; the verbs which compose now the 4th, first ended by er, then eir, finally oir.

A few examples, taken from verbs of the first conjugation, will be sufficient to show their analogy with the Latin.

The Italian, as we said before, is the same as the Latin ; the Spanish and Portuguese drop the e, and the French change are into er.

<i>Latin.</i>	<i>Spanish.</i>	<i>Por.</i>	<i>Ital.</i>	<i>French.</i>	<i>Eng.</i>
Armare,	armar,	armar,	armare,	armer,	to arm.

Present Indicative.

<i>Latin.</i>	<i>Spanish.</i>	<i>Por.</i>	<i>Ital.</i>	<i>French.</i>	<i>Eng.</i>
Armo,	armo,	armo,	armo,	arme,	I arm,
as,	as,	as,	i,	es,	
at,	a,	a,	a,	e,	
amus,	amos,	amos,	iamo,	ons,	
atis,	ais,	ais,	ate,	ez,	
ant,	an,	ao,	ano,	ent,	

All the difference between the Latin, the Spanish and Portuguese, is only the suppression of the *t* in the two latter languages, and the change of *n* into *o*, in the third person plural, in Portuguese. The *a* which precedes *o* takes an accent.

The Italian terminated by *i*, instead of *as* in the second person singular, takes an *i* after the radical letters in the first person plural, and suppresses the *s* final; it changes *tis* into *te*, in the second, and *t* into *o* in the third, as seen in the above example. The imperfect of the indicative, and the present of the subjunctive, follow about the same rule. In the first tense, *b* is changed into *v* in Italian and Portuguese, and the *m* of the first person, in both tenses, is suppressed.

Imperfect Indicative.

Armabam,	armaba,	armava,	armava,	I used to arm.
bas,	bas,	vas,	vi,	
bat,	ba,	va,	va, etc.	

Present Subjunctive.

Armem,	arme,	arme,	armi or e,	arme, that I may arm.
es,	es,	es,	i	es,
et,	e,	e,	i or e,	e,

The terminations of the future have a great analogy in Spanish, Portuguese, Italian and French, but are different from those of the Latin, because that tense has been formed by the addition of the present of the indicative of the verb to have to the present of the Latin infinitive. The conditional has been formed in the same way, with the terminations of the imperfect of the indicative.

We give below the present of the indicative of the verb

to have, and the future of the verb to arm, in the four preceding languages.

Present of the Indicative.

<i>Spanish.</i>	<i>Portuguese.</i>	<i>Italian</i>	<i>French.</i>
he,	hei,	ho,	ai,
has,	has,	hai,	as,
ha,	ha,	ha,	a,
hemos,	havemos,	avemo,	avons,
habeis,	haveis,	avete,	avez,
han,	hao,	hanno,	out.

Future.

armar e,	armar-ei,	armer-o,	armer-ai,
-as,	-as,	-ai,	-as,
-a,	-a,	-a,	-a,
-emos,	-emos,	-emo,	-ons,
-eis,	-eis,	-ete,	-ez,
-an,	-ao,	-anno,	-ont.

Sometimes the Spanish and Portuguese separated these two parts of the future, putting between them the objective pronoun, as : Span. armar los hemos, for los armaremos : Port. dar vos ei, for vos darei.

Thus : amare, amarei, amero are equivalent to : he de amar ; hei de amar ; ho de amare, I shall or will love, or have or ought to love.

In order to carry through regularly the form of the Future, we have made use of avemo in the first person plural of the Italian, although it is now no more employed, having been replaced by abbiamo.

What precedes suffices to show the great affinity which exists between verbs, we shall not conclude, however, before we give the terminations of the imperfect of the verb vendere, to sell. We shall use those of the Latin pluperfect, as the imperfect of the other languages must have derived from it.

Terminations of the imperfect subjunctive of the verb vendere :

<i>Latin,</i>	<i>Spanish,</i>	<i>Portuguese,</i>	<i>Italian,</i>	<i>French.</i>
Issem,	iese,	esse,	essi,	isse.
isses,	ieses,	esses,	essi,	isses,
isset,	iese,	esse,	esse,	it.
issemus,	iesemos,	essemos,	essimo,	issions.
issetis,	ieseis,	esseis,	este,	issiez.
issent,	iesen,	essem,	essero,	issent.

Adverbs.

The greater part of adverbs are formed of a feminine adjective, to which *mente* is added for the Italian, Spanish and Portuguese, and *ment* for the French.

We give below a few other adverbs in frequent use :

<i>Latin,</i>	<i>Italian,</i>	<i>Spanish,</i>	<i>Portuguese,</i>	<i>French,</i>	<i>English.</i>
Bene,	bene,	bien,	bem,	bien,	well,
male,	male,	mal,	mal,	mal,	badly,
quando,	quando,	cuando,	quando,	quand,	when,
quasi,	quasi,	qcasi,	quasi,	quasi,	almost,

Prepositions.

Ad,	a,	a,	a,	a,	at, to,
de,	di,	de,	de,	de,	of,
in,	in,	en,	em,	en,	in,
per,	per,	por,	per,	par,	by,
contra,	contra,	contra,	contra,	contre,	against.

Conjunctions.

quam,	che,	que,	que,	que,	that,
et,	e,	e,	e,	et,	and,
aut,	ovvero,	o,	o,	ou,	or,
si,	si,	si,	se,	si,	if.

We will end this article on the analogy of the Southern languages of Europe with the Latin, by giving a part of the Lord's prayer ; and in doing so, we will give it word for word as in English, without any regard to elegance, as our only object is to show how near they are alike.

<i>Latin,</i>	Pater, tuum nomem	sanctificetur, tuum regnum adveniat,
<i>Italian,</i>	Padre, tuo nome	sia sanctificato, tuo regno venga,
<i>Spanish,</i>	Padre, tu nombre	sea sanctificado, tu reino venga,
<i>Portu.</i>	Padre, teu nome	seja sanctificado, teu reino venha,
<i>French,</i>	Notre-pere, ton nom	soit sanctifie, ton regne vienne,
<i>English,</i>	Our father, thy name	be hallowed, thy kingdom come,

<i>Latin,</i>	da nobis hodie	nostrum panem quotidianum,
<i>Italian,</i>	dacci oggi	nostro, pane quotidiano,
<i>Spanish,</i>	danos hoy	nuestro pan cuotidiano,
<i>Portuguese,</i>	danos hoje	nosso pao quotidiano,
<i>French,</i>	donne-nous aujourd'hui	notre pain quotidien,
<i>English,</i>	give us to-day	our daily bread.

The study of the analogy of languages although considered as dry and useless is very far from being so ; not only is it interesting in itself but it has been very fruitful in important results. He who applies himself to it is enabled to follow through series of ages, the migrations of people and their settlements, in various parts of the world. By it he can trace their origin, their primitive histories, and the developements of their intellectual faculties.

A language is the true, principal, and even sometimes, the only characteristic feature which distinguishes one nation from another ; and it can be said that this feature, properly speaking, is indelible ; for whether or not a people change their government, institutions both social and political, and even their religion, their language remains the same. It is true, as we said in the first part of this article, that the mixture of races can alter a language as has been the case with the English, French, Spanish, Italian, &c., but those idioms show indelible traces of their origin. When a people change their language, it is only by imperceptible degrees, and ages are necessary to effect it ; but no lapse of time, nor any variations in the government, can so destroy the primitive elements as not to be traced by the learned philologist.

When history and popular traditions fail, it is for him to supply their place ; and by comparing their languages, to trace the origin, civilization, and religions of people, about whom history leaves us in the dark. The fact, too, that we can trace the derivation of this family of languages to its parent source, gives us boldness to believe, that a common origin might be assigned to all those Historic languages, the connexions and relations of which are lost to the eye in

the dimness and obscurity of the past. Had not history taught us to whom the Peninsula is indebted for the greatest part of its civilization, the philologist, by comparing its vocabulary with those of other nations, would find the great influence which the Mohomedans exercised over that country, by noticing that the Arabic words preserved in the Spanish, designate civil and municipal offices, and military grades ; or refer to chemistry, botany, agriculture, weights and measures, navigation, machinery, arts and sciences.

We fear very much, that our article has been very uninteresting to many of our readers, on account of the grammatical form which we were obliged to give to it, as our only object was to show the analogy of the languages of Southern Europe with the Latin. Dry and imperfect as it is, we hope that it may prove acceptable and useful to some of our readers who may be fond of languages.

Rev. S. J. P. Anderson

ARTICLE VI.

THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

By REV. THOS. SMYTH, D.D. *New York: George P. Putnam: 1850.*

The Unity of the Human Race. By JOHN BACHMAN, D. D., *Charleston, S. C. C. Canning: 1850.*

Natural History of the varieties of Man. By ROBERT GORDAN LATHAM, M. D. F. R. S. *London: 1850.*

In recurring to this vexed question, we design to give as far as the limits of a review will allow, a resumé of the argument as it now stands. In doing so, we will make free and frequent use of the information derived from the learned and able works whose titles head our page. We cheerfully acknowledge our special indebtedness to the two American authors, Drs. Smyth and Bachman. Our country may well be proud of such contributors to the cause of true science and revelation. Dr. Latham's work

is able and scientific, and to it we are indebted for some valuable thoughts and illustrations.

But it should be remembered, that any discussion connected with the science of Ethnology should be conducted with great diffidence, and with the utmost readiness to receive light from any quarter. This department of human knowledge is yet in its infancy. Ethnology cannot claim a higher place than a seat among the younger members of the great sisterhood of sciences. It becomes us especially to speak with exemplary modesty, as the study of this subject has been incidental rather than direct, and its claims have by necessity, been subordinated to the demands of a higher and holier, and far more important field of inquiry. We shall, therefore, be anxious to put facts forward, and take our humble position in the rear. No originality is claimed. The facts are common to all who have investigated the subject. And these shall be gathered from, and the use made of them be confirmed, by the very foremost men in almost every department of science. The arrangement and illustration of these facts, is all we claim. We shall thus avoid the infraction of that sound maxim of argumentation, *ne sutor ultra crepidem*.

The great reason why this subject is attracting so much attention, is found not in its scientific importance, though that is confessedly great, but in the opinion of a few of its advocates, who think that its developments are unfavorable to the integrity of divine revelation. But this is neither new nor startling. It was so with astronomy and geology. The zodiac of Dendera, the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and the investigation into the buried cities of the great Assyrian plain, have all been expected by some to overturn and overturn, till nothing of revelation, that deserves the name, should remain. But when these and other investigations have reached a respectable degree of maturity, it has been found uniformly, that they have come over from the opposition, and ranged themselves as stalwart and true hearted warriors under the banners of revelation. The Bible then can afford to wait; it bides its time; it is based on the rock of ages, and its deep laid foundations do not even feel the tremor of these transient agitations. Its friends need look with no anxious or jealous eye on the infantile and wayward gambols of science

falsely so called. Christianity does now come out to plead for credence. Her existence and truthfulness have long been fixed facts—like the sun in heaven—and this great luminary that pours the light of salvation on a lost world, shines on, far above the clouds and darkness of crude and wild speculation.

We might safely take this stand now. We might call on Ethnographers to tarry at Jericho till their beards be grown—to settle their own principles, and agree upon a system among themselves—before they assume to unsettle the faith of millions, a faith that is hoary with the venerable moss of ages, and radiant with the hopes and joys of an “innumerable company.” They should have well tempered instruments who “beat upon the anvil that has broken many a hammer.” But we waive this high vantage ground, and cheerfully come down into the arena in the present stage of the conflict. The reader will perceive, that in these remarks it is taken for granted, that the Bible teaches the unity of the races of men; that proposition lies on its face. It calls all men the children of Adam—the first man; Eve is the “mother of all living.” It tells us that “in Adam all die,” and that God has “made of one blood all the nations of men that do dwell on all the face of the earth.” We shall not pause here to prove that such is the doctrine of Scripture; we reserve this part of the argument, for an examination of the new and strange theory of Prof. Agazziz, which wonderfully enough attempts and stakes its claim to acceptance, on its success in reconciling the doctrine of an indefinite plurality of origins, with the teachings of that book which, he confesses, contains the oracles of truth. For the present, however, we voluntarily divest ourselves of the tried and heaven-tempered panoply that God has given, and come to discuss the question on scientific principles.

But here we should by no means forget to give due attention to the fact, that the overwhelming mass of testimony given by men of science, is on the side of the unity of the races. The whole current flows in that direction, with scarcely obstruction enough to produce a ripple on the tide. Let any one curious to know the state of the case, turn to Dr. Smyth’s work, and read from the 125th to the 135th page, and he will doubtless be surprised as

we have been, at the number, variety and weight of the names that are enrolled, on what we do not hesitate to say, is the christian side of the question. Among them will be found the names of Lawrence, and Pritchard, and Carpenter, and Mitchel, and Prescott, and a host of others too numerous to mention. It is no assumption then to say, that after all the discussion that has been had, that the unity of the races of men is the established law of science, and nothing short of a revolution in science can disturb its claim to universal acceptance. The history of the opposition is significant. It was introduced by Voltaire, Rousseau and Peyrere, for the purpose of disparaging revelation, and consequently takes on the suspicious garb of special pleading. But on this we will not dwell, but turn to the roll of those who, themselves famous, have given their testimony on the side of diversity of origins. And as this roll is so short, one can afford the space to copy it. Rousseau, Voltaire, Peyrere, Virey, Boyle, St. Vincent, Barton, J. C. Warren, Gibson, Coates, Desmoulin, Broc, Kaimes, Thos. Paine and Prof. Agazziz. These are all, at least if there are others known to fame, we must confess ourselves unknown, by protesting that we are not acquainted with them. We enter the discussion then with history, tradition and authority on our side. Well may the Ethnological Journal admit, that in maintaining the diversity of races, it stands "in open opposition to the Bible and to all philosophy, and to all science as now established," and yet it very modestly says, that these new "facts and principles will ultimately change the face of the world."

There are several remarks of a preliminary character that we want to make, and which we flatter ourselves will at once commend themselves to the judgments of our readers; and if so, they ought to have an important influence on the whole discussion. It will not be denied, that the simplest explanation of any given facts will always be the true one, provided it meets all the requirements of the case. "No more causes of things are to be admitted, than are both true and sufficient to explain the phenomena," is a maxim as old as Newton. To suggest other causes is unphilosophical, and offends against the acknowledged simplicity of nature. Hence, if we can assign

causes which seem to be adequate to produce the varieties manifested among men there will no necessity for the doctrine of various origins.

Again, varieties are easily accounted for. When they occur accidentally, there is a strong tendency to perpetuate them rather than return to the original type. Agreements when they are at all frequent and striking, cannot be accounted for so readily, except on the supposition of oneness of origin. Now let it be remembered, that the entire force of the argument generally adduced by the opposition, consists in diversities of form, colour, language, intellect and position. If these can be explained, then there is no reason for adopting the diversity theory which is designed professedly only to remove the difficulties created by them; any other reason for adopting it would be a discreditable one. We will then look at well known varieties arising among animals, remembering that man is an animal, and that his physical economy is governed by the same principles with that of the lower orders of creation. Take the horse. The wild Mexican mustang is the lineal descendent of the war horse of the Spanish invaders, and this too without any mingling of blood. Nothing like a horse was known to the Mexicans before this period. When the cavalry of Cortez charged upon their ranks, they supposed horse and rider to be one animal—a terrible and invincible centaur, dealing destruction among them. Then we have the Shetland pony, the fleet Arabian, and the enormous Flanders dray-horse, and yet all of the same stock. The same remark may be made of the dog, wolf, bear, hog and sheep. Abundant examples may be found in the volumes of Drs. Bachman and Smyth, either of which is a great thesaurus of facts and arguments on this question. Two cases are remarkable enough to demand special notice. They enable us to lay our hands on the point of departure from the normal type, for the transformation goes on under our eyes. The Otter sheep have been originated in New England and Great Britain, from the common stock, and that very recently. Col. Humphrey's account in the philosophical transactions for 1813, tells us that they are small, weighing about 45 lbs, loose jointed and with the fore legs crooked like those of an otter. Varieties of cows are propagated as a speculation. In Opelousas Co.,

Louisiana, there has been produced in the last 30 years, without a mixture of blood, a race of cattle of enormous size, with a peculiar form and large horns, resembling those of Abyssinia. Similar variations occur among men. Specimens of the human family with redundant toes or fingers, or peculiar conformations of some of the parts, come within the notice of every attentive observer. Pliny mentions six fingered persons called Sedigitus or Sedigica, according to sex. We have ourselves seen a family of servants, in which there was a remarkable tendency to the perpetuation of this peculiarity. Indeed, the remark is just, that there is almost always a disposition to propagate peculiarities, even when they are so exaggerated as to become monstrosities. To confirm this position, we need only refer to the case of the Porcupine family, which preserved its character for three generations, though each intermarriage was with an individual of then ormal type. Mr. Poinsett affirms that he saw a regiment of spotted men in Mexico, specimens of a race which has sprung up in modern times.

Another class of variations of which the human race is capable, will be seen by any one who will compare an English nobleman with the equally English beggar, who crawls up his marble steps; or a hard handed, brawny field laborer, with his own sister shut up in a manufactory; or more remarkable still, a scion of the old Celtic nobility, with an Irish bog-trotter, (See Dublin University Magazine, No. 48, pages 658-675.) Ignorance and want have reduced these descendants of a noble race, well nigh to the negro type.

But it is time we turned our attention to the specific objections to the unity of the races, made by those who advocate the diversity theory. 1. The first and one of the strongest, is based on the striking dissimilarities of language, which exist among the tribes of men. At first sight, this seems to be an insuperable obstacle to the theory we advocate. Of the tongues of men it may well be said, their name is legion. The world seems one mighty Babel, where the confusion of tongues confounds the listener. But it is important to remark, that the mere possession of the faculty of speech—the power to communicate thoughts, by articulate sounds—places an impass-

ble barrier between man and the brute creation, and throws all the tribes of men into one great class, having agreements far more striking than their disagreements. Again, all languages are capable of indefinite developement—even that of the lowest tribes of savages. Of some of the American Indian languages, M. Duponceau (whose philosophical attainments generally, but especially his acquaintance with the dialects of the New World, have given him a high reputation,) observes that they “would appear rather, from their construction, to have been formed by philosophers in closets, than by savages in the wilderness.”

It is all important to observe, what no scholar will deny, that just in proportion to the advancement of comparative philology, the apparent diversities of language give place to striking indications of a common character and origin. It tells with great power on this question, that every movement has been towards unity. And these advances have been made generally, without the prejudice and suspicion of a desire to support a theory. These contributions have been made by travellers, officers of the navy, and missionaries, as well as by professed philologists. We are not therefore surprised to find Cardinal Wiseman announcing two grand principles as the result of all such inquiries: 1. that all language was originally one; 2. that the separation was by a violent and sudden cause. The truth of this conclusion is better understood now than when his able Lectures were published. It is a curious fact, that this disagreement in languages exists not so much in the principles of grammar, as in the vocabulary of words. This has led an ingenious writer to describe philosophically, the process of the division of tongues at Babel:

“Bring me, quoth one, a trowel quickly quick;
One brings him up a hammer: hew this brick
(Another bids,) and then they cleave a tree;
Make fast this rope, and then they let it flee;
One calls for planks; another mortar lacks,
They bear the first a stone, the last an axe.
One would have spikes, and him a spade they give;
Another asks a saw and gets a sieve,
Thus crossly crost, they pant and prate in vain,
What one hath made, another mars again.”

[DU BARTAS.

To give a clearer notion of this condensing process of which we have spoken, let us glance at the Indian lan-

guages of America. When the missionaries, sent by the king of Spain, at the instigation of the Pope, reached the New World, they were astounded at the multiplicity of tongues that greeted them. Abbe Gelei says that those he came in contact with, were "infinite and innumerable." Abbe Clavigno is more moderate, and tells of thirty five idioms spoken within the jurisdiction of Mexico. Father Kircher, after consulting with the Jesuits at their general convocation in Rome, in 1676, reached the conclusion, that in South America they had discovered five hundred languages ; but Father Royo insists, that on the whole continent there were spoken not less than two thousand. But the comparative philologist passes his wand, and the whole scene is changed. The learned grammarian Vater, announces this as the conclusion of his researches, "that different as may be the languages of America from each other, *the discrepancy extends to words or roots only, the general internal or grammatical structure being the same for all.*" Humbolt uses the following language :

"In America, from the country of the Esquimaux to the banks of the Orinoco, and again from these torrid banks to the frozen shores of the straits of Magellan, mother tongues entirely different as to their roots, have, if we may use the expression, the same physiognomy. Striking analogies of grammatical structure are acknowledged, not only in the more perfect languages, as that of the Incas, the Aymare, the Guarani, the Mexican and the Cora, but also in languages extremely rude."

Dr. Latham sums up a review of the argument in these words :

"The evidence of language then is in favour of the unity of all the American population—the Esquimaux not excepted."

But the argument takes a wider range than this. The most recent investigations show this astounding result. In eighty-three American languages, one hundred and seventy words have been found, the roots of which have been the same in both continents ; and it is well remarked that it is easy to perceive that this coincidence is not accidental, since it does not rest on imitative harmony, or on that conformity of organs which produces almost an identity in the first sounds articulated by children, (see Dr. Smyth's work, p. 217.) Now apply Dr. Young's mathematical test,

given in his *Calculus of Probabilities*, to this number of agreements in two tongues; the odds would be 3 to 1 against an agreement of two words—10 to 1 against three coincidences—1700 to 1 against 6—100,000 to 1 against 8. And how many against an agreement of 170 words, neither the reader nor reviewer has arithmetic enough to tell.

But, we are asked, whence then this admitted diversity. We might waive the answer by showing undeniable coincidences between the highest and lowest forms, and leave the diversity unexplained. For instance, Dr. Latham says—

“The Hottentot stock has a better claim to be considered as forming a second species of the genus *homo* than any other section of mankind. It can be shown, however, that the language is no more different from those of the world in general, than they are from each other.”

Much has been made of the jargon of the Bushmen, the lowest type of man yet found; and Prof. Lichtensein supposed that they constituted a different species. But Vater has clearly shown that they speak a comparatively recent dialect of the common Hottentot; and it is now well known that the guttural tones and clacking sound that accompany their enunciation, have been adopted by them designedly to conceal their meaning from their neighbours and enemies, the Hottentots. In short, that they speak a slang language, such as is growing up in the streets and purlieus of every city in the world.

The Bushmen are the outlaws and refugees of the Hottentots, and their different dialects are accounted for on the well understood principle, that an inferior and lawless race hides its meaning under strange pronunciations and new coined words. We may see an illustration of this principle in the slang language of any large city. The street-folk of London have a language peculiar to themselves, and utterly unintelligible to the uninitiated. Specimens, both in prose and verse, may be found in Henry Mayhew's most interesting work, *London Labour and London Poor*, to which we would refer the curious reader.

Now shut up these people to themselves for a few generations, and all knowledge of the English language would die out from among them, and they would speak an en-

tirely new tongue, unlike any one now known. And we can fancy some wiseacre coming upon them in their isolation, and proving by their unintelligible jargon, on the principles adopted by our opponents, that here was a distinct variety of the human race—a new creation—instead of a degenerated branch of the boasted Anglo-Saxon stock.

But this does not explain the disagreement in kindred tongues, where no such sinister motive can be assigned. The cause of this variation lies in the very constitution of our mental powers, and we think can be readily understood by every reflecting observer. But we have not space to philosophize; a shorter, and perhaps more satisfactory, course is, to show the fact of actual divergence in languages that are known to be cognate.

This will be notorious to any one who will compare German, Greek, Latin, Russian, English and Lithuanic—all of which are Indo-European, and yet present to the eye and ear the most striking differences. In a narrow geographical district, the greatest variations are found in the Indian languages of America, even when the tribes are known to have had a common, and by no means remote, origin. The tables prepared by Dr. Latham present this fact in the strongest light. To them we refer the reader.

The conclusion of the argument from languages is, that we find unmistakeable traces of agreement in all tongues that have been thoroughly examined—that coincidence becoming clear and well marked in direct proportion to the completeness of the analysis to which they have been subjected. And on the other hand, we can exhibit the causes, and point to the fact, of a marked divergence in cases known to have a common origin. We claim, therefore, that the objection founded on language, is not only fairly disarmed, but actually becomes a powerful auxiliary in proving the unity of the races of men.

2. Another manifest distinction among the races of men is found in colour. But it must strike the most superficial observer, that these colours are not well defined. White, yellow, red, brown, olive and black; shade off and melt into each other by insensible gradations, and no one can point to the line of separation. This fact, to a considerable extent, comes within the range of observation of every one. Now, Dr. Pritchard announces it as an indisputable truth,

that "separate species of organized beings do not pass into each other by insensible degrees." And Guyot and a host of others affirm the same proposition.

The great agency in the production of the "lights and shadows" of the "human face divine," is heat; though it is subject to modifications, which we will take occasion to mention. The classics tell us, that when Phaeton mounted the chariot of the sun, he drove so unskilfully as to bring this luminary so near the earth, that the heat of his rays curled the hair of the negro and burned his skin black. "I am black, because the sun has looked on me," is the declaration of the spouse in Solomon's song. The lower animals follow this law. It may be announced as a general truth, that the birds, beasts and fishes, of the equatorial regions are deeper tintured in their feathers, spots and scales; while as we approach the arctic circle, they put on the silver livery of those snowy regions. The home of the black races is the domain of tropical heat. The old adage is, that "beauty is but skin deep." Colour is still more superficial, having its seat in one of the coats of the skin. We must not be surprised then that it is subject to constant mutations. For instance; the Syro-Arabian family of nations, which had its original seat in Western Asia, has spread itself over Northern Africa. It includes the Jews. The territory occupied by them embraces great diversities of soil and climate—from the fertile vales of Palestine, through the burning plains of Arabia and Egypt, to the lofty mountains that skirt the great Desert of Sahara. Their language and physical formation are strikingly similar, proving their common origin. Now, according to the theory we oppose, the colour of these nations should be the same. The fact, however, is far different; and facts are stubborn things. The Kabyles, who inhabit Algiers and Tunis, have generally a swarthy hue, and dark hair; but the tribe of Mozabi, (which is one of them,) is remarkably white; and the lofty table land, called Mount Aurasius, is inhabited by a tribe fair and ruddy, with hair of a deep yellow. On the other hand, some of the Tuareg tribe, that live on the borders of the great desert, are as dark as the negro. The dwellers on the highlands of Arabia have light complexions, blue eyes, and red hair. Those near Muscat are of a sickly yellow;

those about Mecca are yellowish brown; and those on the low countries of the Nile are jet black. Mr. Buckingham says that the Arabs of the valley of the Jordan—a region of constant heat—have darker skins, and flatter features, and coarser hair, than he had elsewhere seen; and in the Hausan, a region beyond Jordan, he met with a family who had a black face and crisped hair, that is negro characteristics, though he was assured that they were of pure Arab blood.

The purity of the Jewish race is one of the best attested facts in history; yet, while they preserve certain general features, which mark them as a peculiar race, they show a strong tendency to assimilate themselves to the prevailing colour of the nations into which they have been dispersed. In England, as with us, blue eyes and flaxen hair are not uncommon, though a brunette complexion and raven hair are the prevailing type. In Germany and Poland, their complexion is fairer, and blue eyes and red hair are frequently found. In Portugal they are very dark, and those who have dwelt long in Cochin and Malabar are so black, as not to be distinguished from the natives. But at Malacheri, a town of Cochin, there is a recent colony; they are called Jerusalem or White Jews, not having yet had time to don the prevailing sable.

The other great family of nations is the Indo European. They stretch from the Indies, through the larger portion of the continent of Europe, and they have taken as their own, the broad and fair domain of this western world. All these nations have the same general form of cranium, and a fundamental conformity of language which, with the testimony of history, make their common origin sufficiently certain. Here again, the same variety of colour meets us. The changes pass from the fair hair and blue eyes, of northern Europe, to the jet black, of the dwellers in the plains of India. Even among the Hindoo tribes, where cast keeps the blood pure, we have black and white Brahmins. The light complexions are found in the cold and lofty mountains; the dark ones on the burning plains. As another illustration, look at the African nations that many suppose are characterized by uniform sable. Some of the Kaffir tribes have light brown complexions and reddish hair. There are also tribes on the Gold and Slave

coasts, much lighter than the negro usually is, and the Hottentots have a considerable admixture of yellow, while the Fulahs of Central Africa are of a dark copper colour, trenching on the Indian's peculiar prerogative. And having mentioned the Indian, it may be well to say, that he is as much of a chameleon as his more civilized brethren. Though called the red man, and a copper red is the prevailing livery in which he appears, yet he is sometimes well nigh as fair as the European; and then again is found nearly as black as the negro. And while this is true, the identity of the Indian tribes may now be considered as established.

But, then it may be asked, if heat, or rather climate, produces colour, why is not colour uniform in a given region? For the simple reason, we reply, that climate is not uniform even on the same parallels of latitude, and then the period during which races have been exposed to particular climates varies. Some tribes have, in all their migrations, kept within the tropics; while others have travelled across them, passing from cold to hot, or the reverse. But again, many influences, such as food, clothing, and employment, modify the operation of climate. Compare the brawny, sunburned and well-fed field laborer, with his own sister, shut up in a cotton factory, ill-fed, over-worked, and bleached, by seclusion from light and air, to a chalky whiteness, and our meaning will be distinctly apprehended.

It should be remembered also, that elevation changes climate—the ascent of a mountain producing the same result as moving towards the nearest pole. The dryness or humidity of the atmosphere has also its power: a moist and shaded region produces fairness, a dry one embrowns.

But if these things be so, we are asked why does not the negro lose his colour when brought to our northern clime. We answer, in the first place, that he has in some degree undergone this transition, as every one may see, who will compare an African negro with one whose ancestors have lived in America for three or four generations. And as for the rest, we would observe secondly, that it is easier to give a stain than take it away. We need not remind our fair readers, that freckles may be gotten in a day which cannot be gotten rid of in a year.

The conclusion we reach is, that colour changes with

climate ; and if a different colour proves a different origin, then we must have as many origins as climates, and truly their name would be legion.

3. The next point to be noticed is the striking variety in the form of the head and face. The head is frequently measured by the facial angle. This is formed by a line drawn from the centre of the external orifice of the ear, to the edge of the nostril, and thence to the most prominent point of the forehead. It is supposed that the size of this angle indicates the amount of intellect. Camper endeavoured to show, by this mode of measurement, that a negro is nearer an ape than he is to a European—giving the following dimensions : European, 80° ; Kalmucks, 75° ; Negro, 70° ; and apes, 64° . But most fatally to this scheme, Owen proves that Camper fell into the enormous error of measuring the skulls of young apes, in which the projection of the upper jaw, which takes place on second teething, had not occurred. Owen proves that the facial angle of an ape varies from 30° to 35° . There is then a broad and manifest distinction between the lowest form of man, and the highest of the brute creation.

There is, however, another method of measuring the head, which reduces the human family to three classes : 1. The oval skull—seen in the Europeans generally. 2. The pyramidal skull—instance, the Esquimo Hottentots, and Bushmen. These widely separated races have no point of similarity in their history to account for this remarkable conformity of the cranium, but the fact that their manner of life is the same. They are both nomadic, suggesting the principle that similar modes of life develop similar forms of the head—a principle which, as we shall see, has much evidence in favour of it. 3. The prognathous : from pro, forward, and gnathos, cheek-bone. Instance, the negro. It is also seen frequently in Polynesia and Australia. It should be remarked, however, that this is by no means the uniform type of the negro. Indeed, the whole argument based on this diversity of form, is vitiated and overturned by the fact, that each of these classes appears with more or less frequency in each of the great families of nations. The African races often depart from the prognathous and develop the pyramidal, and even the oval form. This fact proves that there is not a

regular transmission of form in a given race of unmixed blood, and so gives to the winds the argument that these various forms require independent sources of the human family.

Not unfrequently we see a blending of all the three forms, so that it is impossible to tell to which of the classes the individual belongs; and there are known instances of change from one form to another. The Western Turks are known to be of the same stock with the Eastern, who live in the northern part of Asia; yet, the western have developed the oval cranium, while the eastern, *being still nomadic in their habits*, retain the pyramidal; and this transformation has not been produced by the intermingling of the Western Turks with the nations they have conquered, for they have kept remarkably distinct. Again, the Magyar race, of which the Hungarian nobility is composed, and of which Kossuth, the statesman, warrior, and orator, may be taken as a specimen, is one of the finest developements of man, considered physically or intellectually; yet they are of the same blood with the feeble Aslyacks and the untameable Laplanders. The first have the oval head, the second the pyramidal; and here again, as in the former case, there has been no mingling of blood, but a *change of location and employment*. Mr. Lyel affirms that there has been a manifest change in the form of the head, face, lips, &c., of negro-families that have remained for several generations in the United States. He received this testimony from the most intelligent physicians in the South, and that, too, where there has been no mingling of races.

We see also a transition taking place in the opposite direction, showing that man is capable of degradation as well as exaltation. Long continued want, ignorance and vice will reduce a race from the oval to the prognathous type; to prove this we need only refer to the Dublin University Magazine, as already quoted. We claim then that facts explode the theory of diversity of origin as founded on diversity of form.

4. Nearly connected with the last head, is the variety of mental endowments, and the capability of improvement. Many contend, that in these respects there is an impassable gulf between ourselves and some of the African tribes.

The most degraded of them are the Bushmen, but they are proved to be a degraded caste of the Hottentots ; but even this degraded form of humanity manifests many of the virtues of a high civilization. The Dutch who first settled among them spoke of them as remarkable for humanity, good nature and honesty—qualities which are by no means universal among ourselves ; and if they have lost these virtues in any degree, that may be attributed to their intercourse with *civilized and christianized* Europeans. It has been said they have no religion, but subsequent investigations have proved this statement to be erroneous ; they have a religion to which they are much attached, though many of them have become converts to christianity, and are much improved by it. So manifest is this influence of a propagation of our holy religion, that some of the wild tribes in concluding treaties of peace, have stipulated that missionaries should be sent them to instruct them in the faith of Christ. This is more than can be said of many refined nations, who are very prone to leave both religion and morality out of view in their international transactions.

Rev. J. L. Wilson affirms that African children are as apt as white children of the same age. The slave Ellis who has gone out to Liberia to take charge of a high school, would have been considered a remarkable man had he been born in Greece, or in any other nation. The annual messages of Gov. Roberts compare well, so far as we can see, with those of our own Governors. These and other facts prove, that "the negro is God's image though carved in ebony."

Classic fable tells us, that the statue of Memnon was silent all through the long dark night, but that as soon as the first rays of morning gleamed out from the rosy east, there came forth from its marble lips, sweet and musical sounds, to greet the god of day. So there may have been comparative silence and torpidity in the negro mind, through all the long dark night of ignorance and superstition that has brooded over him ; but let the sun of science and religion dawn on him, and there will be healing and enlivenment in his beams, sounds sweet as angel-melodies will greet his coming, pleading most eloquently fellowship with man, and son-ship with God. But in all this discus-

sion, we should take into the account the manifest unfairness of comparing on equal terms a race, which has enjoyed the blessings of religion and literature for centuries, with one that has been denied both these for the same time. Rather place side by side the African negro, and the early English, as they struggled, often in vain, to protect themselves from the naked Picts and Scots.

We unhesitatingly claim an identity in mental constitution, for all the races of men. The mind may be sadly dark and undeveloped, but can be educated and elevated, and then it reasons on the same principles, and admits the same axioms, with a Newton or Leibnitz. We claim each man as a brother; and were we to repeat the immortal line of Terence, the slave,

Homo sum, et humani a me nil alienum puto,

to a company collected from all the tribes of men, we would expect to strike a chord in each breast, that would thrill in unison with the heaven descended and ennobling doctrine, that we are all brethren.

But let us for a moment suppose, that differences of mental power would argue diversity of origin, and we are at once led to conclusions known to be false. For Milton, Shakespeare and Newton, differ as widely from a Yorkshire boor or London beggar, as that low type of English intellect does, from the inhabitant of the deserts of Africa, or the jungles of Industan. Now if the one diversity proves a difference of origin, so does the other, and we are led legitimately to a conclusion known to be false. But it may be said that the elements of mind are the same, that the disparity is one of developement. We admit it and affirm the same proposition of all the tribes of men.

If we have been successful in turning the objections of our opponents into arguments in our favour, and if, as we shall subsequently show, there are strong positive proofs of a common origin of the human race, then we claim that the difficulty of position should not trouble us at all. A plausible explanation of the manner in which the dispersion of the race has taken place, can in our judgment be given. Yet if this could not be done, and we were compelled to leave that question in profound darkness, it would, as it appears to us, be entirely fair and logical to

hold to the conclusion affirmed by so many arguments. If we were to find a tribe of men on the head waters of the Mississippi, speaking the Welch language, and following their customs, as early travellers supposed they had done, we claim that it would be manifestly unreasonable to deny that *they were there*, until the discover could show how *they got there*. The fair inference would be, that some how or other they did transport themselves from the land of high hills and hard consonants, to the shores of the great father of waters. So far as our reading goes, it was never ascertained by what means the fly got in the amber, but we should not be favourably impressed with the reasoning powers of one who should hold that as sufficient cause for contending that it never got there at all.

We now come to the positive argument, which is far stronger than most persons suppose. And we may remark that this side of the question grows upon us in authority, the further investigation is prosecuted.

1. There are certain marked characteristics that attach to all the races of men, and that distinguish them widely from all other animals. Dr. Lawrence enumerates sixteen. Dr. Bachman makes a classification which is very striking. We will just intimate some of them. The complete correspondence in the number of the teeth and other bones of the body—the shedding the teeth unlike other animals—the erect stature—the articulation of the head with the spinal column—the possession of two hands—the organs of speech, and the power of articulate singing. All men are omnivorous, and man alone can inhabit any climate on the face of the globe; and he alone possesses a conscience. This distinction is worthy of especial notice. The dog and the monkey are intelligent brutes; yet who ever found a dog grieving for having torn a lamb, or a monkey in the agonies of remorse for having stolen an apple.

The human race is of slower growth, and arrives later at puberty than the inferior animals. They agree in the physical constitution of male and female—have the same period of gestation—on an average the same number of young, and are liable to the same diseases, and in these respects are strikingly unlike the lower orders of creation.

Now on the supposition of the unity of the races, all this is perfectly plain and easily accounted for. All these facts are harmonious and intelligible; but deny it and we are plunged into confusion worse confounded; a thousand questions press upon us, to no one of which can we return a satisfactory answer. The striking agreements in mythological systems, even where nations are most widely separated, make the perplexity more complete.

2. Another powerful positive argument is found in the uniformity of traditions, that have been borne down to us on the ever widening wave of time. The Bible accounts for the introduction of sin, explains the fall, and affirms the corruption of all men. Now go where you will, and you meet results that require for their explanation such a catastrophe. Human nature is every where in ruins, darkness is on all minds, and disease in all hearts; and the gospel, the great remedial system, meets and satisfies these wants wherever they exist. On our principles this is just what might have been expected. The primal taint has spread from the head to all the members, and one great remedy avails for all.

But on the other theory all again is confusion. If there have been five or fifty, or five hundred Adams—for Ethnographers admit, that if the strict unity of the race be denied, the number of origins to be supposed is altogether indefinite—how comes it that they have all fallen, and that they have all transmitted a corrupt nature to their posterity, and what is still more remarkable, the same corrupt nature; for it is essentially the same. There is a mental and moral, as well as a physical likeness in the whole race.

But the case is stronger, when we take into account the startling similarity of traditions found in the most opposite corners of the globe. The creation, the location of man in a garden, primeval innocence, the fall by means of the serpent acting through the woman, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the promise of deliverance through an incarnate, but divine redeemer, and the deluge; some account of these great facts, seems to be the heritage of man, an evidence of a common origin, and we fondly trust, earnest of a common and glorious recovery. Hesiod tells us that man originally lived wifeless and ig-

norant, but innocent and happy. Prometheus, however, steals fire from heaven and teaches man its use; Jupiter incensed, threatens vengeance, and to accomplish his purpose, he orders Vulcan to form a woman of clay, on whom the gods bestow every grace and beauty, but at the same time fill her heart with vanity and cunning, and all violent devices. This woman, Pandora, Jove presents to Epimetheus, who accepts the gift and marries her, despite the dissuasions of his brother Prometheus; and from that moment disease and evil of all kinds have been the lot of man.

In an engraving preserved in Creuzer's *Symbolik*, and taken from an ancient bas relief, we have an account of the fall, that would be intelligible to a child. On one side of the picture we see a man and woman standing naked under a tree, the woman in a drooping and disconsolate posture, the man with one hand raised to the tree, and the other pointing to the woman. On the other side is a sedate and august figure seated upon a rock, and strangling the serpent with his outstretched hand.

The Chinese inform us, that man was originally upright; was good and wise by instinct, but was ruined by over desire of knowledge, according to some, others say by the flatteries and temptations of the woman. He thus lost dominion over the creatures, and they became his enemies. Essentially the same account meets us in the Lamaic faith, in the doctrines of the Budhists, and in the Hindoo mythology generally. The Persian account is too striking to be omitted. They say that the world was created in five periods, that on the sixth man was produced. He enjoyed a season of innocence and happiness. But he becomes proud, and then Ahriman, the evil one, brings him fruit of which he eats, and in that instant all his excellences departed save one.

In one of the oldest of the Hindu pagodas there are two sculptured figures. One represents Creeshna an incarnation of Veeshnu, trampling on the crushed head of the serpent. In the other, the serpent is represented as encircling him in his folds, and biting his heel. The Gothic mythology also preserves in the Edda, traditions remarkable for the coincidence with the first promise of the Messiah. They call Thor the eldest of sons—the middle

divinity—a mediator between God and man, who bruised the head of the great serpent and slew him.

But a volume might be filled with similar traditions. These, however, will subserve our purpose. To us they seem to be undeniably the *disjecta membra* of the history of the race as given by Moses.

Now these agreements must be explained. To suppose that they were accidental—occurring spontaneously to different races of men, deriving their existence from different sources—offends against every principle of reason. Admit, however, a common origin, and at once all is plain and intelligible. Each race as it travelled away from the cradle of the human family, bore with it as sacred heirlooms of the past and attestations of their legitimacy, the memory of the great facts in their early and common history. These accounts are distorted, and the representations are not a little grotesque; but considering the time that has elapsed, and the mutations that the tribes have undergone, the wonder is that they are so accurate.

3. Our concluding argument is derived from the known barrenness of hybrids. A hybrid is the product of a union between two distinct species, in the vegetable or animal kingdom. The doctrine that such mongrels are absolutely incapable of a *permanent* reproduction of their own kind, may now claim the dignity of an accepted truth among physiologists. In proof of this, we refer among others to Hamilton and Carpenter. The latter in his great work just issued, *Comparative Physiology*, speaks as if there was no reasonable ground of doubt on the subject. This principle was long regarded as so well established, that Buffon, Cuvier, Flourens and others, introduced the capability of permanent reproduction into the very definition of species. Dr. Morton, however has laboured to overturn this general belief; but his investigations have been followed by those of Dr. Bachman, who is second to no naturalist in Europe or America.

The following are some of the conclusions which he regards as sufficiently well established:

“1. Nature in all her operations, by the peculiar organization of each species, by the unfertility of a hybrid production, where by art or accident this takes place, and by the extinction of these hybrids in a very short time, gives us the most indubitable evi-

dence, that the creation of species is an act of Divine power. 2. That no race of animals has ever sprung from a commingling of two or more species. 3. Consequently this fact, that all the races of mankind produce with each other a fertile progeny, by which new varieties have been produced in every country, constitutes one of the most powerful and unanswerable arguments in favour of the unity of the races."

If any confirmation of this authority is needed, it is found in this statement of Prof. Owen:

"The tendency of all the natural phenomena relating to hybridity, is to prevent its taking place, and when it has occurred, to arrest the propagation of varieties so produced, and to limit their generative powers, so as to admit only of reversion to the original specific forms. In a few exceptional cases, serving only to establish the rule of their inferiority, specific hybrids have been known to propagate together, and produce a degenerate intermediate race which soon becomes extinct."

But to avoid the crushing force of this argument, an attempt has been made, as the forlorn hope of the diversity theory, to show that the varieties produced by the mingling of the races of men manifestly degenerate, and have a tendency to extinction. But the world is full of the evidence which overturns this objection. The Caucasian, the Mongolian, the Malay, the African, and the Indian, have all produced permanent varieties of the human family. In Mexico a race has sprung up that is the result of mingling the Caucasian, African and Indian blood. The Caucasian and African blood is flowing in the veins of thousands in our country, and cases of this kind have been known to be productive for five generations without a union with the parent stock on either side. The Maloes in Africa, who are Negro and Portuguese, and the Griqua, who are Dutch and Hottentot, are illustrations of this truth. Indeed, this process of amalgamation has gone on so far, that even the *Ethnological Journal* admits, that "the primitive races no longer exist, all or nearly all of the inhabitants of the world being of mixed blood."

We cannot forbear here glancing at this fact, as taken in connection with the notion that the Bible only gives us an account of the Adamic race. The sweep of these doctrines is wider and more desolating than at first appears. Men are not brothers; missionary success is an impossi-

bility, and the attempt fanaticism. This holy enterprise gives place to a war of races—the strong oppressing the weak—the Bible shut up, for we cannot find the Adamic race, if it exists now at all; and we reach the dreary, soul-sickening conclusion, that there breathes not on this globe of darkness and sorrow, one human being who dares to open the precious Book of God, and apply its promises to himself as his own. Oh, this would be an orphaned world indeed if that were true. There would go up from bereaved humanity one universal and despairing wail—taking the melancholy language of the women by the empty sepulchre, and giving to each syllable a deeper and sadder significancy—ye have taken away my Lord, and I know not where ye have laid him. But on our view, how cheering the prospect—a common origin and destiny; a common Father and home; a common Gospel, that opens its rich treasures of hope and life to all, and tells them, amid all their perverseness and antipathies, not to fall out by the way, for they are brethren. Under the influence of this doctrine, no man can ask, in God-insulting insolence, “am I my brother’s keeper?”

We have now reached the conclusion of our resumé of the general argument. We have shown that diversities of language, colour, form, and intellect, are not insurmountable difficulties in our way; and that we have in facts, constantly occurring around us, the key to explain them, and thus, when properly considered, we have seen them change from apparent antagonists to willing and efficient auxiliaries. In addition, we have exhibited the identity of physical structure and intellectual constitution; the surprising uniformity of the principles of language, and the agreement of traditions, and the capability of indefinite reproduction of mixed races; and thus we have given our readers a meagre outline of the evidence on which we affirm, without a shadow of doubt, that all the races of men are one.

We come now to consider briefly the new theory of Prof. Agazziz. Its peculiarity is, that while he admits that all men are of one species he concludes that they are derived from different origins. In his view, God has created an indefinite number of centres, from which men have gone forth to people the globe. This theory is a very accommodating one; it overleaps all difficulties, by bring-

ing in at every exigency the arm of God. Whether he conforms to the Horatian rule,

Nec Deus intersit nisi dignus vindice nodus,

we leave the reader to determine. It is, at all events, capable of indefinite expansion. Wherever a variety occurs which he cannot readily explain, he has, as in classic fable, but to stamp his foot, and a fountain of the human family gushes up and flows on at his bidding. And we see no reason why he may not be driven to adopt five hundred centres, as readily as the dozen or so he now claims. He seems actually to run riot in the covert expenditure of creative energy.

"We maintain," says he, "that, like all other organized beings, man cannot have originated in single individuals, but must have been created in that numeric harmony which is characteristic of each species. Men must have originated in nations, as bees in swarms, and as the different social plants have at first covered the extensive tracts over which they naturally spread."

The strangest feature of this theory is, that he pretends to reconcile it with the Bible, and protests his willingness to renounce it, if it is inconsistent with the teachings of the sacred oracles. Now, even admitting that Moses gives us an account of the creation of but one of these centres, yet, if there be any certainty in language, he restricts the creation to one man and one woman. The laws of interpretation that can reconcile this narrative with a theory that makes men and women swarm up from different localities, like Virgil's bees from the bruised carcass of a calf, can do anything; to them nothing is impossible. Without stopping to do more than suggest that this view is inconsistent with a community of traditions and religious forms, already proven, we will look at it as a Bible question, which Prof. A. is willing to make it. It is surely a new thing under the sun, that Bible readers are to be told that it does not teach the unity of the races. That doctrine is interwoven with the whole system, both of the fall in Adam, and the recovery in Christ the second Adam. It is the woof of the mighty web of providence and grace.—Take it away, and the penalties and promises become unintelligible.

We may suggest, in passing, that the Bible flatly con-

tradicts Prof. A.'s parallell between the production of plants, and animals and men. The former were produced in swarms like bees, the latter in a single pair.

"And God said, let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit, after his kind whose seed is in itself upon the earth."

"And God said, let the waters bring forth ABUNDANTLY the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven; and God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters bring forth *abundantly*."

But how altered the style when the higher creation is announced: "And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness." And then we are told that he made one man and one woman; not a bee-swarm of Adams and Eves. And He tells that single pair to be "fruitful, and multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over the creatures." Language which is stubbornly irreconcilable with the idea that there were others of the same dignity to dispute with them the dominion of the earth. But our theorist finds unmistakeable evidence of the existence of other races, in the account of Cain's flight into the land of Nod: "And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, eastward of Eden, and he builded a city." Now, Nod means flight, the land of the vagabond, and manifestly derived its name from Cain's flight to it. But we are gravely told, as an end of controversy, that he must have found many people there to help him build a city. We should like to be informed, what idea Prof. A. has formed of Cain's city. One would think that there rose before his mind a vision of some glorious handiwork of myriads of men—a Thebes, with its hundred gates of brass—a Nineveh, with a diameter of three day's journey, or a Palmyra, rising from the desert like a dream of beauty and grandeur, and opening its flashing gates to the merchant princes, who bring the riches of the earth from afar. But how is all this romance exploded by the sober fact, that the word translated city means, in addition to the modern acceptation of it, "a camp, and even a small fortification, as a tower—a watch tower." (See Gesenius Lex.)

A nomadic hamlet, made up of a few straggling huts,

or mud-walled cottages, meets all the requirements of the case. But even if a multitude were required, Adam's descendants had already become numerous. It should be remembered, that though but three of Adam's sons are named—Cain, Abel, and Seth—yet it is distinctly affirmed, that he lived 930 years, "and begat sons and daughters."

Now, if we remember the rate of human progress, even in these degenerate days, we will have no difficulty in understanding how the best authorities put down the population of the globe at the time of Cain's flight, which occurred when he was about 130 years old, at not less than two hundred thousand. Some say more than 400,000 men alone. So that if Cain had needed aid to build this famous city of his, he could easily have gotten it. But be these Noddites many or few, they were closely affiliated with Adam's family, else Cain would have had no dread of their punishing him for the murder of Abel.

But let us close this argument by presenting a synopsis of the Bible declarations on the subject. Adam is called "the first man." We are expressly told, that after God had made the heavens and the earth, "there was not a man to till the ground;" and to supply this deficiency, he made Adam. Eve is called the "mother of all living."—It accounts for the curse which rests on the whole earth by Adam's sin; death is referred to the same event. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive."—"As by the offence of one, judgment came on all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, judgment shall come upon all men to justification of life. For, as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous." We are "debtors to all men," on the ground that we are brethren. But to crown the Bible testimony, take Paul's sermon at Athens. The Greeks proudly claimed to have sprung from some drops of sacred blood, that fell down from Jupiter. They scorned to acknowledge the common herd of men as of the same blood. It is under these circumstances that Paul throws down the gage and stakes the reputation of Christianity on the unity of the races.—"And God hath made of one blood, all the nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." No one can mistake the meaning of the phrase of "one blood," unless he

is blinded by desire to sustain a theory. It has the sense of the English *consanguinity*, in classic Greek and Latin.

If the objection is made that some versions read "God hath made of one, all the nations," it does not alter the case. Some word must be supplied of the same signification essentially, and it would still be an assertion of *unity* for all men.

We cannot conclude without saying a word on the relation that Revelation sustains to the speculations of science. Some seem to think, that she stands by, trembling lest some truth should be discovered that would explain all her doctrines and give her authority to the winds. Far from it, she calmly bides her time, with no fear except for her opposers. We see here exemplified the peaceful and confident heart, in the centre of universal doubt and hesitation. No new or strange thing happens to the Bible when it is attacked—"The word of the Lord is tried," as silver in the furnace. It can expect no less than opposition. It is a revelation of pure truth and holiness to a world of ungodliness. Its light condemns their darkness; and hence the effort of Satan and his emissaries is to put out that light. The Bible has been in a crucible, heated seven times hotter ever since its promulgation; and from this furnace of trial, it has come forth only purer and brighter for the ordeal. He who threw the shield of His omnipotence over the Hebrew children in the Chaldean furnace, so that the very smell of the fire was not found on their garments, has so defended His own oracles that in no one instance have they been worsted. When weighed in the balances, the Bible has never been found wanting; and it has never shrunk from investigation. It has never fallen back on any ground of right, which lay above or beyond the range of human inquiry, in its fullest and most unbiassed exercise. It has laid open its claims to obedience, and asks no advantage in the scrutiny. It admits the same rules of investigation that are applied to any department of human knowledge.

The form of opposition has ever been changing; when one store-house of weaponry has been tried unavailingly, another, and often entirely different one has been opened. There is scarcely a science known among men that has not been pressed into this unholy warfare. Its adversaries,

too, have been unreasonably exacting; men who are credulous on every other subject, are incredulous here. But above this scene of continual change, and looking down on the self-destructive efforts of its enemies with a calm and pitying eye, the Word of Truth has occupied an eminence of unclouded light, and its foundation is the rock of ages. There stands its fortress, and its base is strewn by the wrecks of systems which have been dashed to pieces in conflict with it. And as the advocates of revelation have been ever thus successful, they have no fears for the future.— They look calmly on the rush and fever of speculation, as it searches all the deep and dark places of creation, fully satisfied that no one well ascertained truth, brought out from all the vast arcana of nature, will controvert one of the declarations of God's word. The Bible comes from Him who formed the earth in the hollow of his hand, and hung it upon nothing; who spread above us the beauteous canopy of heaven, and sent the stars on their courses.

Then, no truth that can be gathered from the heavens above or the earth beneath, or the waters under the earth, can oppose that revelation. God is self-consistent. True, some things that are announced as the discoveries of science, have been uncompromisingly hostile to revelation. But we have had only to wait awhile, and science herself has repudiated these notions, and that without reference to the claims of revelation.

A striking illustration of this remark is found in the history of the "Vestiges of Creation," which a few years ago had a great but ephemeral popularity. Its cardinal principle was, that there is in nature a power of progressive development upwards. According to this high priest of nature, reptiles produced four-footed beasts—these, monkeys—then apes, and then men; and we were gravely told the ominous secret, that in some highly favourable conjuncture of circumstances, that men may produce another order of beings, as far above them as they are above apes, and so on in infinite progression. This principle is the germ of that book, which, under the hypocritical garb of respect for revelation, endeavoured to undermine its foundations. That book is now the jest of men of science. Among them all there is not one who could acknowledge its paternity without blushing. Indeed it is destitute of

an enlarged and thorough view of knowledge. A witty writer remarked of it, that its author had been at a geological feast, and had run away with the scraps. It is rather curious that one of its main doctrines was exploded before the book had well gotten dry from the press. It based a portion of its claims on the nebular hypothesis; but Lord Ross about that time turned his wonder-working telescope upon these famed nebulae, these embryo worlds, and in an instant this theory was dissipated into thin air.

If science and revelation differ, they cannot both be true. The question then arises, and it is worth a moment's thought, should a discrepancy arise, which stands on the best ground of evidence—which should be believed. It will at once be admitted, that to weigh any thing against revelation, an opinion should be based on well ascertained facts. We are under no obligation to notice the crude guesses of a dreaming speculator. Now while we accord all due reverence to these sciences, we would suggest, that great uncertainty hangs over them. This their warmest votaries admit and lament. What is reverently regarded in one generation, is laughed at in the next. A text book which was regarded as specially accurate fifty years ago is valueless now, except as a depository of exploded theories. The difficulty of reaching certain conclusions is felt the more deeply, the more profound is our acquaintance with the subject. Hence really learned men are modest, mere smatterers are bold. He who sees nothing but results as they are arranged in a theory, knows nothing of the doubts through which those conclusions have been reached. He sees the building, but does not see the foundation, and is blissfully ignorant of the labours of the quarry, in shaping and polishing the stones. As the heart knoweth its own bitterness, and a stranger intermeddleth not therewith, so each profession knows its own difficulties. We say then, that science has not yet reached that state of maturity and fixation, that would justify us in putting it into the scales to weigh against revelation, which comes to us with history, miracles, prophecy, propagation and internal and self-evidencing witness, all in its favour. We have no idea that this question will ever become a practical one. But should this be so, we ask not an hour to choose. Let God be true and every man a liar.

We look then cheerfully and confidently on the future. We anticipate a day of conflict, fierce and trying, but we are not afraid of the result. The Bible is the light house of a dark world. By it alone can the voyager be guided to the desired haven. The waves of tumult may lift up themselves and foam and dash around its base, and clouds may obscure its summit, and many may perish on the rocks and quicksands for want of its light; but when the noise of that tumult shall have been hushed, and those clouds have rolled away, we expect, and those who live till that day will see it, that it will shine on calm, clear and truthful; the Pharos of the world, at once the witness for God and the hope of man.

ARTICLE VII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

- 1 *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers, D. D. LL.D. By his son-in-law, the REV. WILLIAM HANNA, LL.D. Volume 3d; 531 pp. 12 mo.; Harper & Brothers. New York. 1851.*

This volume was upon our table when the preceding number of this Review was issued; but we had not then enjoyed its perusal. It gives the History of Dr. Chalmers' life and labors as a Professor, commencing with his inauguration to the chair of Moral Philosophy, in the University of St. Andrews, and leaving him in the most successful occupancy of the Divinity Chair in University of Edinburgh.

It sketches briefly the various publications prepared during this period, and which added to his fame as an author: and sketches his retired and quiet labors as a Christian, in which he partially occupied his Sabbaths. In this volume, Dr. Chalmers is presented more conspicuously than before, as the champion of the rising

Evangelical interest, in the various Courts of the Church; which he was destined at a later day, in a very large degree, to direct as its acknowledged head. Not the least interesting portion of this volume, is the sketch of his tour through parts of England, and of his intercourse with the notables of that great country. Every insight which we gain into the higher religious society of England and Scotland, impresses us with its greater freedom of restraint, and the more open and full introduction into common conversation of religious subjects, than is known in this country. And in which of our great cities could a voluntary attendance of amateur scholars be secured to the Lectures of a Theological Professor, such as filled the class room of Dr. Chalmers, both at St. Andrews and at Edinburgh? To us, the present volume equals in interest, either of the preceding; and we do not regret, that to preserve the scale upon which these memoirs were projected, they are found to swell into four volumes instead of three. We confess that Dr. Chalmers appears a greater man in his biography, than he does in his published works: as we are forced to perceive the unsurpassed sway which he possessed over the minds of his contemporaries; and which, when sustained through a long life over cultivated and noble intellects, is an indisputable sign of genius.

2. *The Variations of Popery.* By SAMUEL EDGAR, D.D. 606 pp., octavo. Robert Carter & Brothers; New York: 1850.

It is certainly unnecessary to introduce this learned polemical work to the notice of our readers, as it has been before the world for at least twenty years. This edition of the Carters will, however, give it a much wider American circulation than it has hitherto enjoyed. The character of the work is sufficiently indicated in its brief title. It is intended, as the author says, to "retort upon Popery the argument of Bossuet," Bishop of Meaux; who industriously collated the slight discordances of the Reformers, which were "rather in discipline than in faith or morality," and published the same as the *Variations of Protestantism*. The evi-

dent design of this subtle controversialist, was to place this uncertainty of the Reformed Faith in contrast with the boasted unity and unchangeableness of the Romish Communion. But the work is fully torn away by Edgar in the work before us; the scope of whose undertaking will be best seen from one or two extracts from the preface :

“ The attack, in this essay, is directed against the unity, antiquity, and immutability of Romanism. These have long been the enemy's proud, but empty boast. * * * The design of this work is to shew the groundlessness of this claim. The subject is the diversity of doctors, popes, and councils among themselves ; with their variations from the Apostles and Fathers ; and these fluctuations are illustrated by the history of the superstitions which have destroyed the simplicity, and deformed the beauty of genuine Christianity. * * * * The authorities in this work are, with a few exceptions, the Fathers and Romish authors. One popish author is confuted from another. Theologian is, in this manner, opposed to theologian, pope to pope, and council to council.”

This broad outline is filled up with a vast collection of important, authenticated and well arranged facts. After showing the harmony of the Reformed Confessions on the main articles of faith, the author proceeds first to show the variations which have occurred in the Pontifical succession, arising from three sources chiefly : the different accounts given by the historians of the Popedom ; the conflicting choices made by the College of Electors ; and the doctrinal heresies and flagrant immoralities, which have thrown suspicion upon the lineage of more than one sacred Pontiff. The conflicting opinions are next recounted, as to which of all the numerous Councils that have been held, are to be regarded as authoritative. The supremacy of the Pope is next discussed, and the four opinions recited, which assign to him a mere Presidency over the Church, or an unlimited sovereignty, or which advance him to an equality with God, or to a superiority over the Deity. The question of infallibility is next presented, and the controversies of Romish doctors are cited, which place this high attribute now in the Pontiff, now in a general Council, now in the two united, and now in the whole collective Church. The author also ranges through the various heresies, which have

been at one time patronized, and at another repudiated: as Arianism and Pelagianism, &c. The rise of Transubstantiation, of Image worship, and of clerical celibacy, is fully traced in some of the concluding chapters.

It cannot be doubted that Dr. Edgar has produced a work which will take its place among the standard polemical treatises of the Church, and that it will be diligently conned, by all who desire to explore and to expose the abominations and blasphemies of anti-Christ.

3. *Bible Dictionary, for the use of Bible Classes, Schools, and Families. Prepared for the Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 476, 12mo., Pres. Board of Publication, Phila.*

This little book is modestly introduced by the compiler, with a statement of the reasons which induced him to undergo the labor of preparing it: amongst the more important of which, we recognize the desire of preparing a manual of reference, that should not be voluminous; that should more distinctly recognize our denominational views; and that should embody the more recent geographical and archæological discourses. It is an humble but useful office, without the reward of intellectual fame, to furnish to young students of the Bible a more complete apparatus. This volume is prefaced with three or four prettily executed maps; and the appendix embraces a full pronouncing Dictionary, and a chronological list of Jewish Kings.

4. *A Series of Tracts on the Doctrines, Order and Polity of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America—embracing several on Practical Subjects. Vol. 6: Pres. Bd. of Pub.*

This volume embraces twenty-one tracts, stitched together, originally printed separately and in different type. The subjects are all interesting and important. Those on experimental religion embrace such topics as the Power of Religion; Love to an un-

seen Savior ; Backsliding ; the Duty of Family Religious Instruction ; Union with Christ ; Effectual Calling, &c. Those more strictly denominational, discuss such points as the Office of the Deacon ; What Presbyterians believe ; Plain Divinity, or a Sketch of the Doctrines of Revelation, &c. We can sincerely wish these tracts sown broadcast over the Church, in their separate form ; and widely distributed in the volume in which they are here collected.

5. *The Canon of the Old and New Testaments ascertained, or the Bible Complete, without the Apocrypha and unwritten Traditions.* By ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER, D. D. 12mo. pp. 359 : Pres. Board of Publication, Phila.

This is a new edition, revised and enlarged by the venerable author, for the Board of Publication. Of its merits, as a discussion of the subject of the Canon, we have no need now to speak ; as for many years it has been a manual in the hands of our students, and has long since received the approval of Christian men, both in Scotland and England, as well as in this country. It deserves the wide diffusion which English, Scotch and American editors have given it, since it is so well suited to serve the purpose of a manual on the subject treated of. We cannot forbear, however, in this connexion, to call the attention of the Protestant world to a far more complete, (so far as the issue is joined with Papists,) and we are compelled to say, a more masterly discussion of the Canon, published in 1845, by Rev'd. Dr. Thornwell, in a work entitled "Romanist Arguments Refuted"—a work of original research, as well as convincing logic ; in which profound learning, acuteness of reasoning, and breadth of discussion, are intermingled with invective which some think, but not we, too severe—a work which deserves a circulation, on the score of intrinsic merit, above any other with which we are acquainted, on this department of the Papistical controversy. We trust we shall be forgiven this reference to one of our own co-laborers, especially as it is done without his privity, and upon the sole responsibility of the writer.

B. M. P.

6. *Moriah, or Sketches of the Sacred-Rites of Ancient Israel.* By REV. ROBERT W. FRASER, M. A. Pp. 309, 12mo: Pres. Board of Publication.

It is the design of this book to awaken an interest on the part of Christians, in those ordinances of the Jewish Law which are considered as obsolete, and therefore unimportant.

With considerable unction, the writer depicts, with nearly as much glow of feeling as though he had been a spectator, the Temple of Solomon, its dedication, the officiating Priests, the sacrifices, the feasts, the year of jubilee, &c.; and from each deduces those spiritual lessons which are suggested, when those sacred rites are viewed in connexion with the Gospel Dispensation which they foreshadowed. We find, scattered through the chapters of this book, a number of stirring thoughts, and beautiful analogies; but the author intends to address himself much more to the affections of his readers, than to their reason. Of course, his production has more of a devotional than an intellectual cast.

7. *Ears of the Spiritual Harvest.* Pp. 180. Pres. Bd. of Pub.
8. *Life of a Vagrant, or the Testimony of an Outcast to the Value and Truth of the Gospel.* Pp. 165: Carter & Brothers, N. Y.
9. *Roger Miller; or Heroism in Humble Life. A Variation,* by GEORGE ORME. Pp. 185. Carter & Brothers, N. Y.
10. *The Life of Col. James Gardiner.* By P. DODDRIDGE, D. D. Pp. 228: Pres. Board of Publication.

We group together these four volumes because of the general resemblance between them, though each possesses its individual characteristics. The first is a collection of striking narratives, which illustrate the power of Divine Grace in the conversion and sanctification of sinners. They are such sketches as may at all times be culled from the note-books of faithful and observant pas-

tors. The narratives are brief and pertinent, and well adapted to illustrate the varieties of christian life and experience.

The second is a plain, unpretending autobiography of one who was born to vagrancy and vice; but who was eventually reclaimed by the Gospel, and is now an humble and useful member of society, and an ornament to the church. The narrative is full of minute details, which put the stamp of genuineness and authenticity upon it, which besides has ample vouchers in the testimony of responsible individuals, who have personal knowledge of the author and his history.

The third is a stirring biography of one who was born in like circumstances of want, but who was earlier reclaimed from vice by the Gospel of the grace of God; and whose entire life was spent in severe buffetings and afflictions, in all which the heroism, which belongs to the Christian character, was fully displayed. This book, with the preceding, has a special interest to the philanthropist and philosopher, in the disclosures they make of the want and vice and misery into which multitudes, in densely populous countries, are born, as their natural inheritance.

The life of Col. Gardiner, so long known to Christian readers as a remarkable illustration of the omnipotence of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of men, is here presented in a neat form, and widely circulated through the agency of the Board of Publication.

-
11. *Charity and its Fruits; or Christian Love, as manifested in the Heart and Life.* By JONATHAN EDWARDS. Pp. 530, 18mo: Robert Carter & Brothers, N. Y.

We feel free to present this work to the notice of our readers simply upon the name of the great author found on the title page, not having had time for its perusal. It is, too, a stronger ground of confidence, to those who cannot speak upon their own judgment, to know that this is a work of Jonathan Edwards, on Practical Religion; as its title indicates, the subject is the Christian's love both to God and man; and that love, the fruit of the Spirit. It is for

the first time given to the world from the hitherto inedited manuscripts of the great Theologian, by a lineal descendant, to whom these manuscripts have come down as an heirloom. We cherish the expectation of an early and diligent reading of this volume; not doubting that we shall find it like old wine, which has been long mellowing.

12. *The Christian Philosopher triumphing over Death. A Narrative of the Closing Scenes of the late William Gordon, M. D., F. L. S.* By NEWMAN HALL, B. A. Pp. 250. 12mo: Pres. Board of Publication.

This book has not only interested, it has *moved* us. It is affecting to see Christianity stooping in its condescension and lifting up the vagrant from his squalid filth, and regenerating him from hereditary and habitual vice; but it is sublime to behold it overtaking the man of science and research, turning his disciplined reason upon a searching scrutiny of its evidences, and then lifting him into the higher region of faith, to enjoy its peace and expatiate in its raptures. Such is the picture presented in the volume before us: that of a philosopher, with the earnestness and candor which are his proper attributes, searching through the wastes of Deism and Materialism, and finally resting with the firmest intellectual faith upon the Gospel, as containing the truth of God. It is the picture of a Christian pouring out his intense affections upon an incarnate Redeemer; and proving the reality of heavenly bliss by the immediate foretaste of its joy—a joy so perfect that it casts out the fear of death, and puts “the chamber where the good man meets his fate, quite on the verge of Heaven.” The exhilaration of this stirring narrative, we feel in every sentiment and power of the soul: it imparts the enthusiasm of an ardent, yet well-balanced and reflective, mind—and of a mind filled with knowledge, refined by faith, and stimulated by love.

13. *Songs in the House of my Pilgrimage. Selected and arranged by a Lady* : pp. 315, 18mo. Rob't Carter & Brothers, N. Y.
14. *Green Pastures, or Daily Food for the Lord's Flock.* By Rev. JAMES SMITH. Pp. 188, 32mo : Gilt. Pres. Board of Pub.
15. *Still Waters, or Refreshment for the Savior's Flock, at Eventide.* By Rev. JAMES SMITH. Pp. 188, 32mo : Gilt. Pres. Board of Publication.

Poetry is the natural language of sentiment and emotion. The aim of these books is to sanctify it as the vehicle of spiritual desires. The first is, throughout, of a plaintive tone; the two latter, couple a verse of Scripture and a verse of poetry, summed up with brief reflections, by the author. All of them are prepared for daily use, the selections being apportioned to every day throughout the year.

-
16. *Sacramental Meditations and Advices.* By the REV. JOHN WILLISON. 376 pp. 18 mo., Robert Carter & Brothers; New York.

17. *The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax.* By RICHARD SIBBES, D.D. 291 pp. 18 mo. Presby. Board of Publication.

"No man having drunk old wine straightway desireth new; for he saith, the old is better." These meditations of Willison have, for a century, aided the Lord's people in their preparations for a worthy approach to the communion table; and thousands who once on earth indulged in them, have passed into Heaven to sit down forever at the marriage supper of the Lamb. And the comforting words of Sibbes, for still a century longer, have been as the oil and wine of the good Samaritan, poured into the sinner's wounded breast. These books come to us, not only redolent with the warm devotion of their authors, and impregnated with christian doctrine, but pregnant with sacred associations of the many saints whose piety has burned the deeper for the aid they have rendered.

18. *Lessons of Life and Death; a memorial of Sarah Ball.* 144 pp. 38 mo.
19. *Memoir of Mrs. Agnes Andrew, of Paisley.* 18 mo. pp. 101.
20. *The Cripple.* 21. *Still Happy.* 22. *The Ragged Scholars.*
23. *Visit to the Holy Land.* 24. *The Labourer's Daughter.*

A class of brief narratives, entertaining and instructive, designed for the young, to whose benefit the Board of Publication in their issues, devote very properly a large share of their attention.

25. *Man: his Religion and his world.* pp. 238, 18 mo. Carter & Brothers; New York.
26. *My Father's God; a testimony for religion.* pp. 96, 18 mo. Pres. Board of Publication.
27. *Three last things; or Death, Judgment and Eternity.* By REV. JOHN HAMBLETON. pp. 117, 18 mo. Presby. Board of Publication.
28. *Light of the Dark Valley.* 29. *Address to Brothers.* By REV. DANIEL BAKER, D.D. Pres. Board of Publication.

We regret that want of space compels us to group together, and deal in the gross, with these books; to some of which we would like to give a more particular notice. This holds especially true of the first in the above group; which comes from the pen of Rev. H. Bomar, already known as an author of devotional spirit. His aim is to show man's religion in its points of contrast with the religion of God; and that his world will never become what he hopes, upon the principles, and by the agencies which he is willing to employ. The book is full of striking thoughts, and has touches of a deep philosophy. The remaining books are smaller, and their characters sufficiently indicated in the titles.

30. *Decision ; or Religion must be all or is nothing.* By GRACE KENNEDY.
31. *The Converted Unitarian.* A short memoir of E—E.
32. *Universal false and unscriptural.* An Essay.
33. *Confessions of a Convert from baptism in water, to baptism with water.* From the 2d English edition.

The first of this group is a reprint of an old book, written in the form of a dialogue, by the author of "Profession not Principle," "Father Clement," and other religious fictions, long familiar to religious readers. It is one of Carters' Cabinet Library.

The second is a sketch of a young female of lovely natural disposition, who became entangled in the sophistries of Unitarianism; but was afterwards brought to see "the truth as it is in Jesus;" and finally died a triumphant death, resting her faith upon that cross she once despised. The book contains little else but her spiritual exercises, as she passed through these successive changes.

The third is a brief essay, sweeping over the prominent points in the controversy on universal salvation. It is well written and forcible, and adapted for general circulation amongst that class of readers, who would break down under a treatise more lengthy and elaborate.

The fourth book, whether fact or fiction, in a lively manner traces the line of argument in favor of Pædo-baptism. It is void of invective, but full of piquant humour, and the narrative form has this advantage, that it presents the progressive and cumulative nature of the argument, just as it would naturally expand before an earnest inquirer. Its rapid passage through two editions in England, evinces the popular form of the book, and its adaptation to the masses. Together with the two preceding, it emanates from the press of our Board of Publication.

34. *It is I: or the voice of Jesus in the Storm.* By NEWMAN HALL, B.A.
35. *Come to Jesus.* By NEWMAN HALL, B.A.
36. *Considerations for days of Adversity.*
37. *The Brazen Serpent, or faith in Christ illustrated.* By J. H. JONES, D.D.
38. *Sermons to young children.*

A collection of small books from the Press of the Pres. Board of Publication; all having a sweet savour of the Gospel.

39. *My Own Book: or select narratives for youth.*
40. *The Child's Poetical Keepsake.*
41. *Alphabet of Birds—Illustrated.*
42. *The works of Creation—Illustrated—from the English edition.*

Books prepared specially to arrest the attention of young children, and to fill their minds with moral and religious sentiments. The illustrations are very beautiful, and suited to please the eye of young persons, and thus create a deeper interest in the subjects handled.

John

C