

THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN
REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

An Association of Ministers,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

VOLUME X.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

1858.

BX
 8901
 5688
 v. 10

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME X.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER I.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—CONSTITUTION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, BY REV. SAMUEL R. BAIRD,	1
II.—CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND AFRICAN COLONIZATION, BY REV. J. B. ADGER, D. D.,	17
III.—THE MARTYRS OF SCOTLAND AND SIR WALTER SCOTT, BY JOHN H. BOCOCK,	69
IV.—TESTIMONY OF THE ANCIENT JEWS TO THE TRINITY, BY REV. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D.,	94
V.—HISTORICAL SKETCH OF SYSTEMS OF THEOLOGY, BY ENOCH POND, D. D.,	106
VI.—IDOLATRY, BY WM. SCOTT, D. D.,	115
VII.—WIGFALL'S SERMON UPON DUELLING, BY REV. J. B. ADGER, D. D.,	126
VIII.—CRITICAL NOTICES,	137

CONTENTS OF NUMBER II.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—MIRACLES, BY REV. J. H. THORNWELL, D. D. LLD.	161
II.—A VINDICATION OF THE SCRIPTURAL MESSIANIC INTER- PRETATION OF THE LIIID. CHAPTER OF ISAIAH, BY REV. JAS. COHEN,	201
III.—THE TEACHINGS OF THE DEAD, BY REV. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D.,	233
IV.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MDCCCLVII. BY REV. J. B. ADGER, D. D.,	276
V.—CRITICAL NOTICES,	334

CONTENTS.

CONTENTS OF NUMBER III.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—THE SABBATH CONTROVERSY, BY REV. R. L. DABNEY, D. D.,	337
II.—THE MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION OF THE LIIRD. OF ISAIAH, (continued from last number,) BY REV. JAS. COHEN,	377
III.—THE ALPHABET OF NATURAL THEOLOGY, BY REV. E. F. ROCKWELL,	411
IV.—THE INFLUENCE OF STIMULANTS ON THE MANIFESTATION OF MIND, BY J. MC. F. GASTON, M. D.,	436
V.—OUR PROBLEM, BY REV. A. F. DICKSON,	451
VI.—THE TESTIMONY OF THE ROCKS, BY REV. W. D. MOORE,	463
VII.—CRITICAL NOTICES,	473

CONTENTS OF NUMBER III.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—REVISION MOVEMENT, BY REV. RICHARD S. GLADNEY,	493
II.—CONVERSION OF THE WORLD, BY REV. JOHN G. SHEP- PERSON,	520
III.—GEOLOGICAL SPECULATION, BY REV. EDWIN CATER,	534
IV.—EDWARDS AND THE THEOLOGY OF NEW ENGLAND, BY REV. SAMUEL J. BAIRD,	574
V.—BRECKINRIDGE'S THEOLOGY, BY J. H. THORNWELL, D. D. LL. D.,	593
VI.—CRITICAL NOTICES,	623

THE

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. X.]

APRIL, MDCCCLVII.

[NO. I.

ART. I.—THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

THE Protestant reformation proceeded from the practical development of two propositions, the one of which embodied its formal, the other its material principle. The first is, that the Scriptures are the only rule of Christian faith and practice; and the second, that justification before God is solely through the righteousness of Christ, imputed to the believer, without the works of the law. The former of these principles inaugurates the right of private judgment, and rescues the liberties of the church and people of God from the bondage of a usurping priesthood. The latter enunciates a theology, which, whether designated, from its unanimous reception by the divines of the reformation, by the name of "Reformed;" or from its great exponents called Calvinistic, Augustinian, or Pauline, has always proved itself the alone sure basis of a stable faith; and the only reliable fountain of a pure morality.

Viewed in its practical bearings the reformation was characterized by their cardinal features, springing from these principles. These were, the preaching of a Pauline theology, instead of the Pelagianism of the papacy; the vindication of the morality of the divine law, in contrast with the licentiousness of Rome; and the establishment of a scriptural polity and order in the church, in opposition to the hierarchy of a domineering priesthood. The three elements thus indicated, that is, doctrines, morals, and polity, sustain to each other relations exceedingly intimate and almost inseparable. A pure morality has never long survived that

VOL. X.—NO. 1.

1

theology, which, whilst it disclaims all reliance on works for justification, yet develops, in love, the only principle which is adequate to produce the fruits of a holy obedience. On the other hand, permanent defections from sound doctrine have always been either preceded or attended by departures from scriptural principles of church order and government. In this respect the opposite extremes of Hierarchy and Independency have alike proved incompetent to the maintenance, either of truth in doctrine or purity in practice. Whilst error has never entered a Presbyterian church, without at once assailing the principles of its polity, and striving to arrest or neutralize their operation; it is in all its forms found in congenial and quiescent alliance with the lofty pretensions and imposing ceremonies of hierarchical systems, and the popular constitutions and irresponsible separation of Independent churches.

The distinguishing characteristic of Hierarchy is, that it attributes to the clergy the primary and sole possession of all the rights and prerogatives of ecclesiastical authority and grace; asserting that every sacred function is vested immediately in them by the Head of the church. If it be true that church power exists essentially in the clergy and not in the church at large, it follows that the divine prerogatives thus arrogated can only be vested in any by the interposition of such as are already endowed; and so at each antecedent step back to the investiture of the apostles by the Son of God. It further results that none are members of the church of Christ, or entitled to appropriate the promises of the Gospel, except such as submit themselves to the guidance of these divinely commissioned officers; and that no degree of depravity in morals, or heresy in their doctrines, would justify the people of God in withdrawing from their communion, or in the least slighting their teachings or authority. Nor do such conclusions attach exclusively to the prelatial system, although in that they find their normal organization. They cleave alike to any and every theory which rests church power primarily in the ministry.

It must be manifest that whenever the church is required to bow to such an authority as this, claiming to act in the name of her Lord, Christ, she is imperiously bound, by the very allegiance which she joyfully owns, to demand an open display of the commission which assumes to convey such powers. With the utmost jealousy must she examine its terms, and inspect the seal, knowing the words of Christ, that "many shall come in his name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many;" and giving heed to the warning of the beloved apostle,—“Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world.” (1 John, iv: 1.) Nor in such a case will probable evidence be sufficient. The very face

of the claim which is to be tested, implies that mistake may involve imminent hazard of perdition. The beloved bride of Christ is not incautiously to be entrusted to the hands of those who may prove emissaries of the Man of Sin. Interests involving the redemption of the blood-bought Church, the glory of God, and the great realities of a future state, are not to be staked on doubtful evidence. Nothing less than demonstration is adequate to this occasion. To effect this, two alternatives occur. The claimant of a divine commission may show miraculous evidence of his authority. This the apostles everywhere exhibited, "God bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost." (Heb. ii : 4.) The fact of such attestation being given to them, adds emphasis to the demand for similar proof, in every similar case. Failing this, two things must be made to appear. *First*, the derivation of office through a lineal succession fully authenticated in every link, from such as had miraculous attestations on their behalf. *Second*, that these predecessors, acting under this seal of divine authority, directed the powers exercised by them, to be thus lineally transmitted from age to age. Neither of these points may be assumed without proof; nor will the proof of either of them alone, sustain the claim which is under consideration. Both must be demonstrated, to be of any avail.

It may be thought that these alternatives may be avoided, and the claim of hierarchy justified, by the plea of prescriptive right; that although there be irreparable defects in the evidence of succession, and it be even possible that the chain has been completely severed, and the apostolic ordination utterly lost, still the acquiescence of the Church, and the undisputed possession of its authoritative offices for ages, has fully compensated for any such defect, and given validity in its present exercise to an authority, which, in its origin, may have been irregular and invalid. If by this reference to the acquiescence of the Church, as embodied in its private members, it is meant to acknowledge that she has received from the Lord Jesus Christ, power adequate to the perpetuation of the ordinances, and her own edification, even in default of a regular succession of officers; and that the ministry now possessed derives its authority from that source; it is manifest that such a concession in fact abandons the pretence of hierarchical authority. It is an acknowledgment that, in the last resort, ecclesiastical power abides essentially in the body of the faithful; in the Church, and not in her officers. Otherwise it must remain a mystery how the acquiescence of the Church, which, by the terms of the statement, was originally, and remains perpetually, without any share in the power of the keys, can by

the mere lapse of centuries, exercise a force so extraordinary, as to beget for the usurping officers a valid commission, and that, not from her, but from heaven; or how it can have any other effect than to implicate the acquiescent Church, in common with her officers, in the guilt of treason to her Head. If, therefore, miraculous powers be not displayed, or apostolic ordination and commission demonstrated, not approximately but absolutely, the figment of hierarchy is left without a shadow of foundation. Should either of these proofs, however, be given, it would only remain, that all must yield cheerful and unreserved submission to an authority, which, in its dominion over doctrines, morals, and order, must, in the nature of the case, be unlimited by anything short of direct and signal interposition from heaven.

In this doctrine of clerical prerogative, is revealed the fundamental heresy of the papal system; the pregnant germ from whence every essential feature of that apostacy results, by direct logical consequence. Necessarily involved in it is the doctrine of *opus operatum*, or the essential efficacy of outward forms and rites for conveying spiritual gifts and graces to the soul—a doctrine which strikes directly at the root of the cardinal principle in the Pauline system, that is, the sole and entire sufficiency of Christ's righteousness, without any difference, "unto all and upon all them that believe." Admit the hierarchical pretensions, and private judgment is impious, as assuming to sit in trial of the instructions of acknowledged oracles of God; the Bible becomes not needles only, but a temptation and a snare, and its instructions must be received only so far and in such sense as they may be affirmed by the living teacher; rites and ceremonies appointed by these officers are to be received at once as of divine appointment; and this power, "sitting in the temple of God, and showing itself that it is God," may confound every distinction in morals, canonize the grossest sensuality, smile upon the most loathsome vice, and discard every principle of virtue; and yet no man may protest, or hesitate to submit his faith and his senses alike to the atrocious dicta. A refusal to acquiesce involves the guilt of rebellion against God, and apostacy from the fold and the salvation of Christ. The fact that many who adopt the premises shrink with horror from these conclusions, does credit to their hearts at the expense of their understandings. Admit the primary position, and the conclusions are as inevitable as the demonstration that follows a theory of Euclid.

It is not necessary here to enter into detail in illustration of the essential connexion that subsists between the hierarchical theory, and the prelatie organization of the Church. The one is in fact

the normal development, in practice, of the other. Admit the prerogatives thus ascribed to the ministry, and it at once becomes important, that some be set apart as the official conservators and dispensers of the powers and grace thus possessed; men who shall be authorized to take charge of their proper distribution and transmission, for the present edification of the Church, and its perpetuation in after time. Precisely such are the distinguishing characteristics and functions of diocesan bishops; whose office as preachers of the word, is entirely subordinate and secondary to that more important jurisdiction which they exercise in the ordination of ministers, and the confirmation of catechumens. In these rites they, by the imposition of hands, assume to bestow upon the one and the other that mysterious and inappreciable gift of the Holy Ghost, which, whilst it neither works faith nor any grace in the heart, nor loveliness in the life, yet entitles the one to arrogate to himself, and those who have been similarly ordained, the supreme and exclusive title to dispense the privileges and blessings of God's covenant of mercy to a lost world; and makes the other a child of God, and heir of heaven. All this—although the one may be a Simon Magus in heart, and the other a worker of iniquity in his life.

The Constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church, exhibits a modified form of hierarchy singularly anomalous in all its aspects. Its author, John Wesley; a professed believer in the primitive purity of the ministry, yet an adherent of one prelatial church, and founder of another. Citing his faith in the original equality of the ministry, as a justification of his own position, when in the act of trampling that equality under foot, by the assumption to himself of apostolical authority, in the ordination of prelates to rule in a foreign church, and the erection of a system of hierarchy, as unmitigated in its usurpation over popular rights, as that of the English establishment itself. Nor is the system any less remarkable in its structure than its origin. Here is a ministry which does not pretend to derive its authority by immediate commission from heaven, which cannot claim apostolic succession, and which is, therefore, shut up to the alternative of admitting, that any prerogatives they may possess must be conveyed to them through the mediation of the Church—the body of believers. Yet, notwithstanding, from the day of their commission by Wesley, to the present time, they have held the reins then seized, without pretending to secure from the people, in any form, their sanction to the original investiture, or the subsequent use; or admitting them to any share of authority, or any right of interposition in the exercise of the powers thus acquired. Here are prelates confessing that the system is not derived from the word of God; and

a ministry, whose warrant is in a ministerial succession which terminates in the person of a disorderly presbyter, who violated the obligations of his own ministry, and cast indignity on the authorities and order of his own church in originating theirs. In short, the system is one whose only pretence of excuse is necessity; whose justification was opportunity; and whose only present vindication is the consent of the people, obscurely indicated in their unresisting acquiescence. Incapable of vindication in argument, its security is silence.

On the opposite extreme of opinions on this subject, Independency secures, indeed, the liberties of the people of God against the domination of usurping officers, but it is at the expense of the existence of the Church itself. It is dissolved, and out of the elements are created a multitude of petty democracies, each congregation being erected into a sect, responsible to no common authority and bound to the rest by no common organization. "Each congregation, assembly, or brotherhood of professing Christians meeting for religious purposes in one place, is a complete Church, receiving from Christ the right to appoint its own officers, to discharge the duties of worship, to observe the instituted sacraments, and to exercise discipline upon its own members."*

If it be true that each particular congregation is thus complete in itself, and possessed of such privileges and independence as are here claimed, it is evident that they are thereby involved in an imperative obligation to maintain in full integrity the invaluable trust thus committed to them by the Lord Jesus Christ. As to them belongs the privilege, so on them alone rests the obligation and responsibility, of designating officers, of directing worship, and of exercising discipline within their own assemblies. Faithfulness to Christ forbids that they should transfer any of these prerogatives to others, or permit their integrity to be impaired, by allowing any measure of interference, any the least weight of obligation, to extraneous influences and sister organizations. Whilst thus sedulous in guarding their own rights, they are on the other hand bound by a reciprocal obligation as carefully to respect those of sister congregations, abstaining from any attempt to influence the choice of officers, the exercises of worship, or the formularies of doctrine, or to interfere in any way beyond the limits of their own fold.

A modified form of this system is displayed in Congregationalism, which does not essentially differ from it in principle. It is an attempt to inoculate independency with the efficiency and ex-

* Upham's Ratio Disciplina, or Constitution of the Congregational Churches. p. 44.

pansiveness of Presbyterianism, by a partial adoption of its forms and modes of action. The result, so far as it differs from strict independency, is a congeries of compromises and expedients; not rising to the dignity of a system; reducable to no ultimate principles; recognizing no law, but the necessities of the occasion; and exhibiting no uniformity in its results, as developed in the constitutions and proceedings of the multiplied Councils, Unions, Conventions, Conferences, Associations and Consociations, Anabaptist and Pædo-baptist, to which it has given existence.

Although the Congregational system departs so far from pure Independency, as to admit of the organization of councils and synods, both occasional and stated; yet it is held as a cardinal principle, that particular churches retain the right of examining their decisions by the light of reason and Scripture. "If they find them agreeable to the scriptures, and satisfactory to their consciences, they are to be received; but if otherwise, they may be rejected."* The synods of these churches are not like those of other churches; for they have no weapons but what are spiritual. They pretend to, nor desire any power that is judicial. If they can but instruct and persuade, they gain their end. But when they have done all, the churches are still free to refuse or accept their advice.† The particular worshipping assembly is, therefore, the tribunal of the last resort; in fact, the only authoritative body known to the system. In the varying phases of Congregationalism, we do indeed sometimes find features which suggest the authoritative supervision and control of Presbyterian synods. Yet, however intimately the churches may be associated in mutual confidence and fellowship, they still remain mere conferences of independent sovereignties. Each is entitled, in the last resort, by the fundamental principles of the system, to do what may seem good in its own eyes, irrespective of the opinions or expostulations of the rest. This renders such organizations altogether inadequate to resist the incursions of error. Strictly interpreting their principles, the churches have no right to go behind their mutual profession of a common faith; or inquire whether any of their number may not have departed from the truth of the Gospel. This would be assuming a right to sit in judgment one upon another. Necessity has, indeed, induced the partial abandonment of this principle, by the adoption of systems of association, cemented by rules of discipline. But the feeble influence thus exerted, has only partially protected the

* Upham, p. 205.

† Samuel Mather, in Upham, p. 205.

bodies thus organized from the continual and desolating inroads of error in every form. Arminian, Pelagian, Antinomian, Arian, and Socinian heresies, have alternatively swept over their fairest fields, until scarcely a remnant is left to lift up a standard for the primitive faith, which was inscribed by their fathers in the Savoy confession of 1658, the Boston confession of 1680, and the London Baptist confession of 1689, identical as were each of these in doctrines, almost in terms, with the confession of the Westminster Assembly. Nor is it unworthy of special note, that the Pelagian tendencies, which have been so actively developed in the Congregational churches of this country within the last half century, have proceeded at an equal pace with a corresponding disposition to cast off the stricter regimen of Presbyterio-congregationalism, and to recur to the principles of pure Independence.

An equally weighty objection to the Independent polity, occurs in the fact that it is entirely deficient in any provision for sending abroad the Gospel, and evangelizing the destitute, and the heathen world. On the contrary, its principles present great obstacles in the way of such attempts. It hence happens that whenever churches thus organized, have attempted to do anything for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, it has been through organizations extraneous to the churches, abnormal to their system, and which, at every point of contact with the churches, are sustained and borne forward in violation of the fundamental principles of their polity. The mission of a minister of the Gospel to labour among the barbarians of Rarotonga, implies, on the part of the Church which sends him forth, authority competent to the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in that distant field. The moment a church in Boston or Plymouth attempts to designate a church officer to exercise his official functions in a foreign field, the idea of authority limited to the bounds of its own assembly is abandoned. A right is thus assumed of effectually interposing as to the mode of worship, the qualification of members, and the exercise of discipline in assemblies separated from her, perhaps by the diameter of the globe. This, too, not in its proper form by the assembled Church, but by an individual designated to act for her in this behalf. The sons of the pilgrims, as well as many of our Baptist brethren, are entitled to praise in all the churches for their noble exertions on behalf of the heathen world. But the manner in which they are compelled to act in every branch of evangelic effort is, of itself, an overwhelming argument against this system of polity. Take the example of the American Board—a society originating in the casual association of a few individuals, impelled, indeed, by noble purposes, but in whose designation the churches as such had no

more to do, than in the organization of a bank or an insurance company. Thus independent of the churches in its origin, it is equally so in its perpetuation; being a close corporation with the sole right within itself of electing its own members from time to time, and exercising that right by the election of men who are not officers in any church, and men who never belonged to a Congregational church at all. A society whose powers are derived, not from the churches by any mode of delegation, but from the Legislature of Massachusetts, and defined in a municipal charter. The theory is, that the prerogative of calling men to the ministry belongs exclusively to the several churches, each for itself. The practice is, that the call of the missionaries comes neither from church nor church-court, but from this civil corporation. The theory is, that the ordaining council exercises an authority delegated to it, by the church from which the call proceeds, and in the bosom of which the labors of the minister elect are to be bestowed. The practice is, that the council, when assembled, consists of ministers and messengers from churches, none of which expect to enjoy his stated ministry; who do not pretend to have been called together, or authorized to act by any church which does; who, with one voice, repudiate any right of jurisdiction beyond the bounds of their several churches; and yet, in the teeth of all this, they go forward, and, by the laying on of hands, assume to invest with the Gospel ministry, men whom they design to exercise its functions in foreign lands, and among other people. The doctrine is, that the power of the keys belongs to the body of worshippers in a particular church. The practice is, that it is assumed by the missionary, if there be but one, or by the council of the mission in the earlier stages of missionary operations. Subsequently, according as the preferences of the missionaries, or the necessities of their situation have determined, the practice varies between a *quasi* congregationalism, in which the Church has a nominal share of power, but is held in real subordination to the authority of the general council of the mission; and defectively organized Presbyterianism, exercised by the missionary pastor, with his college of parochial assistants, subordinate to the presbytery of the mission.

Thus have the principles of this polity met and withstood the friends of missions in every step of their progress and every department of their operations; and compelled them to seek, in a purely civil corporation, a channel through which to exercise their zeal for a perishing world: and to yield to this body an ecclesiastical jurisdiction over ministers and churches,—the rising temple of God in heathen lands,—as authoritative, and often more direct and effectual, than is ever exerted by the highest court of

the Presbyterian church. All honor to those men of God whose love of souls impelled them, despite all obstacles, to embark in this cause, and organize that Board, and send forth that host which has planted the standard of the Cross among the many islands of the sea, and upon the shores of every continent, and unfurled to the breeze that blood-sprinkled banner, whose folds display the only hope of a perishing world. Future ages, and many nations will rise up and call them blessed. Yet, still it remains that the very existence of that Board, and of the other Congregational, miscalled national societies, is a standing protest against the Congregational theory. Churches which are precluded, by the essential principles of their polity, from acting *per se* in the work of missions,—which are compelled by defect of provision in their constitution to abandon extraneous and independent organizations, the duty of obeying the last command of the ascending Redeemer are self-condemned. A form of government, which is found practically inapplicable to the case of churches newly gathered from the heathen, cannot be the true constitution of the Gospel Church.

Broadly distinguished from Hierarchy on the one hand, and Congregationalism or Independency on the other, is the Reformed or Presbyterian constitution of the Church. Of this system the fundamental principle is that the power of the keys is, by the Lord Jesus Christ, vested primarily and essentially in the Catholic or Universal church, which “consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God.”* The powers thus attributed to the Church at large, are a common investment for the benefit alike of all the members. These hold their interest in it, not by a joint, but several title; so that where distance, diversity of nation, or other cause, precludes a common organization and joint use of its privileges, those who can thus associate, are fully endowed with all the prerogatives of the keys, and assured of the presence and sanction of the Head of the Church, to their proper exercise of ecclesiastical functions. Ministerially, these functions are exercised by officers whose several qualifications and duties are defined in the Scriptures; and who are called and designated to the service by the Church, acting under the promised guidance of the Spirit of Christ, leading her to the choice of such persons as he has qualified and prepared for her service. Thus, the powers exercised by church officers, are not theirs primarily and essen-

* Westminster Confession, chap. 25, sec. 2.

tially, but only mediately and representatively. In their several spheres they minister in the name of the Church, acting as its representatives, and under responsibility to its ultimate authority. "Unto the Catholic visible church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world."*

The services which the ordinary exigencies of the Church and its members demand are of two kinds, namely—pastoral care and supervision of the flock of Christ; and the management of temporalities. Hence arise two classes of officers,—elders or bishops, who, according to their several gifts and qualifications, labor in word and doctrine, and in the exercise of government and discipline;—and deacons, whose office it is to take charge of the temporal affairs, and dispense the charities of the Church.† Although the functions and services of these officers appertain to the Church at large, yet as their labors are ordinarily, by the nature of the case, confined to specific fields of more or less limited extent; so are they called and set apart to their work through the intervention of particular congregations, or associations of them; in this, as in all other proceedings, acting under the constant supervision and corrective authority of the whole body; to whose final decision all disputed questions of whatever kind are ultimately brought.

The number, names, and particular distribution of functions, in the series of courts which normally grew out of these principles, are entirely immaterial to the integrity of the Reformed system. They are determined, according to the exigencies of each particular case, by what is found requisite, in order to the exercise of an efficient and active supply and supervision of every part of the body. The Scotch church possessed as pure and complete an organization, when it had no intermediate court between the church session and the General Assembly; and our American church, when it had only the sessions subordinate to the general presbytery, or when the latter body had interposed a system of classical presbyteries between it and the sessions; as does either body as now expanded, with its gradation of sessions, presbyteries, synods, and General Assembly. The Waldensian church does not fall below the purest standard of Presbyterian order, because its organization contains but the two elements of the parochial session and the synod; nor, on the other hand, would it involve any deviation from the same standard, should our church in the United States find it expedient to interpose a

* Westminster Confession, chap. 25, sec. 3.

† "Of this settlement, [of the Scotch church,] besides that profession of the evangelical faith which is common to all the churches of the Reformation, the peculiar and

system of provincial synods between the particular synods now existing, and the supreme court. In this respect the principles which control the system are,—unity in the body, the source of all the functions exercised by its members;—subdivision and delegation of ministerial powers to the parts, so far as requisite for the purposes of local efficiency;—and subordination of every part to the primary authority residing in the unity of the body; thus securing active supervision, coöperation, and expansive action in the work of Christ.

Development by growth and subdivision is the law of this system. The growing church at Jerusalem sends forth its shoots to all quarters of the world, each of which taking root becomes a new centre of expansive and healing influence, pushing forth into other regions as yet unevangelized. At the same time, all recognize and cherish the relation of unity to the parent stock, and subordination to the authority which resides in the body of which it is the centre. The church of Scotland, planted by the labors of a few divinely enlightened men, maintains at first the communion of its members through the annual convocation of its pastors and elders in one assembly. As it expands, this body develops an organization of subordinate synods, which, in their turn, are divided into presbyteries, each exercising in its sphere its distributive part of the functions of the body. A few missionaries of this church organize in Ulster a presbytery, which, by a like process, becomes the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in Ireland. Driven from their homes by privation and persecution, a handful of members of these churches find themselves exiles from the means of grace, scattered in the wilds of the new world. Their call for help is heard; and a missionary from their native land erects, in their midst, the standard of the Cross, and performs the work of an evangelist by planting churches and dispensing the ordinances of the Gospel beneath the shades of the primeval forests. Others join in his labors, and the organization of the Church is completed. At first, half a dozen names make up their roll when met in full assembly. But, as years roll on, the infant Church expands with the widening continent, and creates out of its bosom a numerous retinue of synods and presbyteries, whose annual commissioners, in General Assembly, perpetuate the succession of the original court. Hun-

essential features are: I. The government of the Church by presbyters alone, or by that order of men which is indicated in the New Testament indiscriminately, by the terms presbyters and bishops, or overseers,—*πρεσβυτεροι*, and *ἐπίσκοποι*. And II. The subjection of the Church in all things spiritual to Christ as her only Head, and his word as her only rule."—*Act and Declaration of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, May 31, 1851.*

dreds of thousands of souls, the flock of Christ in her fold, are led in the paths of knowledge and holiness by a growing multitude of ministers, her sons. By them the call of mercy is urged on unconverted millions throughout the land. Herself planted by the spirit of missions; her organization constructed in special adaptation to that work; her commission from Him who is the Prince of the kings of the earth; and her field the world; missionaries trained in her schools, commissioned and sent forth through her executive agencies, sustained by her contributions, and followed with her prayers, bear the glad tidings of salvation to the dark tribes of Asia and Africa, the aborigines of America, and the baptized pagans of Europe; and her General Assembly welcomes to its bosom commissioners from presbyteries which are springing into existence in India, China and Africa; the germinating courts of churches which shall yet flourish among regenerated nations, where heathenism now broods amid the gloom of the shadow of death.

Neither historically, nor in theory, is the system which thus unfolds itself one of confederate association, but of organic union. The functions and powers exercised under it are not derived by concessions of the inferior courts; nor do they primarily reside in them. Originating in the fountain Christ, and replenishing the spring-head—the Church catholic—his body; they flow downward from the higher courts in a rich and exhaustless stream, which, freighted with the riches of immortality, permeates every congregation, and pours the blessings of life and salvation into the heart of every believer. “*Labitur, et labetur in omne volubilis ævum.*”

It does not enter into the present design to exhibit the scriptural argument in favor of the system of polity which is here defined. It is a fact, however, worthy of being marked with peculiar emphasis, that unadulterated Presbyterianism has never been found in permanent connection with a corrupted theology. The first step in the apostacy of Rome, was a departure from the simple Presbyterian constitution of the primitive Church, the erection of a towering system of clerical orders, and a gradual assumption of hierarchical prerogatives. The subsequent history of the Church presents abundant examples of a similar character, illustrating the intimate relation there is between a corrupted polity, and unsound theology. On the other hand, sound doctrine has almost invariably found congenial alliance with Presbyterian order. During the ages when the Roman antichrist sat enthroned among the nations, the Culdees, the Waldenses, and the Lollards; the Presbyterians of the Alps and of Britain, were

almost alone the martyr confessions of a Scriptural faith. So soon as the returning light burst upon Europe, the reformers with one voice, in Germany, in Switzerland, in France, in Holland, and in Britain, concurred in bearing witness to the divine authority of the Presbyterian system. In every instance where the churches were organized without secular intervention, it was under this form. Without exception, prelacy was borrowed from Rome, and imposed by secular influences, and for the promotion of secular ends upon unwilling churches. Full fledged hierarchy, and independency, are alike of later origin in the Reformed church. The former transplanted from Rome, and freely germinating in a soil prepared by prelatric organization, Arminian theology, and alliance with the State; the latter born of oppression which "makes wise men mad." Its victims driven into exile, or pursued with inquisitions and fines, scourgings and imprisonment, tortures and death; no wonder if a morbid state of mind was induced,—if eagerness to escape the persecutions that oppressed them should result in comparative forgetfulness, or indifference to other considerations. Under such circumstances independency originated. Starting with the fundamental proposition that Christ has no visible Church upon earth, except the particular congregations of worshippers, it hence seemed to follow that establishments and persecutions for dissent must necessarily cease; inasmuch as there could not, on this theory, be a church geographically coëxtensive with the nation, to enjoy the prerogatives of an establishment, or direct the engines of persecution. It was reserved for the fathers of New England to exhibit a practical illustration of the fact, that it is possible to erect an establishment of Independent churches; and that the spirit of persecution may find exercise under that system as effectually as through the towering and gorgeous structure of an established prelacy. To the alliance of the churches of the pilgrims with their State authorities, serving as it did for a bond of union and discipline, is to be attributed much of their earlier prosperity. To it they owe their preservation from the intrusions of disorganizing heresies sheltered under their own form of polity; as well as the effectual exclusion of Presbyterianism from their soil. Yet, that alliance sprang from other causes, and was sustained through other influences, than any essential adaptation or peculiar tendency of Independent principles to such a connexion with the civil power.

In this respect the affinities which characterize the three systems here described are sufficiently obvious, and their operation plainly marked in the history of the churches. Hierarchy originating in a spirit of ambitious self-aggrandizement, under that

influence, naturally seeks to strengthen itself in irresponsible lordship in spiritual things, by alliance with the civil rulers, and by then exaggerating the authority of the powers on which it thus leans. On the other hand its dignitaries, persuaded that salvation depends on submission to their authority, and acceptance of the ordinances as dispensed by them, readily conclude that the magistrate cannot exercise his authority more properly, than in constraining men to come within the fold, and accept the grace that flows from the imposition of a bishop's hands; and that mercy itself may require that souls be snatched from perdition, even though at the expense of tortures to their bodies, and the erection of the stake for the destruction of the finally contumacious, and the warning of others. And this especially, as those who refuse to conform, are not only chargeable with treason to their own souls, the souls of others, the Church and her Head; but also with insubordination to the laws and the powers that be.

Independency originating in instincts of self preservation, and looking no farther than the safety of the village congregation, withdraws from the unity of the Church, as well as from contact with the State, and seeks in solitude the enjoyment of an unlimited freedom. If heresy enter a neighbor congregation it is her own concern. If it threaten to cut off, in detail, the great body of the churches and impregnate all fountains with the waters of death; the evil may be lamented, but it is without remedy; the sister churches may not interfere; their sphere is their own fold. If the cry of distress comes up from the heathen world, relief may be provided, and the Gospel given them through other channels and by other agencies; the churches have no provision for such a case; and their principles forbid them to interfere.

Of Presbyterianism, the normal condition is that of enterprising activity, alike unaided and untrammelled by State alliance; devoted to the vigorous prosecution of measures for the conquest of the world to the sceptre of Immanuel. Her republican institutions and inflexible temper disqualify her for winning the smiles of royalty; whilst her recognition of the people as the source of power, indisposes her to set a high value upon them; and her doctrine of faith which worketh by love, and alone justifies the ungodly, can expect no advantage to souls from the arguments of the civil power which appeal only to fear. Cherishing with peculiar prominence and affection the doctrine of the kingship of Christ, and his title to the dominion of the entire world; and in connexion with this holding to the catholicity of the Church, her commission to preach the Gospel to every creature, and to recall the world to its rightful subjection to Immanuel's crown; and her endowment, by Christ, with all the prerogatives

and powers which are requisite to that end ; there hence arises, and is cherished an expansive and aggressive tendency, the true spirit of evangelic activity and spring of the missionary enterprise.

Hierarchical organizations have existed without alliance with the State, and in republican lands ; Independent congregations have been consociated, established, and endowed ; and Presbyterian churches have been allied to the throne and wrapped in inactivity and sloth. But these have been accidental and anomalous positions, at variance with the native adaptations and tendencies of the several systems ; and so far as influential, their bearing has been to restrain and modify their native dispositions and normal action.

We have thus sketched the outlines of Presbyterian polity, broadly marked as they are in themselves, and still more clearly as Presbyterian, its more appropriate title is that primitive name by which the early disciples loved to call the bride of Christ, "the Catholic church,"—a designation intended to signalize her organic unity, and her universality ; and by which her polity, tracing all authority and prerogative to that unity as its source, is descriptively distinguished from hierarchy on the one hand and independency on the other. Of this Catholic constitution the annals of the Presbyterian church in the United States exhibit the appropriate results. Excluded by fine and imprisonment from the goodly shores of New England ; planted on the peninsula of Maryland at a time when the unbroken forest still waved in native majesty over the breadth of the continent ; compelled to struggle in infancy against the arrogant pretensions and oppressions of an established hierarchy ; subsequently a conspicuous victim to the calamities of the war of the revolution, and in later years, harrassed and betrayed by the intrigues of "false brethren, come in at unawares ;"—successfully resisting the interposition of the State clothed in the allurements of endowment and honor ; and from first to last knowing no other resource, but in the free and normal operation of her principles, and the approving presence of her Head ;—her history presents a theme and unfolds results which her children may contemplate with pleasure and thankfulness, and others may study with intense interest and advantage.

ART. II.—CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND AFRICAN COLONIZATION.

Western Africa: its History, Condition, and Prospects. By the Rev. J. LEIGHTON WILSON, eighteen years a Missionary in Africa, and now one of the Secretaries of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. *With numerous Engravings.* New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1856.

If the Chinese had sent out missionaries of their faith into all parts of the Christian world, into Russia, Germany, Great Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, Austria, and also the United States, together with every other part of both North and South America; if all the chief points were occupied by small but active detachments of this pagan irruption, so that they had as it were *invested* Christendom; if they had mastered all its various languages, and were preaching the doctrines of Confucius, both publicly and also from house to house; if they had also translated their sacred books into all these languages, and were printing, and publishing, and circulating them everywhere in Europe and America; if they had established schools in all the chief cities and towns, and were actually getting under their influence the whole education of Christendom; if, everywhere, they were gaining disciples, even a few disciples, but usually the youthful, the intelligent, the energetic, and were associating these individuals into bands, all affiliated together; if all this had been accomplished by them in but a single half century, and if it had been accomplished without any political power backing them up; if it had been accomplished by moral means entirely, and in the face of danger always, and frequently of persecution; if, looking abroad through Christendom, there were to be seen such a thing as we have supposed, would he be considered a fair or wise man who should ridicule the movement as an utter and contemptible failure?

In estimating the results of such a movement on the part of the disciples of Confucius, would it not be necessary to consider the extent and the strength of that social, political, and religious system built up by Christianity in all these countries; how its ramifications penetrate the whole fabric of society amongst them; how it constitutes, indeed, the very life of these different peoples; and how, accordingly, the whole being of every one of them must vibrate if a foreign hand be stretched out to assail any portion of that system?

That the first shock to the religious sensibilities of these Christian nations had not caused the absolute and immediate sweeping away of these assailants; that they had been tolerated

in their assault at all; nay, that their presence had begun to be a familiar thing, and they were fairly at work in pulling down Christianity and building up another religion; would not these circumstances, as we compared the two parties, give some respectability to the assault?

But suppose that it were the whole world, instead of Christendom alone, that the Chinese were thus investing by their moral forces, would not their enterprise then deserve to be considered as truly a sublime one? Would the grandeur of their undertaking be at all diminished by the fact, if it were a fact, that amongst these Chinese propagandists there were differences of opinion on minor points of their common faith, and that accordingly they were divided to some extent among themselves? insomuch that occasional sharp contentions arose amongst them, which, however, did not cause them to abandon their common leader or their common cause.

What we have been supposing true of the Chinese, is the actual picture of Protestant Christian missions. And in all paganism there is nothing like it. "This perpetual spirit of aggression characterizes Christianity in its whole history, and lives even in its most corrupt forms. We do not see anything like it in other religions." The author of the Eclipse of Faith may well construct out of this difference between Christianity and all other religions an argument for its divine character. "Till we see Mollahs from Ispahan, Bramins from Benares, Bonzes from China, preaching their systems of religion in London, Paris, and Berlin, supported year after year by an enormous expenditure on the part of their zealous compatriots; till the sacred books of other religions can boast of at least an hundredth part of the same efforts to translate and diffuse them which have been concentrated on the Bible; till these books have given to an equal number of human communities a written language, the germ of all art, science, and civilization; till it can be shown that another religion to an equal extent has propagated itself without force amongst totally different races, and in the most distant countries, and has survived equal revolutions of thought, and opinion, and manners, and laws, amongst those who have embraced it; until then, it cannot be said that Christianity is simply like any other religion."

The great systems of religious error which divide amongst them the whole world outside of Christendom, are thus making no organized efforts of aggression. They lie slumbering like so many enormous whales, and the keen harpoon of Christian truth shall shortly wake them up to fruitless efforts to prolong their feeble life. Even Islam, once so vigorous, now seems for the most part as *sick* as does its chief political support, the Turkish empire. In the meanwhile, what of infidelity, that mere negation of

Christianity? It stands amidst this scene of life, and hope, and effort, on the one hand, and of sluggish torpor on every other hand, it stands *mocking*, as the son of the Egyptian bondwoman stood mocking on that day when the father of the faithful made a feast for his son of promise. It lifts its skeleton arm that has no blood in it, and points its bony finger in scorn of what God is doing in the world by means of Christianity. From the metropolis of England, through all the literary world, its slanderous reproaches go forth again, and its accusations against men that have gone to live and die preaching to the Gentiles, are repeated to readers, many of whom do not know or have forgotten how triumphantly they were answered once and again years ago. But what is *it* doing, or what has it ever done for humanity? Why do its advocates never go and seek to penetrate with their flickering torches the darkness of paganism? Miserable men! they know their light could never dissipate that darkness; it is for the gospel alone to accomplish this task. School after school of unbelievers rises up and boasts and babbles wherever Christianity has quickened the common intellect, but no one school lives long enough to convert a single nation; and never since the world began did any set of infidels organize themselves and go on laboriously and perseveringly to propagate their opinions among the ignorant and savage heathen. And who would venture to speculate about the probable results of such missionary efforts, supposing them undertaken and persevered in? How long would infidelity take to civilize and enlighten such a group of barbarous islands in the South Seas as Christianity has regenerated in some forty years? Nay, rather let us ask, what kind of a monster would be produced by crossing paganism with infidelity?*

The work, whose title we have placed at the head of this article, is a compilation, of course, in respect to the history of Portuguese discoveries in Western Africa, and of English, French, and Dutch exploits in that country; but it is an original work in

* "They have ever been boastful and loud-tongued, but have done nothing; there are no great social efforts, no organization, no practical projects, whether successful or futile, to which they can point. The old 'book-faiths' which you venture to ridicule, have been *something* at all events; and, in truth, I can find no other 'faith' than what is somehow or other attached to a 'book,' which has been anything influential. The Vedas, the Koran, the Old Testament Scriptures—those of the New—over how many millions have these all reigned! Whether their supremacy be right or wrong, their doctrine true or false, is another question; but your faith, which has been book-faith, and lip-service *par excellence*, has done nothing that I can discover. One after another of your infidel reformers passes away, and leaves no trace behind, except a quantity of crumbling 'book-faith.' You have always been just on the eve of extinguishing supernatural fables, dogmas, and superstitions, and then regenerating the world! Alas! the meanest superstition that crawls, laughs at you; and, false as it may be, is still stronger than you."—*Eclipse of Faith*, pp. 48, 9.

respect to the present condition of its various tribes, and to the operations of Christian missions amongst them. The fanatical excitement of the day respecting negro slavery, we suppose, must create an interest in any work of this kind; but the one before us now has solid claims. There is something here for the naturalist, the geographer, the historian, the ethnologist, the philologist, as well as something for the Christian, who waits for the coming of his Lord's kingdom in the whole earth. The book sets before its readers, the three great divisions of Western Africa: 1. Senegambia, with its two great rivers, the Senegal and the Gambia; 2. Northern Guinea, with its various coasts, the Sierra Leone, the Grain, the Ivory, the Gold, and the Slave Coasts, and its two military despotisms of Ashanti and Dehomi; 3. Southern Guinea, with its Pongo, Loango, Kongo, Angola, Benguela districts. We are introduced to the three great families of Western Africa which correspond to these three geographical divisions, viz.: 1. The three Mohammedan tribes of Senegambia, the Jalofs, the Mandingoes, and the Fulahs; 2. The Nigritian family, getting their name from the river Niger, which runs through the country from whence they are all supposed to have come; and subdivided into six or seven separate tribes, the Kru and the Ashanti tribes being the chief; 3. The Ethiopian or Nilotic family, so called because supposed to have descended from the ancient nations of the Nile, now spread over the whole southern half of the continent, from the Mountains of the Moon to the Cape of Good Hope, and differing as much from the other two great families as they differ from each other. The habits and customs of these various tribes of people; their social relations and conditions; their agriculture and their trade; their superstitions, their witchcraft, their demonolatry, and their capacity of improvement, are among the topics discussed in a simple and unpretending, yet clear and satisfactory manner. We have one chapter on the natural history of Western Africa, and another full of a highly interesting philological comparison between the Mandingo, Grebo, and Mpongwe dialects; the two latter having been reduced to writing first by the author. We have also a chapter on Liberia, one on Sierra Leone, another on the Slave Trade, another on Christian Missions in Western Africa, and a concluding chapter on the necessity under God of the *white man's* agency in the conversion of Africa to Christianity.

We acknowledge a special interest in this book, because its author is a Southern man. John Leighton Wilson (another of the many distinguished Wilsons), is a native of Sumter district, South Carolina, where his kindred still live and flourish. His wife is a highly respectable lady, reared in Savannah, Georgia. They dwelt eighteen years on the African coast, devoting talents, and fortune, and the vigour and prime of their life to the instruction of savage

devil-worshippers in the knowledge of Christ. His health at length failing, he returned, and now occupies the position of Secretary to the Foreign Missionary Board of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. This is a position which gives a still wider scope than his former one, to all the talents of Mr. Wilson. His clear, strong judgment, his comprehensive, vigorous intellect; his learning, his energy, his industry, his perseverance, and his larger experience of men and of the world—of heathen men and the heathen world—may here, even more than there, be constantly in exercise. *There* he was, indeed, the father of a nation, and was forming their social, intellectual, and religious character, after the new and perfect model furnished in the gospel. Here, he is the patron of various nations. He has an important share in directing the operation of Christianity upon the whole heathen world. In the one true aspect of all things, their eternal aspect, his position is greater than any statesman's. It calls for, and he brings to it, a statesman's qualities of mind. We repeat it, here is a Carolinian in New York, of whom we are not ashamed. He sheds glory on his country as well as his name and lineage; yet he has been only a Christian missionary! his book is only an account of a Christian mission to the degraded negroes of Africa! and he is now only directing Christian missions to various heathen or unevangelized nations!

What are the grounds upon which such an undertaking is viewed by any persons with a secret and real contempt? The *spirit* of the missionary and the missionary enterprise is one of self-abnegation—the same which gives to Washington all his glory. That father of his country is not revered by mankind for great talents, nor for great military achievements, but for unselfishness. The *object* of the missionary also is grand—as grand, to say the least of it, as Washington's end and object. But if neither the goodness of spirit nor the goodness of end and object which shall characterize any undertaking entitles it to honour, or shields it from contempt amongst mankind—if *success* be the true ground of honour and the touchstone of greatness, then we affirm that the success also of the missionary—of the company and order of missionaries, is, and promises to be, as full and complete as was that of Washington and his associates. Their undertaking is vaster than Washington's. They have a right to occupy more time than he required.

We think one of the main grounds of that contempt which, either secretly or openly, many indulge towards Christian missions, is, that they are considered a vain and hopeless undertaking. The enterprise, is deemed quixotic—the offspring of crazy benevolence. To effect the real conversion of savages to Christianity, is reckoned an impossibility. Some, indeed, go further, and set

down such a conversion as not only impossible, but undesirable. "There are things in heathen morals and manners which might edify Christian missionaries; as, for instance, the brotherly love and social harmony which exist before missionaries appear;" and as their "amiability and instinctive kindness and joyousness." "There is a genuine religious faith at the root of the practice of cannibalism and of the suttee and other pagan observances." "The well-meaning but bigoted and conceited missionaries destroy these old graces, without introducing any virtues which can be relied on;" and "the poor creatures lose some of the best virtues they have," by means of Christianity, and get nothing good by way of compensation.* But this is an objection to Christian missions we shall not now discuss. Taking it for granted by all our readers, that the introduction of Christianity is beneficial to any people, even for this life, we propose to meet a very general objection to Christian missions which is based upon the *impossibility* of their success.

We suppose all who make this objection would unite in maintaining that what the heathen need first and foremost is civilization: that civilization must, at least, precede Christianity, and open the way for it; and that a true and real reception of Christianity presupposes civilization, and its attendant blessings of education, intelligence, and refinement.

Now, the first question which we would put to any reader who entertains such ideas, is this: Do civilization and its attendant blessings indeed predispose any person or any people to receive Christianity in its real power or in its actual experience? Is not the very genius of Christianity such, according to the Scriptures, as that we are, *a priori*, to expect its rejection by the elevated, and its reception by the depressed? The apostle Paul says, "Not many wise, mighty, or noble, are called, but God chooses the foolish, the weak, the base." The Founder of Christianity himself said of a people that were long under the best preparation to receive Christianity, that "they should be thrust out," and that others not thus prepared beforehand, should "come from the east and west, and north and south, and sit down in the kingdom of God." He told the most enlightened and best instructed portion of the Jews, while he preached Christianity himself on the earth, that harlots and publicans would receive it before them. The Chinese are a far more highly civilized people than the Hotentots or Greenlanders were, but Christianity has been more successful amongst the latter.

But laying out of sight this peculiarity of the gospel, we go a

* Westminster Review, for July.

step further and ask the reader to consider another question, viz. : Does civilization always or necessarily insure the moral improvement and elevation of a people? The Chinese are probably the most civilized of all the pagan nations. Is it certain that, on the whole, their moral state is better, for example, than was that of our own Indians before the white man came? Look at the condition of the Greeks and Romans of Paul's time; they are generally considered to have been a polished, refined, intellectual race. But would not many a simple savage tribe put them to shame, in respect to truth, and purity, and humanity? What, for example, was the condition of their females? What, for another example, the laws concerning their slaves?

But let civilization be for the heathen all that any man may choose to suppose. We ask a third question: What is the prospect of Africa, for example, obtaining this boon? Christian missions are ridiculed as quixotic, or worse; but, in their endeavours to propagate Christianity, its friends and believers are at least consistent. But the admirers of civilization as against or independent of Christianity, what are they doing to send what they admire and advocate to the heathen?

We shall be told in reply that civilization cannot be sent or given. We know it. Like liberty, civilization must be the fruit of a development from within. You cannot send civilization to a people; you may bring them individually to it, as our slaves have been brought to it from Africa. You may break them up into individuals, and then plant them in the midst of it; and, there being no antagonism between them and their civilized masters, but, in fact, a union for mutual benefit—so that it is the interest of each that the other should prosper and increase—you may, in these circumstances, civilize the barbarian, or rather, he may, in these circumstances, be developed gradually into a civilized man, the blessed influences of Christianity also meeting him on every hand. But you cannot plant a civilized people among a barbarous people, each being a *people*, and striving in antagonism with each other, as rival peoples will inevitably strive; you cannot thus bring the two together, but, whether the contest be a bloody one or not, the savage man will feel himself doomed, and will, sooner or later, wither away. Of course, we do not mean to deny, that oftentimes a small and feeble colony of civilized men has been cut off by a superior force of savages, coming down unexpectedly upon them. The case we are supposing is of a colony, fairly established and strong enough, in itself and by its reinforcements, to defend itself and maintain the ground it has begun to occupy. Nor do we forget how the northern tribes, which, in countless thousands invaded the Roman empire when it had begun to decline, prevailed in their rude vigour over its growing weakness. The

empire had reached its culmination, and might have perished without their attack. In fact, they brought to it new elements of life and vigour. Perhaps if we were acquainted perfectly with all that goes to constitute the truth upon this nice question, we might conclude that the Germans were, in some respects, as civilized as the Romans. However this may be, it is certain that the Rome they conquered did yet subdue them. Weak as were its powers of digestion, it nevertheless assimilated them to itself, and so the civilized man still conquered the savage.* Nor yet have we forgotten that other savage invasion, if we may so call it, of civilized Europe—that far more energetic and enthusiastic invasion by the Saracens, in which, as Guizot says, “the spirit of conquest and the spirit of proselytism were united”—that invasion which was “undertaken with moral passions and ideas,” with the “power of the sword and the power of the word” conjoined. But that was a very peculiar case, precisely because the Arabs came “both as conquerors and as missionaries.” And it is to be doubted indeed, whether, after all, they were, at that time, a much less developed race, either morally or mentally, than were the people they invaded.

What we do mean to assert, and we would assert it with all suitable moderation, is, that in respect especially to modern civilization, with all its improved appliances of art, and all its development of social, political, moral, and religious ideas, adding, as they must do, a thousand fold to its strength over any ancient forms of civilization in a struggle with barbarism—that, in respect to civilization thus circumstanced, it would seem to be a law, that its colonies must drive before it any barbarian people with whom they come into an antagonistic position.

There is, therefore, no hope for the heathen of civilization from without. And what hope is there, let us ask, for it from within? Take Africa, and how many hundreds of years has she been the same degraded thing she is now? And in all the probabilities which mere civilization can anticipate, how many hundreds of years more must she not remain the same degraded thing!

Now, Christianity may be given to a heathen people, and she may start them also in the race of civilization. Christianity has been given to every people that have got it. It is always external help—help from heaven. And here is one great difference

* “Singular spectacle! Just now we were in the last age of Roman civilization, and found it in decline, without strength, fertility, or splendour, incapable, as it were, of subsisting; conquered and ruined by barbarians. Now, all of a sudden, it reappears, powerful and fertile. It exercises a prodigious influence over the institutions and manners which associate themselves with it. It gradually impresses on them its character. It dominates over and transforms its conquerors.”—Guizot's *History of Civilization*, vol. i, p. 489.

between our Christian philosophy respecting the state and prospects of the heathen, and the philosophy of those who think civilization must go and prepare the way for Christianity. We hold that no moral development from within man, unassisted from heaven, ever really benefitted man. We hold that there are no upward tendencies in any people of themselves, and most manifestly and especially, that there are no upward tendencies in any modern heathen nation, irrespective of external influences. And we hold that God has extended a helping hand to man in the Gospel of Jesus Christ—a helping hand the most direct, the most positive, the most efficient, the most gracious, that ever was extended from heaven.

Let us go a little further in setting forth our philosophy respecting the heathen. As we hold that the help of God is the one and only hope of heathen man, so too we hold that the measure of its being extended to any people, and of its being made efficient among that people, is the sovereign will and pleasure of the Almighty. That Christianity is to prevail finally in the whole earth, we understand Him to have promised in His word; but we do not read that He designs to save all men now living, or to elevate by means of Christianity and by civilization following it, all the nations at present existing. In the person of His Son Jesus Christ He instituted, while on this earth, an order of men whose calling is to preach His word; and commanded His church to send that word to every nation. But He has not said, so far as we know, that when His servants go and preach, the heathen shall all hear and believe. It may be His sovereign pleasure to effect the national conversion, or it may seem good to Him to call individually out of heathen darkness only some portion of the nation; even as it has always been His method to build up His kingdom in this world, not *by nations* but *by individuals*, calling them as individuals, and as such joining them to that holy nation and that peculiar people over which He is King. In the South Sea Islands, for example, there has been a conversion of the nations. Those governments are Christian; their laws accord with Christianity. But even in those islands it is only *individuals* that can be regarded as true Christians. Now the point we insist on, after having stated our philosophy respecting the heathen, is, that if it be true, indeed, as has lately been alleged, that many of these professed converts to Christianity are still heathen at heart, and in their dark recesses still practice heathen rites, this is no proof of the failure of Christian missions. Why should we expect Christianity among the heathen to accomplish what her Divine Head has not promised to accomplish by her anywhere upon the earth? Are there not in every country, hypocrites doing in secret what openly they repudiate? But we are very willing at any

time to enter into a comparison of the actual success of Christianity amongst the heathen with any efforts of civilization for their benefit. The statement of what the latter has done for any heathen people must indeed be a very short one, as there is no such thing as civilization coming to any people from without, as the actual contact of a civilized people with a savage people has always been to the damage of the latter. We do not recall a case in all history where the colonization of civilized men amongst barbarians ever operated to the benefit of those barbarians. Even colonies of Christian people in distinction from missions of Christian ministers have, so far as we know, never gone to any heathen shore, except as the forerunners of destruction to its inhabitants. We are of opinion that the colony of American blacks at Liberia will be found, in the end, no exception to this general law. Mr. Wilson, in the work under review, warns the Colonization Society that this will be, without great care, the effect of their labours. He makes also some other observations on the scheme of African colonization, which we consider eminently judicious. We regard that scheme as particularly open to objection from the standpoint of our present theme. As being a scheme to propagate Christianity by means of civilization; as being a scheme which puts civilization on a level with Christianity, if not in advance of Christianity, with respect to the improvement of the heathen of Africa, it is just here we find the weakest of all the weak places in that undertaking. We propose to discuss the whole question of African colonization before we close, and we drop the subject for the present.

Returning to the point in hand, viz., the comparative benefits of Christianity and civilization among the heathen, we meet an accusation against the former which has been recently urged with a virulent zeal, but which we have anticipated and disposed of in the preceding paragraph. The charge is, that whereas there were formerly in the Sandwich Islands four hundred thousand people, now that Christianity has entered only sixty-five thousand remain. It is admitted by the accusers, that after the discovery of those islands by Europeans, there was the addition of physical and moral mischiefs, diseases, and intemperance; which, acting upon the established licentiousness, might account for even such a depopulation as is recorded.* But it is urged, that the depopulation has been greater than ever since the introduction of Christianity, although she claims to have put an end to "war, and to infanticide, and to recklessness of life." This depopulation is, in the first place, traced to the fact that all their "customs were

* Westminster Review, for July, 1856.

changed and their pleasures taken away" by the missions. A second way in which, it is said, they have caused this depopulation, is that the naked people have been taught to put on clothes. It seems that this has "rendered them liable to consumption." Another of the depopulating influences of Christianity, is that their heathen and licentious "sports and festivals have been suppressed," which causes them to mope and die. Another way in which the advent of Christianity has been disastrous, is that the missionaries and the nobles live in so much luxury, that the rest of the people are "underfed," and have to "suffer a chronic hunger which their fathers never knew." The fifth and last charge against Christianity, is of a piece with these other four. It is, that the missionaries oppose what is known as the custom of "local husbands," and also preach against fornication, and punish sensuality with church censures; and hence whenever wicked civilized foreigners lead astray native females, the "public shame" which follows is, of course, the fault of the missionary. And so, too, the infanticide resorted to in order to escape from that shame is the fault of the missionary! And therefore because infanticide, of course, helps depopulation, that depopulation which is going on at the Sandwich Islands is to be laid at the door of Christian missions!

To state, is to refute such objections to Christian missions at the bar of all common sense and candour. The depopulation of the Sandwich Islands is indeed a melancholy spectacle. There is in it all, however, nothing different from the universal law of colonization. The missionary has not been alone at the Sandwich Islands. Civilization, too, has gone there—civilization, as represented by a large body of American and of European settlers. And civilization, which could not be given to them from without, could nevertheless blight them, as it always does, and must blight the barbarian that comes into antagonism with the civilized man. And if this be the law of colonization; if it be ordained by the Creator, that, whether with or without bloody warfare, the savage people must fade before the civilized people; while we drop a tear of pity for the "poor Indian" and the poor savage of every name, that submissively bows before his irreversible fate, and retires out of sight, we do not understand how this matter can be fairly brought into the war against Christian missions. If that be God's plan and purpose, we do not know that it is revealed by Him anywhere in the Scriptures. It is revealed by Him in the book of His providence only. But we are not of those who reject either revelation. We humbly receive whatever He reveals in either book. We bow submissively to it all, for we cannot presume to judge Him. If it be His purpose to fill the world with a superior race for the glory of the millenium to dawn upon, we do not see why that should

damp our zeal for saving, as far as possible, the present fading races. His written word commands us to go and preach the gospel to them. All we have to do is humbly to obey, and, filled with awe of His terribleness and with adoring gratitude for His grace, to feel that all our toils and sacrifices are ten thousand times repaid, if we can be the means of saving only some individuals of them ere they pass away.

If the reader would justly apprehend the success of Christian missions, let him consider fairly the present state of the case.

1. Many important points have been already occupied. From these points the light is radiating in all directions. It is getting brighter continually at all these chief points, and at other new points continually fresh lights are being kindled. Is there not, therefore, some reasonable hope of the darkness everywhere receding, at last, before the light?

2. Much preparatory work has been accomplished, which could not, except by miracle, have been done without time and labour. The apostles had miraculously given to them the knowledge of tongues, but the modern missionary must patiently learn them. And so, the Scriptures must be laboriously translated and printed. And so, the slow processes of education must be carried on, for years, in order to have a soil prepared for the good seed. And so, there must be a slow and patient acquiring of the confidence and respect of the heathen. Their prejudices must be *lived down*, by years of kindness, and of probity, and patient endurance of their reproaches. Now these are some of the preparatory works which were indispensable to a *beginning* of the missionary work. And these have all been to some extent accomplished.

3. But there was a preparatory work to be done also in the church at home. She was to be roused. She was also to be trained. A generation must be trained at home who should know how to *give*, and also a generation who should know how to *go*, that the gospel might be preached to the heathen. Something has been done in these preparatory works.

4. Meanwhile, the providence of God has been marvellously coöperating with the church. China and Turkey (and we may add India too), closed to the Christian missionary thirty years ago, are now thrown open to him. In Turkey the fullest toleration of Christianity is the established policy of government. In the meanwhile, commerce and the arts are in an hundred different ways made subservient by God's providence to the work of Christian missions. And yet these encouraging features of the case, we would not have the reader contemplate alone. Other views must be taken along with these, in order to a just conception of the case. "We have laboured, prayed, and hoped," says a missionary in India, "for their conversion, expecting God, in his own time, to

take out of them a people for His name! Some hear us attentively, attend our Sabbath preaching, read the New Testament, and sometimes ask us to pray for them. But, on the other hand, I see the evil influence of Hinduism, Mohammedanism, and Pantheism, on the character of the people in such a way, that I am led to fear the masses are generally sinking under these influences." "Our work is just begun," says another; "while a few names are added to our church yearly, myriads are added to the swarming ranks of heathenism. We could have no hope, but the Lord of Hosts." Here, as with a needle, does this missionary touch the very point of weakness in the whole enterprise, considered in a mere human point of view; which is, that in the very moment that they, by God's blessing, convert one heathen, and he is translated out of the kingdom of darkness into that of light, hundreds are in that very moment born naturally into a state of sin and misery. So that, instead of gaining ground, Christianity is actually losing ground every moment. This is a difficulty in the way of the success of Christian missions which their adversaries seem not to have considered. It is greater than all their enumerated difficulties put together. Yet is even this nothing, before the invincible cause of Christianity; because, as said the missionary, "our hope is in the Lord of Hosts." For Him, "nothing is too hard." He can "convert a nation in a day."

But there remains a second main ground of contempt for Christian missions, upon which we would offer a few observations. This is the opinion, that the enterprise as commonly understood and pursued by its friends, is a melancholy, baseless, and fanatical delusion. Christians, generally, believe that all heathen men and women, dying such, are lost. The great motive power of the whole undertaking is this belief. It must be confessed that, with a lamentable inconsistency on the part of the Christian church, this awful belief, like some other Christian beliefs, operates very feebly. Yet, what else, we would ask, is operating at all for the good of any heathen people? Let civilization or philosophy point to any benevolent or unselfish efforts whatsoever, on the part of either of them, to improve savage men.

But this old and well nigh universal belief of the Christian church is represented in some quarters as belonging only to the dark ages. For this enlightened age, such an idea does not answer. We are too civilized, we are too liberal, and too humane for it. In vain do old-fashioned Christians point to the express language of the Bible. In vain do they produce positive testimony from the Apostle Paul, or argue from various declarations of our Saviour, and from His ascending command to preach to every creature. There is a tribunal of appeal in this age, higher than the Bible—and that is human reason and human sympathy.

The moral intuitions of humanity can better teach us the future of the heathen, than can God himself.

The readers of this journal dwell in all old-fashioned section of the country. We are behind the age, undoubtedly, in many of its improvements. We have not yet given up our Bible, although we confess that we come very far short of obedience to the rules of that book. We still venerate it as a perfect standard of faith and obedience. When modern civilization condemns slavery as a barbarous and wicked institution, we go to *the Word*, and, finding it there sanctioned by the God of Abraham, and by our Lord Jesus Christ, we do not suffer a sickly sentimentalism to explain away the distinct language of that inspired volume. And when the same modern philanthropy, more humane and more merciful than God reveals Himself to be, would explain away what the same Word says, respecting the heathen, we will still hold fast to our Bibles. That Divine book is not good enough for abolitionists, nor for any other sect of the brotherhood of human reason and human charity, but it is good enough for us. We want no better Bible, and no better God.

It is worthy of notice how the denial that the heathen are in any danger of perishing, which has recently appeared in a certain quarter, is accompanied by the denial that Christianity does the heathen any good, or makes them any better. The idea is broadly held forth, that the heathen are better as they are, than Christians themselves. Christian missions "destroy what is good among them, and put only evil in its place." "At the bottom of the suttee and of cannibalism, there is a genuine religious faith;" but at the bottom of Christian missions and of the Christian faith which produces them, there is only folly and fraud. It is not very long since we were informed from the same quarter that the "early books of the Old Testament abound with misapprehensions of the meaning of ancient astronomical and chronological emblems, and with imaginative interpretations and misreadings of hieroglyphical records; that "the Pentateuch is a miscellaneous collection of fragmentary records—a compilation of old documents, interspersed with narrations founded on oral traditions;" that the story of the serpent reads "like one of the numerous myths which arose out of the zodiacal emblems;" that "the story of Joshua is one of the whimsical mistakes in the progress of the change from the pictorial hieroglyphic to the phonetic mode of writing;" and that "in fact, Christ himself denied the infallibility of the Jewish Scriptures, and was nailed to the cross, in great part, on account of this 'infidelity.'"

From the same humane, meek, and liberal quarter, also was promulgated not long since, the following imprecation of "death

without mercy" upon the Christian clergy—well illustrating what Robert Hall called the real *ferocity* of infidelity :

"The crime of depriving a fellow-creature of life, is not the offence of greatest magnitude of which any human being can be guilty. If capital punishment be allowable for that, then would death without mercy—the death of the Mosaic law, death by stoning—be the appropriate penalty, not of Sabbath-breaking, but of trafficking in superstition; trading in man's weakness, and with his loftiest aspirations; converting his instincts of awe and reverence for the wonderful and admirable, into abject terrors; his most sacred emotions of grief, his solemn moments of parting on the confines of eternity, his very hopes of immortality, into implements of a craft, a source of income, a miserable instrument of popularity and power; and, the object attained, endeavouring to perpetuate it by proclaiming the infallibility of creeds and canons, persecuting those who question it as infidels to God, resisting the extension of knowledge among the masses, or rendering it exclusive and nominal, and thus seeking to crush the human mind under the wheels of the modern Juggernaut of conventional idolatry."

We are aware, of course, that doubts of the Christian doctrine respecting the future of the heathen, extend to many persons who have no sympathy with infidelity. Even amongst the supporters of Christian missions, some take the low view lately put forth, to our surprise, in a very respectable quarter in the north of Britain :

"We shudder at the accounts of devil-worshippers which come to us from so many mission-fields. We pity the dreary delusion of the Manichees, who enthroned the evil principle in heaven. But, if we proclaim that God is indeed one, who could decree this more than Moloch sacrifice of the vast majority of his own creatures and children for no fault or sin of theirs, we revive the error of the Manichee; for the God whom we preach as the destroyer of the faultless, can be no God of justice, far less a God of love. It needs no exaggerations, such as these, to supply a sufficient motive for missionary enterprises. Our object is to introduce Christianity with all the blessings that accompany it; its true views of God, its ennobling motives, its pure morality, the elevation of life and manners, the civilisation, the knowledge, even the material progress which are sure to follow in its train. And we may leave it to God himself, to decide how the benefit of Christ will be extended to those whom it has pleased Him to permit to live and die in ignorance of His gospel; confident that the same rule of perfect justice, tempered with boundless mercy, has one uniform application everywhere and to all."*

This theory of the object of Christian missions is not from the

* North British Review, for August, 1856.

Bible. We are gratified to be able to say it is understood to be an expression of individual opinion only, by the conductor of that journal. The religious press, both of England and Scotland, has animadverted upon it severely. The Free Church of Scotland is not responsible, either directly or indirectly, for the sentiments of that journal.

But it is no strange thing that some well-disposed persons should fail to follow out the teachings of the Bible upon this subject. We continually observe the same phenomenon in respect to various other subjects. As respects the principles of the slavery question, for example, it is not infidels alone that entertain opinions not warranted by the Bible. Some good Christians do the same. So, as respects charity, how many pretty things are said in these days, by a very good kind of people too, which find no warrant in the word of God. The spirit of the age, in some of its strongest aspects, is latitudinarian. The liberal minds of this age denounce bigotry and sects. In their zeal for toleration, they are intolerant of those who make any difference between the most opposite ideas. They love error as well as truth, and evil as much as good. Let them but have their ease, and all opinions are alike matters of the most charitable indifference. Thus we see how many sides there are to selfishness. But Christianity and the Christian Scriptures are distinctive; and, without some degree of that which this age calls bigotry, there would never have been and never be again any patriots or any martyrs. And if, indeed, the bloodiest battles ever fought have been about Truth, that only shows what a precious thing truth is.

We venture to assert that many of those good, easy souls, who cannot admit the idea of heathen perdition, have never considered how, in their benevolence and charity, they either make out the gospel a curse to any people, or else totally repudiate the Divine justice. If the heathen shall all be infallibly saved without a union by faith to Jesus Christ, and if those in Christian lands, who believe not in Him, are lost, then it is better to be born in heathenism, which insures eternal life to all, than under the gospel, which certainly involves the doom of some. But if, on the other hand, all those in Christian lands who repent not, and believe not in Christ, as well as those who repent and believe, shall alike be saved, what becomes of the justice and veracity of God? We wish all these "charitable" people would study their Bible better, and, better following out the teachings of the Bible, would cease to occupy, unconsciously, the ground of those who reject the Bible. There is not much to be feared from infidelity, if we can just isolate and identify it. There is a neighbourhood in the upper part of this State, where the attempt was made some years ago to get up a congregation of that strange kind of Christians, who hold

the salvation of all men alike. For a short time, the true scope of their doctrine was concealed, and all went well. But their creed came fully and fairly out at last, and then the common sense of our people, and their knowledge of the Bible, revolted alike at such a monstrous perversion of Christian truth, and they quit all attendance upon such a ministry. The deserted building is now pointed out to the traveller by the name it bears in all that region, as the "No-Hell Church." It was this name which helped to kill it. There were involved in the name, as in the creed, two contradictory and mutually destructive ideas. The name made them patent to every understanding. The idea of "No Hell" rendered nugatory the idea of "Church," and the creed, thus exposed, soon forsook the field.

If the reader suggest that, after all, the idea of heathen damnation is too awful to be entertained, we have only to say, it is indeed an unspeakably awful idea; but so are several other ideas which we admit. The Bible gives us the idea of a world in ruins! Is not that awful? It gives us the idea of that ruin of the world, being moral and eternal! Is not that awful? It gives us the idea of God becoming incarnate, and crucified for the redemption of His own creatures from His own curse! Is not that awful? Now, if we admit these ideas, can we not admit that other idea? But if we prefer to reject the Bible, because of these awful ideas, what shall we do with the constitution and course of nature, that is analogous to the Bible? Are not pain, and woe, and death, and sin, too, all of them *facts* patent before our eyes? Tremendous facts, occurring under the government of a good God, and an Almighty God? If the future destruction of heathen men and women, which is plainly revealed in the Christian Scriptures, lead us to reject those Scriptures, what shall we do when we behold the constantly recurring fact of their present destruction as often as they come into collision with superiour races of men? Or with that other melancholy fact, that, as fast and faster than the existing races and generations are being destroyed, others are being born into their places? If we could have our own way, no doubt we should ordain the immediate banishment of death from the world, as well as of sin, which introduced it; and if these things might not be, then no doubt we should prohibit any further increase of human life under such a curse. But, if the infinite and incomprehensible Governor of the Universe should condescend to speak to us, while thus presuming to criticize His ways that are past finding out, He would, perhaps, do it merely by some such word as that which silenced presumptuous and complaining Job: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?"

Recurring again to the subject of African Colonization, it certainly is a remarkable circumstance that the condition of the free people of colour is better in our slaveholding South than it is at the

free North. *There*, all agree that it is indeed deplorable, and perhaps hopeless. How to dispose of this unfortunate people; how to remove them from the baleful presence, and the withering superiority of white men that regard them as antagonists and rivals, while Southern masters look upon their slaves as valuable assistants, useful dependents, and faithful though humble colleagues and friends; whither to remove them, and what to do for them after they have been removed, these are questions which have long interested benevolent men. The scheme of colonizing them upon the coast of Africa has unquestionably numbered among its earnest advocates some of the best and wisest men of this country, both at the North and at the South. And certainly that is a very interesting question which this scheme will be the occasion of solving, viz: the question, whether the negro now, at this present stage of the civilization which his slavery in America has been the means of forcing him into, is prepared for self-government.

If there were no other reasons for our regarding the subject of African colonization candidly and kindly, these are enough. That this scheme is abolition in disguise (as many of our fathers at the South considered it at first) we do not believe. The abolitionists have been the uncompromising and bitter foes of this Society; and, on the other hand, many of the Southern friends of this Society have been too noble and too good to be chargeable with secret treachery to the South. So, too, the Northern colonizationists are the most sober and sound men in that region. They are perhaps the only men who have not run mad with the fanaticism which has become epidemic there. Not to take some position or other on the negro question is now simply impossible amongst our Northern brethren, and Colonization is the platform of those who do not hate their own flesh and blood, out of this mad negro-philism. From mere regard, then, for the good men, both North and South, who have favoured this scheme, we are bound to treat the question with great respect. And so we are, also, because it is to a certain extent a question, as we think cannot be denied, of sincere benevolence. And so we are, moreover, because it is a highly interesting experiment in political science. We have long regarded the scheme with curious and watchful eyes, because, whichever way it be decided, it must instruct the world upon many points that are now in debate. We have no sympathy with the new theory of a diversity of original races of men. We have no doubt whatever that the negro is of Adam's race. And if he shall succeed in the experiment of self-government at Liberia, it will be a practical demonstration of his complete and perfect humanity. But, on the other hand, we are equally satisfied that he belongs to an inferior variety of the human species; a man of like passions, of like original capacities, with ourselves, but yet wanting in the development which nothing but ages of good training can give to any people of our darkened and degraded race. And, therefore, if the expe-

riment of a negro republic in Africa, under the auspices of the Colonization Society, should prove, after the best and most patient efforts on the part of all concerned, to be a failure, the world must certainly be made wiser as to the nature of civil liberty and the rights of man, and as to the fitness of all men for governing themselves; questions certainly very interesting and important, and very little understood by most persons. We say, therefore, let the colonies of free blacks in Africa have a *fair chance*, although probably we should differ with the more ardent Colonizationists as to what is a *fair chance* for the said colonies. But not to discuss that point yet, let them be fairly and patiently tried, and let them have all the aid it is proper and advisable to give them. Their success will hurt nobody who does not deserve hurting. Their failure to succeed, if it is to come, will come soon enough for their worst enemy.

But, besides the reasons already mentioned for giving to this question a candid consideration, there are some others, which we very cheerfully proceed to mention. The experiment has made some progress, and claims our respect for the measure of success which it has unquestionably secured. It is to be remembered that the original obstacles were very formidable. The first was to obtain a territory on the African coast, where the native tribes were very savage, deeply interested in the slave-trade, and very jealous of all interference with this traffic. Virginia, through the President of the United States, had endeavoured to acquire such a territory, but had not succeeded. Yet a voluntary association, almost without funds, has accomplished this end. The territory owned by these colonies runs (according to Mr. Wilson) from Cape Mount to Cape Palmas, distant from each other about three hundred miles, and the six settlements of American coloured people planted on this coast, number about eight thousand. The aboriginal population of the same bounds, that is, from Cape Mount to Cape Palmas, over a belt of country of twenty-five miles, is supposed to be about two hundred thousand. To a certain limited extent, Liberia has jurisdiction over this whole region. Monrovia, the chief town, will compare not disadvantageously with most of the inland towns of our own country. The dwellings are usually framed buildings of one story or one story and a half high, raised on a stone or brick foundation of six or eight feet. Most of them are painted or whitewashed. There are a few brick dwelling houses of two stories, neat and well furnished. There are three brick or stone churches, and six or seven large, substantial stone ware-houses. The Liberian merchants own a number of small vessels, built by themselves, and varying in size from ten or fifteen to forty or fifty tons. The sailors are Liberians. There are four or five merchants worth from fifteen to twenty thousand dollars, a larger number worth ten thousand dollars, and perhaps twelve or fifteen worth five thousand dollars. Mr. Wilson tells us "trade is

the chief employment of the Liberians, and that the want of a disposition to cultivate the soil is perhaps the most discouraging feature in the prospects of Liberia." They raise sweet potatoes, cassava, plantains, ground-nuts and arrow-root, sugar cane and coffee, but all to a limited extent. Cotton has been attempted, but failed, though it might, in Mr. Wilson's judgment, succeed very well in that climate. Of all these things the consequence is, he says, that "the community are still dependent upon this country and the aborigines for the principal part of their provisions." Yet the settlers show considerable intelligence, manliness, independence, and honourable bearing, and have a feeling of national pride. So that Mr. Wilson, after the most mature consideration, "sees no reason why, in the course of time, Liberia may not take a respectable stand among the civilized nations of the earth, and is free to confess that he now entertains more hopeful views on this subject than he did at an earlier period of his acquaintance with the country."

We have now presented a fair and candid statement of the claims which this question has upon our respectful consideration. But our opinions on the subject, formed after mature reflection, are adverse to the scheme. We desire earnestly that it should have a fair trial, but are without any faith in its success, and we now propose to consider the three main arguments in favour of the scheme, which its friends are urging. We think the grounds on which it is recommended are unreal and imaginary. We are ourselves constitutionally of a hopeful temperament, and have been accustomed all through life to struggle against difficulties. But there are some things which cannot be done; some things which man cannot accomplish, because the means are wanting, or the instruments unsuitable, or the time for its being done not yet come. We are satisfied this is one of those things. If asked what, then, shall be done with the half million of free blacks? our answer is ready. Let those of them who think they would better themselves and their families by going to Liberia, and of whom you believe that they would benefit that colony, be encouraged and aided to go there. As for the others, do the best you can for them and with them, in this country. Society must have dregs. With all the blessings we enjoy, both North and South, we might be content to tolerate some evils. At the South (in this State, certainly,) we do not find them, in the numbers in which they now exist, an intolerable or even an unmixed evil. If elsewhere, if at the North, especially, they are such, still let the North tolerate them, teach them, govern them, restrain them, help them to improve, not sacrifice them and the colonies, and that, too, in the very name of philanthropy.

The first ground on which the Colonization Society urges its claims to favor is the advantages it will confer upon the free blacks, and upon this country, by removing them to Africa. But the

inherent and fatal difficulty of the scheme in this aspect of it is, that it is thus proposing to bring about two mutually incompatible results. It proposes to rid the United States of a corrupt and worthless population, and at the same time, by this very process, and out of these very materials, to construct a virtuous, intelligent, and prosperous community in Africa.

The class of people out of whom it is hoped a vigorous and healthy and pure Republic is to rise in Africa, are characterized by Mr. Clay, in his speech at the annual meeting of the Society in Washington, January 21st, 1851, as "poor creatures," "a debased and degraded set," "more addicted to crime and vice and dissolute manners, than any other portion of the people of the United States." (Annual Report, page 38.) This annual report quotes, also, from a Cincinnati paper, a representation of the free blacks of Pennsylvania, Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio, as being "a pestiferous class of ignorant blacks, whose increase in Ohio would be the increase of crime, misery, and want, to a fearful extent." Page 14. Indeed, these opinions, in all their fulness and strength, are characteristic of Colonizationists at the North, in distinction from abolitionists. Now, to maintain that we can construct a prosperous Republic out of such materials, is to falsify the whole history of freedom.

We here quote a page from one of Mr. Calhoun's speeches, than which there never were spoken truer words on the much misunderstood subject of human liberty:

"Such being the case, it follows that any, the worst form of government, is better than anarchy; and that individual liberty, or freedom, must be subordinate to whatever power may be necessary to protect society against anarchy within or destruction without; for the safety and well-being of society are as paramount to individual liberty as the safety and well-being of the race is to that of individuals; and in the same proportion the power necessary for the safety of society is paramount to individual liberty. On the contrary, government has no right to controul individual liberty beyond what is necessary to the safety and well-being of society. Such is the boundary which separates the power of government and the liberty of the citizen or subject, in the political state, which, as I have shown, is the natural state of man; the only one in which his race can exist, and the one in which he is born, lives, and dies."

"It follows from all this, that the quantum of power on the part of the government, and of liberty on that of individuals, instead of being equal in all cases, must necessarily be very unequal among different people, according to their different conditions. For just in proportion as a people are ignorant, stupid, debased, corrupt, exposed to violence within, and danger from without, the power necessary for government to possess in order to preserve society against anarchy and destruction, becomes greater and greater, and individual liberty less and less, until the lowest condition is reached, when absolute and despotic power becomes necessary on the part

of the government, and individual liberty extinct. So, on the contrary, just as a people rise in the scale of intelligence, virtue and patriotism, and the more perfectly they become acquainted with the nature of government, the ends for which it was ordered, and how it ought to be administered, and the less the tendency to violence and disorder within, and danger from abroad, the power necessary for government becomes less and less, and individual liberty greater and greater. Instead, then, of all men having the same right to liberty and equality, as is claimed by those who hold that they are all born free and equal, liberty is the noble and highest reward bestowed on mental and moral developement, combined with favourable circumstances. Instead, then, of liberty and equality being born with man; instead of all men and all classes and descriptions being equally entitled to them, they are high prizes to be won, and are, in their most perfect state, not only the highest reward that can be bestowed on our race, but the most difficult to be won, and when won, the most difficult to be preserved.

“They have been made vastly more so by the dangerous errors I have attempted to expose, that all men are born free and equal, as if those high qualities belonged to man without effort to acquire them, and to all equally alike, regardless of their intellectual and moral condition. The attempt to carry into practice this, the most dangerous of all political errors, and to bestow on all, without regard to their fitness, either to acquire or maintain liberty, that unbounded, individual liberty supposed to belong to man in the hypothetical and misnamed *state of nature*, has done more to retard the cause of liberty and civilization, and is doing more at present, than all other causes combined. While it is powerful to pull down governments, it is still more powerful to prevent their construction on proper principles. It is the leading cause among those which have placed Europe in its present anarchical condition, and which mainly stands in the way of reconstructing good governments in the place of those which have been overthrown, threatening thereby the quarter of the globe most advanced in progress and civilization with hopeless anarchy, to be followed by military despotism.”

Now, in view of these plain and uncontrovertible statements of fundamental principles on this great subject, can any reasonable man maintain that the free negroes of this country are fit for the degree of individual liberty which is involved in the idea of a Republic? It is very well known that the Colonization Society will send to Africa all the slaves that any Southern master will set free, particularly if he also contribute the means of transporting and supporting them in Africa for a time; and also that they are equally ready to send any poor, miserable, suffering, free negro from any of the Northern cities, who may be willing to try the experiment of bettering his sad condition by removing to the land of his forefathers. And is either the one or the other of these two classes prepared and qualified for republican liberty, which is “the noble and highest reward of mental and moral developement?” The English people transport their debased and corrupt population who addict themselves to vice and crime. But they transport them to a country ruled by military power. And they judge that they do

well if they can even then succeed in governing them. We are, however, to dignify with freedom, in its widest acceptation, "a debased and degraded set of people," "a pestiferous class, whose increase is the increase of crime and misery and want;" and they are to know the value of this liberty, how to use it, how to preserve it, how to transmit it to posterity!! Surely, those who hope that this result can and will follow, must be prepared to maintain not only that France is fit for that freedom she has so long desired in vain, but that all the nations of Europe are prepared for it. Surely, the South American Republics ought, in their view, to be examples of high and peaceful prosperity. If the miserable free negroes, being as they describe them, are at the same time fit to be citizens of a Republic, surely all the Hindoo and other heathen tribes on the face of the globe must be equally prepared for such a rank. We, on the contrary, believe that the nations of the earth, even those who have long been civilized and enlightened, are generally unprepared for freedom such as we have inherited. We believe that thousands and thousands who come amongst us from Europe are unprepared for it. We believe that very many of our own native Americans do not know how to prize or take care of it, and so are unfit for it. We believe the experiment of self-government in this most favoured land is at best a doubtful experiment. In the language of one of the wisest and noblest advocates of the Colonization Society:

"National independence, viewed from the summit on which we stand, may strike the beholder as a thing easily won and kept. The nations have found it much otherwise. Far the larger part of the history of mankind is a record of the subjugation of races and states, successively, by each other. So, too, from the lofty eminence on which we are placed, personal freedom may appear to us the simplest and the surest result of every proper, social organization. The human race has not found it so. It has desired to be free; it has deserved to be free; it has struggled to be free; nay, to be free has been the object of its most fixed desire, of its highest desert, of its fiercest struggles; but yet it has not been free. To preserve a perfect equality of rights, and to preserve those rights perfectly, which are the two conditions of civil liberty; and, at the same time, to recognize and maintain that inequality of condition which is the inevitable result of the progress which liberty itself begets, this is the grand problem which the nations, after so many ages, have not yet solved, and, therefore, are not yet free. To preserve our national independence; to secure our personal liberty; to advance in the career of civilization; this is what we are doing. But we should bear in mind how many have tried, and how few have succeeded in the same career; how long, how peculiar, and how fortunate was our previous training, both personal and national, for these great attempts; and how serious are the dangers which still threaten us."*

* Rev. Robert J. Breckenridge, of Kentucky.

But, furthermore, we are well satisfied that there is not and cannot be any liberty worth the name, except what is of slow growth. Not only must a people be prepared for freedom by a long course of suffering and discipline, so as to learn that self-control which is essential to any real liberty, but the foundation of free institutions have to be laid deep in the remote history of a people, or they cannot sustain the weight of a solid superstructure. They must inherit liberty from sires who struggled for it, and won it by many struggles; won it not at once, but piecemeal. English liberty, which is a large part of our American liberty, gets its value and strength from this more than from any other circumstance, that it is the result of a gradual accretion. The people and their Parliament constantly gained from the Kings when struggling against their encroachments, and what they thus slowly gained, there was time enough for them to learn how to use, and not abuse. And when the sons of those sires have had to contend with their own government, they have followed the example set them by that Parliament, to which, for contending as it did with an encroaching monarch, (and therefore a tyrant,) are due the thanks of their American no less than of their English posterity; that Parliament which said to King Charles I., in their *petition of right*, (drawn by Selden and other profoundly learned men,) "your subjects have *inherited* this freedom." The great bulwark of their rights they find to be this; and they go back to history to show that what they claim is theirs, because it belonged to their fathers. And the further back they can trace their rights, the stronger and the bolder they are in contending for them. These have always been the principles of English revolutions. The patriotic actors in those great events have always professed to contend for nothing but a lawful inheritance; for rights which had long before been connected with the circumstances and relations in which they were providentially placed. And so, too, these were the principles of the Revolution of 1776. The popular idea that that Revolution freed us from British slavery, is to be indignantly repudiated. We were no slaves. Our fathers contended for their lawful franchises, not on abstract principles as the *rights of men*, but on legal principles as the *rights of Englishmen*, and as a patrimony derived from their forefathers.

Just so when the contest is with the foreign invaders of their rights, the panoply in which freemen arm themselves is the conviction that they have these rights. And the older their title, the better do they consider it, and the more they value and contend for it. The more it cost their fathers of struggling, and contest, and sacrifice, the more patiently will they endure in its defence the sacrifice of their substance, the more cheerfully the sacrifice of their lives.

Now, if it were proposed to plant a colony in Africa, selecting

the colonists from the very best of our free coloured population, upon the theory and in the belief that in them has already taken place the requisite mental and moral developement; and if it were also proposed to give this colony, so carefully selected, at least one century to grow; it would, even then, be sufficiently doubtful (if history has taught mankind anything) whether, with all this care and pains, we could manufacture a republic on the African shore. But no such single and simple object, difficult as it would be of attainment, is proposed by the friends of African Colonization. The free negroes are a curse to this country; who must be got rid of. And therefore philanthropy is mightily stirred up by self-interest. Individual contributions, and the appropriations of the separate States, and biggest, and so best of all, those of the General Government, are to be united together; and at the same time, the most stringent legislature *here* against this unhappy class, and the most humane and benevolent treatment of them *there*, are to be called into operation, in the vain and delusive hope that without the needful mental and moral developement, without the needful progress of long ages of struggling and suffering and contest and discipline, a free and enlightened Republic can be constructed in Africa out of a set of wretches (to take the Society's own account of them) whom this continent cannot endure. "*Coelum non animum mutant qui trans mare currunt,*" was once true, but now a voyage across the ocean can make this "pestiferous class," this "degraded set," fit, and fit immediately, to rule the continent of Africa! Under the Society's auspices and by means merely of a voyage of thirty days, the poor, degraded, vicious negro will soon "blossom into something divine and beautiful:

"And in another country, as they say,
Bear a bright golden flower, but not in this soil."

"In some future stage of transatlantic being, they are to exhibit all the qualities of the negro, but improved and glorified:

"Nothing of him that doth fade,
But doth suffer a sea-change
Into something rich and strange!"

We are far from imputing selfishness to all the friends of African colonization; for, as we said above, it has undoubtedly enlisted the support of many of the purest and best men in this country. But there certainly is something absurd in this double aspect under which the scheme is often eloquently advocated. There is some quackery about this *nostrum* which promises by the simple efficacy of transportation from America to Africa, that it will transmit the greatest curse of the former into the greatest blessing of the latter.

We readily admit that a change of circumstances often produces the greatest effects on character. But the Colonization Society

makes quite too much of this consideration. They either exaggerate the bad condition and character of the free negroes here, or else their good condition and character there. The mere passage across the Atlantic; the mere presence or absence of the white man, cannot produce such wondrous effects. The actual truth we suppose to be, that the change is favourable upon all that are not too low and degraded and ignorant, to be elevated and stimulated and improved by such a circumstance. But very many of those sent out are unquestionably incapable of feeling such beneficial effects. And therefore it is not fair to reason at all from their case in favour of the scheme. The whole argument, indeed, ought to run thus: There are a number of free blacks in the United States who are fit to go to the colony. It is a good thing for these persons, and for their families, and for Africa, and for their race everywhere, and for our race, too, that they be removed thither. Therefore let us help them to remove. And as for the miserable balance of them, let us bear the burden which a wise Providence has laid upon us, and redouble our efforts to do them good here, but let us never think of sending them to be a curse yonder! Or else let the argument run thus: It is better for us to remove all these free blacks to Africa. Therefore let us remove them, although it may be that they will degenerate, and even sink back into their original barbarism; for neither can we endure them here, nor they endure us; nor can we do them any good, nor they us; and so we have no use for them and they none for us, and let them begone!

Either of these lines of argument would be consistent and convincing. But the Colonization Society adopts neither. On the contrary, like most voluntary societies, that have to plead for patronage, they aim to enlist, as far as possible, all classes alike in their support. Accordingly, they argue that the free blacks are very bad here, but will be very good there. And their removal will be every way a very good thing. It will be good for the Southern master, by removing that class at the North most zealous in hindering the rendition of fugitive slaves; and good for the abolitionists, by constantly swelling the number of negroes emancipated from slavery. It will be good for the Northern cities, by ridding them of their domestic heathen, and good for the heathen of Africa, by tending to convert them to Christianity. It will work good, as against slavery, by growing cotton with free labour, and yet good, as on behalf of slavery, by sending away a class that we, slaveholders, ought to consider very dangerous. In fine, Liberia will afford us more and more, as she grows, a very good market for our goods, and at the same time, good riddance of our *bads*. And so the scheme is to bless both continents and all races, and is thus the fit harbinger of the reign of Universal Benevolence.

But the friends of this cause point us triumphantly to their colonies, where, they contend, we shall see the transmutation which

they claim as within the potent influence of their scheme. And we do not deny, that in a certain degree they have thus far succeeded. But it does not appear to us that their success is nearly as great as they consider it. No one who reads the statements of the judicious writer whose book is our text, will say that the success of the colony is perfect. We quote a few of these statements :

“Trade is the chosen employment of the great mass of the Liberians.” Page 406.

“The want of a disposition to cultivate the soil is, perhaps, the most discouraging feature in the prospects of Liberia.” Page 407.

“The consequence is, that the community are still dependent upon this country and the industry of the aborigines around them, for the principal part of their provisions.” Page 407.

“While there are individuals among them of intelligence and force of character enough to sustain themselves anywhere, the great mass of them, it cannot be denied, are too weak to withstand the influences of barbarism and superstition with which they must be surrounded in their new homes.” Page 408.

“We regard it as one of the chief failings of the Liberians, and one of the most serious hinderances to their improvement, that they are too willing to be taken care of. They have no self-supporting schools; very little has been done to support the Gospel among themselves; and there is a disposition to look to the missionary societies to do everything of the kind for them; and the sooner they are *taught* to depend upon themselves the better.” Page 410.

“The directors of the Colonization enterprise, we think, have erred in directing their efforts too exclusively to the one object of transporting emigrants to Liberia. Many regard the number actually sent out as the true, if not the only test of the prosperity of the enterprise. But this is a serious mistake, and if adhered to much longer, may prove the ruin of the cause.” Page 410.

“Another great drawback to the prosperity of Liberia, is the undoubted unhealthiness of the climate, which, however, it is thought, is confined to the immediate sea-coast region. The process of acclimation must be passed through, even by coloured persons, and for the first six months it is quite as trying to them as it is to the whites. The only difference between the two is, that one may, after a certain time, become inured to the climate, while the other can scarcely ever become so.” Page 411.

In addition to these statements of our author, we notice the fact of a recent attack by the natives upon one of the settlements, which was the cause of considerable loss of life, and great suffering. Also, that the Liberians are now anticipating great embarrassment for the want of food. The Rev. J. Burns, the superintendent of the Methodist mission in Western Africa, writes from Monrovia, under date of October 15, as follows :

“There is now a strong probability that the ensuing twelve months will be rather a serious time throughout Liberia for breadstuffs. This

has been a very hard year, and produce of all kinds has been high. The misfortune is, that in many places, and for some weeks together, it could not be had for any price. Hundreds among the natives, even, have died of want. There is every reason to fear that the next year will be much worse than this."

Now, all this constitutes a somewhat darker picture of the state of things in Liberia than is usually given by its zealous friends. But were the true condition of the colonies ever so successful, up to this period, this circumstance is no adequate guarantee for its future prosperity. Because, for a few thousand blacks to be settled on the coast, most of them making a tolerable living by petty trading, (their chief support being from this country and from the natives,) is a small affair, compared with what is desired and expected by the Society. They have been almost from the first stronger than the petty kings of the country, and they have, for the most part, enjoyed the favour of some of the great powers of the earth. They have had help and protection from without, and no great dangers from within. Their very weakness taught them moderation and humanity, and preserved them from the machinations of the more ambitious among themselves. Meanwhile, no very difficult questions of external or internal policy have yet had to be settled among them. Above all, the friends of the colonies in the country have, up to a late period, been unwilling to suffer a too rapid increase of their members. The experiment has been, to some extent, cautiously carried on, and therefore it has not utterly failed. But within a few years past the Society has gained more strength at home. Several of the Northern States have made laws of the most stringent character against the settlement in their bounds of free blacks, and in favour, also, of their removal. In Ohio, the Constitutional Convention resolved, by a large majority, to let no negro or mulatto come into the State, to make all contracts with them void, and to fine all persons employing them not less than ten nor more than five hundred dollars. Indeed, nearly every State which has revised its constitution within twenty years, has made it more equal and democratic in respect to whites, and less so in respect to the blacks. Besides all this legislation in favour of their end, the Society reported, in 1851, the bequest to them by John McDonough, of New Orleans, of twenty-five thousand dollars annually, for forty years; also, "the approach of *the good time* when we shall not be compelled to rely solely upon voluntary contributions to carry forward the work of colonization. The Legislature of Virginia has made a noble *beginning* in the work, by passing an act for the removal of free persons of colour to Liberia." P. 9. To carry this act into execution, the Legislature appropriated, for five years, thirty thousand dollars annually, besides taxes to the amount of fifteen thousand dollars annually. The

Society reported, moreover, at the same time, that similar action had nearly been taken in the Ohio Legislature, failing only for the want of time. Similar prospects in Indiana were opening, as also in Iowa, Kentucky, Missouri, Illinois, New Jersey, and New York. But the best part of the anticipated "good time" was referred to in the following words: "We also anticipate the action of the General Government in favor of colonization. From all parts of the country, the desire has been expressed that Congress should foster and encourage the work." P. 19. And then follows an account of the plan that was before Congress that year, 1851, for a line of steamers to run to Liberia, and convey emigrants to the colonies. "The colonization interest, therefore, in all parts of the country, (says the report,) is warmly in favour of the adoption of this scheme. The public press has almost universally come out in its favour, and advocated its adoption with great zeal and strong argument. It can hardly be doubted that the great ends to be accomplished present considerations of sufficient magnitude and importance to induce the government to adopt the measure. The suppression of the African slave-trade; the extension of American commerce; the opening of another market for American productions and manufactures; the elevation of a depressed race; the removal from our midst of an unfortunate class of people; the planting of civilization and Christianity on a foreign shore; and the redemption, from the deepest woes, of a whole continent; all combine and appeal to the honour, the benevolence, the patriotism and the justice of every true American, and urge the adoption of a policy which shall so rapidly advance one of the greatest glories of the age!" Turning to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which recommended this plan to Congress, we find it contemplating the building by our government of "three steamships, of not less than four thousand tons burthen each, at a cost for each one, not to exceed nine hundred thousand dollars! The three vessels were to make altogether twelve voyages every year, and to convey, it was expected, fifteen hundred passengers at each voyage, making altogether eighteen thousand passengers yearly"! (See Report, pp. 24-28.) This report and this plan received the public sanction of Mr. Clay, in his speech quoted from, in the former part of this article. The occasion is described as having been a most "glorious" one. The "audience was immense." Mr. Clay himself presided. Mr. Fillmore, the President of the United States, sat at his right hand. The British Minister and the Russian Minister, with many Senators and Congress-men, were present. Mr. Clay endorsed this plan in the strongest terms; so did many other distinguished men. "Across that bridge of boats, (said one of these, speaking at the meeting,) there will go, with a tramp like an army with banners, a mighty crowd, whose Exodus will be more glorious than the Exodus of Israel."

If this effort, to engage by an unconstitutional act of Congress, the gigantic powers of the United States government in the service of the Colonization Society, failed, it was from no lack of zeal or energy on the part of that Society and its friends. They did what they could to accomplish this object. They regretted their failure to accomplish it. The directors and managers of the Society did not, in the year 1851, shrink from the idea of sending out eighteen thousand emigrants in one year, if so many could be tempted to go by the offer of a passage in a fine steamer, and if they could get the means from State appropriations to support them. No doubt they would still be willing to enlist this government in precisely such a plan. And we say, this disposition on the part of the Society and its friends constitutes a danger in the future, greater than any the colonies have yet passed through. No degree of success which may have attended the enterprise thus far, cautiously and slowly carried forward by the feeble hand of a voluntary association, can constitute any warrant for believing that its future success is at all certain, when its best friends have shown themselves capable of "killing it with kindness." Those pestiferous and degraded wretches whom America, free and enlightened and powerful America, cannot govern, cannot improve, and cannot endure, will ere long (if the Colonizationists can but have their way) be sent in crowds to poor Africa. Of those unhappy people, concerning whom Mr. Clay himself says that "they are more addicted to crime and vice, and dissolute manners, than any other portion of the people of the United States;" and that "the proportion of those who commit crimes and are sent to the penitentiary, of people of color, is infinitely greater than those of any other of the races that compose the aggregate of our population," (see page 38); of this wretched class of men, the capacious stomach of a steamer of four thousand tons is (if the Colonizationists can at any time carry their point) to disgorge itself upon the shores of weak and pitiable Liberia, of not less than fifteen hundred every month! The enrolment of eighty thousand Africans, as citizens of the Republic, was bad enough as an omen for the future prosperity of this unfortunate Republic. But worse would be the monthly prognostic of these mammoth steamships from the West, which a merciful Providence enabled the enemies of Colonization to hinder its friends from sending forth, for the ruin and destruction of these colonies.

We repeat, then, the fatal difficulty of the scheme in this aspect of it is, that it cannot be successful unless it can bring about two results which are absolutely incompatible with each other. It must *remove the free negroes rapidly*, or else it will not even keep pace with their natural increase, which is now about seven thousand annually. But it must at the same time *remove these same free negroes slowly*, or else the colony will be ruined by the too sudden influx of new comers; for the whole number of colonists, after thirty

years operations, is now only about eight thousand, little more than the natural increase every year of the free blacks in America. The wheels of this Society, therefore, must *move fast* and they must *move slow* at one and the same time. Both objects aimed at, they can never accomplish, for they are completely incompatible. A black republic might grow up in Africa, if the best of the race only could be sent there, and sent slowly. But that is only one-half the object aimed at; and, moreover, that would require the refuse part of this population, which is much the larger part, to remain here. Such a pure philanthropy to Africa is, however, not generally claimed by the advocates of Colonization. They are anxious to send a blessing to Africa, but it is with the distinct understanding that we thereby rid ourselves of a curse!

Before quitting this branch of the subject, we make one further remark upon the connection of the white race at the North with this scheme. That connection, on the part of so many of the best men there, is a pregnant fact for us in our controversy as slaveholders. It is a most plain acknowledgement, even though unconsciously, of the righteousness of our position. If the free blacks at the North cannot be improved there, with all the training and kindness our brethren can bestow on them, it is plainly better that the unmanumitted mass, who cannot be removed, should be kept in slavery; for, as slaves in the midst of white men, they can and do improve. The friends of Colonization, therefore, whenever they dilate on the necessity of removing the free blacks, do thereby prove the righteousness of slavery. And never can a Colonizationist with any consistency favour the abolition or the weakening of the institution of slavery. If they find a few hundreds or thousands of free negroes so intolerable a burden, never should they be willing, for a moment, to have us burdened with millions of this population, in a condition of freedom for which they are not prepared. And yet, strangely enough, there are multitudes of good men at the North, friends of Colonization, in distinction from abolition, who do really in their hearts wish and expect and pray for the peaceful overthrow of our domestic institutions. There are many who have never considered our case as though it were their own; have never allowed the light of their own experience and observation to fall upon the case of their Southern brethren as it comes up before their minds, and who, therefore, wonder at the pertinacity with which we cling to that institution which forms the best relation for this population to sustain among us. Colonization, they consider the most glorious of schemes, because it rids them of the free blacks; but the emancipation of the black they consider next in glory to his Colonization, while slavery is evil and only evil. Yet the truth undoubtedly is, that whether Colonization be or be not what they represent it, slavery, in the circumstances, is undoubtedly good, and only good. We mean to say (and if any

reader at the North should cast his eye on this page, we request him to notice carefully what we say,) that Slavery, so far from being, as they often represent it to be, the cause of negro indolence, ignorance, and licentiousness, has proved already, *in part*, the sure remedy of these evils; that while it is an evil to have three and one half millions of semi-barbarians existing anywhere, in the shape of men, yet, as they do exist in the midst of us, it is not *evil*, but *good* that they should stand in a relation to us by which we can govern, restrain, teach and improve them. If you choose, call the negro an evil, but the relation between that negro and his master is good. That relation has already changed the whole barbarian to a semi-barbarian. It is civilizing and christianizing him, that is, it affords *the occasion* of both these operations upon him. And we say, therefore, to the Colonization men at the North, whose ears, we suppose, are still open to the voice of their Southern brethren speaking for reason and for right, that what they would have us destroy is not only *not an evil*, but that it is the *only good there is* in the whole affair of negro existence in America. Without this relation, the case of both races would be indeed deplorable.

The second main ground on which the Colonization Society bases its title to favour has regard to the slave-trade: It sets up a very large claim for its colonies, as having put down and as keeping down this traffic. The naval affairs committee of the House of Representatives, in their report on the plan of steamers to Liberia, speak (page 15,) of its being "regarded, both in Europe and in this country, as a settled truth, that the planting and building up of Christian colonies on the coast of Africa is the only practical remedy for the slave-trade." And Mr. Clay, in his speech at the meeting referred to, said, "We have shown the most effectual and complete method, by which there can be an end put to that abominable traffic, and that is by Colonization." Now, there are two points involved in this claim of the Society; first, whether the traffic has been put down; and secondly, whether the colonies have done this work. We have testimony to produce on both points, but before we proceed to introduce it, we must take occasion very frankly to express our judgement upon the reopening of the slave-trade; a measure recommended in his message to the Legislature by the late highly respected chief magistrate of this Commonwealth, and by them referred to a special committee, with leave to sit during the recess, and to report at the next session. We hesitate not to avow that, in every aspect of the case, we are opposed to the measure. We regret the very agitation of the subject, for while it can do no good, it may do harm. We could not, if we would, reopen the trade. The agitation of the subject will tend to divide South Carolina within herself. It will also tend to divide the South, of late more united than formerly, and the complete union of which, in her own defence, is all important.

But we have overwhelming objections to the measure itself. In the first place, it would change the whole character of the relation as it exists amongst us. *Now*, it is domestic and patriarchal; the slave has all the family pride and sympathies of the master. He is born in the house and bred with the children. The sentiments which spring from this circumstance, in both master and slave, soften all the asperities of the relation. They secure obedience on the part of the slave as a sort of filial respect. They secure kindness and sympathy on the part of the master as a kind of paternal affection. All these humanizing elements would be lost the moment we cease to rear our slaves and rely upon a foreign market. Pitt, in his splendid speech on the abolition of the slave trade, proved, upon data furnished by the West India planters themselves, that the moment an end was put to the slave trade, the natural increase of the negroes would commence, but that otherwise there could be no such increase.* The reason was, that so long as the slave was made cheap by the trade, the master's pecuniary interest was more operative than his sympathies. In Brazil now, (as in Louisiana before her annexation,) it costs less to buy an adult negro from Africa than to rear an infant. We do not want to see the day come amongst us when it will be economy to wear out our negroes and buy new ones, rather than to take care of them and of their increase. But, *in the next place*, the reopening of this traffic would render the institution positively dangerous. Lawless savages, imported from Africa, many of whom have been accustomed to command, to war, and to cruelty, and none of whom have been accustomed to work, would be the surest instruments of insubordination and rebellion that could be devised. We should have to resort to a standing army, as they do in the West Indies, to keep our plantations in order. It suited our fathers to take such savages and tame them, because our fathers were the pioneers of this country, but it would not suit our generation, softened, as we have been, by long years of ease, and safety, and prosperity; or if it would suit any of this generation, it would be only those who have gone, and do go out into the South-western wilderness to subdue its roughness by their hardy vigour. *In the third place*, the whole scheme proceeds on a blunder. Capital and labour, with us, are not distinct. The slave is as really capital as he is a labourer. To reduce his value, therefore, is not simply to cheapen labour, it is also to diminish capital. The country will be no richer by the foreign importation. To show how a great and wise political economist of Virginia, who profoundly studied this question, judged very differently of its pecuniary bearings from those who are now urging the reopening of the slave-trade, we quote the following sentence from Professor Dew's Essay on Slavery:

* See Dew on Slavery, page 371.

“Perhaps one of the greatest blessings (if it could be reconciled to our conscience) which could be conferred on the Southern portion of the Union, would arise from the total abolition of the African slave-trade and the opening of the West India and British American markets to our slaves.”

His idea is for the South to grow rich, not by the importation of new slaves, but by a new and constant market for those she has to spare from time to time, at their full value. But we are free to admit the difficulty of judging what would be the effect of reopening this trade upon the pecuniary prosperity of the South. It might operate differently from what we have supposed, and so also it might operate differently from what its advocates suppose. Perhaps the reopening of this trade, while it might remove our present difficulty, viz: the scarcity of slave labour, faster than their natural increase can do this, would expose us to the very opposite embarrassment, viz: a redundancy of the labouring population, which is an evil Europe has laboured under for centuries. Perhaps, as was urged by Mr. Cochran, of Alabama, in the late Commercial Convention at Savannah, to deprive ourselves of an outlet for that redundancy of our slave labour which must be produced in the old States in a few years, by filling up the new countries of the Southwest with labourers imported now from Africa, might prove to be bad policy. The question, in these pecuniary and political aspects of it, is vast and complicated, and may well baffle human sagacity, and multiply the speculations of political economists. There is one aspect of the question, however, that is perfectly plain; and this forms our fourth and *last ground* of objection to reopening this traffic. It is an immoral traffic. If you reopen the trade, you will not only *buy slaves* in Africa, but you (that is, your agents) will go there and *steal men*; and while the Bible allows the one, it condemns the other. It is nothing to the purpose to say (what is, doubtless, true enough) that it is, after all, for the benefit and advantage of these very men to be stolen. We may not “do evil that good may come.” The South can afford a great pecuniary loss; she can afford a political weakness or deficiency; but she cannot afford to *put the Bible against her*. She cannot afford to sanction an immoral traffic. You might regulate the traffic after it reaches our shores; you might even reform the “*middle passage*”; but you could not regulate the trade, as it would operate in Africa. There, it would be the fruitful cause of wars, and bloodshed and seditions, and man-stealing. Professor Dew observes, that “wars in Africa have been made more mild by the trade, yet they have been made much more frequent. An additional and powerful motive for strife has been furnished. Countries have been overrun, and cities pillaged, mainly with a view of procuring slaves for the slave-dealer.” “Brougham (he says) likens the operation of the slave-trade, in this respect, to the effect which the different

menageries in the world, and the consequent demand for wild beasts, have produced on the inferior animals of Africa. They are now taken alive, instead of being killed, as formerly; but they are certainly more hunted and more harassed than if no foreign demand existed for them."

At the risk of making this digression too long, we would here observe, ere we quit this subject, that, in our view, his Excellency the late Governor's argument was a *non sequitur*, when he said: "If the slave-trade be piracy, then slaves are plunder." It is evident that the Bible distinguishes between slavery as an existing institution and the "stealing of men," which, of course, shows, and on the highest authority, that we are not to confound them. And, moreover, it seems to us plain that, while any criminal act by which a man is reduced to bondage, (for there are ways, undoubtedly, of his being so reduced that are not criminal,) "can never come to be otherwise than criminal, yet the relations to which that act gave rise may themselves be consistent with the will of God, and the foundation of new and important duties. The relations of a man to his natural offspring, though wickedly formed, give rise to duties which would be ill discharged by the destruction of the child." Plunder, the forefathers of our slaves undoubtedly were, if stolen, and not born slaves in Africa; but our slaves themselves, as born in slavery, are not plunder. The true and only title of any man to liberty, as of property, is *inheritance*, or *honest and legal acquisition*, both of which depend upon the discriminations of Providence, and not upon any abstract natural equality. The legal maxim is just and right—*Partus sequitur ventrem*—that is, all men have an equal and perfect right to the *status* in which they are born, with all its established rights and privileges, and also to whatever else they can legally and meritoriously acquire. Some men are rulers, some subjects; some are rich, some poor; some are fathers, some children; some are bond, some free. And if a man is justly and providentially a ruler, he has the rights of a ruler; if a husband, the rights of a husband; if a father, the rights of a father; and if a slave, only the rights of a slave.

We now beg the patient reader to go back with us to the points we left, viz: Has the slave-trade been put down? and, Have the colonies on the coast put it down?

As to the first point, we read of late, almost daily, in the newspapers, of vessels being fitted out at the North to carry on this trade. Here is a paragraph on the subject from a very respectable sheet in New York—the "Journal of Commerce"—of December 11, 1856:

"THE SLAVE TRADE FLOURISHING.—A gentleman who has recently arrived in this city, from the coast of Africa, states that he learned from good authority that there were thirty vessels, principally Portuguese, or

s sailing under that character, lying in the creeks at the mouth of the Congo river, waiting for cargoes of slaves, and on the look-out for opportunities to get to sea unperceived by the cruisers. Sheltered by the thick growth of forest which abounds there, these slavers are safe from observation. Persons are stationed near the mouth of the river to give warning of the vicinity of national vessels, and when the coast is clear, the traders select a dark night and a fair wind, and effect their escape in safety. The English government have a steamer on the coast, but it is too slow to be of much service. With a propitious breeze, the smart clipper-built slavers find little difficulty in evading the pursuit of their clumsy antagonist. Not long ago, a brig (supposed to be an American craft) was making her way out of the mouth of the Congo river, with four hundred negroes on board, when she was espied by the steamer, which promptly gave chase. The brig slipped away from her pursuer with the greatest ease; the steamer fired several shots at her, but without success. When the brig had got out of the reach of the steamer's guns, the captain, by way of tantalizing the cruiser, ordered a negro to be pulled up to the yard-arm, where he was allowed to hang for some time, as an insulting token of the acknowledged character of the vessel. The captain also signified his exultation by standing at the stern and fiddling as his brig scudded away. It is said that the trade in the vicinity of the Congo might be stopped, or at least materially diminished, by a small well-armed steamer, capable of sailing fourteen miles an hour, which should cruise at intervals for a short distance up and down the river."

In the late Commercial Convention at Savannah, Mr. Gaulden, (Goulding?) of Georgia, is reported to have stated that England had withdrawn her squadron from the coast. This we suppose is not strictly correct. She has not maintained it in the state of efficiency which it had attained before the beginning of the Russian war, but she will doubtless now reinforce it. Mr. Wilson's opinion is, that "occasional cargoes of slaves are still carried off from that coast, especially since the partial withdrawal of the squadron on account of the Eastern war, but the system by which it was carried on so extensively in former times is broken up." He says: "From Senegal to Cape Lopez, a distance of something like two thousand five hundred miles, there is now, with the exception of three factories, on what is called the Slave Coast, no trade in slaves whatever. In fact, the trade, with these exceptions, is now confined to what is called the Congo country, in which there are not more than eight or ten points where slaves are collected, and from whence they are shipped. If we add to these the three above mentioned, we have, on the whole, not more than twelve or fourteen, whereas there were, even within the knowledge of the writer, nearly four times this number." P. 435. Yet Mr. Wilson admits that it may be objected, "although the trade has been shut up to fewer points, the only consequence is, that it is carried on more vigorously at these, and that the number still exported is as great as it ever was." And in replying to this objection, we find him employing

no stronger language than this, that in reference to the force of it, he has "more than his doubts." And he proceeds to argue that nothing can be known, positively, on the subject. "The time has been when tolerably accurate statistics might be collected on this subject, but we do not see how this can be done at present. There is no one on the coast of Africa who can furnish anything like accurate information; and as most of the slaves which reach Brazil are smuggled into places where there is the least likelihood of their being detected, we doubt whether there is any one there that can furnish information upon which more reliance can be placed." P. 437. And he adds: "Our own impression is, that the number of slaves exported has vastly diminished." This is all which Mr. Wilson (as good authority as is to be found) can give us on this subject; he gives us his impressions, but he asserts nothing.

We have produced testimony enough, we think, to show that it is not so certain as the Colonization Society and its friends represent, that the slave trade has been put down.

But, admitting, as we must do, that the slave-trade has been driven away from many parts of the coast, is it true, as the Society maintains, that their colonies have been the authors of this? Mr. Wilson says: "It is unquestionably true that important aid has been derived from these settlements in breaking up the slave-factories in their immediate vicinity, but it is equally true that they could have rendered no such aid had it not been for the countenance and support which they received from the English and other men-of-war on the coast. And for the simple reason, that none of these settlements, nor all of them together, have sufficient naval force to contend with a single armed slaver. If they have it in their power to destroy any barracoons that may be established in their immediate neighbourhood, by marching a land force against them, their enemies, if not intimidated by the presence of so many men-of-war, could at any time take ample revenge by destroying what little commerce they have, if they did not put in imminent peril the most promising settlements on the coast." Page 437. He says, also, that these settlements "have always had and still need the protection of foreign governments. There are few, if any of them, that could withstand the combination of hostile natives that would be formed against them, especially when they were instigated and supported by Spanish and Portuguese slave-traders." "Those who have allowed themselves to be persuaded that they have already acquired sufficient strength to protect themselves, or who depend on them to do anything effective in putting down the slave-trade without the coöperation of the squadron, will find out, ere long, that they have leaned upon a broken reed." Page 444.

We think Mr. Wilson's sober statements make it plain that there has been very great exaggeration employed by Colonization orators, in setting forth the influence and power, as against the

slave-trade, of a few thousand coloured people that occupy some little spots on that extensive coast.

But let us pass on to the third main ground on which the society sets its claim to favour and support, which is, that it is really a Christian Missionary scheme. With the good Christian people of our country this is really, after all, the great argument for African Colonization, and, we think that of late, it is the one most earnestly presented by its advocates generally. It is indeed strange, when men of all sorts—orators of all kinds of personal character and religious ideas—are found uniting in such an ardent advocacy of the missionary cause. One would think that the world had fallen in love with Christianity, and that missions to the heathen are not generally viewed with a secret and real contempt, obliging us to make an apologetic defence of that cause in the first part of this article. We have quoted a few specimens of the manner in which this religious aspect of the case has been presented; not designing to insinuate, however, that in these particular cases there is any inconsistency in such a testimony from such parties.

The Hon. Elisha Whittlesey says:

“Every intelligent emigrant from this country is a missionary to and an instructor of his brethren. Africa will be Christianized when parts of Asia will be in heathen darkness.”

The Maryland Colonization Journal says:

“Every argument which can be adduced to prove that it is both lawful and expedient to send men out to labour for the evangelization of the world, in any of the departments of the Christian Church, may be used in its measure to prove that the cause of African Colonization possesses claims to a position side by side with them. Is the Bible so good, so heavenly in its mission, that the best divines of our day, and of other years, hesitate not to become its advocates and agents? Colonization is the best colporteur that cause ever had. Is the great missionary enterprise held in such estimation in the eye of the Church, that men of the first talents and most gigantic intellect are willing to deny themselves the endearments of home, and go in person to lands of barbarism and most repulsive degradation and vice, to ‘preach the truth as it is in Jesus?’ Were such men as Heber and Judson, Phillips and Williams, with a noble army from other lands and this, willing to go? Colonization is a missionary society *by wholesale*, and eternity only will develop how much it has had to do with the heralds of salvation in the redemption of Africa.”

Matthew St. Clair Clarke, Esq., of Washington, says:

“It is the only means which, under the blessing of God, can bring light out of gloom, order out of disorder, mind out of instinct, civilization out of barbarism, and heaven-born truth out of pagan superstition and cruelty.”

The Rev. James A. Lyon, Pastor of the Westminster (Presbyterian) Church, St. Louis, says :

“Here, then, is the ‘salt’ that is to redeem Africa from her impurities and corruptions—here is the ‘leaven’ that is to convert the multitudinous nations of that continent into a homogeneous brotherhood; and here is the ‘light’ that is to penetrate all the dark places of that benighted land, and dissipate ignorance, superstition, and degrading error.”

The Naval Committee of the House of Representatives say :

“These colonies will be the means, at no distant period, of disseminating civilization and Christianity throughout the whole of that continent. As a missionary enterprise, therefore, the colonization of Africa by the descendants of Africans on this continent deserves, and no doubt will receive, the countenance and support of the whole Christian world.” Report, p. 14.

And Mr. Clay, in a speech before the Society, January 18, 1848, said :

“What Christian is there who does not feel a deep interest in sending forth missionaries to convert the dark heathen, and bring them within the pale of Christianity? But what missionaries can be so potent as those it is our purpose to transport to the shores of Africa? Africans themselves by birth, or sharing at least African blood, will not all their feelings, all their best affections, induce them to seek the good of their countrymen? At this moment there are four or five thousand colonists who have been sent to Africa under the care of this Society; and I will venture to say that they will accomplish, as missionaries of the Christian religion, more to disseminate its blessings than *all the rest of the missionaries throughout the world.*” Report, p. 61.

Now, with all respect for those who entertain this idea of the necessary operation of the colonies, we must say that we have no belief at all in the evangelization of Africa by any such means. And after much reading and reflection upon the subject of colonization, and long observation, too, of the operation of Christian Missions, we say deliberately that we regard this aspect of the scheme of Colonization as its weakest and most unreal aspect.

We suppose that one especial occasion of this opinion is the belief which has arisen, that white men cannot live in Africa; and that, consequently, if Africa is to be evangelized at all, it must be by negroes. And at the same time, benevolent hearts, looking to find some explanation of the permission given in God’s providence for the introduction, by so much violence and so much suffering, of slaves and slavery on this continent, have eagerly seized upon this opinion as the explanation of this mystery. Now, we are not of those who see mystery in any of the movements of Providence, once it is admitted that sin is in this world by God’s permission.

That is *the mystery*. After that, nothing which men suffer here is mysterious. But if a solution of slavery in this aspect of it must be had, it is surely enough of explanation when we see thousands of these African slaves admitted into the Christian Church all through the South. It is not necessary to the vindication of God's ways to man, supposing man could without presumption undertake such a vindication, that we should say the evangelization of Africa is to grow out of slavery. If there grow out of it the civilizing and Christianizing our slaves, that is vindication enough. But is it not presumption for us to say that Africa cannot be evangelized except by blacks? Is the Divine Author of Christian Missions limited in power, so that he cannot take care of white men who go to carry thither His Word? Or supposing that Africa is to be the grave-yard of the European, American, or Asiatic races, as often as they may in humble faith undertake to avangelize Africa; supposing this is appointed to be so, we ask is the difficulty of sickly or deadly climates the only difficulty in that work of converting the world which has been undertaken by our Omnipotent Captain?

In point of fact, we do not believe the allegation that the white man cannot live in Africa. Mr. Wilson, who lived there himself eighteen years, expresses the opinion that the danger has been greatly magnified, is common to negro and to white men, is peculiar to certain localities, and is greatly attributable to that want of experience which always endangers the stranger in a strange land. He says :

"Commander Chamberlain of Her Britannic Majesty's brig *Britomart*, informed the writer that he had been cruising on the coast nearly two years, without having lost a man, or having had, so far as he knew, a single case of African fever on board his vessel; the United States sloop of war *Yorktown*, with a crew of nearly two hundred men, cruised on the coast two years without having lost a single man; and the writer was informed by Capt. Bell, that he had never had a healthier crew in any part of the world." Page 449.

He tells us "there are not less than three thousand whites now living on that coast and on the Islands adjacent; and that if you add to this the floating population engaged in commerce and the suppression of the slave-trade, the whole white population cannot be less than six or eight thousand." "And we may add to all this, that there is a considerable number of individuals of affluence, who reside in that country as a matter of preference." Page 522.

"On this subject, I have no convictions I would wish to conceal. The insalubrity of the climate has been, and I presume ever will be, to a greater or less extent, a serious hinderance to the progress of the Gospel in Western Africa; and this difficulty exists, be it known, irrespective of the kind of agency that may be employed in carrying it on. For the *coloured man* from these United States is as sure to feel the effects of the climate as *the white man*; and if the physical constitution of the former possesses some

advantage in adapting itself more readily to the climate, I am not sure but the other will have equally as much advantage in his superior discretion and the precautionary measures which he will practice to preserve his health. The difficulty in either case, however, has been unduly magnified." Page 511.

"The Christian public in this country has had no means of forming a judgment on the subject, except by the number of deaths that have occurred among their missionaries; and these have been paraded before the public mind by the opposers of African Missions with such studied care, that no one case has failed to produce its full effect."

"Now, while no one can be more sensible than ourselves of the extent and severity of these losses, we feel that it has been specially unfortunate for the cause of truth and humanity, that the attendant circumstances and collateral causes of most of these calamities have not been made equally prominent at the same time."

"And *first*, there are certain points along the coast of Africa, as in all other countries, that, by local causes, have been rendered more unhealthy than the country generally. Of these, none are supposed to be more so than Sierra Leone and Cape Messurado. I do not remember ever to have heard a dissent from this opinion by a single individual whose judgment was entitled to respect; and yet it is from statistics of sickness and mortality that have occurred at these two places, chiefly, that the public, both in England and America, have derived their impressions of the unhealthiness of the country at large."

"But there are other and still weightier considerations."

"I allude to the peculiar difficulties and trials in which most of the missions to Africa have had their origin."

"It will be borne in mind, that all of them, except those of Sierra Leone and Gambia, have been founded within the last twenty-five years. The places selected for most of these were not only new and unbroken ground, so far as all missionary influence was concerned, but many of them were located in the bosom of heathen tribes, who had scarcely any intercourse with the civilized world. Most of the missionaries were pioneers in a difficult undertaking. They were unfurnished with missionary experience, and in many instances, they were without the aid of Christian counsel. They found themselves, at the commencement of their labours, among a people who could not comprehend the object of their mission, and who regarded all their professions of friendship and disinterestedness with distrust. They were ignorant of the native character, and it required much labour to master their barbarous languages, through which alone they could arrive at correct knowledge of their character, or hope to influence their minds. In many instances, they were without medical aid, and in others, when physicians were at hand, those physicians themselves were inexperienced in the treatment of African diseases; and in every instance, the missionaries were pressed down by the cares, anxieties, and responsibilities incident to all new missions. So that, when all these things are taken into the account, we almost wonder that the mortality has not been greater; we almost marvel that any have escaped."

"But this perilous crisis, we believe, has been passed. The most formidable obstacles have been removed, and the missionary work, it is believed,

will henceforth move forward more easily and with less sacrifice of life. Missionaries in that country, notwithstanding their losses, their reverses, their afflictions and bereavements, have been sustained in their work, and obtained a firm footing on many points along that coast. A large amount of missionary experience has been acquired; the roughness of native character has been smoothed down; the habits, customs, and feelings of the natives are better understood by the missionaries; and the objects of the missionaries are better understood by the natives. Many of the most difficult dialects of the country have been reduced to writing, and now serve, not only as easy and direct channels of conveying religious truth to the minds of the people, but will serve as a clue to the acquisition of all other languages in the country. Missionaries going to that country hereafter, will find missionary brethren on the ground to welcome them and give them all needed counsel and aid. In this way they will escape much of the wasting care and anxieties that were unavoidable at the commencement of this undertaking. They may now go to Africa with the reasonable prospect of *living*; and if they cannot calculate upon enjoying the same amount of vigorous and elastic health that they would in their native country, they may at least expect to have strength enough to proclaim the unsearchable riches of the Gospel to thousands of their fellow-men who are perishing for the want of it. There is a reasonable prospect that white missionaries, provided they are endowed with the faith, the courage and the perseverance befitting their high calling, may live in that country to establish Christian churches there, which will be able, in due time, not only to sustain themselves, but to communicate their blessings to the remotest region of that benighted continent. This is all we can promise. This is the view of the subject upon which we base our arguments. We believe no obstacles lie in the way of this undertaking as thus stated, except such as have been permitted by God, to try the faith and courage of his people. The bare existence of trials and difficulties, provided they are not insuperable, is never a sufficient cause for abandoning any great and good undertaking. No great result, fraught with blessings to mankind, has ever been achieved in this apostate world of ours, except by a triumph of patient perseverance over difficulties and discouragements. Human probabilities have always been arrayed against the promises of the Bible; and if missionaries were to look at the former, without regard to the latter, every field of missionary labour would have been abandoned long ere this."—Pages 512-15.

There is another prevalent idea, having reference to *the Natives of Africa*, which has contributed to create the opinion we are considering, viz: the idea that the aborigines of Africa are so turbulent and savage in their habits that no missionary could live among them, except so far as he might enjoy the countenance and protection of some civilized power which the natives would hold in fear. On this subject, we quote from Mr. Wilson, not only to show how little weight is due to such an objection to white missions in Africa, (an objection by the way, which would apply equally to black ones) but also to exhibit to our readers, the nobleness of character, and of feelings, and of behaviour, which go to make up the true Missionary of the cross.

"It (this current idea) has its origin in such low views of the nature and power of the Gospel; it so dishonours the promise of the Saviour to be with his disciples to the end of the world, and is so completely refuted by the history of missions in almost every portion of the habitable world, that it might safely be thrust aside as an argument unworthy of serious consideration."

"It is, in reality, but the revival of that oft-refuted idea, that civilization must precede Christianity in reclaiming the heathen tribes of the earth; and the argument is specially unfortunate when applied to Africa, inasmuch as her history furnishes many of the most striking illustrations of the utter impotency of all secular power to benefit a heathen people. And while there is no set of men in the world whose situation and circumstances naturally lead them to set a higher value upon the blessings of enlightened governments than the missionaries of the cross, in the majority of cases, nevertheless, they find themselves in circumstances where duty to the heathen compels them to protest against the measures and designs of these very governments."

"But, apart from all speculation, what is there, it may be asked, in the history of missions in Western Africa, to warrant the opinion under consideration."

"No one who has given attention to the subject, can be ignorant of the fact that, of the numerous missionary stations established in that country during the last fifteen years, the majority of them are located, not only beyond the jurisdiction of all civil governments, but many of them in situations where no civilized government on earth could render them aid, however urgent might be their distress."

"And yet we ask, what one of those stations has been cut off by native violence? What spot of African soil has been stained with the blood of these missionaries? Is there an individual in whose mind are not called up associations of unparalleled cruelty in connection with the names of Ashanti, Dehomi, Badagry, and Kalibar? And yet in these dark abodes of cruelty, Christian missions have been planted; the Gospel is stately preached; missionaries live in peace and security, and pursue their work with a confident assurance that, ere long even these dark habitations will be filled with the light and blessings of the Gospel."

"As there seems to be a general misapprehension in relation to native character, as found in Africa, I may be excused for introducing personal experience in illustration of the subject."

"During my residence in that country, I have traveled many thousands of miles among these people, sometimes on water and sometimes by land, among tribes to whom I was known, and among those who had never seen a white man. I have gone among them in times of peace and in times of war. I have visited them at their homes, and I have met them on their way to shed the blood of their fellow-men. And yet, in all these journeyings among remote, and to me, unknown tribes, I never thought it necessary to furnish myself with a single implement of defence, nor was I ever placed in circumstances where there would have been any just cause for using such a weapon, even if I had been supplied."

"Among those of the natives to whom I was known as a Minister of the living God, I have generally traveled alone; and on many occasions when

called upon to visit the sick, or to perform some other errand of mercy, I have passed through the largest villages alone and in the middle of the night, with a feeling of as much security as I could possibly have felt in traversing the streets of any city in these United States, under similar circumstances. And so far from finding it impossible to live among them, I may further add, that during the whole term of my residence in that country, I scarcely remember to have heard a single syllable from the lips of one of these people which could, in any just sense, be construed as an intentional insult to myself."

"It is far from my intention to leave the impression, that the natives of Africa are perfectly inoffensive in their habits. They are *heathen* in the full sense of that word, and no missionary can live among them without finding ample cause of perplexity and annoyance. But when it is affirmed that the missionary cannot live among them on account of their turbulence and lawlessness, the assertion is without foundation." Pages 509-11.

It is not true, then, either that the climate or the natives of Africa are such as to make it indispensable that her heathen tribes be furnished with the gospel only by black men. And as to their being no hope of their evangelization except from the colonies of Liberia, we say, the pretence is perfectly contrary to all history, and to the Bible.

It has, indeed, been asserted by an authority which we esteem very high, that "Europe became what she is by colonization, and by this, America was christianized," and that "colonization has been, in past ages, the great and glorious plan of missions." But we think a great, and wise, and good man never made a greater error. We assert, unhesitatingly, on the contrary, that from the beginning, Christianity has been propagated by Missionaries in distinction from Colonists. We have tried, in vain, to recall a single instance recorded in Ecclesiastical history, ancient or modern, in which colonization has established the gospel among a heathen people. America was, indeed, christianized by colonies, but the aboriginal inhabitants of America were not so christianized. The colonists took the soil of America and christianized it, in the sense of growing up upon it into a great and mighty Christian nation, but they exterminated the Indians that dwelt upon it formerly. And as to Europe, it was Missionaries that converted her as well as Asia, and it is Missionaries that are, by God's blessing, to convert Africa.

Any respectable work on Ecclesiastical History will verify our assertions. The Book of the Acts tells us that the Apostles carried the gospel in that early day to nations near and remote. "Eusebius tells us that in the second century Pantænus carried it *to the Indians*, by which may be meant either the Persians, Parthians, Medes, Arabians, Ethiopians, or Lybians. Jerome thought it was those we now call East Indians, for he represents him as sent to instruct the Brahmins." In the second century, we first find une-

quivocal proofs of the existence of churches in Transalpine Gaul, now called France. But who planted them? History tells us it was Pothinus, "a man of distinguished piety and devotedness to Christ, in company with Irenaeus and other holy men, who proceeded from Asia to Gaul, and there instructed the people with such success that he gathered churches of Christians at Lyons and Vienne, of which Pothinus himself was the first Bishop." Eminent French writers have, indeed, disputed about the precise origin of their churches, but none of them pretend to say that colonies brought the gospel to Gaul—it was *these* Missionaries, or it was *those* missionaries.

In the third century, "the Goths, a ferocious and warlike people that inhabited Mœsia and Thrace, and made perpetual incursions into the neighbouring provinces, received a knowledge of Christ from certain Priests whom they carried captive from Asia. Philostorgius says it was the influence of the Christian captives which induced the Goths to invite Christian teachers among them." But whether the one account or the other be correct, it was still, in either case, individual teaching and testifying which converted those Goths.

In the fourth century, "Gregory first persuaded private individuals in Armenia, afterwards the King Tiridates, and finally the Nobles to embrace Christianity, and for thus driving away the mists of superstition from their minds, this missionary was called 'the Illuminator.' It was he who gradually spread Christianity throughout that country." "In the middle of this century, Frumentius proceeded from Egypt into Abyssinia, and baptized the king and many of the nobles." "To the Georgians, a Christian woman, who had been carried captive thither, was the first missionary. She persuaded them to send for other teachers to Constantinople."

Hitherto, we read of no conversions to Christianity, except through the teachings of missionaries. But we are descending far from the pure fountain head, and the stream begins to be muddy. We have just been reading of a part of the Goths converted by their captives. Now we hear of Constantine the Great "vanquishing them and the Sarmatians, and engaging great numbers of them to become Christians." Whether he "engaged" them to this change by the mere effect of the vanquishing, or whether he brought them over by teaching, we are not told; but it is plain that colonization was not the means of their conversion. "But still, a large part of the nation remained (says Mosheim,) estranged from Christ until the time of the Emperor Valens, who permitted them to pass the Danube and inhabit Dacia, &c. on condition that they would be subject to the Roman laws and embrace Christianity, to which condition their king Fritigern consented." They were *bought* to be Christians by the Emperor Valens, and they were probably just

about such Christians as Constantine "engaged" the others to be, when he vanquished them. Mosheim remarks, that in this century whole nations as well as individuals found cogent reasons for embracing Christianity in the fear of the Roman arms, and the desire of pleasing the Emperor. "Yet (says he) no person well informed in the history of this period, will ascribe the extension of Christianity wholly to these causes. For it is manifest that the untiring zeal of the bishops and other holy men, the pure and devout lives which many of the Christians exhibited, the translations of the sacred volume, and the excellence of the Christian religion, were as efficient motives with many persons, as the arguments from worldly advantage and disadvantage were with others." Nothing is said of colonies in this century as the means of spreading Christianity. But special mention is made of "the great Martin, Bishop of Tours, who travelled through the provinces of Gaul; persuaded many to renounce their idols and embrace Christianity; destroyed their temples and threw down their statues; and who therefore, deserved the title of the *Apostle of the Gauls*." He was evidently a great *missionary*.

In the fifth century we find a still muddier stream. "The German nations who rent in pieces the Western Roman Empire were either Christians before that event or they embraced Christianity after establishing their kingdoms, in order to reign more securely among the Christians. But at what time, and by whose instrumentality the Vandals, the Suevi, the Alans, and some others, became Christians, is still uncertain, and is likely to remain so. As to the Burgundians who dwelt along the Rhine, and thence passed into Gaul, it appears from Socrates that they voluntarily became Christians, near the commencement of the century. Their motive to this step was the hope that Christ, or the God of the Romans, who they were informed was immensely powerful, would protect them from the incursions and ravages of the Huns. They afterwards joined the Arian party, to which also the Vandals, Suevi, and Goths, were addicted."

In this century Clovis or Lewis, king of the Franks, "when in a desperate situation in battle with the Allemanni implored the aid of Christ, and vowed to worship him as God, if he gained the victory. He did conquer, and stood to his promises, and was baptized at Rheims; some thousands of Franks followed his example." But in his case, we read of something better than existed in the case of the Germans. He had "a wife, Clotildis, a Christian, and she had long recommended Christ to him in vain." She was the Missionary, and planted the seed in his mind which at last germinated.

In this century also, we read of Succathus, a Scotchman, whose name was changed to Patricius (Patrick) who converted many of the Irish to Christianity. He was "the Apostle of Ireland," that is, its missionary.

Mosheim very properly comments upon the mixture of motives which operated with many in this century, to abandon their false gods and profess Christianity. There is not a word however, about colonization as the means of any of them being, either "soundly" or "unsoundly" converted.

In the sixth century we are told that "Gregory the Great, sent forty Benedictine Monks into Britain, with Augustine at their head, to complete the work which Bertha, wife of Ethelbert, King of Kent, had begun to accomplish, partly by her own influence and partly by that of the ministers of religion whom she had brought with her from Paris." By this double missionary effort, the King and the people of Kent were converted.

The seventh century witnessed various missionary labours among the Gauls, the Franks, and other nations of the West, and also the splendid success of the Nestorians of the East, who, "with incredible industry and perseverance, laboured to propagate the Gospel from Syria and India, among the barbarous and savage nations inhabiting the deserts and the remotest shores of Asia. And that their zeal was not inefficient, appears from numerous proofs still existing. In particular, the vast empire of China was, by their zeal and industry, enlightened with the light of Christianity."

In the eighth century we still read of Christianity being disseminated in the remote East by the Nestorians. In Europe, Boniface was famous as a missionary, and was called "The Apostle of Germany." So was Corbinian, and so too, was Pirmin, a French Monk, and so was Lebwin, an English one. They were, doubtless, not missionaries of an uncorrupted Christianity, yet they were spreading their doctrines by individual persuasions and arguments and influence. Charlemagne in this century, sought to convert the Saxons by force of arms, joined to rewards, and at length succeeded.

We should wear out the patience of our readers were we to pursue this investigation all down through the dark ages. The result however, would be still the same; constant endeavours amidst all the superstition of the times to propagate opinions, and always by the missionary in distinction from the colonist! Even where the power of Kings and armies is employed, still it is in connection with teachers *individually engaged in propagating opinions*, and never by colonies sent out for that purpose. Coming down to the sixteenth century, when the Reformation took place, we read, that "the Roman Pontiffs, after losing a great part of Europe, were roused to new zeal to propagate Christianity in other parts of the world. For no better method occurred to them, both for repairing the loss they had sustained in Europe, and for vindicating their claims to the title of common fathers of the Christian Church. Therefore, soon after the institution of the celebrated society of Jesuits, in the year 1540, they were especially charged

constantly to train up suitable men, to be commissioned, and sent by the Pontiffs into the remotest regions as preachers of the religion of Christ. With what fidelity and zeal the order obeyed their injunction, may be learned from the long list of histories which describe the labours and perils encountered by vast numbers of the fraternity, while propagating Christianity among the pagan nations." Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, iii, 84.

In the seventeenth century, (1622,) was established at Rome, the famous "Congregatio de propaganda fide." Then in 1627, also at Rome, "the College or Seminary for propagating the faith," and in 1663 in France, "the Congregation of Priests for Foreign Missions," and likewise the "Parisian Seminary for Missions to Foreign Nations." From these colleges and societies (says Mosheim) issued those swarms of missionaries who travelled over the whole world, so far as it is yet discovered, and from amongst the most ferocious nations gathered congregations that were, if not in reality, yet in name and in some of their usages, Christians."

Efforts were made (we are told by the same historian) to rouse the Lutherans in imitation of the Roman Catholics to missionary enterprizes. But the situation of the Lutheran princes and various other causes, combined to make these efforts vain. "But the Reformed, (he remarks) and especially the English and Dutch, whose mercantile adventures carried them to the remotest parts of the world, and who planted extensive colonies during this century in Asia, Africa, and America, enjoyed the best advantages for extending the limits of the Christian Church. Nor did these nations wholly neglect this duty, although they are taxed with grasping at the wealth of the Indians, but neglecting their souls, and perhaps they did not perform so much as they might have done." Vol. iii, p. 294.

Here, then, for the first time, we come upon colonies in connection with the religious condition and prospects of heathen people; and certainly no great advantage appears to have arisen from them to the cause of the propagation of faith or opinions. We do not forget the missionary labours of that "Apostle to the Indians," John Eliot, nor of his noble compeers, the Mayhews; but we deny that their influence was that of colonists as distinguished from missionaries. We deny that their success in converting the Indians is any more to be attributed to the colonies of English around them, than the withering, blighting influence of these colonies of white men upon the Indians, is to be attributed to these missionaries. With as much justice the influence of the Christian missionaries in the Sandwich Islands may be attributed to the European and American settlers there, who are to a great extent, enemies of the missionaries and of Christianity!

It would, therefore, be altogether a new feature in the conduct of Christian missions to send out colonies with a view to converting

heathen people. And not only would this be a new feature in the conduct of Christian Missions, but its being applied to Africa is a *singular* feature in this new missionary theory of the colonizationists. Only in reference to that continent, do they advocate colonization as an improvement upon preaching and teaching the gospel of Christ. We may depend on missionaries to do the work in all other countries, but in Africa it has to be done by colonies!

This new theory of Foreign Missions, is contrary to all modern as well as ancient missionary experience. We assert, and we do it with full knowledge of what we say, that missionaries in heathen countries now, do not find the presence of Englishmen, or of Americans generally, any advantage to them in their work. Indeed, they consider it a hindrance, except in those few cases in which these parties are men of decided and consistent piety. And the reason is obvious. The inconsistent conduct, the dishonesty, or the sabbath-breaking of one such American, whether seaman or merchant, or consul, speaks to the natives more powerfully against Christianity than many sermons of the missionary can speak in its favour. Missionaries would generally, much prefer to be alone among the heathen than to have irreligious compatriots near them. The want of their protection and their society, they consider a small evil, compared with the hindrance of their presence and example. And how much more certainly, must the influence and example of irreligious colonists always counterwork and oppose all the good instructions of good men in the colony.

There can be no doubt whatever, to any one who has had any experience in such affairs, or who will carefully consider the subject, that a colony of settlers from another country speaking another language, and belonging to another nation, and professing another religion, (even though their complexion may be the same with that of the natives) must, in a thousand ways, come into collision and conflict with them; and that the consequence must be mutual jealousy and hatred and strife, so, that in the end, one or the other must succumb. All these difficulties attend the effort to propagate Christianity by colonists in distinction from missionaries. The colonist is very apt to be their enemy, but the missionary is the friend of the heathen. He lives for them. He dies for them. He has renounced home and friends for them. He is devoted to their good and is their servant for Christ's sake. And they know that these things are so.

In confirmation of these remarks upon the inevitable mutual jealousy and hatred of natives and colonists, we quote Mr. Wilson's kind and cautious hints to the Colonization Society:

"There are some things connected with the management of these settlements, as well as the manner in which trade is conducted, that are very prejudicial to the improvement of the natives, and they ought to be corrected."

Page 442.

“Another object which ought to be kept constantly before the minds of those who feel an interest in the general welfare of the country is, that the moral and religious improvement of the natives should be cared for as well as that of the Liberians. If one class is educated and improved to the neglect of the other, then the neglected one must be doomed to the task of drawing water and hewing wood all the days of their life; and their fate must be that of all other barbarous tribes who have been brought in contact with civilized men without the intervention of the gospel.” Page 410.

“In consequence, however, of frequent collisions between the colonists and the natives, which kept the minds of the latter in an unfit state to receive religious impressions; and in consequence of the jealousy with which the colonists looked upon the efforts of the missionaries to raise the natives in the scale of civilization and intelligence; and in consequence of legislation which had the tendency to embarrass the labours of the missionaries, the mission was transferred to the Gabun in 1842, where it has been carried on efficiently ever since.” Page 501.

We quote also, to the same effect, some remarks from the pen, we suppose, of a coloured man in Liberia, copied from the *Liberia Herald* of June 18, 1856:

“I am very sorry for this spirit, too prevalent among Americo-Liberians, who are, by the way, overrun with missionaries, while thousands and tens of thousands of natives are perishing for lack of knowledge. It is time, high time, for Churches and Boards to say, ‘So I turn to the Gentiles.’ In my humble opinion, gospel fat, gospel foundered, gospel sick, gospel free, and gospel hardened; the gospel thrown away in the street until loathed as it were; how can any other feeling toward missionaries prevail among those who look only at the bread they eat, and envy what they do not give?”

“Should God turn these blessings into a curse, while three and four missionaries are stationed among some two or three hundred Americo-Liberians, and three and four denominations at work in one small hamlet, we should not repine. The missionaries are not to be blamed; they are sent. In the mean time, whole tribes of ten and twenty thousand native Liberians, (all destined, I hope, to be one nation and one people,) hear not the preacher’s cry, ‘Come over and help us.’ No *book-man* sits before their children, and when schools are sent them, the same ignorant gabbers say, ‘better send them powder, and shot, and fire, and death;’ ‘wasting money,’ ‘eating up means,’ ‘making them more able to cheat and rob,’ ‘bigger rascals, and villains.’ And just as it goes; what teachers ever taught boys wickedness? Alas! for men, I believe the duties of the church to be marked out by God. I do not expect to see the good only of civilization and education. There is evil in Christian nations, evil and good seem to go together, tares and the wheat are in the same field, and the bad apparently looks the prevailing thing; evil ever had the majority, and when will the world be better?”

“A TRAVELLER.”

This “Traveller,” of whatever complexion he may be, is evidently a man of sense. There is great good sense in his last remark that, there is always evil in Christian nations mixed with the good and predominating over it, and that we must not expect to see only

what is good in civilization or education. If we send only civilization (and that but half civilized itself,) to Africa we must not expect that we shall see "only good," or even chiefly good, come out of it. The heathen of Africa to be made better, need a mightier influence than civilization; the influence of Divine illumination and grace.

Some of the orators of the Society represent every colonist at Liberia as a missionary! So far is this from being true, if the judgment and experience of wise and good men may be taken, (men who have for years, directed the affairs of Foreign Missions from these United States to all the heathen world) that we have heard them say they never knew a single coloured man in this country, whom they would be willing to commission as a missionary to the heathen! Coloured men to be preachers to the colonists they had sent out; but to go alone amongst the heathen, as missionaries, they had never known any that were fit. And yet persons who have had no experience in the conduct of Foreign Missions imagine that every colonist that is sent forth to Liberia is a missionary of Christianity! These simple hearted persons know very little of the nature and circumstances of heathen society, or they would be less sanguine of the results of indiscriminately thrusting forth poor, unprepared, free negroes upon it. There is not a Missionary Society in this country, that has had even twenty years experience, but has been led to feel more and more impressed with the necessity of more carefully selecting even the ministers of the gospel whom it sends forth. And the reason is, because *some ministers*, even educated men and men approved at home, have been found unable to pass unhurt through the ordeal that awaited them amongst the heathen. Yet here is a Society that will receive from any planter in South Carolina, one hundred negroes for their colonies to-morrow, if he will pay (or if the Society can beg the money to pay) their passage and six months provisions; and these one hundred negroes, good, bad, and indifferent, are to be considered so many missionaries of the gospel of Christ! Well may Mr. Wilson say:

"The idea of gathering up coloured people indiscriminately, in this country, and setting them down upon the shores of Africa, with the design or expectation that they will take the lead in diffusing a pure Christianity among the natives, deserves to be utterly rejected by every friend of Africa. A proposition to transport white men in the same indiscriminate manner to some other heathen country, with the view of evangelizing the natives of that country, would be regarded, to say the least, as highly extravagant." Page 507.

Upon what principle of sober sense can such rash proceedings be approved? Who can doubt that every company of blacks sent out thus, from a Southern plantation, or from a Northern city or community, carries out at least, twenty fold more of the world, and

the flesh, and the devil, than of Christian character, or of the experience of God's grace in the heart? And are the world, and the flesh, and the devil, in the hearts of poor, ignorant, depraved men, so very different in Africa, from what they are in America, that the sending forth of a cargo of such influences is to be considered a Christian missionary operation?

The Lord Jesus Christ himself, was the author of Christian missions. He ordained a very simple means for the conversion of the world. It was just preaching and teaching. "Go teach all nations," said he. And the Apostle Paul, himself a most distinguished and successful missionary, tells us that the means appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ to this end, is just "the *foolishness of preaching.*" "We preach, (said he,) Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness, but to them who are called both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." This is a very simple means. But it is employed by an almighty agent, the Divine Spirit, who accompanies the faithful use of it, all the world over, with his omnipotent grace. It is this omnipotent influence of the Spirit of God, which alone can do anything for the heathen. And He will be honoured by us in the employment of what He devises and reveals, or else His blessing shall be withheld. If we substitute a new and a different means from that which the Head of the church has promised to bless, we must not expect his blessing. The Colonization Society may move heaven and earth, may enlist the general government, and all the people of this country, in the scheme of sending the free blacks to Africa, and they may urge on the movement by pleading that it alone can and will christianize Africa. But let it not be expected that all this effort and noise can change the ordinance of Jesus Christ. It pleases God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe, and by nothing else; especially by nothing that man devises, and in which the wisdom and the contrivance of man are seen conspicuous.

We do not undertake to say, that the missionaries by whom Africa is to be converted to God, must be white men, any more than we can allow others to say they must necessarily be black men. God will raise up whom he will for that work. But what we do say is, that according to the Bible and all church history, God will convert Africa in no other way than he has converted, or will convert any other country, viz: by the foolishness of preaching, and by the doctrine of the cross, and by the use of men called by him to preach this preaching, and to teach this doctrine.

In conclusion, we must be permitted to say to the Colonization Society, that they should learn a lesson from the "steamships effort," to beware of rash measures, and of rash men. The colony might well say of the Society, "Save me from my friends," and the Society might well say the same of the Naval Committee of

the House of Representatives, that agreed to urge for them that gigantic measure. Legislative benevolence is always the most fumbling and bungling benevolence in the world. The greatest enemies of the Society and its colonies, need not have desired them any greater misfortune, than the adoption of that mad report would have been. The Society have put their hand to a work whose very magnitude and difficulties should make them sober. Let them beware of rash councils, and hasty plans. Let them eschew the great swelling words to which the writers of their reports, and the orators of their annual meetings have been so much addicted. We know not, nor do they, whether the Providence that brought the negroes here, intends to take them, even those now free, back to Africa or not. If He designs it to be done, His hand will do it, for no mortal's can. If He designs to bless the African race with Christianity, He will do that also, for it is beyond the power of man. And of one thing we may be sure, that the methods by which He will accomplish this latter object, never will be found to be the employment of darkness to enlighten darkness, or corruption to purify corruption. And though He may make use of some of Africa's own children, to raise their mother up from degradation, they will, doubtless, be men who have personally experienced another transformation, than any which a mere removal from America to Africa can work in the Colonists of Liberia.

ART. III.—THE MARTYRS OF SCOTLAND AND SIR WALTER SCOTT.

THE martyr age of Scotland begins with the restoration of Charles II. to the thrones of England and of Scotland, in the year 1660. This king was a free-thinker in regard to the authority of the Sacred Scriptures, a Sadducee in regard to a hereafter, and a mixture of the epicurean and the satyr, in relation to the moralities of the present life. He became reconciled to the church of Rome before his death. He was never its very bitter enemy in his life. The epigrammatic point of his reason for the faith that was in him, as to his choice among Protestant churches, has made the saying famous. He was an Episcopalian, he said, because that was "the more gentleman-like persuasion" of them. Men since have smiled, and thought that *gentility* must, indeed, have been prominent, and morality far in the rear, to suit Charles II!!

The atheist Hume gives a pleasing *resumé* of the character of Charles II., part absolutely laudatory, part apologetic, and all

thoroughly fallacious, as might be expected. And he actually snorts with contempt at the pious character of such men as Guthrie, Argyle, Warriston, and Carstairs. The great wonder is, that all men have not seen that Hume speaks of Charles just as a man standing where Hume stood, might be expected to speak of a man standing where Charles II. stood. That must, indeed, be a dull eye and a blunt sense which does not see the ever visible leanings to despotism and to infidelity in Hume's History. *His* praise of Charles, therefore, throws almost as clear a light on what that king really was, as do the filthy records of PEPYS' DAIRY itself.

It was in the reign of this king that two thousand illustrious and holy men—the old non-conformists—were put out of the pulpits in England, on the sad Bartholomew's day, for disagreeing with the king on the point of church government. It was in the reign of this king that Vane, and Russell, and Sydney were judicially murdered, for being the friends of constitutional liberty in Church and State. It was in the reign of this king that the mountains, and the mosses, and the moors of Scotland were made red with the blood of eighteen thousand of her holiest men; and those same mountains, and mosses, and moors, made sacred forever by the glory of those martyrs, because they would not take this king to be the Head of their church, the lord of their conscience, their earthly Pope and spiritual father.

That we may have a better view of the times, we must have patience, therefore, to call up the various witnesses to the character of this king that we may clearly see what right he has to expect his people to bend their religion and their consciences to his command. Who, and what was this Head of the Church of England?

First Witness, David Hume: "If we survey the character of Charles II., in the different lights which it will admit of, it will appear various, and give rise to different and even opposite sentiments. When considered as a companion, he appears the most amiable and engaging of men; and, indeed, in this view, his deportment must be allowed altogether unexceptionable. His love of raillery was so tempered with good breeding that it was never offensive: His propensity to satire was so checked with discretion that his friends never dreaded their becoming the object of it: His wit, to use the expression of one who knew him well, and who was himself a good judge, (the Marquis of Halifax,) could not be said so much to be very refined or elevated,—qualities apt to beget jealousy and apprehension in company,—as to be a plain, well-bred, recommending kind of wit. And although he talked, perhaps, more than strict rules of behaviour might permit, men were so pleased with the affable communicative deportment of the monarch that they always went away contented both with him and with themselves.

"This is, indeed, the most shining part of the king's character—and he seems to have been sensible of it—for he was fond of dropping the formality of State, and of relapsing every moment into the companion.

“In the duties of private life, his conduct, though not free from exception, was in the main, laudable. He was an easy generous lover (!!!) a civil and obliging husband, a friendly brother, an indulgent father, and a good natured master. The voluntary friendships, however, which this prince contracted, nay, even his sense of gratitude, were feeble; and he never attached himself to any of his ministers or courtiers with a sincere affection. He believed them to have no motive in serving him but self-interest; and he was still ready, in his turn, to sacrifice them to present ease or convenience.

“With a detail of his private character we must set bounds to our panegyric on Charles. The other parts of his conduct may admit of some apology, but can deserve small applause. He was, indeed, so much fitted for private life, preferably to public, that he even possessed order, frugality, and economy in the former—was profuse, thoughtless, and negligent in the latter. When we consider him as a sovereign, his character, though not altogether destitute of virtue, was in the main dangerous to his people, and dishonourable to himself. Negligent of the interests of the nation, careless of its glory, averse to its religion, jealous of its liberty, lavish of its treasure, sparing only of its blood, he exposed it, by his measures, though he ever appeared but in sport, to the danger of a furious civil war, and even to the ruin and ignominy of a foreign conquest. Yet may all these enormities, if fairly and candidly examined, be imputed, in a great measure, to the indolence of his temper—a fault which, however unfortunate in a monarch, it is impossible for us to regard with great severity.”

This is, indeed, an important witness—a significant testimony. The private life of Charles II. is then the exemplification of what Hume thought “in the main laudable,” and deserving of “panegyric!” We are also compelled to accept this chaste, virtuous, and high-principled king as a specimen, at least for his own times, of those who choose a religion on the *gentility* principle. This man was the Head of the “gentility” church of his day!

WE CALL A *Second Witness*—*T. B. Macaulay*: “On the ignoble nature of the restored exile, adversity had exhausted all her discipline in vain. He had one immense advantage over most other princes. Though born in the purple, he was far better acquainted with the vicissitudes of life and the diversities of character than most of his subjects. He had known restraint, danger, penury, and dependence. He had often suffered from ingratitude, insolence, and treachery. He had received many signal proofs of faithful and heroic attachment. He had seen, if ever man saw, both sides of human nature. But only one side remained in his memory. He had learned only to distrust and despise his species—to consider integrity in man and modesty in woman as mere acting. Nor did he think it worth while to keep his opinion to himself. He was incapable of friendship; yet he was perpetually led by favourites without being in the smallest degree duped by them. He knew that their regard to his interests was all simulated; but from a certain easiness, which had no connection with humanity, he submitted, half-laughing at himself, to be made the tool of any woman whose person attracted him, or of any man whose tattler diverted him. He

thought little, and cared less about religion. He seems to have passed his life in dawdling suspense between Hobbism and Popery. He was crowned in his youth with the covenant in his hand; he died at last with the Host sticking in his throat; and during most of the intermediate years, was occupied in persecuting both Covenanters and Catholics. He was not a tyrant from the ordinary motives. He valued power for its own sake little, and fame still less. He does not appear to have been vindictive, or to have found any pleasing excitement in cruelty. What he wanted was to be amused—to get through the twenty-four hours pleasantly without sitting down to dry business. Sauntering was, as Sheffield expresses it, the Sultana Queen of his Majesty's affections. A sitting in council would have been insupportable to him, if the Duke of Buckingham had not been there to make mouths at the Chancellor. It has been said, and is highly probable, that in his exile, he was quite disposed to sell his rights to Cromwell for a good round sum. To the last his only quarrel with the Parliament was, they often gave him trouble and would not always give him money. If there was a person for whom he felt a real regard that person was his brother. If there was a point about which he really entertained a scruple of conscience or of honour, it was the descent of the crown. Yet he was willing to consent to the Exclusion Bill for 600,000 pounds; and the negotiation was broken off only because he insisted on being paid beforehand. To do him justice, his temper was good; his manners agreeable; his natural talents above mediocrity. But he was sensual, frivolous, false, and cold-hearted, beyond almost any prince of whom history makes mention."

Such is the picture of Charles II. drawn by the pen of the prince of modern historians, in an article in the *Edinburg Review* for 1835, upon MacIntosh. This, too, is just such as might have been expected from a witness intending to be fair, but occupying Macaulay's stand point. It is a first principle of the Christian religion, very often strangely overlooked in hearing the testimony of historians, that he that is not heartily under its spiritual influence does not comprehend the nature of its power, but is actually averse to its spirit. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." This is as true of historians as of other men. Mr. Macaulay never has professed, but often laughed at, evangelicism. He understands almost as little, and seems not to care much more than did Charles II. himself, about the tremendous inward and outward workings of the spiritual powers, and that grand era of conflict between Jesus Christ, as rightful head of the Church, and the World's Prince who claimed to be head of the Church. Some say, Macaulay is not to be trusted at all; because he is superficial, flippant, and obstinate. We think this judgment too severe. He appears to us to be unreliable only when the very actings of the religious principle, in its deep, grave, unearthly moods, is the matter in hand. Of religious loyalty, faith, and conscience; the deep struggles of renewed souls for immortal principles; and of the peculiar conflicts and trials, and gifts from the throne of the Divine grace, to religious souls to die martyrs for

inspired truths, he comprehends little more than David Hume himself. Of course he failed to see the true nature of the conflict between the English dragoons, to execute the decrees of Charles II. as Head of the Church, and the Scottish Covenanters maintaining that the Lord Jesus was Head of the Church. This he failed to see; and no man can be much surprised at it, but one who thinks that historians are not fallen men; or one who thinks that the veils on men's minds, which are woven out of their own spiritual condition, do not apply to writers of history.

The Third Witness—the *Pictorial History* of England. By CRAIK and MACFARLANE :

“When the crawling and foot-licking age of loyalty succeeded with the Restoration, there was exhibited by right reverend and most learned prelates, a fanaticism less fervid, indeed, but far more profane and mischievous than that of the Commonwealth—and God, the Church, and the king, became their Trinity, while it was hard to tell which person of the three was the most devoutly worshipped. Then, too, the duties of non-resistance and passive obedience were inculcated as the golden rule of Christian practice, while opposition to monarchy was represented as a crime in which if the sinner died, his salvation was hopeless. In the same way, Charles and his brother were fanatics, who vibrated to the very last between their confessors and their ministers; and those gay and guilty courtiers were fanatics, who even amid their excesses, would sometimes fast and pray and be visited by superstitious impulses more ridiculous than the worst that have been fabled of Cromwell himself.”

And again :

“In this temper of the public mind, the restoration brought with it a tide, not only of levity, but of licentiousness—an inundation of all the debauchery of the French court, in which Charles and his followers had chiefly spent their exile. The strangest scenes were exhibited in the Duchess of Portsmouth's dressing-room, where Evelyn saw this worthless Cleopatra in her loose morning garment, as she had newly got out of bed, while his Majesty and the court gallants were standing about her. In some other points Charles' domestic habits were also very singular. His especial favourites were little spaniels, of a breed that still retains his name—to these he was so much attached that he not only suffered them to follow him everywhere, but even to litter and nurse their brood in his bed-chamber; on account of which the room, and, indeed, the whole Court was filthy and offensive. Court language was in no better taste. Charles, in quarrelling with Lady Castlemaine, called her a *jade*, and she, in return, called him a *fool*; and the first English phrase which the queen learned, and which she applied to her husband was, “you lie.” The levity of the court is strikingly exemplified in the anecdote told by PEPYS, that on the evening of that day of national disgrace, when the Dutch had blocked up the mouth of the Thames and burned the English shipping, Charles was supping with

Lady Castlemaine, at the Duchess of Portsmouth's, where the company diverted themselves with hunting a moth."

This witness speaks from the stand-point of that liberal feeling in Great Britain, in modern times, which gathered chiefly under the lead of the conductors of the *Edinburg Review*—Sydney Smith, Brougham, Jeffrey, and MacIntosh—to put down religious persecution. The work seems in the main, impartial. But failing to distinguish between the persecuting spirit, the lamentable error of almost all Christendom in the seventeenth century, as it is the fault of all other religions, and even of mankind at large, before the benign principle became known that man is not lord of the conscience—these writers seem impartial only in the hatred of all spiritual religion. It appears entirely fair, therefore, to give full credit to this witness, in reference to all matters not connected with the personal experience of spiritual religion.

Fourth Witness—WILBERFORCE, *Lord Bishop of Oxford*; taken from his Introduction to *Evelyn's Life of Mrs. Godolphin*. Published in 1847. See *London Quarterly Review*, for September, 1847.

"In the reign of Charles II., that revulsion of feeling which affects nations just as it does individuals, had plunged into dissipation all ranks, on their escape from the narrow austerities and gloomy sourness of Puritanism. The court, as was natural, shared to the full in these new excesses of an unrestrained indulgence—while many other influences led to its wider corruption. The foreign habits contracted in their banishment, by the returning courtiers, were ill-suited to the natural gravity of English manners, and introduced at once a wide-spread licentiousness. The personal character, moreover, of the king helped on the general corruption. Gay, popular, and witty, with a temper nothing could cross, and an affability nothing could repress, he was thoroughly sensual, selfish, and depraved;—vice in him was made so attractive by the wit and gaiety with which it was tricked out, that its utmost grossness seemed, for the time, rather to win than repulse beholders. Around the king clustered a band of congenial spirits, a galaxy of corruption, who spread the pollution on every side. The names of Buckingham and Rochester, of Etheridge, Lyttleton, and Sedley, still maintain a bad preëminence in the annals of English vice. As far as the common eye could reach, there was little to resist the evil."

The wild young Phæton, of the classic fable, could as easily have driven the horses of the chariot of the sun,—Pan and his satyrs could as easily have drawn up a system of orthodox, living, evangelical divinity,—as this king and this court could play the part of Head of such a deep, grave, and vitally religious Church as that of Scotland. The witness is unexceptionable, too, on the points on which we have heard him. He is of that church of which monarchs and ministers of State are still controlling potentates.

Fifth Witness—PEPYS' DAIRY ITSELF, as we find the cream of it in the *Edinburg Review*, for November, 1825. This man Pepys can hardly be said to have a stand-point at all. He is a mere flunkey,—a mere moth, buzzing with extatic delight around the lamp of royalty, though that lamp be fed with the very essence of sensual degradation. He says :

“In the privy garden I saw the finest smocks and linen petticoats of my Lady Castlemaine's, laced with rich lace at the bottom, that ever I saw ; and did me good to look at them. Sarah told me how the king dined at Lady Castlemaine's, and supped every day and night last week ; and that the night the bonfires were made, for joy of the queen's arrival, the king was *there* ; that there was no fire at her door, though at all the rest of the doors almost in the street ; which was much observed ; and that the king and she did send for a pair of scales and weighed one another ; and she, being with child, was said to be the heaviest.

“Mr. Pickering tells me the story is very true of a child being dropped at the ball at court ; and that the king had it in his closet a week after, and did dissect it ; and making great sport of it, and said that, in his opinion, it must have been a month and three hours old ; and that whatever others think, he hath the greatest loss, (it being a boy, as he says :) that he hath lost a subject by the business. He told me, also, how loose the court is. Nobody looking after business, but every man his lust and gain ; and how the king is now become besotted upon Mrs. Stewart ; that he gets into corners, and will be with her half an hour together, kissing her, to the observation of all the world ; and she now stays by herself and expects it, as my Lady Castlemaine did use to do ; to whom the king, he says, is still kind.”

Truly the gay cavalier king is, we would think, rather too richly, strongly gay, even for the furious anti-puritanism of Sir Walter Scott. One would hope he was rather too gay to be head even of the church which contended so valiantly for the Book of Sports ; much more, to be head of the Church of Scotland. But let us hear the witness :

“Pierce, do tell me, among other news, the late frolic and debauchery of Sir Charles Sedley and Buckhurst running up and down all the night, almost naked, through the streets ; and at last fighting, and being beat by the watch, and clapped up all night ; and how the king takes their parts ; and my Lord Chief Justice KEELING (the same miscreant who imprisoned the auther of *Pilgrim's Progress* for preaching) hath laid the constable by the heels to answer it next sessions ; which is a horrid shame. Also, how the king and these gentlemen did make the fiddler of Thetford, this last progress, to sing them all the obscene songs they could think of. That the king was drunk at Saxam, with Sedley, Buckhurst, &c., the night that my Lord Arlington came thither, and would not give him audience, or *could not* : which is true ; for it was the night that I was there and saw the king go up to his chamber, and was told that the king had been drinking. He tells me that the king and Lady Castlemaine are quite broken off, and she is

gone away, and is with child, and swears the king shall own it; and she will have it christened in the chapel at White Hall so, and owned for the king's, as other kings have done; or she will bring it into White Hall gallery, and dash the brains of it out before the king's face! He tells me that the king and court were never in the world so bad as they are now, for gaming, swearing, women, and drinking, and the most abominable vices that ever were in the world; so that all must come to nought."

What a luscious and generous escape from Puritanism this was! But he proceeds:

"They came to Sir G. Carteret's house, at Cranbourne, and there were entertained and all made drunk; and being all drunk, Armerer did come to the king, and swore to him by God. 'Sir,' says he, 'you are not so kind to the Duke of York, of late, as you used to be.' 'Not I?' says the king. 'Why so?' 'Why,' says he, 'if you are, let us drink his health.' 'Why let us!' says the king. Then he fell on his knees and drank it; and having done, the king began to drink it. 'Nay, sir,' says Armerer, 'by God you must do it on your knees.' So he did, and then all the company—and having done it, all fell a crying for joy, being all maudlin and kissing one another! the king the Duke of York, and the Duke of York the king! and in such a maudlin pickle as never people were; and so passed the day."

We now wish to recall one of the witnesses for a moment—Mr. MACAULAY—and hear a few sentences from his article on the *Comic Dramatists of the Restoration*. Published in the *Edinburg Review*, for 1841. He says:

"We can at present hardly call to mind a single English play, written before the civil war, in which the character of a seducer of married women is represented in a favorable light. We remember many plays in which such persons are baffled, exposed, covered with derision, and insulted by triumphant husbands. Such is the fate of Falstaff, with all his wit and knowledge of the world.

"On the contrary, during the forty years which followed the Restoration, the whole body of the dramatists invariably represent adultery—we do not say as a peccadillo—we do not say as an error which the violence of passion may excuse—but as the calling of a fine *gentleman*—as a grace without which his character would be imperfect. It is assential to his breeding and his place in society that he should make love to the wives of his neighbors, as that he should know French, or that he should have a sword at his side. In all this there is no passion, and scarcely any thing that can be called preference. The hero intrigues just as he wears a wig; because if he did not, he would be a queer fellow, a city prig, perhaps a puritan. All the agreeable qualities are always given to the gallant. All the contempt and aversion are the portion of the unfortunate husband."

To be of the "gentleman-like persuasion" in such times, we submit, is rather an equivocal compliment.

Keeping our attention still fixed on the great quarrel in Scot-

land, which we are endeavoring to approach understandingly, one more witness must be introduced. His testimony relates more specially to the subject-matter of the quarrel, that is—the determination of king Charles II. to compel the Scottish people to become Episcopalians.

When Sir Walter Scott was called to account for his singular misconceptions of Scottish Church History, in a series of articles, by McCRIE, in the *Christian Instructor*, he defended himself, by reviews of some of his own works, published in the *Quarterly Review*, in London. In those defences, he quoted *Kirkton's Church History* as his authority. We will, therefore, take Sir Walter's witness in relation to the ecclesiastical character of Charles II.

Sixth Witness—Kirkton: "The king, (Charles II.,) even as his father, was resolute for bishops, notwithstanding his oath to the contrary; he knew well bishops would never be reprovers of the court, and the first article of their catechism was non-resistance. They were men of that discretion as to dissemble great men's faults, and not so severe as the Presbyterians. They were the best tools for tyranny in the world; for do a king what he would, their daily instruction was kings could do no wrong, and that none might put forth a hand against the Lord's anointed and be innocent. The king knew also he could be sure of their vote in Parliament, desire what he would; and that they would plant a set of ministers which might instill principles of loyalty into the people, till they turned them first slaves, then beggars. They were all for the king's absolute power, and most of them for the universal propriety, and to make the people believe the king was lord of all their goods without consent of Parliament; and for these reasons—and such as these—they were so much the darlings of our kings, that king James was wont to say 'no bishop, no king.' So bishops the king would have at any rate.

"Meanwhile the king's character stood so high in the opinion and idolatrous affections of the miserable people of Scotland (they were far away and knew him not) that a man might more safely have blasphemed Jesus Christ than derogate in the least from the glory of his perfections. People would never believe he was to introduce bishops till they were settled in their seats; and there was a certain man had his tongue bored for saying the Duke of York was a papist, which the priests at London would not believe upon his coronation day; and that day he first went to mass, fourteen of them choosed for their text, Psalm cxviii: 22.—('The stone which the builders refused is become the head-stone of the corner,')—making him the corner-stone of the Protestant religion.

"As for Charles, many times did the ministers of Scotland, and even many godly men among them, give the Lord hearty thanks that we had a gracious Protestant king, though, within a few years, he published it to the world that he lived a secret papist all his life, and died a professed one with the hostie in his mouth." *History of the Church of Scotland*, p. 132.

If the reader has in his mind a picture of the character of Charles II., then we are ready to proceed to the real thing before

us, that is—the forcible alteration of the Scottish Church government from Presbytery to Episcopacy, by the authority of the king's supremacy in Church as well as in State. Charles II. was the acknowledged Head of the Church of England. All her Protestant monarchs had been so acknowledged since Henry VIII. Why the Church of England never complained of her head, when he was such as this man, let those answer who have the means and inclination so to do. It seems to us to be a most biting reproach to the English bishops that they never once recalcitrated against Charles II. as the Head of the Church. How much lower *could* they have bowed to sin?

The Scottish Church refused to acknowledge the king as its head. They would obey him in civil matters—not in spiritual matters. They acknowledged him as Chief of the State, not as Head of the Church.

The famous act of supremacy did “assert, enact and declare that his Majesty hath supreme authority and supremacy over all persons, and in all causes ecclesiastical within his kingdom; and that by virtue thereof, the ordering and disposal of the external government and policy of the Church doth properly belong to his Majesty and his successors, as an inherent right of the Crown.”

It would seem that nothing could be much clearer to a sober mind, in our day, than the principle that the civil government is supreme in civil matters, and that the Lord Jesus alone is supreme in matters of conscience in religious matters. *Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.* This principle gives clear light against the corrupt *Seward* and *Sumner* doctrine of modern times; that the civil government *is not* supreme in civil affairs, on the one hand; and equally clear light against the corrupt Jacobite doctrine of the seventeenth century, that the civil government *is* supreme in religious matters. It is astonishing that, even under such kings as Henry VIII, Charles II., and George IV., the high-bred and learned English prelates should have continued, up to this day, to hold to this principle of the supremacy of the king in religious matters. But it is true that they do hold to it yet. This doctrine in England sprung from the peculiar nature of the reformation in that country. The reformation there, as is well known, sprung from the divorce of Henry VIII., and was conducted chiefly by Act of Parliament. It was, in a great measure, a political affair. It was a mere revolt from a chief-priest who dwelt upon the Tiber, and could have no lawful wife at all, to a chief-priest who dwelt upon the Thames, and would have what wives he chose—a revolt from a priest-pope to a king-pope—save, and except, indeed, what the word of God did among the people, which was often against the Acts of Parliament.

The story of the Scottish Church had been far different. The

Reformation in Scotland was in the main, a revival of religion, a work of the word of God, made powerful by the Spirit of God. It was such as the reformations on the continent were. It was such as the reformation at the day of Pentecost was. It was produced by spiritual, not carnal weapons. It was conducted by spiritual and religious men. The politicians were merely its protectors. They were not its fathers and its martyrs, as they were in England. The union of the crowns of England and Scotland, in the dynasty of the Stuart's, brought this principle of the supremacy of civil authorities in ecclesiastical matters, to trial in Scotland. The attempt of Charles II. to compel Scotland into Episcopacy put the matter to immediate issue.

In the month of August, 1661—the same year on which Sir Harry Vane was put to death for republicanism, and the Marquis of Argyle for Presbyterianism—the same year on which the body of Oliver Cromwell was dug up from the grave and publicly hung at Tyburn, by the chaste religious and patriotic court of Charles II.—in the month of August of that year, Charles II. sent a letter to the Scottish Council of State, in which, after reciting the inconvenience of the Presbyterian form of government, and asserting its inconsistency with monarchy, he says: "Wherefore, we declare our firm resolution to interpose our royal authority for restoring the Church of Scotland to its right government by bishops, as it was before the late troubles." The tory writers have pleaded to this, that it was a simple repeal of the recent laws which established the Presbyterian church, and a leaving of those old laws in force which established Episcopacy—only the king of England was the head of the bishops instead of the pope of Rome. The answer to this is, that there never were any Protestant bishops in Scotland before the late troubles, but nominal bishops, *tulchan* bishops, put there by ungodly patrons to draw the revenues of the old sees. Knox, Melville and Henderson are sufficient proof that the stroke of the word of God, on regenerate Christian conscience, always sent forth a Presbyterian sound in Scotland. And it is also alleged, in extenuation, that this violent change in the Scottish Church government was sanctioned by the Scottish Parliament. So it was, with the aid of a corrupt packing of the Parliament, and then not without threats and intimidation. All pretence of excuse for the Act on the ground of the consent of the governed is swept away completely, by the fact that the Church of Scotland herself bled and groaned forth her opposition for twenty years. She never did agree to it.

As to the attitude in which the royal satyr, who was kissing my Lady Castlemaine and Mrs. Stewart in corners, and carousing with Sedley and Buckhurst in drunken brawls, appears in this grave Scottish transaction, of course his attitude is sorry. Few readers, however, will fail to be surprised, on being reminded

how sorry is the attitude in which he appears. The Scottish people had felt a deep and tender loyalty to Charles II. long before his restoration in England, on account of his misfortunes, and because he was the heir of their *own* ancient line of kings. He had been proclaimed king of Scotland ten years before he was acknowledged king of England. Cromwell's crowning mercy of Dunbar had awakened him from that dream of hope. But not before he had published to the world his famous *Dumferline Declaration*, in August, 1650—which may be found at length in Wodrow. On that occasion he vowed that he was a conscientious Presbyterian, and after subscribing the covenants, or mutual bonds in which the Presbyterians of that day bound themselves to each other, he voluntarily added the following clause: "And his Majesty having, upon a full persuasion of the justice and equity of all the heads and articles thereof, now sworn and subscribed, the national covenant of the kingdom of Scotland, and the solemn league and covenant of the three kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland, doth declare that he hath not sworn and subscribed those covenants, and entered into the oath of God with his people, upon any sinister intention of crooked design for attaining his own ends, but so far as human weakness will permit, in the truth and sincerity of his heart, and that he is firmly resolved, in the Lord's strength, to adhere thereto, and to prosecute to the utmost of his power all the ends thereof in his station and calling, really, constantly, and sincerely, all the days of his life."

The only apology he ever offered, as far as is known—for what appears about the basest instance of perjury in history—is found in the flippant jest already mentioned, about the "gentleman-like persuasion!"

Few of the Scottish noblemen had submitted to the government of Cromwell—or as submitting to the government of Cromwell was called—*taken the tender*. A faithful loyalty to their hereditary line of kings had prevented the Scottish noblemen from going over to Cromwell in any considerable numbers. It is hardly necessary to tell the intelligent reader, that the ingenious slander against them that they sold their king, Charles I., to the English Parliament, has been thoroughly exploded by the *dates*, which prove that the corruption imputed was impossible. One of the few Scottish noblemen who did take the tender, forsake the fortunes of the Stuart's, totally, and go thoroughly over to Cromwell, was James Graham, Marquis of Montrose, who afterwards betrayed the Covenanters in turn, went back to the king, and became such a pink of royalist chivalry as to become a prime favourite of the author of *Waverley*.

About as few of the Scottish clergy as of the Scottish nobles had taken the tender. Cromwell's Independents were regarded

by them as the ultra-puritans, which they have since shown themselves to be in New England. We are sorry they did not at once imbibe the spirit of religious liberty which breathed from the soul of that great-hearted Paladin of spiritual christendom. But he was too revolutionary, too levelling, too unconservative for the greater part of them. Among the few of the clergy who did take the tender, and join in the ultra-puritanism of Cromwell's army, was the Reverend JAMES SHARP. This brought him into personal intercourse with the Protector. On one occasion he and Cromwell had a long conversation. Grim old Great Heart had a far keener eye to look into the hearts of men, even while he was delivering himself of his winding and parenthetical sentences, than such a man as Sharp could stand. Cromwell never liked Sharp. He declared, after that conversation, that he believed Sharp to be an atheist at bottom.

When the agitations and negotiations were going on at London, after the abdication of Richard Cromwell, and during the hesitation of Monk and his army, as to what was to be done, Sharp was sent up thither, as the agent or ambassador of the Presbyterians, to see that they might obtain protection under the new government, whatever it might be. While Charles was at Breda, making abundance of those fair promises which were to be kept like the Dumferline Declaration, Sharp was sent over there to look after the interest of the Scottish Church. And after the bringing in of the king in 1660, Sharp was still the trusted agent of the Scottish Church near Charles II. When lovers break off, the letters which pass between them in their days of harmony, often tell awkward tales upon one party or the other. Sharp's letters to the Presbyterian ministers of Edinburg, while he was their accredited ambassador to Breda and to London, are preserved in the introduction to Wodrow's History. It is the most cleanly cut and deeply engraved monument, to his own infamy, that any man known to history has erected in writing. There will never be any need for the chisel of Old Mortality to touch that monument, while the English letters are legible, and human reason has her throne in society. As soon as it was certainly known that the king intended to break the covenant of his youth with the people of Scotland, undertake that singular job for such a man as he, the dragooning of those people from one religion to another, Sharp instantly became a convert to Episcopacy. With the very letters of credence and of confidence of the Presbyterians in his pocket, he at once received and accepted the Archbishoprick of St. Andrews, which constituted him at once the arch-enemy, and the arch-persecutor of those whose trusted agent and vowed friend and brother he was up to that time. His being in possession of the counsels, designs, and full confidence of the Presbyterians, enabled him to be, what he immediately became, the

most exquisitely cruel, and stinging, and unrelenting of their persecutors.

Among our American Jacobites, and sympathizers with the measures of Charles II., there is found a remarkable want of information concerning the plainest facts of the history of the period. Some think the Covenanters were merely rebels on a civil account, and that good king Charles, and dear bishop Sharp, had never done any harm to the horrid Covenanters! The writer has himself heard an Episcopal lady strive hard to make capital out of the Presbyterian persecution of Sharp!! She knew evidently not a word of his treachery—not a word of the private licentiousness of his character at St. Andrews—not a word of his bribe.

In this connection, it becomes a matter of a little curious interest to notice what account is given of the troubles in Scotland in the reign of Charles II., in the *Waverley Novels*, from which some of our Jacobites boast that they derive their whole stock of Scottish Church History. The principal historic sketch of those times which he gives, is introductory to *Old Mortality*, and commences with the second chapter of that romance. It begins thus:

“Under the reign of the last Stuarts, there was an anxious wish, on the part of the Government, to counteract, by every means in their power, the strict or puritanical spirit which had been the chief characteristic of the Republican Government, and to revive those feudal institutions which united the vassal to the leige-lord, and both to the crown.” And thus the sketch proceeds for a page or two, as every reader may see, by turning to that fascinating and ubiquitous romance. Now, although the scene of this romance is laid just after the assassination of Sharp, though Sharp is the martyr-lamb of the whole story, though Balfour of Burley is the big black fiend, the hero of pitch, of the book, yet no man could gather from any place of the whole work that is remembered or can be found, any thing of Sharp’s bright, sweet history in London, or any thing of the real nature of the troubles in Scotland, in the effort of the Government to force the consciences and change the religion of that people. Throughout those fascinating romances the Scottish troubles are represented as the restlessness of *civil* rebellion and turbulence, against a reasonable and paternal Government! And such many American Jacobites, who have not met with other and better information, seem really and honestly to believe them to have been!

But with what feelings could an American, thus apologizing for his countrymen as well as might be, read an article which appeared in *Blackwood’s Magazine*, for November, 1847, entitled *Magus Muir*—the place at which Sharp was assassinated, signed W. E. A., the initials of Professor Aytoun, the reputed editor of that magazine, in which, without mention of either Sharp’s public

or his private baseness, he is held up as a saint and a martyr. It seems to us to complete the list of that hagiology on which stand the names of Archbishop Laud and Charles I. Laud—Charles I.—and Sharp—it seems the very apotheosis of baseness. Pity for the interests of this martyr-roll, that Charles II. and Sir Charles Sedley had not been put to death somehow or other, instead of dying, as they did, in the private rottenness of their infamy. Their names would have greatly enriched the list of martyrs for anti-puritanism. And this gilding of corruption, and murder of historic truth, has been the great deed of modern genius! How precious a gift is genius! Yet how weak are they who are thus misled by its false and illusory glare! And how fearful are their responsibilities who, by its bright torch, undertake, Salmeon-like, to eclipse the radiance of the sun of truth!

Sharp was assassinated on Magus Moor, in 1679, by a company of men who were lying in wait for Carmichael, an infamous creature and tool of the Archbishop, whom they expected would pass that way. The act was a foul crime, and a piece of wretched and short-sighted policy; and was so regarded by the best and purest of the party—the Covenanters—to which these men claimed to be attached. Not that any man in his senses, and in possession of the commonest facts in the history and antecedents of the man, can for a moment doubt that Sharp deserved death, if man ever deserved it. He, the false and treacherous instrument of the death of thousands, whose blood was at that very time flowing all over the west of Scotland, under the broadswords and pistols of Claverhouse and the English dragoons, for the offences of a strict religion and a strict morality—he surely deserved death far more than they—unless, indeed, Jacobism and genius can avail to overturn Mount Sinai and eternal Law also, as well as to bribe and make drunk the muse of historic truth. But Archbishop Sharp did not die by the sentence of a legal tribunal, and after fair trial. Therein, really, lies the crime of his fall. But Archbishop *Laud* did die by the sentence of a legal tribunal and after fair trial, and they have made a martyr of him. Charles I. did die by the sentence of a legal tribunal and after a fair trial, and they have made a martyr of him!

But can any one conjecture what idea there probably is in the mind of that All-seeing God, who looks down from heaven with a recording eye upon the memory of his saints and the truth of their transmitted good names, concerning that history and that romance which make a martyr of such a man as Sharp, and forget or conceal the martyred blood, and the unspotted good names of the host of godly men then dying on mosses and moors, by the pistol of military execution—Guthrie, Argyle, Warriston, Cameron, and thousands of others, eighteen thousand saints in all, says the smallest estimate, dying for their religion—offered

life any day, any of them, if they would swear a profane oath, or blaspheme God, or deny the Lord Jesus Christ? It is an awful question, and to be fearfully answered on that strange and grand day, when the sins of acted history, and the sins of the records of history, come to be displayed to the light of truth, and to the consciences of an intelligent universe.

But we have slightly anticipated. The master-piece of the Government, for the ruin of the Covenanters, was that famous INDULGENCE, for their scruples about accepting which, the gay and gifted Sir Walter Scott holds them up to such virtuous and paternal reproach. Its alliance with the arbitrary government of Charles, the miserably shabby moral character of the bishops, (with the single exception of Archbishop Leighton,) and its dependence for propagation on the pistols of Claverhouse, and his dragoons—those Sharp's-rifle-evangelists of the seventeenth century—these things were stripping the Episcopal movement in Scotland of all the small amount of moral force which it may have had at first among the people. In addition to these considerations, the moral character of the persecuted stood out in very striking and very telling contrast to that of the persecutors. Some device must be fallen upon, to take off some of the colour of ungodly violence which the movement bore every where, or else the failure of that movement was evident and impending. The indulgence was such a device, to the credit of the invention of which, we believe, that Archbishop Sharp is confessedly entitled.

This was an ecclesiastical proclamation or edict of the king, openly avowing itself to depend for its authority upon the king's supremacy in matters of religion; and offering the privilege of a kind welcome back into the church to all such Presbyterian ministers as would acknowledge the principle of the royal supremacy. They were wretchedly impoverished. They were hunted by dragoons upon the moors and upon the hills. Why should a mere abstraction prevent them from returning to the church? The act would put bread into the mouths of their famishing wives and children. There is hardly another nation on the face of the earth, in which the device would not have been completely successful. There are numbers of men, every where, who make a boast of their practicability,—who laugh at abstraction, and call all principle, abstraction;—and who almost advertize themselves as for sale, in the market of short-sighted expediency. All such would have taken the indulgence with a rush. But the indulgence involved the very principle for which the Covenanters were contending, the only principle worth contending for in the whole business—the principle that Charles II. could not alter the Bible; and bind men's consciences with new obligations in religious matters. The indulgence granted subsistence and a place in the church, to such as would barely acknowledge the king's religious

supremacy, that is—such as would accept a benefice without acknowledging the bishops' authority. And none could accept it at its lowest terms, and return, in any way, and “keep kirk-sessions, presbyteries, and synods,” except, said the edict, “in our name and by our authority.” But high privileges were granted to such of the ejected ministers as would return and accept, not only the king's indulgence, but the bishops' collation, and so not only acknowledge the religious power of the king, but the ecclesiastical authority of the bishops also.

This was, indeed, a master-piece of the serpentine cunning which the writers of the period ascribe to Sharp. It was sure to divide the Presbyterians. Some in other countries might have been expected to accept it completely, and go wholly over to Episcopacy. But as good as none did this in Scotland. Some would acknowledge the king, but not the bishops. And some would take the plain, but fearfully-trying ground of downright truth and principle, and acknowledge neither. So there would be a variety of parties among them. Eighty clergymen were mentioned, by names, as indulged. They were to confine themselves to their own parishes—to celebrate the communion on the same day all over a diocese to prevent concert among them—and not to depart from their diocese without leave from the bishop.

Would that it could be written that not a man of them accepted it at all! And yet the reader of the *Tales of My Landlord*, will remember to what derision their *Macbriars*, and their *Muckleoraths*, and their *Pound Texts* are held up in that work of wonderful genius, because they would not all permit themselves to be lured into what all men now admit, was an insidious Episcopacy, involving the denial of every principle which they held peculiarly dear. It was with a pang of sadness, gradually changing itself into the most thorough contempt, that the writer first saw the fact, since perfectly obvious to him, that the author of *Old Mortality* takes it as his first principle that the Scottish and the English people *ought* to have accepted whatever changes in their religious faith and conscientious obligations king Charles chose to make; and that he actually deals blame and praise to the parties respectively, as they accept the king as lord of their conscience, or do not accept him. It will be a first principle of the most hideous bad odour in coming years. Let every man who perceives it, free his garments from it in good time.

But there is another feature about this indulgence, not to be forgotten in estimating the *animus* of those who granted it. The courtiers of Scotland, who were called lords of the clergy, actually became alarmed for fear too many of the Presbyterians would accept the indulgence, and that thus their bishops would not have vacant benefices enough to reward those who hungered for the spoils of the ejection! We do not know that this histori-

cal fact has been disputed, or is disputable. We use it on the authority of WODROW, and quote it in his words. Vol. 2., p. 131 :

“In this interval, the lords of the clergy, and some of their orthodox ministers, had a meeting to fall upon means to *hinder the indulgence*, which they apprehended would be ruining to their interests. No practical measures could be proposed to prevent it altogether, since the king had made known his pleasure ; but bishop Sharp, to comfort his brethren, promised to do his utmost to make it a bone of contention to the Presbyterians. Indeed, he wanted not abundance of serpentine subtilty ; and when his attempts to break it altogether failed, he set himself with all vigour to have it so clogged, from time to time, as to break ministers and people of the Presbyterian judgment among themselves.”

And yet Sharp is the virtuous and illustrious martyr of Old Mortality, and these men whom he set himself, with all vigor, to break up and divide among themselves, that his *brethren might get the spoils* of their Church, are perverse rebels, whom fanaticism would not permit to be quiet under the mildest and most virtuous of monarchs. We rather think it would take all the gentility of “the more gentleman-like persuasion,” and all the genius of the Waverly romances, to reconcile us to such martyrs as Sharp, and such men of honour as Sir Walter Scott. And, yet, we await with great cheerfulness, the coming, in the realms of history, of Talus, the iron man of truth, with his fearful flail “to beat down falsehood, and the truth unfold.”

The reader will find the Presbyterian church reviled for its *republican* tendencies during the whole time of the dynasty of the Stuarts in Great Britain.

When the Presbyterian and Episcopal divines met together for conference, at the Restoration, to see if there was a chance of accommodation or compromise, the Presbyterians objected to the government of the church by a single person. The Episcopalians replied that “they wondered they should except against the government by one single person, which, if applied to the civil magistrate, is a most dangerous insinuation.”* It is well known that the attachment of king James I. and king Charles II. to Episcopacy, was on a political account, as it agreed with their ideas of monarchy, and that in the far-famed and classic phrase of the British Solomon, “presbytery agreed with monarchy as God with the devil.”† Hume, MacIntosh, Macaulay, Sir Walter Scott, and a vast multitude of authorities and quotations might be heaped up upon this point. They would be useless, because well known to any one acquainted at all with the tenor of British

* Neal's Puritans, 2., 572.

† Pictorial History, Book 7., pp. 444, 446.

historians. We can hardly undertake those who know no history but the romances. The climate of their Bœotia is too thick for us at the present. The reader will find as neat a little specimen as he has often seen, of the art of carrying water on both shoulders, in the late Episcopal tract entitled, "Why I am a Churchman," wherein certain beautiful analogies are pointed out, between the constitution of the Episcopal Church and that of the American Republic!! We wondered as we read, whether the writer had forgotten the bold and eloquent champion of his cause in the reign of Charles II.—he that spoke of blind and glorious old Milton as "the Latin Secretary, the blind adder—and of Charles II. as "the *ne plus ultra* of all regal excellency"—Dr. ROBERT SOUTH—and his vehement assaults on the covenant as republican, in his anniversary sermon on the day of the death of Charles I., in the memorable year 1662;—and his splendid and triumphant declaration, in his fifth sermon, that "*the Church of England glories in nothing more than that she is the truest friend to kings and to kingly government of any other church in the world.*" It is a little awkward sometimes, to attempt to steer both sides of the same breakers; to ride both sides of the same tree; to be both hound and hare according to the fortune of the chase.

But the Presbyterians defended themselves from the charge of republicanism in the seventeenth century, in Scotland, and pointed to their deep and earnest loyalty towards their ancient line of kings. They did not confess the charge of republicanism under a monarchy; for that would be synonymous with rebellion. But they claimed then, and they claim now, they claimed in Scotland, and they claim in America, to be constitutionalists under all governments. The title of the famous book of old Samuel Rutherford—*Lex Rex*, which, by the way, it is said, has never been answered, and never can be fairly answered—that famous work which king Charles II. graced with the honour of being burnt by the hangman at the market-cross, the title of that noble book was, indeed, the motto of all their struggles for liberty. The condition of Britain at the present time demonstrates, with all honour to her noble races of men, that liberty may exist under a government of law, even though administered by a king. Indeed, it is hardly probable that the Covenanters of Scotland, or the parliamentarians of England, would have rebelled against the Stuarts on a merely civil account. But they could not make a Stuart the lawgiver of their consciences and their religion. And the mighty God who works his deep designs in wondrous ways, bound civil liberty close around religion, as the golden circle around the jewel, so that in securing the one, which he saw they never would quietly let go, they secured the other too. They could not permit a Stuart to be the ape of the Lord Jesus, as a

Romanist permits the pope to be, and lay the rude hands of carnal and sensual laws upon the mysteries of man's religious soul.

But, in truth, the course of events very soon refuted the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance which the bishops had so sedulously preached to the Scottish people during the Episcopal dragonade in that country. James II., unfortunately for their logic, was a Roman Catholic. Never were principles more thoroughly refuted by adverse necessity than theirs were by the regular legal succession to the throne. If the Scotch had no right to resist the compulsory Episcopacy of Charles II., then the English had no right to resist the compulsory Romanism of James II. If it was wrong to resist Charles in Scotland, it was wrong, by precise parity of reasoning, to dethrone James in England. The parallel is far worse than equal for the bishops. James' offence was a suspension of the laws enforcing Episcopacy. His sin against them was his ceasing to persecute in their behalf. He suspended the laws, by usurped power, so as to grant toleration to papists and covenanters. Then they deserted, dethroned, defeated, and drove him away. Charles' offence was a rigorous administration of executive decrees, establishing Episcopacy where the people did not desire it. He persecuted the Covenanters to drive them to a faith strange and hateful to them. They never preached passive obedience. They seldom practiced civil rebellion. They made a sort of *passive resistance*, if that is an allowable idea. The Cameronians, or *hill-people*, alone, disowned the civil authority of the king. But if it was right and proper to drive off the king of England for being a Roman Catholic, would it not have been precisely as right to drive off the king of Scotland for being an Episcopalian? Is there any imaginable difference, except that the bishops were on the winning side in one case and not in the other? All honour to the English people for that manly bravery with which they cast off the meshes of that slavish logic, when their religious rights were in danger. All those rights, save the right to persecute the Scotch, were worth preserving, even at the expense of the expulsion of a graceless bigot from the great Protestant throne. It is strange and sad that their zealot Tories, to this day, have not caught the noble and generous idea of giving equal honour to the Scottish people, for simply disobeying the sorrier of the two brothers, in his attempts to overthrow their faith. The act of the English church and people, in 1668, went much farther than a full sanction to the patient refusal to apostatise, of the Scottish church and people during the previous twenty-eight years. So certain are erroneous and one-sided principles, of a practical refutation, when men are required themselves to live by principles which they manufacture for others.

Here it may be observed how different were the circumstances under which the Presbyterian system was attempted to be set up in England, in the time of the commonwealth, from the circumstances under which the Episcopal system was attempted to be set up in Scotland in the reign of Charles II. The Presbyterian system proposed to the English was the Westminster Confession—a system formed by a body of *English* divines, convoked by *English* civil authorities. There were not a dozen Scots in that large assembly. The solemn league and covenant was a voluntary bond entered into by the English, Scottish, and Irish peoples, to adopt that system, as a more complete reformation of the church. The Scottish people swore to adopt it, and did adopt it. To this day, the fact stands out broadly in British church history, that the Scottish Confession of Faith is a book furnished them by an assembly of English divines. Truly, it is not easy to see how this solemn league and covenant was a persecutor of the English. If the English Episcopalians were persecuted, it was by English Presbyterians, not Scottish.

The Episcopal system attempted to be set up by military force in Scotland was foreign to the whole Scottish mind. It was the Romish system restored. It was reactionary. It was a lapse from reformation. It was never assented to at all by an ecclesiastical assembly in Scotland, but was professedly based on the claim of royal supremacy in religious matters, and was ratified only in a Scottish Parliament, composed of the profligate tools of a more profligate king.

The reason for which presbytery was attempted to be set up in England was that it was a more perfect reformation of the church than the old system; and, in the language of David Hume, that "that form of ecclesiastical government is more favourable to liberty than to royal power." The reason for which Episcopacy was attempted to be set up in Scotland, was that it was regarded as a form of ecclesiastical government more favorable to royal power, and especially to the peculiar ideas of royal power entertained by the house of Stuart. Both these propositions could be established by a very large number of authorities and references, which will occur without difficulty to the memory of the reader well informed in the history of the seventeenth century.

When Episcopal ministers were ejected from their parishes in England, in the times of the commonwealth, it was, as a general thing, for a dissolute moral character, for shameful incompetency to teach, or for a denial of fundamental doctrines. Old Fuller, the witty historian, almost as zealous a royalist as South himself, was admitted to a living by Cromwell's Court of Triers. The reader who has met with the morceau, will hardly have forgotten how the jolly old clerical wit, amused himself afterwards with the questions the Triers asked him on the subject of the new

birth. That subject he treats very much with the sharp and scorning wit with which Dickens treats it in the Pickwick papers. He evidently got through the Court of Triers by means of equivocations and double-entendres. Many an other as good an Episcopalian, and far better Christian than he, was admitted to the comprehensive church of the commonwealth. The court was not authorized to inquire into a man's views of church government. The conclusion is, therefore, irrefragable, that when Episcopalians were excluded it was not as Episcopalians, but as men of unsound tenets, incompetent qualifications, or scandalous lives. Surely, this was a very righteous sort of persecution with which old protector Great-Heart visited that dissolute body of men.

When Presbyterian ministers were ejected from their parishes in Scotland, in the times of Charles II., it was, as a general thing, for the unflinching strictness of their morality, and the deep conscientiousness of their piety. No contrast could be better established in point of fact than this. None could be more telling in its import. When one of the Covenanters was brought before a magistrate to be committed to prison, if he or she exhibited signs of piety by abstaining from the vices of the licentious speech of the age, the commitment was made out at once without waiting for forms of law. But if the accused threw out a profane oath, the court laughed, and at once discharged the prisoner, as not the game for which they were in search. In all their proceedings, in pursuance of the king's proclamation concerning church government, piety led to conviction, open vice led to acquittal. Those who were put into the English church in the place of the ejected, were men of great piety and learning: as the names of Owen, Baxter, Howe, Flavel, Bates, Alleine and a host of kindred spirits abundantly testify. Those who were put into the Scottish church, in the place of the ejected, were—with the single exception of Leighton, the good—men whose names have never been on the records of learning, piety, or talent; and have perished from the memory of none. The outcry which the tory writers make about the drumming of these worthless curates out of Scotland, at the coming in of William III., must be a desperate resort. They had no right to the stipend by any just law,—no personal merit,—no hold upon the affections of the people. Their blood was not spilled. They were simply laughed, drummed, or as it was called, *rabbled* away. Those who were ejected from the church of England, at the Restoration, were the best, purest, holiest, most-learned men of the land. The act of uniformity, and the five-mile act were intended to hunt them from the face of the earth.

It was a wide and unfortunate mistake of the civil government, during the times of the English commonwealth, that they undertook to produce sanctity of manners by legislation. They had taken the English idea of the oneness of Church and State,

and had puritanized it, and spiritualized it. Many more of them, besides the mad Fifth-Monarchy men, dreamed of the reign of king Jesus upon earth, and a code of laws drawn directly from the pure wells of Gospel truth; and of the administration of laws by the hands of the saints. Civil laws, however, can never safely or properly go farther than the promotion of public decency and social morality. Men can not be made either moral, or religious, or holy, by legislation of any kind. The error of the reign of the saints, was that they thought they could promote sanctity by law. This gave rise to the hypocrisy with which they have been charged. Unholy and profane men, who thought all holiness was but hypocrisy and pretence, as unholy and profane men often do think, and who, therefore, did not scruple to pretend it, when they did not possess it, seeing that sanctity of manners was the passport to civil emolument, crept in among the puritans, and brought reproach upon them. But it seems very clear and easy reasoning, that it was not the puritan himself who was justly entitled to bear this reproach of hypocrisy. The real puritan had no need to pretend to be a puritan. The real Christian has no need for the cloak of christianity. But it was the man of loose morals, and of low ideas of the sacredness of holy things, from the anti-puritan ranks, who practiced this hypocrisy; who alone had need of it; and whose civil promotion depended on it. Puritans may be fanatics. They sometimes have been. They often are in modern times. But it is an impossible thought that men were hypocrites who dared, and suffered, and were brave, and denied themselves, and raised the dignity of the State, and spread the reign of morals, thrift and industry around, as did Cromwell and his saints. If so, then hypocrisy made the deepest impression for good, which has ever been made by any one else's sincerity, on the destinies of England;—which is a contradiction.

But the wider and more unfortunate mistake of the civil government, in England and in Scotland, under Charles II. was, that it levelled all the artillery of the law *against* holiness, sanctity, conscience, religion, and against all strictness, and self-denial of morals and of manners. Self-denial was the emblem and the watchword of the commonwealth. Joyous license to do as one would, was the prevailing principle of the restoration. The one was the reign of the saints and prophets. The other was the reign of the fiends and satyrs. The one attempted, erroneously and extravagantly, to legislate holiness into men's hearts. The other attempted, blasphemously, to legislate holiness and conscientiousness out of the land. Oliver Cromwell dictating to the "Latin Secretary," the epistle which was a shield of defence around the Protestants of Savoy, is an emblematic scene of the commonwealth. Charles II. hunting a moth, and writing letters of urgency to Claverhouse and Dalziel to hunt and slay the Pro-

testants of Scotland, is a scene emblematic of the Restoration. Cromwell may have prayed too long; but was never drunk. Charles II. was drunk about as often, probably, and as long, as Cromwell prayed. And Charles never prayed at all that we know of.

The men who resisted presbytery in England were, as a general thing, the advocates of despotic government, the Buckingham, the Lauds, the Straffords, and the Mainwarings. They were remarkable for their lofty views of kingly authority, and their low ideas of virtue, conscience, duty, and right. They saw the restoration of their king and church in 1660. But along with them came the lowest condition of religion, of morals, and of national standing abroad, which the nation has ever known. They saved their cherished dynasty of the house of Stuart; and their favourite doctrine of the divine right of kings, and the sacred obligation of the subject to passive obedience and non-resistance. But they saved them both for only twenty-eight years. The revolution of 1688 came; and the dogma was scattered to the winds, refuted by the very conduct of its authors; and the dynasty was dethroned forever. They saved also an established Episcopal church; but they lost two thousand of its brightest jewels who would not conform to its "crawling and footlicking" spirit. And the toleration which came has turned into other channels than those of the establishment, a majority by estimate, of the numbers and piety of Protestantism in that land.

Those who resisted Episcopacy in Scotland were, as a general thing, advocates of law and legal liberty: Rutherford, Argyle, Guthrie, Baillie, Warriston, Brown, Cargill, Peden, Blackader, Renwick, and Carstairs; men against whose morals nothing could be alleged; men who plead their consciences, and whose self-denial proved them to be conscientious. They stood for religious liberty. Their loyalty was to the unseen and divine King to whom they had given themselves soul and spirit. They did save religious liberty, conquering by patient endurance. And they also saved civil liberty—Hume, himself, being witness, no friend, indeed, to them, to either of their liberties, or to their religion. They delivered Scotland from what they thought an impure Protestantism; and gave to it a naked, clear, spiritual system, deeply fixed in the convictions and affections of the people. To this day that grand little kingdom, though rife with dissent from established Presbyterianism, is still almost unanimously Presbyterian—all the dissenters claiming to stand in some respect or other, nearer to the pure and primitive model than the establishment.

Another fault from which the English commonwealth-men can be defended, but the Scottish Covenanters cannot, is intolerance. But there was no conception of the idea of toleration in those days any where except in the mind of Cromwell, of Milton, of

John Howe, and a few other such foremost men of all the world. The English Episcopalians regarded toleration as treason to the throne of the king and to the mitre of the bishop. The Scottish Presbyterians regarded it as treason to the Gospel of Christ, and to the souls of the people. The suppression of error by force was the principle of both parties in Scotland. The only advantage the Presbyterians have in the estimate is that they spilt little or none of the blood of others, and shed much of their own; while the Episcopalians spilt much of the blood of others and shed but very little of their own in the religious persecutions. The suppression of error by force—says the *Pictorial History*—“was still the popular and national feeling; for, after all, nothing is more incontestible than that all the severe laws which were passed against non-conformists, between the restoration and the revolution, were in accordance with the sentiments of the great majority of all classes of the English people.”

At the very time when the English Parliament had become alarmed at the prospect of having a papist upon the throne; and were busily discussing and insisting upon the bill for the exclusion of the Duke of York from the right of succession, at that very time it was treason in Scotland to maintain the principle of the bill of exclusion. Penalties for opinion were run mad. No party is perfectly clear from the just reproach. The world had not yet been lifted high enough to see the light of religious liberty, and the wrong and inexpediency of laying edicts concerning spiritual truths upon the conscience of man by human authority.

We have a concluding word to say, in the way of protest, against the odium now attempted to be cast upon the Scottish and English puritanism of the seventeenth century, in consequence of the sorry and abortive fruits of puritanism in New England in the nineteenth century. It is like casting a reproach upon the Geneva of Calvin, which is taken from the modern Geneva of the Unitarians. It is reasoning from names, but not identities, or resemblances. Never were two things of the same name much less identical in spirit and intrinsic character than the English puritanism of the seventeenth century and the Yankee puritanism of the nineteenth. They seem alike only in the erroneous practice of inquisitorial and intolerant legislation concerning moral questions. Like all imitators, the modern spirit has copied the mere defects, but few or none of the greatneses of the ancient. Never was there a more deep, earnest, inward, mental, spiritual, and real civilization than that which sprung up with such mighty radiance in Great Britain, in the seventeenth century, under the influence of the old puritans. Seldom has there been seen among the nations, a more shallow, outward, physical, mechanical, and materialistic civilization, than that which has sprung up with such

mighty *bruit*, under the puritan influences in New England, in the nineteenth century. The one is all physical. It subjugates matter. It excels in the mechanic arts. It makes constant and important contributions to the material comforts of outward life. It glories in the wide diffusion and the shallow depth of education. It is envious of all but itself. It is devoted to pecuniary profit. It has learning enough to receive ideas—not logic enough to sift them, so as to discern between the superficial and the profound, the plausible and the true, the sham and the real.

The other was all spiritual. The moral, intellectual and spiritual grandeur which its writers spread over religious life, yet lies on it like golden sunshine, still uneclipsed by any brighter radiance. It had its trophies on battle-fields. It had its Marstons, and Nasebys, and Worcesters. But it had more trophies in the realms of genius and learning. It was full of great ideas and generous impulses. It gloried in all depths of learning, of thought, of piety; and strove to diffuse learning without rendering it shallow. It had no inordinate thirst for the *peculium*. Mammon was never its God.

It was its highest glory to be able to know truth from plausibilities; fleeting shams, and unveracities, and empty forms, from eternal realities. Never was the same name borne by two more intrinsically different things, than the English puritanism of the seventeenth and the New England puritanism of the nineteenth century.

ART. IV.—THE TESTIMONY OF THE ANCIENT JEWS TO THE PLURALITY AND TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD.

ON this point we have already adduced a number of very strong passages from the most authoritative books of Jewish learning.* We will, however, give an outline of the sources from which testimony may be drawn to prove that the ancient Jews did not believe in the present Jewish dogma of an absolute personal, metaphysical unity of God. These views are sustained by other learned men from an examination of the same writings. The ten Sephiroth† have been represented in three different forms, all of which may be seen in H. Moore's *Opera Philos.*, I., 423. The

* See especially the Article on the Unity of God as an objection. *So. Pres. Rev.*, Vol. VIII., p. 305.

† *Kitso's Bib. Cyclop. Art. Kabbalah*, vol. 2., p. 190. English Edition.

Jews themselves generally regard them as the sum and substance of Cabbalistic theology, as indicating the emanating grades and order of efflux according to which the nature and manifested operation of the Supreme Being may be comprehended. Several Christian scholars have discerned in them the mysteries of their own faith, the Trinity, and the Incarnation of the Messiah. In this they have received some sanction, by the fact noticed by Wolf, that most learned Jewish converts endeavour to demonstrate the truth of Christianity out of the doctrines of the Cabbala. (Bibliothk Hebr., I., 360.) The majority of all parties appear to concur in considering the first three Sephiroth to belong to the essence of God, and the last seven to denote his attributes or modes of existence. The words of Count G. Pico della Mirandola are very remarkable.* After studying the Talmudic and other writings of the Jews "with indefatigable labour and the greatest diligence, I saw in them, God is my witness, not so much the Mosaic as the Christian religion. There I found the mystery of the Trinity, there the Incarnation of the Word, there the divinity of the Messiah, original sin, expiation from it by Christ, &c. In short there is scarcely any controversy between us and the Jews concerning which it is not possible so to argue and convince from the Cabbalistic writings that there shall not be a corner left in which they can hide themselves."†

The celebrated Witsius makes a similar statement. As a result of his researches he expresses himself as follows: "De Trinitate et Judæus contra Judæos disputaturus hanc mihi observandam methodum esse existimavi. *Primo* ut tollam præjudicium illud, quod per sententiam Christianorum derogetur unitati essentiæ Divinæ, quam toties et merito inculcant Judæi; *Deinde* ostendam in genere, non posse non, juxta propria ipsorum secta, pluralitatem aliquam personarum in Deo agnosci; *Ac denique* probem in specie, tres illas personas esse, Patrem, Filium, et spiritum sanctum, *nota ac vulgata apud ipsos nomina.*"

Grotius, also, in his learned treatise, "De Veritate Religionis Christianæ." L. v., S. xxi.,‡ vindicates Christians from the charge of worshipping three Gods, against the Jews, on their own principles, and from their own writings. The following are his words: "We are now to answer the two remaining charges with which the Jews at once attack us on the points of doctrine and of worship. In the first place, they accuse us of worshipping a plurality of Gods. This, however, is no more than an exposition of some foreign tenets maliciously wrested to such an application. For

* Cited in Hottenger's Thea. Phil., p. 439.

† See in Kitto, *ibid.* Burgess, p. 171.

‡ See also the numerous proofs given by him and Le Clerc in the notes.

why should this be urged as an objection against the Christians, rather than against Philo-Judæus who has frequently established a Trinity in the Deity; and who calls the reason or word of God (the original expression is *λογος*) the name of God; the Maker of the world; neither unbegotten, as God the Father of all is; nor so begotten as the human race are? The same is also called, both by Philo himself and by Moses, the son of Nachman, an angel or messenger regarding and protecting this universe; why against the Christians, I say further, rather than against the Cabbalistics, who consider the Deity as three distinct *Lights*; and some, indeed, adopt the very same appellations that we do, of Father, Son or Word, and Holy Spirit? But, now, to avail myself of a fact universally and especially admitted by the Jews, *that Spirit* by which the prophets were impelled is a something *uncreate*; yet it is mentioned as a *distinct* essence from *that* which sent it; and the Jewish Shechinah is, again, considered as a similar distinction. It hath, moreover, been recorded by several of the Hebrew writers that *that vis Divina* (Divine Energy) which, by them, is called *wisdom*, was to dwell in the Messiah; and hence the Chaldean paraphrast gives to the Messiah the appellation of "the word of God;" hence, also, he is called in David, in Isaiah, and elsewhere by the august titles of "God and Lord."

Maurice, in his Dissertation on the Oriental Triads, in confirmation of this opinion says,* "It became absolutely necessary to examine the Hebrew Scriptures as well as the Jewish Cabbala; and to prove, not only that this distinction in the divine nature formed a part of the Rabbinical creed, but was promulgated to the Jewish nation at large, as far as a people, forever relapsing into Polytheism could bear the revelation of so important and mysterious a truth."

The proofs upon which these and other learned men have founded their opinions are, of course, very numerous, drawn as they are from the voluminous writings of the Jews. They are, therefore, given by many writers and constitute many volumes.† As one example out of many we would adduce, Rabbi Simeon, who explains the repetition of the word "Holy" three times, (Is. vi., 8.) as meaning, Holy is the Father, Holy is the Son, and Holy is the Holy Ghost; and the second from Jonathan ben Uzziel, whose paraphrase of the text is as follows, viz: Holy the Father, Holy the Son, and Holy the Holy Spirit.‡

No less than about seventy passages were quoted by Dr. Pye

* Ind. Antiq., vol. 4., p. xii.

† See Allix's Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church. Gill's Commentary throughout. Lightfoot. Carpzovius' Introd. Theol. Judaic, c. li., p. 6. Gray's Connex. of Sacred and Prof. Lit., vol. I., p. 143.

‡ Knowle's Primitive Christianity, p. 93.

Smith, which are applied by the writers of the ancient Chaldee paraphrases to the Messiah, in the most express manner. And, though the number of such is not very great, still they sufficiently show that the writers did not refrain from ascribing to the Messiah the titles and attributes of the Supreme God. In instances innumerable those writers translate the Hebrew JEHOVAH by the expression, "the Word of the Lord." Many have maintained that this supplies an indubitable ascription of personal existence to the *Word* in some sense distinct from the personal existence of the Supreme Father; that this *Word* is the *λογος* of the New Testament, and, consequently, that the phrase is a proof of a belief among the ancient Jews in the preëxistence, the personal operations, the Deity of the Messiah, "the Word who became flesh and fixed his Tabernacle among us." For as the date of the earliest and most valuable Targums may be safely assumed, as not much exceeding, nor much below, the first century of the Christian era; it is but natural to expect to find in the Targums the vestiges of purer knowledge and more correct interpretation of the sacred text. All, however, must acknowledge that, during that period, the theology and religion of the Jews had become extremely corrupt. But as in an advancing state of society there will always be some who outstrip their cotemporaries, so, in a degenerating state, there will be found individuals whose knowledge bears the character of the departed, more than of the existing age. The summits of the mountains catch the last feeble rays of the sun when all below is covered with shade. From these considerations we should expect to find, in the Targums, the vestiges of purer knowledge and more correct interpretation, combined with other matter of an inferior kind. It ought not, therefore, to excite our surprise, if we should discover in those compositions, doctrines concerning the Messiah, which the general state of sentiment, at the partiular period, would not have led us to expect.

"Solely from the phrase 'memra Jah,' or 'the Word of the Lord' in those paraphrasts, no absolute information can be deduced," says Dr. Pye Smith, "concerning the doctrine of the Jews, in the interval between the Old Testament and the New, upon the person of their expected Messiah. I have said 'solely' from the use of this phrase, adds this writer; but if we combine this fact with others, derived from the study of the Old Testament, it will, I conceive, appear a very rational conjecture, that the Rabbinical authors of the age referred to, had vague ideas of the 'Word' as an intelligent agent, the medium of the Divine operations and communications to mankind. This sentiment is strengthened by the reasons which we have to conclude, that the Jews of the same age employed the term 'Word' with a personal reference, and that reference to the Messiah. The use of this

term, by Philo, and by the Christian Evangelist John, appears unaccountable, except on the supposition that it had grown up to the acceptation supposed, at least among the Jews who used the Greek language, such an extension of meaning and reference agreeable to the ordinary progress of language would flow from the primary signification of the term 'Word,' that is 'a medium of rational communication;' and yet it would thus become a natural designation of 'Mediator' between God and man; one who should 'speak' to man on the things of infinite moment, in the name and by the authority of the Most High. We have, also, another evidence which is entitled to the greater weight, as it comes from a quarter the most hostile to the Christian religion. Celsus, whose words are cited by Origen, reproaches the Christians with absurdity and folly, for imagining that such a mean and contemned person as Jesus could be 'the pure and holy Word;' the 'Son of God;' and personating a Jew, which is his manner in the construction of his work, he declares their belief that 'the Word was the Son of God,' though they rejected the claims of Jesus to that honor. No reason can be imagined why the malignant and inveterate Celsus should have invented the statement; or that it could have come into his mind, if it were not true. It was not likely to answer his purpose of denying Christianity. On the contrary, its tendency is favorable to the claims of Christianity."

Such is the least we can deduce from these Targums. Others, however, eminently qualified to give an opinion, have been much stronger in their support of the Trinitarian views of the ancient Targumists, as for instance Walton,* Owen,† Lawrence,‡ and Ryland.§

Another source of proof of the Trinitarianism of the ancient Jews, will be delivered from the writings of the Jews, called Apocryphal, which are considered as a collection of the most ancient Jewish works next to the inspired books. They are curious, and some of them extremely valuable. The earlier of them seem to have been compiled or translated from materials written within a century after the last of the inspired prophets; and the latter of them, interpolations excepted, were probably composed some years before the birth of Christ.

In some of these books, the "Eternal Saviour" is represented as the object of prayer and trust, under the sufferings which the Jews endured in the Babylonish captivity. Simon Maccabæus was, we are told, confirmed in the pontificate

* Proleg. in B. B. Polygl., p. 86.

† Owen on Heb., vol. I., p. 114 and vol. II., p. 273.

‡ Diss. on the Logos.

§ In Smith, 1., 526.

“until a faithful prophet should arise;” not improbably referring to the Great Prophet foretold by Moses. In the prayer which concludes the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, there is a passage which, (if the reading be genuine,) it seems impossible not to admit as a recognition of the Messiah as the Son of God; “I called upon THE LORD, THE FATHER OF MY LORD.”

There are some other very ancient Jewish writings, of which the most celebrated and possessing the highest interest, is called “The Book of Enoch the Prophet.” The Epistle of Jude recites a declaration of the Divine justice upon the wicked expressly as made by “Enoch,” the seventh from Adam. The existence of such a book is mentioned by Clemens of Alexandria, by Origen, and by others of the Christian fathers, as “The Prophecy of Enoch,” extant in their times, and apparently in a Greek translation from a Hebrew original. None of them, however, appear to have regarded it as having divine authority, except Tertullian who considered it as both authentic and genuine. The two following passages from the Zohar (still found in the existing book of Enoch) will sufficiently demonstrate that the Cabbalists were acquainted with a written composition, in their own language, under the title of The Book of Enoch, viz: * “The Holy and the Blessed One,” it is said, “raised him (Enoch) from the world to serve him, as it is written, *for God took him.*” “From that time a book was delivered down, which was called the Book of Enoch. In the hour that God took him he showed him all the repositories above; he showed him the tree of life in the midst of the garden, its leaves and its branches. We see all in his book.” “We find in the Book of Enoch, that after the Holy and Blessed One had caused him to ascend and showed him all the repositories of the superior and inferior kingdom, he showed him the tree of life, and the tree respecting which Adam had received a command, and he showed him the habitation of Adam in the Garden of Eden.” † In this book called Zohar—the most celebrated compilation of what was long supposed to constitute the hidden wisdom of the Jewish nation,—other occasional references are made to the Book of Enoch, as to a book carefully preserved from generation to generation. ‡ It was only, however, after a lapse of many centuries, during which this book was supposed to be lost that Bruce, the Scottish traveller, happily succeeded in bringing from Abyssinia three manuscripts of this lost and long-desired Book of Enoch, which, in the year 1821, was translated into English by the Rev. Dr. Richard Laurence, now Archbishop of Cashel. The argu-

* See Zohar, vol. I., Parashah Bereshet, p. 87., v. ed. Mantua and Amsterdam.

† See Zohar, vol. II., Parashah Beshallah, p. 55.

‡ See given testimony in Pye Smith, vol. I., p. 586, and Prof. Stuart's Diss. in Bib. Repository, Jan. and July, 1840.

ments of Dr. Laurence, as also those of Dr. Gottlieb Hoffman, of Jena, have proved that it was written (undoubtedly by a Jew) in the earlier part of the reign of Herod the Great, and, consequently, about thirty years before the birth of Christ, and most probably in the country which had been the northern part of the ancient Assyrian Empire. Now, in this extraordinary work which has been restored to our use and enjoyment, we have an undeniable witness to the religious opinions and expectations which were entertained by at least some of the Jewish nation, supplying many additions to our information upon the belief and expectations of the Jews before the Christian era, concerning the Messiah. The Book of Enoch contains undeniable references to a Trinity of persons in the Godhead. Thus, in chap. xlviii., 5. 1. 2. 3., the following language is found, viz: "In that hour was **THE SON OF MAN** called upon with **THE LORD OF SPIRITS**, and his name in the presence of the chief of days. Before the sun and the signs (of the heavens) were created, before the stars of heaven were formed, was his name called upon, in the presence of the Lord of the spirits. He will be a support to the righteous and holy on which they may lean without falling; and he will be the light of nations. He will be the hope of those whose hearts are in distress. All who dwell upon earth will fall down and worship before him, will laud and glorify him, and will sing songs of praise to the Lord of spirits. On this account was the Chosen One and the Hidden One in his presence, before the world was created, and forever in his presence, and the wisdom of the Lord of spirits hath unveiled the Holy One and the Righteous One; for he hath preserved the lot of the righteous, since they have hated and rejected this world of unrighteousness, and have abhorred all its works and ways in the name of the Lord of spirits. For in his name shall they be preserved, and his will shall be their life."

In this book of Enoch, therefore, clear and distinct allusions are made to a Being, highly exalted with the Lord of spirits, under the appellations of the Son of Man, the Elect One, the Messiah, and **THE SON OF GOD**. Disputes have arisen respecting the nature of the Son of Man described in the vision of Daniel; and Unitarians contend, that his existence commenced at the birth of Jesus Christ; affirming without fear of contradiction that no Jew of any age ever held the opinion of his preëxistence, much less ever regarded him as an object of Divine worship. "But that the Jewish doctrine before Christ upon this point was totally different from that which the Unitarians assert it to have been, I have," says Archbishop Laurence, "shown in my remarks upon the first book of Ezra. The present publication, however, affords fuller and more decisive testimony upon the same subject."

After quoting the above and several additional passages, he remarks, that "in these passages the preëxistence of the Messiah

is asserted in language which admits not the slightest shade of ambiguity. Nor is it such a preëxistence as the philosophical Cabbalists attributed to him, who believed the souls of all men, and, consequently, that of the Messiah, to have been originally created together, when the world itself was formed; but an existence antecedent to all creation, an existence previous to the formation of the luminaries of heaven, an existence prior to all things visible and invisible, before every thing concealed. It should also be remarked that the preëxistence ascribed to him is **A DIVINE PRE-EXISTENCE**. For before all things, his name was invoked in the presence of the Lord of spirits—the Elect and the Concealed One existed in his presence, who has dominion over all things, for “from the beginning the Son of Man existed in secret, whom the Most High preserved in the presence of his power.” Hence, therefore, is it explicitly affirmed, that all the kings of the earth shall fall down and worship before him, shall bless and glorify him, as a true object of adoration.

Neither is allusion thus only made to the Elect One or the Messiah, but also to another divine person or power; both of whom, under the joint denomination of **THE LORDS**, are stated to have been over the water, that is, as I conceive, over the fluid mass of unformed matter, at the period of creation. “**HE, THE ELECT ONE**, it is stated shall call to every power of the heavens, to all the holy above, and to **THE POWER OF GOD**. The Cherubim, the Seraphim, and the Ophanim, all the angels of power, and all the angels of the Lords, namely, of **THE ELECT ONE**, and of **THE OTHER POWER**, who *was* upon earth over the water on that day, shall raise their united voice,” &c. In this passage an obvious reference, I conceive, occurs to the first verse of Genesis, in which it is said, that **THE SPIRIT OF GOD** moved on the face of the waters. As, therefore, the more full description of the Son of Man here given may be considered as the Jewish comment of the day upon the vision of Daniel, so also, I apprehend, must the last quoted allusion to the book of Genesis be considered as a comment of the same nature, upon that account of Moses, which describes the commencement of creation. Here, then, we have not merely the declaration of a *Plurality*, but that of a precise and distinct **TRINITY**, of persons, under the supreme appellation of God and **LORDS**. **THE LORDS** are denominated **THE ELECT ONE**, and **THE OTHER (DIVINE) POWER**, who is represented as engaged in the formation of the world, on that day, that is, on the day of creation. And it should be added, that upon these a particular class of angels is mentioned as appropriately attendant.

“This argument, adds Archbishop Laurence, in proof that the Jews, *before the birth of Christ*, believed the doctrine of the Trinity, appears to me much more important and conclusive than that which has been, indeed, frequently, deduced from the philosophical prin-

ciples of the ancient Cabbala, which is full with allegorical subtleties. The passage under consideration is, indeed, liable to no objection whatever. Here there is nothing Cabbalistical, here there is no allegory; but a plain and clear, although slight, allusion to a doctrine which, had it not formed a part of the popular creed of the time, would scarcely have been intelligible. Three Lords have been enumerated; **THE LORD OF SPIRITS, OR THE LORD, THE ELECT ONE;** and **THE LORD, THE OTHER POWER;** an enumeration which evidently implies the acknowledgment of three distinct persons, participating in the name, and in the power of the Godhead. Such, therefore, from the evidence before us, appears to have been the doctrine of the Jews, respecting the Divine nature, antecedently to the rise and promulgation of Christianity."*

Another source from which we may derive a knowledge of the opinions of the most ancient Jews is the writings of Philo. Philo was a Jew of Alexandria, of a sacerdotal family, eminent above his contemporaries for talents, eloquence and wisdom; and whose learning it is not probable that any of his nation, in any subsequent period, if we except Josephus, have exceeded, or even approached. From the most probable estimation, says Dr. Pye Smith, he was about sixty years old at the time of the death of Jesus Christ; and he lived for some years afterwards. The coincidences of sentiment, and more frequently of language of Paul and John in the New Testament, are very remarkable. Yet it would be contrary to all the philosophy of human nature not to ascribe these different, but similar, streams to one primary source. That source, I venture to propose, is not so much to be sought in the writings of Plato, or in the ethical lectures of the learned Jews of Alexandria, or in the sole speculations and invented diction of Philo himself;—as in the sacred writings of the Old Testament, transfused into the Alexandrian idiom, paraphrased and amplified in the terms and phrases which were vernacular to the Grecian Jews, and mixed in a very arbitrary manner with the speculations of both the Persian and Greek philosophers. Since the New Testament was written in this idiom, and since the component parts of the Christian dispensation were not so much new ideas as the fuller explication and the more interesting impression of truths and promises previously revealed, the conformity of which we are treating appears less an object of just surprise than its absence would have been. But no part of the writings of Philo has excited so much attention and admiration as his frequent expressions on the subject of the Logos or word. He has been thought to ascribe to this mysterious object, personality, divine perfections, and gracious communion from heaven, the be-

* See Archbishop Laurence's Preliminary Dissertations, pp. xlviiii—lvi : 3. Oxford Ed., 1838.

stowment of the highest blessings on mankind. Hence Philo being only a Jew, furnishes the most authentic statement of the belief and the expectations entertained by the most pious and the best informed of his nation with regard to the hope and redemption of Israel.

Philo is as express as words can enable him to be, on the limitation of the number of the persons spoken of as divine to THREE, as is evident from the passages, well known and frequently referred to, for the illustration of this subject. I have not room to insert them at length, though the purpose of them all, is much elucidated by the sentences which immediately precede and follow, but shall faithfully give the substance. In the first of the remarkable passages alluded to, which occurs in the tract on the Cherubim, speaking of the Eternal *Ens*, he asserts, that in the ONE TRUE GOD there are TWO SUPREME and PRIMARY Δυναμεις or POWERS, whom he denominates *Αγαθοτητα και Εξουσιαν*—that is, GOODNESS and AUTHORITY, and that there is a THIRD AND MEDIATORIAL POWER between the two former; who is the Λογος. *In the second, which is that in his dissertation concerning the sacrifices of Abel and Cain,† Philo is still more explanatory, for, speaking of the same ὁ ὤν, he says, (“He came attended by his two Most High,”) appearing to Abraham, he acquaints us that HE came attended by his two Most High and puissant powers, PRINCIPALITY and GOODNESS; HIMSELF in the middle of those POWERS, and through ONE, exhibiting to the discerning soul the appearance of THREE. In a third passage Philo is still more decisive; for he says, THE FATHER OF ALL is in the middle; and as if to prevent any possibility of those POWERS being mistaken for mere attributes, he assigns to each of them active, personal properties, and denominates one the POWER CREATOR and the other the POWER REGAL. He then adds, “the POWER CREATOR is LORD.”‡

One other source from which we may deduce the opinions prevalent among the Jews of a still early, though later period, is the Talmudical writings.

In the Talmudical writings frequent and honourable mention is made of Rabbi Simeon, the son of Jochai, who is said to have been before the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. A collection of Cabbalistical doctrines called *The Book Zohar*, or *The Book of Light*, is extant, which is affirmed to have been gathered up after Simeon's death, from his oral instructions, by his pupils and companions; in the same manner as the sayings of Socrates were collected by Xenophon. This book is written in the Chaldee dialect, similar to that of the Targums, a dialect which became totally

* Vide Philonis fudaci Dissert. de Cherubim, p. 86., F. G.

† Dissert. de Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini, p. 108., B.

‡ Dissert. de Abraham, p. 287., F.

extinct by the fourth or fifth century of the Christian era, and was succeeded, in Jewish literature, by the Talmudical Hebrew. The circumstance of its language and style is held by those who are sufficiently skilled in the Hebrew dialects, to be decisive of its having been written at, or very near, the time to which it is attributed.

The eminent scholar, Schœttgenius, has devoted a large portion of his life to the study of the Zohar, and has made much use of it for the illustration of the New Testament in his *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*. The following are extracts from Schœttgenius' numerous citations. "The angel of the Lord, which is the Shechina," referring to Exod. iii., 2.* "God, the holy and blessed, is perfectly united with the Schechina," literally "united in one unity."† "There was the Schechina, God the holy and blessed, who is one."‡ "It is he who liveth for ever and ever, who is arrayed with the name (Metatron) Mediator."§ "The Mediator is the servant of the Lord, the elder of his house, who is the Head of the creation of the Lord, exercising dominion over all things that are his, for the Holy and Blessed God hath given him dominion over all."¶

There are other passages, the sense and purport of which are, that the Shechinah is both of a heavenly and an earthly nature; that the Messiah is the Shechina, the Angel of the Covenant, the Mediator, the Redeemer, the Just One; that the Shechina is the Heavenly High Priest, and the Fountain of Life; that all perfections belong to the Messiah. In several places the divine name "Jeyah"—the Chaldee abridgment of "Jehovah"—is in a circuitous manner given to the Shechina. The following passages, also, are quoted by Eisenmenger. * "All those who do not study the Law of God very earnestly, the Holy Ghost, which is the Shechina, does not rest upon him;"† and, "God forbid, to suppose that the Shechina is a created Being. HE IS THE GLORIOUS AND BLESSED GOD. For, in the writings of our Rabbis, there are many things, which very plainly indicate that the Shechina is THE GOD BLESSED FOR EVER. Amen."‡

I now subjoin a part of the summary drawn up by Schœttgenius himself. "With respect to the names of the Messiah," says this learned writer, "he is expressly called in the Zohar by

* Schœttgenius *Hor. Heb. et Talm.* tom 2., p. 451.

† Do. do. do. do. do. p. 353.

‡ Do. do. do. do. do. p. 335.

§ Do. do. do. do. do. p. 334.

¶ Do. do. do. do. do. p. 427.

* See Eisenmenger *Entdecktes Indentum*, Part I., p. 268.

† Tickoni *Azohar*, vol. 6., col. 2.

‡ *Avodath Ackodesh*, 5th chap. of *Cheleck Ayichod*, fol. 11., col. 1.

the incommunicable name of Jehovah, the Angel of the Lord, the Shechina or Divine Glory, the Mediator, Michael the Archangel of the Covenant, the Word of the Lord, God the Holy and Blessed—the image of God, the Brightness of his Glory, the Lord of Hosts, the Son of God, the Son of the Most High, the Faithful Shepherd, the Lord of the Ministering Angels—the Angel Redeemer.”*

“When,” says Dr. Pye Smith, “the utmost allowance is made that reason will warrant, for the figurative style and the mystical character of this ancient book, a sufficiency of evidence will yet remain that the doctrines concerning the Messiah, which existed among the Jews about the time of their dispersion, had, indeed, much of the characters of absurdity and indistinct apprehension; but that, without any reasonable ground of question, they attributed to him a superior nature, a preëxistent state, and, to say the least, many characteristics properties of Deity. Even Gesenius admits that they at least rose up to the conception of AN INCARNATE JEHOVAH.”† And this opinion is confirmed by both the elder Buxtorf and Witsius, who have collected several opinions of several eminent Rabbies which testify to the great truths of the Messiah’s mediation, his expiation of sin, his authority, and his teaching.‡

It is thus evident, from evidence drawn from a variety of sources independent of one another, and as accessible to Christians as to Jews, that the ancient Jews, both before the time of Christ, immediately after, and during the early ages, did not believe in an absolute unity in the Godhead, but in a plurality of divine subsistence, and which they limited to THREE, in the One undivided Godhead.

* Schoettgenius *Hor. Heb. et Tal.* tom. iii., pp. 911—913.

† See Gesenius *Commentar über den Isaia*, I., 365.

‡ See Buxtorf *Lexic. Talm. et Rabb.* Col. 1192 ed. Basil 1639. Witsii *Miscellanea sacra*, vol. ii., p. 126. ed. Herbom 1712. See Schoettig. *Jesus der wahre Messias*, pp. 12, 25, ed. Leipzig, 1748.

ART. V.—HISTORICAL SKETCH OF SYSTEMS IN THEOLOGY.

BETWEEN the facts of theology, and those of natural science, there is a striking analogy. Both are from God, and, like all truth, are perfectly consistent with themselves, and with one another. Both are capable of being *systematized*, or of being logically connected and arranged, and yet God has not systematized either of them for us. The facts of nature stand out before us in the world, apparently isolated, and require much investigation and study, in order to their being arranged in scientific forms. And so it is with the facts of theology. They are before us in the Bible, standing out there with sufficient prominence, but not in a connected series, or scientifically arranged. This work of connexion, of arrangement, God has wisely left to be performed by ourselves. He has endowed us with inquisitive minds, with rational and logical powers, and he designs that we exercise and improve our powers in this way.

The sacred writers have given us the truths of revelation, as they were moved to do it by the Holy Ghost;—in narratives, in parables, in prophetic symbols, in pithy proverbs, in sacred songs. Thus the apostles and prophets received them, and uttered them; and it is enough for our *faith*, perhaps, to receive them in the same way;—just as it is enough for the purposes of animal life to receive the promiscuous, unconnected facts of nature. Still, the purposes of life can be better enjoyed and promoted, by the help of science in the natural world; and the same is true in the religious world. The Bible can be much better understood, and its benefits be more fully realized, by a scientific adjustment of its great facts and principles.

I propose, in this paper, to give a brief account of the efforts which have been made, at different periods, to systematize the truths of the Bible.

The first century of the Christian era includes the age of the apostles, and, in fact, of the immediate successors of the apostles. If we except the inspired penmen, the writers of this period were few, and their writings few; and these chiefly of an epistolary and hortatory character. We hear of no attempts to form the truths of religion into anything like a regular system. The circumstances of the times did not require it, and the suffering followers of Christ did not attempt. They were more concerned to honor the religion they had embraced in their lives and deaths, than to explain its principles scientifically, and arrange them according to the rules of art.

And what was true of the first century, may be said with almost equal propriety of the second. The fathers of the second century had frequent controversies with the Pagans, the Jews, and

different classes of heretics; and, in these controversies, some of the truths of religion were brought out with peculiar prominence. On the part of some of these fathers, too, there was more of a disposition to mingle human wisdom with the teachings of Scripture, than had before been exhibited. Still, no system of doctrines of the second century has come down to us, nor is it likely that any was attempted. The age of systems had not yet come.

In the third century, the disposition to explain the truths of religion, philosophically, had very much increased. This disposition first shewed itself in the catechetical school at Alexandria, and among the teachers who had there been educated. The new Platonic philosophy was now taught at Alexandria, by Ammonius and his followers, and some of the ministers of Christ were pleased with it, and embraced it. They were accustomed to speak of Christianity as one of the philosophies of the age. They associated with philosophers, and wore the philosophic garb. And as the new Platonists professed to regard all the philosophies as very much alike, only differently expressed, and undertook, by dint of allegory, to harmonize them all; some Christian teachers were not unwilling to go into the compromise with them. This was especially true of Origen, the most learned man, and the most prolific writer, of the age. Among his numerous works, Origen wrote one *de Principiis*, on the *first principles of the Christian faith*. This can hardly be called a system of theology, however; though it comes nearer to it than anything which had before appeared. It is in *four books*; in which the author lays down, with sufficient accuracy, some of the great truths or facts of the Christian system, and then explains and illustrates them, by the help of his philosophy. His error consisted, not so much in his religious belief, as in the philosophy of that belief; not in his denying any of the prominent facts of the Gospel, but in his strange and perverse explications of them.

A work very similar to this of Origen, and prepared on the same principles, was got up by Theognostus, in seven books. Gregory Thaumaturgus also prepared a manual of doctrine, which he called *Expositio Fidei*. Still, none of them can be regarded as complete systems of religious truth.

In the fourth century came the great Revolution, which placed Constantine on the throne, and brought Christianity into power and favor. This, too, was the beginning of Arianism, and of the long continued controversies respecting the Joinity, and the person of Christ. It was an age of great mental activity, of great men, and of distinguished writers in the Church. The controversies of the times brought several points of doctrine into earnest discussion, in consequence of which they were more accurately defined, and better understood, than they had been before. Creeds, too, had been drawn up, embodying the principal truths or facts of

the Gospel. There was the apostles' creed, so called; though it had no existence till long after the apostles. There was the creed of Irenæus, of Tertullian, of Origen, and some others. There was, also, the Nicene creed, drawn up with great care and labor, for the purpose of entrapping the wily Arius and his adherents, and of excluding them from the Church. Still, the truths of religion were not yet scientifically arranged and discussed. There was nothing written in the fourth century, which deserves to be called a theological system, if we except the catechetical discourses of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem. Nor do I think that these should be excepted, as they were prepared rather for the instruction of catechumens, than as a formal statement and vindication of the truth.

And what has been said of the fourth century may, with little qualification, be extended to the fifth. The discussions already commenced, concerning the Trinity and the person of Christ, continued through the fifth century, and every theory was propounded which, perhaps, ever can be, to explain the mysteries of the Incarnation, and of the hypostatic union. The great Augustine flourished in the first part of this century, and wielded the pen of a ready writer, as no one had done before him, in the defence and inculcation of the Gospel. His treatises in opposition to the Pelagian errors, and in vindication of the great doctrines of depravity, predestination, and grace, will ever be held in grateful remembrance, by all the friends of evangelical truth. Still, he prepared no connected system of theology. Nor do we find any in this age. The religionists of the times were chiefly divided into two classes, as they had begun to be a century before, viz: the *scholastics* and the *mystics*—the former seeking for light and truth by disputation and discussion; the latter by seclusion and meditation.

We proceed, then, in our search after systems, to the next century, *the sixth*. The discussions respecting the person of Christ were continued through the greater part of this period, very little to the edification of those concerned in them, and with little benefit to the world. Towards the latter part of the century, Isadore, of Seville, published three books of *sentences*, collected from the writings of Augustine, and of Gregory the Great. These sentences or propositions were followed up by Scripture proofs and illustrations, and may be regarded as constituting a manual of theology, still, it was but a naked compilation, and very poor at that. This, however, and other works of the like character, introduced a new form of theology, called the *positive*, in which every thing was made to rest on *authority*—the authority of the fathers, and of Scripture; so that, henceforward, we have three kinds of theology, instead of two—the *scholastic*, the *mystic*, and the *positive*.

During the seventh century, as in the sixth, the controversies

were continued respecting the person of Christ. They related, however, at this time, not so much to the question of his Divinity, as to the manner in which the Divine and the human were united in his person. Had he two wills, or only one will? Had he two natures, and two persons; or two natures, and one person; or only one mixed nature, and one person? Some might think these questions of small importance; but they were not so estimated by the venerable fathers of the sixth and seventh centuries.

There were three works of theology published in the seventh century, which passed, perhaps, for systems in those days, but would not be so regarded in our own. The first was a short summary of Christian doctrine, composed by Antiochus, a monk of Palestine, entitled *The Pandect of the Holy Scriptures*. At the close of the Pandect, we find some verses, in which the author deplores, in mournful measure, the loss of the true wood of the Cross, which he believed the Persians had carried away. The second is a summary of the theology of the times, composed by Idefonsus, bishop of Toledo, entitled *De Cognitione Baptismi*. The third was prepared by Tajo, bishop of Saragossa. It contains five books of sentences, taken chiefly from the writings of Gregory the Great. It is a dry and insipid performance; and yet so highly was it esteemed by the other bishops, that they did not hesitate to pronounce it the salt of the earth, and its author a Divine luminary in the Church.

In the eighth century, we first find, what we have been so long seeking after, a *proper system of Christian theology*. It was prepared by John, of Damascus, an eminent divine of the Eastern church. It is divided into four books; and, in point of method, unites what had been called the scholastic and positive theologies. The author employs a subtle ratiocination in explaining doctrines, and then confirms them by quotations from Scripture and the fathers. In his first book, John treats of the being and attributes of God, and of the Trinity. In his second book, he considers the work of creation, and the beings and things which God has made; as the world, angels, demons, heaven and earth, paradise and man. He speaks of Divine Providence, prescience, and predestination, and insists that the latter does not reach to the free actions of men. God permits their actions, but does not ordain them. He concludes his second book with a consideration of Adam's fall, and its consequences to his posterity.

John's third book is on the doctrine of Christ, and the way of salvation. He asserts the two-fold nature of Christ, and his two wills, and holds that the sufferings of Christ were confined to his human nature. The fourth book is chiefly occupied with the external rites and ordinances of the Church. He speaks of the sacraments, much after the manner of the Romanists. He says there are eight distinct kinds of baptism. 1. The deluge. 2. That

of the cloud and sea. 3. The purifications under the law. 4. The baptism of John. 5. That appointed by Christ. 6. The baptism of tears. 7. That of blood, or martyrdom. 8. That of eternal fire, in which the wicked will be merged forever.

I have given a more particular account of this celebrated work, because it is the first of its kind that occurs in the history of the Church, and because of the high estimation in which it was long held in the Eastern church, and is, perhaps, to the present day.

There was no new system of doctrine composed, so far as we know, in the ninth century. John, of Damascus, was high authority among the Greeks, while the Latins acquiesced in the decisions of Augustine. The great writers of the age were Rabanus Maurus, John Scotus, and Gotteschalk. The doctrine of transubstantiation began to be moved by Radbert, and was opposed by Scotus and Rabanus Maurus. It was not finally established in the Romish church, until the sixteenth century, Gotteschalk distinguished himself by reviewing and advocating the doctrine of Augustine, respecting predestination and grace; and, strange as it may seem, while the name of Augustine was held in great veneration, these doctrines were opposed, and Gotteschalk was severely persecuted.

During this century, the mystic theology, and with it monkery, were greatly promoted in the west, by the translation of the reputed work of Dionysius, the Aropagite, into Latin.

The tenth century produced no new work on systematic theology. John, of Damascus, was still the oracle among the Greeks, while Gregory and Augustine were the principal authorities with the Latins. The predestinarian and sacramentarian controversies were continued, though with less vigour than in the preceding age. Indeed, the tenth century was a period of great darkness and ignorance, when there seemed to be scarcely enough of life in the Church to maintain a controversy of any kind. The principal topic of interest was *the coming of Christ*, which, through the greater part of the century, was immediately expected, producing its usual results when not rightly improved, in the neglect of business, squandering of property, pilgrimages to Jerusalem, &c.

In the eleventh century, theology was more studied than in the preceding, and discussions assumed more of the scholastic form. The sacramentarian controversy was vigorously prosecuted. Transubstantiation was opposed by Berengar, and advocated by Lanfranc and others. The two principal theologians of the age were Anselm and Hildebert. Anselm did not profess to write a system of theology; and yet most of the points of a system are discussed in his several works, and that, too, with great acuteness. In his little work entitled, *An Deus Homo*, he insists on the fallen state of man, and his need of an Almighty Saviour to make expiation for his sins; and shows that an Incarnate God, and he only, could perform the office of Mediator.

Hildebert, bishop of Mans, and afterwards archbishop of Tours, prepared what may be called a system of Divinity. It is divided into forty chapters, and occupies some ninety folio pages in his works. It treats of the nature of faith, free-will, and sin, the trinity, the Incarnation of Christ, of depravity, predestination, and grace, and of the sacraments. It scarcely touches upon the important subjects of atonement, regeneration, and sanctification. The author's method is, first, to substantiate each doctrine by passages from Scripture and the fathers, and then to remove difficulties and objections by the help of reason and philosophy; thus uniting the positive method with the scholastic. Meagre as this publication was, it came the nearest to a proper system of theology of any that had as yet been written in the Latin language. Hildebert was long studied, and was a model, as to method, for those who came after him.

The twelfth century was a period of more theological activity than any which had preceded it. The famous Abelard, by his lectures and books, gave a new impulse to the scholastic theology. He is thought by some to have published a system, but it seems to have been little more than an introduction. He was the great liberalist of the age, and was strenuously opposed by the more pious and equally celebrated Bernard, Abbot of Clairval. Bernard was a voluminous writer, but put forth no regular system of theology. Systems were published, however, by several individuals; among whom were Hugo of St. Victor, William of Auxerre, and Robert Pulleyn, a distinguished scholar of England. But the most celebrated of all works of this kind which had yet appeared in the Latin world, was *the sentences of Peter Lombard*. These sentences are propositions, taken from the fathers,—chiefly from Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, and are divided into four books. Lombard begins by saying, after Augustine, that all knowledge pertains either to *things* or *signs*. The things to be known are again divided into such as are to be *enjoyed*, and such as may be *used*. Accordingly, in his first book, he treats of things to be enjoyed. These all may be comprised in God, the supreme good of man,—in his nature, his attributes, and the mysterious mode of his existence, three persons in one God. These constitute the subject of his first book. The second book treats of things to be *used*, viz: of the creation, of the formation of angels and men, of the apostacy of angels and men, of grace and free-will, of original and actual sin. In his third book, Lombard treats of the Incarnation and sacrifice of Christ, of redemption, faith, charity, and good works. Having spoken of *things*, the fourth and last book treats chiefly of *signs*, that is, *the sacraments*. These can be no more and no less than *seven*, as seven is a sacred number. In some of the last sections of this book, the author treats of the resurrection, the judgment, and the final state. Such

is the plan of this celebrated work, which was a principal text book in theology for several hundred years. The author was commonly called "the Master of Sentences;" and learned divines, for several centuries, employed themselves in writing commentaries on his work.

In the thirteenth century, the scholastic theology was in the highest repute. It was opposed, indeed, by the *positives* and *mystics*; but all who aspired to fame and influence adopted the scholastic method, and were collectively called *schoolmen*. They studied Aristotle more than the Bible, and were metaphysical philosophers rather than Christians. To save their credit as philosophers, and yet not endanger their studying as Christians, they invented the distinction of a thing philosophically true, yet theologically false. Many propositions which they believed as philosophers, they rejected as Christians.

Many in this age wrote commentaries on Lombard's Sentences, and several prepared *summas* or *systems* of theology for themselves. Prominent among the latter class were Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas. Albert wrote a compend of theology, in seven books. Aquinas wrote a much larger system, in three parts. In the first part, he treats of God,—his essence, attributes, and operations; of his blessedness; of the three Divine persons, their processions and relations. The second part is chiefly ethical and practical, treating of the Christian experience and virtues. In the third part, Aquinas speaks of the means of coming to God,—the Incarnation of Christ, and the sacraments. Aquinas' works are published in 17 folio volumes, three of which are occupied with his *Summa Theologiae*.

Compend of theology were also written, in the thirteenth century, by Alexander Hales, by Henry of Ghent, and by Pope Innocent III.

The fourteenth century was less fruitful in *summas*, or systems of theology, than the thirteenth. The *Summa* of Aquinas was in great repute, and was translated into Greek. Distinct commentaries were written on Lombard's Sentences by not less than thirty individuals. Duns Scotus' Commentary on Lombard occupies six folio volumes. This century was one of much keen theological controversy. Duns Scotus and Occam wrote against the doctrine of Aquinas on the subjects of predestination and grace; Aquinas affirming, and Scotus denying, the theology of Augustine. And as Aquinas was a Dominican, and Scotus a Franciscan, these rival orders of monks entered deeply into the controversy. There were controversies, also, between the different classes of theologians, the Biblical, the Scholastic, and the Mystic. This, also, was the age of John Wickliffe, and of the controversies awakened by his writings. Wickliffe wrote much, and on many subjects, but left no connected system of theology.

In the fifteenth century, we find little done in the way of preparing new systems. Many studied the Summa of Aquinas, and more wrote commentaries on the Sentences of Lombard. The scholastic method of teaching theology was in less repute than it had been, while the mystics were coming into favour. It was in this age that Thomas à Kempis, who was a mystic, wrote the popular treatise ascribed to him on the Imitation of Christ. The ignorance of the clergy in respect to the Bible was deplorable. Multitudes of them had never seen a Bible, but depended entirely on their glosses and summas for all that they knew of it. This age witnessed the martyrdom of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, and the bloody Bohemian wars, by which their sufferings were avenged.

We come, at length, to the sixteenth century, the time of the Protestant reformation. It is no part of my object to write a history of the reformation, or of the endless disputes and controversies which grew out of it. We have to do, at present, with systems of theology. I am not aware that any system of note appeared in this century among the Romanists. Several of their learned men wrote commentaries on the Sentences of Lombard, and on the Summa of Aquinas; but they were too much engaged in controversy to draw out a system for themselves.

Among the Protestants, several important works were published. The *Loci Communes* of Melancthon, went through sixty editions, during the author's life, and served as a common guide to the Lutheran teachers for a long period. Ursinns, a disciple of Melancthon, published a system of theology, in the latter part of the century. At an earlier period, Zuingle published his work on True and False Religion, for the benefit of the Swiss churches. But the greatest theological work of the age was Calvin's Institutes, which long held the same rank and authority in the Reformed churches, which Melancthon's Common Places did among the Lutherans. It is a standard work in theology, at the present day. Others among the Reformed, who prepared compends of theology, were Musculus, Piscator, Peter Martyr, and Zanchy.

In this age, most of the creeds which have any authority at the present day were composed. The creed of the Romish church was published by the Council of Trent, about the middle of the sixteenth century. The Augsburg Confession, which was the creed of the Lutheran church, was written earlier, by Melancthon. The creeds of the different Reformed churches, in Switzerland, Holland, France, England, and Scotland, were drawn up and published in the latter part of the century.

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were fruitful in systems of divinity, especially among the Protestants. I cannot pretend to give a complete list of the authors, or to go into a de-

scription of their several works. The following are some of the more distinguished :

In the Lutheran church, Calixtus wrote in the 17th century ; Buddæus, Dæderlein, and Næsselt, in the 18th ; and Knapp, Morus, and Storr and Flatt, in the 18th and 19th.

Among the Swiss, Turretin wrote in the 17th century, and Pictet and Osterwald in the 18th.

Among the Scotch, John Brown, of Haddington, and Dr. George Campbell prepared systems in the 18th century, and Dr. John Dick in the 19th.

In the Church of England we have Bishop Pearson, Bishop Burnet, and Tilenus in the 17th century ; Stackhousè, Dr. John Edwards, and Dr. Fiddes in the 18th ; and Newland in the 19th. Newland is little more than an analysis of the system of Burnet.

Among the English dissenters, Milton and Thomas Watson wrote in the 17th century ; Doddridge, Ridgley, and Gill in the 18th, and Richard Watson in the 19th. Of these, Dr. Gill was a Baptist, and Richard Watson a Wesleyan Methodist.

Of Dutch theologians, we have Limborch, Marck, Wigandus, and Binchius in the 17th century, and Herman Witsius in the 18th.

In our own country, the following divines, among others, have published systems of theology : President Willard, in the 17th century ; Dr. Samuel Hopkins, in the 18th ; and Doctors Dwight, Woods, and Schmucker, in the 19th. Neither President Edwards nor Dr. Emmons can be said to have prepared a formal system, though they wrote largely and connectedly on theological subjects.

In the commencement of this article, I remarked on the *advantages* of system in theology ; believing them to be as great in this branch of knowledge as in any other. With a word as to the appropriate *province* of system or science in theology, I close. In order to be a benefit, science in theology, as in other things, must confine itself to *facts*. Science cannot *make* facts, here or anywhere else. Nor is it allowable for science to supply theories or conjectures, where facts are wanting. As in nature, true science has to deal with the facts of nature ; so in theology, it has to deal with the facts of theology. These are clearly made known, some of them in the works of God, but more in his word ; and it is the province of the theologian to take them as they are, arrange them appropriately and connectedly, and show their consistency one with another. This is *scientifico* or *systematic* theology. Above it, and beyond it, is *practical* theology—the truth of the Bible turned into motives, and pressed upon the conscience and the heart.

In theology, thus studied and pursued, there can be no danger. It will be a help and a source of happiness to the inquiring soul. It will be a means of sanctification, and of final salvation.

ART. VI.—IDOLATRY—ITS RISE—NOT MAN'S PRIMITIVE RELIGION—HUME'S ARGUMENT DISPOSED OF.

———"O that men
 (Canst thou believe?) should be so stupid grown,
 While yet the patriarch liv'd, who scap'd the flood,
 As to forsake the living God, and fall
 To worship their own work in wood and stone
 For Gods!"—*Par. Lost*, xii., 116-119.

I. OUR word Idolatry is derived from two Greek words, *ἰδωλον*, an image, and *λατρεῖν*, to serve or worship. The term is used by us, however, in a more extended sense. It comprehends—1. The worship of images, idols, or any thing made by human hands as God; 2. It comprehends also the worship of the heavenly bodies, the sun, moon, and stars, or of men, demons, animals, and angels or saints; and 3. The term is used now to signify any excessive attachment, or veneration, for any thing, that borders on adoration or complete devotion to it. The learned and curious are not agreed as to when nor how idolatry first began. It is confessedly, however, both very old and very widely spread; but we think we can explain its origin, and account for its wide diffusion, without finding any just accusation against the one living and true God. So remote is its origin, however, and so extended is its domain, that infidels say: If there is any true religion, it must be Polytheism, and that idolatry is the primitive religion of mankind. Mr. Hume,* and other writers of his school, have not hesitated to urge it as an objection to the Bible, that it teaches that Theism is the oldest religion of our race; whereas, they say, Polytheism, or the worship of many gods rather than of one only Supreme Creator, is prior in point of time. Mr. Hume exerts all his reasoning powers to prove that Polytheism must have been the primary religion of mankind; but, with all his ability and acuteness, he fails to make out his cause. His arguments, as far as they bear upon the subject, only go to show what we admit, namely: that some eighteen hundred years ago, all of our race, except the Jews, was plunged into gross idolatry; and that Theism, or the worship of one Supreme God, could not have originated in mere human reasoning. It is true, the whole world lies in wickedness, and that eighteen hundred years ago nearly all mankind, and even still a large portion of our race are idolatrous. And it is true that the belief in one God, as a pure spirit, is not the result of men's

* This was not original with Hume. "There is yet one heresy," says Philostratus, "which affirms that heathenism was not introduced through the wickedness of men, nor even invented through the suggestion of the devil, in order to practice vice and sin, but was instituted by God himself. But if it was established by God, why is it condemned by God? For, that from the beginning of the world, a knowledge of God, the Almighty Father, was published, admits of no doubt." Quoted by Theolock on Heathenism, p. 14.

own reasonings, but of revelation from God himself. Now, as Theism is not the result of mere unassisted reasoning, but of a Divine communication from heaven to man, we say, the very existence of such a system of faith and worship is proof that a Divine communication was actually made to man, and that its revelations are true. Suppose it true, as Hume asserts, that it was impossible for men, in the first ages of the world, left to themselves, to have any other religion than Idolatry. Then whence is the Theism of Christianity and of Judaism? According to his own reasoning, it must have had its origin in a revelation from God himself; and if so, then as a Deist he convicts himself, for this is the very thing we contend for. But again, if there be a Creator, is it possible to suppose He would create man, and place him in such circumstances that from the very beginning, he must either have no religion at all, or be an idolater? This is a reflection upon the Divine beneficence and wisdom, that cannot be entertained for a moment. Even Hume himself admits that "there is a consent, almost universal among mankind, in the belief that there is an invisible, intelligent power in the world." This invisible, intelligent power is God, the Creator and Preserver of the world; and it is for Hume to account for this "almost universal consent," and to show how it is that with such a prevailing belief, all men, from the very beginning, should have been, as he supposes, polytheists and idolaters. His arguments are contradictory. His assertion about Polytheism is not true. The first, the primary faith of our race was pure Theism. In the beginning, men were not idolaters; they worshipped the Supreme Being, as one God and only one. If it be admitted there is a God, who is the Creator of the human race, then it cannot be true that his creatures, from the very beginning, and in their first acts, were without any true knowledge of their Creator, and left inevitably to Polytheism or a total want of any religion at all. Historically we know that it was not so. The united testimony of all ancient nations is that their original progenitors possessed a knowledge of one living and true God, who was worshipped by them, and believed to be an All-wise, Infinite Spirit, the Creator of all things. And the farther back we go into the history of ancient nations in Africa, Asia, and America, the purer and more simple is their theology. The Hindoos, Egyptians, and Greeks, though idolaters in practice, seem never wholly to have lost the idea of one Supreme Being, who was over all things, men, angels, and gods. They themselves deny that they are idolaters. And it is a question still in debate among the learned, whether the Egyptians of the oldest dynasties were idolaters at all. Now, the consent of all mankind to the belief in a Supreme Being, and the united testimony of all ancient nations, that their progenitors had some knowledge of and belief in a Supreme Being, who was the Creator of all things, are strong

proofs—1st, that originally mankind were not Polytheists; and 2d, that the Creator did communicate some knowledge of himself to our race. And we submit, in the absence of any proof for any other Creator and of any other communication worthy of our attention, that the Creator of the world is the God known to us as the Jehovah of the Jews, and that the Bible is the revelation which He has communicated to our race. According to Hume himself, Theism, or the worship of one living and true God, is wholly dependent on a divine communication. And historically, it is true that there is not and never has been a pure Theism found among men, but in connection with revelation. Men owe their Theism to the Scriptures. The world is indebted to the Hebrews for a knowledge of the Divine unity and spirituality.

II. The most ancient idolatry seems to have been the worship of the sun, or of the heavenly bodies. Diodorus, and almost all writers since his day, agree that the Egyptians, in some sense, worshipped the sun, moon, and stars, as their principal gods. The same is true of the Phenicians, and ancient Arabs, and of the Assyrians, Chaldeans, and all the tribes of North-Eastern Europe and of Asia. Sir Wm. Jones, in his learned Asiatic Researches, has set this point beyond controversy. And Plato, Aristotle, and Plutarch, tell us that the first inhabitants of Greece esteemed the sun, moon, and stars as gods. Plutarch says it is a great absurdity to deny the things that are generally believed among us—"that there is a Providence, and that the sun and moon are animated, whom, says he, all men worship, and to whom they offer up sacrifice and prayers." Homer saith of the sun, that "he seeth and knoweth all things." Menander declares "that men ought to worship him as the first, or chief of the gods." Macrobinus, a pagan historian, tells us that the heathens of his day addressed the sun in their morning prayers, as the "almighty, all-governing sun, the spirit of the world, the power of the world, the light of the world." The Chinese are believed from a remote antiquity, to have worshipped the sun, moon, and stars. From the time of their first emperor, Fohi, who was probably identical with the Hebrew Noah, their emperors are said to have sacrificed to heaven and earth. And it is well known that the principal deity of the Peruvians and Mexicans was the sun, to whom they erected temples, and offered sacrifices. It is true a class of writers once believed that the aborigines of this continent did not offer human sacrifices, or worship idols, but the proof is now abundant and overwhelming, that at least the most powerful, and the most highly civilized aboriginal nations of the new world, did worship idols and sacrifice human beings to their gods. And recent readings of the monumental history of the Assyrians and Egyptians prove the same things to have been practiced on the Nile and Euphrates. The idolatry which the Scriptures call "the worship of the host

of heaven" certainly did prevail at an early age in Asia, Europe and Africa, and among the aborigines of America. A patient consideration of the subject will, nevertheless, show that man's primitive religion was a pure Theism.

III. The deification of heroes, is another species of idolatry, that soon prevailed in the world. Some suppose that one of the causes that gave rise to idolatry, was affection for lost friends or benefactors. And that a parent, out of love for a favourite child, may have venerated his likeness after his death. And that respect for great benefactors or military leaders caused homage to be rendered to them after death, which, among the enthusiastic, were soon regarded as divine honours. It is well known that some conquerors demanded of their subjects such honours after death. And it was natural that vain and ambitious men, actuated by political motives, should encourage the worship of those who had once been men, and had been taken into the number of the gods. For by encouraging such worship, they established their own authority, and prepared the way for similar honours to be rendered to themselves. And it was easy as soon as men were deified, to apply to them the names and titles that had been attributed to the celestial bodies. The process seems to have been thus: in worshipping the heavenly hosts, who were first regarded as mere *representatives* of the Supreme Being, first the same names and attributes were applied to them as to the Supreme Being, and in process of time, the great mass of the people forgot that they were *representatives*, and worshipped them as true gods. The finest representatives of heathen deities were human figures. The *Hercules Farnese*, *Venus de Medici*, *Apollo Belvidere* are specimens of art unrivalled to this day. But when their sculptors had given human shapes to their deities, then they soon conceived of them as having human passions, and as clothed with human attributes, and hence soon worshipped them as gods that would gratify their sensual appetites. In like manner, by deifying men, the same worship, names, and attributes were first applied to them that were applied to the gods themselves, and this application soon caused them to be regarded as gods—this application of divine attributes led, of course, to great confusion. Thus we are told that Osiris, of the Egyptians, Bel, of the Chaldeans, and Baal, of the Phenicians, signify both a deified man and the sun. And so, also, many of the hero gods of antiquity are the names both of stars and heroes, and both are honoured with divine titles and epithets. And still more, it is the opinion of many of our most learned men, that the names of these gods are but corruptions of the Hebrew names and attributes of the Supreme Being, which were at first applied only to the Supreme Deity, but afterwards came to be applied to deified heroes:—Jehovah, Jove, are examples. And it is worthy of special remembrance also, that Sir

William Jones traces palpably the origin of this idolatry of deified men and the worship of the heavenly bodies to the same source, namely, to the ancient Iran, which he calls "the oldest monarchy in the world;" and Col. Hamilton Smith, in his able and learned work on the "Natural History of the Human Species," has shown most conclusively that the "Typical Stocks" of the human races and of the grains of the fields and of the fruits and animals most used by man, can all be traced back to the interior of Central Asia, or the ancient Persia, and high lands of Thibet *

IV. Now it is certainly no mean proof of the truth of the belief generally entertained among us that the Bible is a Revelation from God, and the source of our knowledge of the one true God, that, *historically*, we can trace the human races back to three progenitors, and that their starting place, or cradle, was in the interior of Central Asia; that to this agree all the traditions of Asia, Europe, Africa, and America; that both *historically* and *traditionally*, also, the same origin is ascribed to the animals, birds, and fruits used by man—and that, *philosophically*, we can trace all human languages, colors, and races pretty clearly and fully up to their *trinal* roots, first appearing and spreading from Central Asia—that is, to the three sons of Noah. Sir William Jones, in his Asiatic Researches, in tracing the origin of hero-worship to the Hindoos in Iran, or ancient Persia, says: "Thus it has been proved by clear evidence and plain reasoning, that a powerful monarchy was established in Iran long before the Assyrian; that it was a Hindoo monarchy; that the language of the first Persian empire was the mother of the Sanscrit, and, consequently, of the Zend and Parsi, as well as of Greek, Latin, and Gothic. * * *

We discover, therefore, in Persia, at the earliest dawn of history, the three distinct races of men, whom we described on a former occasion as possessors of India, Arabia, and Tartary, and that they diverged from thence as from a common centre. * * * And thus the Saxon chronicles, I presume good authority, brings the first inhabitants of Britain from Armenia, and that the Goths, or Scythians, came from Persia; and that both the Irish and old Britons proceeded severally from the borders of the Caspian. We may, therefore, hold this proposition firmly established, that Iran, or Persia, in its largest sense, was the true centre of population, of knowledge, of languages, and of arts, which were expanded in all directions, to all the regions of the world."

There are many facts in support of this origin of hero-worship and of its diffusion. It is certainly worthy of notice, that Dr. Robertson should insist prominently on the resemblance of the

* Lieut. Col. Charles H. Smith's "Natural History of the Human Species;" Dr. Latham's "Man and his Migrations;" Rev. Dr. James Smith's "Defence," 1 vol. sec. 2., in many places; Osburn's Antiquities of Egypt; and also his "Monumental Egypt," *passim*.

aborigines of Germany to the savage tribes of this continent. In his Charles V., he speaks of many striking points of resemblance; and equally striking are the resemblances between the aboriginal inhabitants of Mexico and Peru, and the inhabitants of India. The ancient temples and idols of Mexico, Central America, and of Peru, bear a marked resemblance to those of Hindostan. All who have read the works of our learned and eloquent countryman,* on Mexico and Peru, and who are tolerably familiar with Hindoo history, cannot fail to have been impressed with the analogy. And Sir William Jones says, after a great deal of research and study on the subject, and a long residence in India, that the ceremonies and superstitions of China and Japan have a remarkable affinity with those of Hindostan. Speaking of Hindostan, he says: "We now live among the adorers of those very deities who were worshipped under different names in old Greece and Italy, and among the professors of those philosophical tenets which the Ionic and Attic writers illustrated with all the beauties of their melodious language. On one hand we see the trident of Neptune, the eagle of Jupiter, the satyrs of Bacchus, the bow of Cupid, and the chariot of the sun; on the other we hear the cymbals of Rhea, the songs of the Muses, and the pastoral tales of Apollo Nomius. In more retired scenes, in groves, and in seminaries of learning, we may perceive the Brahmins and the Sarmanes, mentioned by Clemens, disputing in the form of logic, or discoursing on the vanity of human enjoyments, on the immortality of the soul, her emanation from the eternal mind, her debasement, wanderings, and final union with her source. The six philosophic schools, whose principles are explained in the Dersana Sastra, compose all the metaphysics of the old academy; nor is it possible to read the Vedanta, or the many fine compositions in relation to it, without discovering that Pythagoras and Plato derived their sublime theories from the same fountain with the sages of India. I believe it is now admitted, by the best writers, that the worship of Egypt was closely allied to that of India. Col. Smith, in his work already referred to, tells us that British sepoy's under General Sir R. Abercrombie, in the re-conquest of Egypt, "no sooner entered the ancient temples in the valley of the Nile than they asserted their own divinities were discovered on the walls, and worshipped them accordingly. They even pointed out the Oresvaminam, or Brahmin distinguishing card, as likewise a decoration of the painted divinities." In view, then, of the latest and best investigations that have been made on this whole subject, it is not too much to say that, according to philosophy, tradition, and history, the origin of our race and their dispersion, the rise

* Prescott.

and diffusion of the most ancient kinds of idolatry, the worship of deified men and of the heavenly hosts, is found to have sprung from the same part of the world and to have spread from thence to the four quarters of the globe. Sir William Jones asserts that this conclusion is "supported by indisputable facts."*

V. We can then trace our race to Central Asia, as well as the animals, fowls and fruits most used by us, and there also, we find, the origin of the idolatry and Polytheism of mankind. Historically, traditionally, and philosophically, we are thus taught to turn our eyes in the same general direction for man's origin, and the centre from which he dispersed over the globe. The lines of idolatry and superstition diverge in the same way that our traditions do, as to our races. And thus we are brought back to the point at issue between us and infidels. Is it true, then, as Hume asserts, that the first and only religion of mankind in the early ages was idolatry? Or is it true, that all other religions are derived from the Hindoo mythology, as another infidel writer, Mr. Taylor, of England, asserts? I trust it has already been made

* The first colonists of the valley of the Nile reached Egypt from Asia by the Isthmus of Suez. The first city they founded was Heliopolis, "where they dedicated a Temple to the setting sun, under the impersonation of a man named *Athor*. In this name the builders of Heliopolis identified the sun, their *divus pater*, with ADAM, the father of mankind. In exactly the same spirit of man-worship they also deified the Nile under the impersonation of Noah." Osburn's *Monuments of Egypt*, 1 vol., 262. And what is *Amun*, but Ham? And *Isis*, but the Hebrew *Isha*, female-man or woman. *Isis* is the feminine of OSIRIS. And the way Osiris got his wife is also significant. At Abydos MENCHZERS split the wooden image of Osiris into two halves, and out of the left side the figure of a woman was carved, which he called *Ishi*, that is, the female Osiris." 1 vol. Osburn, p. 348. There are some very curious facts on this point. For example: Learned men tell us the Hebrew Noah is the same as the Chinese Fohi. And Osburn reads from the monuments of Egypt, that the impersonation of the Nile worshipped as a god among the Egyptians, is known by a name corresponding to the Fohi of the Chinese, and the Noah of the Hebrews. 2 vol., p. 579. and 1 vol., 240. And the Chinese records claim to have discovered this Continent about 1,400 years ago. The history of Mexico, as it was when discovered by the Spaniards, suggests that the religion of the Aztecs was the same as that of the ancient Chinese. Their forms of Government were nearly the same. Many words are the same, and others have a striking resemblance. Mr. Jas. McC. Hanley has furnished us the following examples. Mr. Hanley is a Chinese interpreter::

TRANSLATION.

<i>Chinese.</i>	<i>Indian.</i>	<i>English.</i>
Nang,	Nang-a,	Man.
Soo,	Ti-soo,	Hand.
How,	How-a,	Mouth.
Ee-lung,	Lee-lum,	Deafness.
Choe-Koo,	Koo-cheo,	Hog.
Soo,	Ack-a-soo,	Beard.
Yoet,	Yoet-a,	Moon.
Yeet-ow,	Yee-a,	Sun.

Yi-yam, in the Indian language, is night.

Yi-yam, in the Chinese, is the God of the moon or of night.

Hee-ma, in the Indian language, is day.

Hee-ma, in the Chinese, is the God of the sun or of day.

plain, that these assertions are not true. 1st. They cannot be true, without impeaching the wisdom, goodness, and parental character of God; they cannot be true, if we have any communication from God, at all, teaching us how to worship him. 2d. Historically, we find that all nations, even after they had sunk into idolatry, preserved traditions among them, to the effect, that their original progenitors did not worship idols as they did, but had some knowledge of an invisible, all wise and Supreme Being, whom they worshipped as God. It is true, the knowledge or belief they still preserved of God, was encumbered with a mass of gross superstitions, and that, in the crowd of idols, the true God was not worshipped at all; but still, there prevailed some idea of one Supreme Being, even amongst idolatrous nations. This appears from two facts:

First. Among the ancient idolaters of Greece, Egypt, and Asia, it is difficult, perhaps impossible, always clearly to define in what light they regarded the objects they worshipped. If they regarded the sun, moon and stars, as real divinities, they certainly did not so regard the animals, serpents, vegetables, and blocks of stone and wood, before which they worshipped. It is probable, that the most intelligent among them, only considered all such objects of worship, as mere *representations* of deities, and not as gods. And it is certain, that with them, there were orders and ranks among their gods and goddesses, which implied a supreme or presiding Deity.

Secondly. Among the savage tribes of this continent, as well as among those of the old world, it is certain, there is, and was, an almost "universal consent," as Mr. Hume calls it, in the belief of the existence of a Great Spirit, who is the Creator and Ruler of all things. The aborigines of North and South America, and of the Islands of the sea, and the negroes of Africa, and the Hottentots, as well as the natives of the frozen regions of the north, even if they do not worship the Great Spirit, it is not because they do not believe in His existence, but it is because they think He is too great, and too far removed to care for them. They all profess to hold some kind of belief in an Almighty Being, who is the Creator, and God of all the gods.

Thirdly. It is admitted, that the Greek and Latin poets, believed in a pure Theism. They were corruptors of theology. Their writings contain a great mass of licentiousness and error; but still there runs through them, the idea of one Supreme Being. Cicero, and several of the best heathen authors, have declared their opinions in favour of one Supreme Governor and Maker of the world. The poets of Arabia, and the ancient writers of Persia, India, and China, have also testified to the same belief. Sir William Jones tells, "that the pure adoration of one Creator prevailed in Tartary during the first generations from Yafet, * * *

and that the great Chengiz was a Theist." The ancient Chinese had a knowledge of the Supreme God. Confucius and his followers had a firm belief in one Supreme God. The early Egyptian mythology taught most distinctly, the unity of God, although the method of instruction used by its priests, led the people to the lowest depths of Polytheism. Porphyry* declares unhesitatingly, that "originally, the Egyptians worshipped but one God." And the Greek authors generally concur in this conclusion. Herodotus says, the ancient Egyptians retained the idea of a God who was supreme, self-existent, and from eternity to eternity." Iamblichus† says, "the Egyptians worshipped God, the Master and Creator of the universe, above all the elements, self-existent, immaterial, incorporeal, uncreated, indivisible, unseen, and all-sufficient; who comprehends all things in himself, and imparts all things to all creation." "The idea of this unity was conveyed, by making the sun, the point to which all the parts of the Egyptian polytheism converged, and in which they became one. He was an attribute of all the divinities above him; all those below him in the hierarchy, were emanations from, or parts of himself."‡ And according to William Jones, "the first religion of Iran," which was the oldest country inhabited, and the source and centre of all idolatry, "was that of the one Supreme Being." The oldest, and the noblest religion, of all religions, he affirms, was "a firm belief that one Supreme God made the world by His power, and continually governed it by His providence; a pious fear, love, and adoration of Him; a due reverence for parents, and aged persons; a paternal affection for the whole human species, and a compassionate tenderness, even for the brute creation." This was the religion of Menu, who flourished in India, about A. C. 1000. His religion prevailed in his own country, and thence spread into China, Japan, Thibet, and Ceylon.

VI. We have then plainly arrived at the demonstration, historically, that Mr. Hume's assertion, that the first and only religion of mankind was Polytheism, is not true. But he also maintains, that Theism, or the belief in one Supreme God, is not possible, without some communication from God, himself, to men. Now observe: First. It is not true, that the original religion of our race was Polytheism, or the worship of many gods, and of idols. We have offered proof, taken from the most ancient nations, and from the most reliable sources—sources which, in part, have been brought to light since Mr. Hume's day, showing that the primitive religion of the human race, was the belief in, and worship of, one Supreme God. We have not offered a single

* De Abst., lib. iv., 6.

† De Myste. Egypt.

‡ Osborn's Antiquities, p. 128.

text, or proof from the Bible. We have relied on historical evidence for this point, as if there was no Bible.

Secondly. Then we press the disciples of Mr. Hume, and all his school, to explain on his principles, the origin, and the wide spread idea of a pure Theism. We have found among mankind, at a very early period, the worship of idols, the deification of heroes, and religious homage paid to the heavenly bodies. But we find, aback of all this, and prior to this, and still more widely diffused among mankind, some notion of a Supreme God, and that this notion has never been wholly extinguished. Now, whence this knowledge of one Supreme God! If the primitive religion of Iran, or of mankind, wherever they were in their earliest years, was idolatry, how, then, did the author of the book of *Menur* come to possess any idea of one Supreme, Self-existent Spirit? How did the savages of our own continent, make so important a discovery? Some kind, or degree of belief, in a Supreme Being, we find among legislators, poets, and historians of all nations, rude and savage, as well as civilized—and even among those that were sunk in the grossest idolatry, and surrounded with thousands of deities and idols. Now, according to Hume's own argument, this notion, or knowledge of, and belief in, and worship of, one Supreme God, is not natural to man. He asserts, "it cannot be the result of men's own reasoning." Well, so let it be. Whence comes it, then? We find Theism pure in the Bible, and held by Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans. And we find it more or less pure, overlying, and lying aback of, all idolatry itself. Now, we press the followers of Hume for an answer: Whence is it? He says, it cannot be the result of mere human reasoning; and for once he is right. And but one intelligent answer can be given: A knowledge of the Creator, was communicated by himself, to the progenitor of our races, and has been handed down by tradition, from generation to generation, and carried with them, in their dispersions over all the earth. To us, there is no other satisfactory solution of this difficulty; but this solution leaves our opponent in an inextricable dilemma.

If the Creator has communicated this knowledge of himself to our race, then, Theism, and not Polytheism, is the primeval religion of man, and we are indeed dependent on His revelation, for our knowledge of the way to worship Him, and of what is acceptable in His sight; and thus we have a strong presumption at once, in favour of the Bible, as a message from the living and true God, teaching us what to believe concerning Him, and what duty he requireth of us. And even if we admit all that is claimed reasonably, for the light of Nature, still that light is a revelation. Or, if a part of this knowledge of the Creator, is inwrought with our creation, or flows from the teachings of conscience, still it is a

revelation. It comes to us from the voice of God, speaking to us in His works, by His spirit, and from our own hearts. The explanation, then, we give, is as simple, as it is historically true, and philosophically correct. When God created man, his knowledge of his Creator was perfect. The Creator's laws were written on his heart. The creature was then in communion with the Creator. There was perfect peace between them. Man was in harmony with all the laws of his Maker. When man sinned, then the Creator's laws were erased from his heart—only some traces of them remained. And as time rolled on, these traces grew more and more dim, and consequently, communications from God became more and more necessary, and more frequent. Man's traditions were partly from his consciousness of his primeval state in Eden, and his fall and expulsion, and partly from what God told him. Thus, the history of man towards his Maker proceeded, till wickedness filled the earth, and the flood put an end to the first dynasty of Adamic races. A new era began with Noah's emergency from the ark. He had a store of knowledge, consisting of what he knew of his own history, and of communications from God to himself, and the traditions of his fathers back to Adam. This store of knowledge he communicated to his sons, who are the trinal progenitors of the races of men now on the earth. The knowledge which Noah taught to his sons, comprised the belief in, and worship of, the Jehovah of the Bible, as the one, only, living, and true God. This knowledge prevailed among all his descendants, as we have shown, in the most remote times, and around the very place where his sons' families began their pilgrimage. This knowledge soon began to decline, and, by degrees, became more and more corrupted, until God called Abraham, and revealed himself anew to him. Enoch and Melchizedech, and even the Philistines, and the Egyptians of Abraham's day, had some knowledge of the true God.

And in process of time, even to the descendants of Abraham, who were a people chosen to keep alive pure Theism in the world, and to prepare mankind for the manifestation of God in the flesh, it became necessary to communicate more and more fully, the Divine attributes, and to give a transcript of the Creator's character. This was done at Mount Sinai, and by the Hebrew prophets, till the fulness of time came, when God sent His own Son into the world. God sent His Son into the world, born of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law. For since the world, by its wisdom, knew not God, God has revealed Himself unto us by His Son, who is made unto us, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and complete redemption.

ART. VII.—DUELLING.

Sermon upon Duelling; by the Rev ARTHUR WIGFALL, Rector of the Holy Trinity Church, Grahamville, South Carolina: published by request. Together with the *Constitution of the Grahamville Association, for the suppression of Duelling*. Charleston: Printed by A. E. MILLER, No. 3, State street. 1856.

A VERY lamentable and indeed dreadful occurrence last fall in the chief city of this commonwealth, has drawn forth from the ministry of various denominations there, solemn public rebukes of that relic of the barbarism of our forefathers—the Duel. This is as it should be. We by no means advocate the introduction into the pulpit of all the topics which agitate the public mind. Long distant be the day when the Southern pulpit shall become that mere “drum ecclesiastic” which in some denominations, at the North especially, it has been made. But duelling is sinful, and ministers of the gospel are set for the rebuke of all sin.

The preacher of but one of these numerous discourses has honoured us with a copy of his discourse. That one we should certainly hail with as much of commendation as we could justly bestow, even if it possessed no great excellence. We stand prepared to cheer on every man who strikes a blow against that bloody monster to whom another bright and gifted son of Carolina has been sacrificed. We would encourage any minister with our notice and our praise, who speaks out against this old pagan custom, which violates both divine and human law, and yet goes unpunished of the magistrate. But Mr. Wigfall’s sermon against duelling is excellent. It appears to us just what the case demands: not argument so much as earnest expostulation. It appears to us that the man has no nature in him who could stop at such a time as that was in Charleston and its vicinity to argue calmly such a case; and even now, after months have elapsed since this horrible affair, we do not want to hear such a question as duelling *argued*. We think denunciation far more suitable. Not reasoning, but a rod of stripes is the thing required to be used. Let the stupid and absurd, as well as wicked duel be whipped back to the dark age from whence it descended.

Let us hear Mr. Wigfall’s text, and the exordium of his simple, earnest, manly discourse:

And the Lord said unto Cain, What hast thou done? The voice of thy Brother’s blood crieth unto me from the ground.—Genesis iv. 10.

“The Code of Honour” challenges for itself an antiquity which belongs to no other human institution. This claim we admit to its fullest extent;

our cause warrants us in conceding every plea, to which our adversary has the shadow of right. True; no monuments of architecture, law, or literature reach so far back into time as this institute; and if immunity always runs with antiquity, then let no profane hand touch this time honoured pandect. Since the day in which it was instituted, men and nations have passed away; kingdoms have been planted—flourished and forgotten. Nay, this earth has been swept by a flood, seas have become dry land and mountains rooted from their firm foundations; but all the waters of that deluge were not sufficient to wash out the writing of this code, “it would the multitudinous seas incarnadine.” It found some lurking place in the Ark of the covenant, and rode out the deep waters of that day. It stands before us now clothed in a mantle ancient as time, and dignified with hoary locks whitened by the frosts of six thousand winters. But with the authority it unites none of the feebleness of age. Nay, it confronts us to-day in all the vigour of green old age; and manifests the same power and energy—the same venom and violence that marked it in the hour that Cain wrote it in Abel’s blood. For the code of Cain is but the original draft of the Code of Honour; their moral identity cannot be mistaken.

* * * * *

Another, and yet another sacrifice has been offered upon the altar of our idolatry—the phantom Honour. We are busy spending our strength in arresting the car Juggernaut upon the Ganges, but I am persuaded we had better spare a hand to stay the triumphal procession of our own Idol God, whose wheels are even now dripping with the warm blood of our husbands, sons and brothers. The heathen, I tell you, are at your doors. Moloch is presiding upon our own hearth stones. Nay, our very temples are polluted with Idolatry.

How long, oh Lord, how long shall thy fierce anger thus afflict us? How long shall a besotted people continue to offer “the fruit of their bodies” to dumb Idols?

I challenge the ingenuity of human wit to point out the difference between offering human sacrifice to an imaginary Deity, which you clothe in scarlet and call Honour, or offering it, as our brother heathen upon the Hoogly do, to their god Vishnu. The deluded, helpless victim who offers himself a sacrifice in the Pagan temple of Honour, is moved by the same spirit which teaches the Hindoo to throw himself beneath the car of Juggernaut. And unprejudiced reason must confess that one and the same great principle rules alike in both cases. The Hindoo widow, who will perish upon the funeral pile of her husband sooner than endure scorn and lose her cast, is no whit more benighted than the pagan man of Honour, who seeks death sooner than endure the scoffs of public opinion.”

Mr. Wigfall undoubtedly points out in the last sentence, the real cause which perpetuates this unreasonable custom. It is cowards that keep up duelling; those weak, nerveless men that dare not refuse to do a wrong thing when their *set* or clique say they ought to do it.

Let us hear Mr. W. upon the unequal administration of justice amongst us, by which certain classes of men are allowed to trample with impunity upon the law:

“There is a view of this subject outside of the Church ; but upon which a Christian Minister may surely speak without impertinence ; since Christian men must alike, with all others, be interested in the proper administration of the laws of the country. Now it is a startling but undeniable truth that duelling, as practiced under our government, has effected a practical subversion of the law of the land. Nay, the absolute overthrow and destruction of the criminal code, would be less offensive to our sense of justice than the partial and unjust administration of the law as it now exists. It is a disgraceful fact, a reproach to our country, that our criminal law, while it professes to know no man, is, in its practical administration, made for but one class of our citizens, and those, the weak, the ignorant, and the defenceless.

There exists in our country a privileged class, *soi disant* men of honour, who have established for themselves “a higher law.” They put their foot upon the criminal code and trample it in the dust. They may and they do commit murder with impunity. This may sound like plain language, but we have set out to tell plain truths, and do not intend to be balked in the work. And when we assert that there is a privileged class in the country who commit murder with impunity, we have weighed our words, we speak advisedly, and challenge contradiction. And what renders the thing utterly revolting to every honest and right thinking man is the fact that, while a class of men in our midst are absolutely irresponsible to the law for their crimes we are guilty of the injustice and meanness of continuing to enforce the law against those who have not the daring or the power to resist. The first human lesson ever taught us, was to despise the leveller, to scorn the man who would array one class of society against another, and it is one we shall never forget. We have, then, no objection to a privileged class ; whenever the country is ripe for it, we will submit without a murmur to an aristocracy, built upon virtue and intelligence. But we do protest, and shall with our dying breath protest against an aristocracy of crime. An aristocracy in whose ensigns armorial the *gules* typifies the hand of Cain. If the majesty of the law is so degraded that it must bend its supple knee before this brotherhood of blood—if public opinion is so besotted—the public mind so degraded that the administration of law has degenerated into the essence of cruelty and injustice, then let us have a general jail delivery, let the jail-birds go free, let us proclaim a year of jubilee for the murderers, and see if the very excess of crime will not work out its own remedy. But let us hear no more of hanging Jack Cade in his rags, while the law meanly quails under the frown of an aristocracy of crime.

Let us, here, enter a little into the details of this subject. When we have honesty enough to look it in the face, what is that thing we dignify with the name of duelling? If “taking the life of a reasonable being under the King’s peace, with malice aforethought, expressed or implied,” constitutes murder, then homicide in the duel is murder ; and if he who commits murder is a murderer, then that man who slays another, in a duel, is a murderer. I speak advisedly and soberly ; I use the term not only in relation to the moral law, but in its proper and technical sense under the common law of the land. This is a simple statement of a self evident truth, and no man who regards his reputation for ordinary intelligence will presume to question it. And it is a suggestive thought that the utterance

of this truth may fall strangely, and perhaps harshly, upon the ears of a Christian congregation; if so only the greater the necessity for the uttering. And the pulpit surely is the place where it must begin to be uttered. If God's ministers will not speak out the truth, who, in God's name, will? The fact is that words are things. "Death and life," says Solomon, "are in the power of the tongue." Few men look beyond names. Let me make the songs for a people, said a profound observer, and you shall make the laws. Now I maintain that the remedy for this evil, must begin by *branding it with its true name*. You may think that this is a very idle and impotent weapon of attack; but, if so, it is only because you have not duly considered this subject. Suffer me to direct the language of every Christian family in the land upon this subject, and I have no fear for the result. With this *simple* weapon, wisely and fearlessly brought into this contest, the tyrant shall fall as did him of Gath—under a pebble from the hand of a shepherd's boy. I have said that homicide in duelling is murder, and the slayer is a murderer. Now if any man's heart revolts at this language, and his tongue refuses to utter it, let me tell such a one a great and solemn truth—that is, that his heart is not right in the sight of God; that unconsciously, perhaps, he is a sympathizer with this system of murder; and while the veil of Christianity may conceal him, he "joins hand in hand" with those who move the secret springs of this "infernal machine;" and in that great day, when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed, his raiment shall be found stained with blood.

I insist, then, that the first step in warring against this evil is to strip it of the false, gilding of a flattering name. Let Christians refuse any longer to be hoodwinked by the delusive epithets of a wicked generation. Let Christian men come up manfully "to the help of the Lord," and fearlessly meet this issue between the Church and the world. And first let them bear upon their lips "the words of soberness and truth." When the man-slayer is at his work, and the blood of our citizens is crying to heaven for vengeance, let us hear no more of duels and duellists. Let the Christian parent say to his son: this is the deed that God calls *murder*; this the man whom God denounces as a murderer—and declares shall never enter into the kingdom of heaven. Let such be the language which shall be spoken in the Christian man's parlour; uttered in fearful solemnity—it may be in bitterness and tears. Let such be the language he shall teach his children to speak, and they will never be able through life to separate the idea from the words—the crime from the name. What else is education, but associating in infancy, particular acts with suggestive names. And when this language shall begin to be spoken by grave and respected lips—when this language begins to be sounded in the ears of our young men—do you tell me that it is a weak and impotent weapon? Nay; the Church of Christ is not so degraded in this nineteenth century, but that it may still make itself felt; and Christian lips may yet awe iniquity into subjection. Does any man think that I speak lightly or unseemly upon this subject? Let him not mistake himself. Does any one suppose that I have not considered the cost of such a measure; what a sacrifice it might inflict upon a Christian family?

Surely, I need not a teacher upon this subject. But a Christian man must rise above these scenes that are passing around him; these "fashions

of the world that are passing away;" he must enlarge his horizon—something, I repeat, must be done. Here is an evil that is pervading the Church of Christ itself; that is sapping its foundations; wielding its bloody sceptre over our very altars—even now beating at the doors of our sanctuaries, and, with its fiendish gaze, peering into "the Holy of Holies." I say it is time that the Church of Christ rally itself for the conflict and make one death struggle to strangle this head of the Hydra. Deadly diseases require deadly remedies. Let us hear Christians talk no more about sacrifices—no more about counting the cost. "If a right eye offend thee pluck it out." Our Father Abraham thought it not too costly a sacrifice when he laid his son, his only son, upon the altar of his religion; and are we ready to make none upon ours? or shall we be stopped in this work by considerations of sympathy for the offender? Nay; it is a well known principle in jurisprudence that humanity to the criminal is the extremest cruelty to the community. I appeal then for mercy in behalf of those victims who are next to be sacrificed to this demon of blood. And who knows where the lot may fall, at your door or mine?

I have said that reformation must *begin* in amending our phraseology; calling things by their right names—but it must not end there. Names are potent things, but we want *action* as well as words. We want Christian men to show that they have something more than "a name to live." When you have taught your children right words—we would have you teach them right actions. And when a young man dripping in his brother's blood seeks an alliance with your house, we would have the man of God soberly and solemnly to say: Nay; I can never entrust the happiness of my child to one bearing the mark of Cain. We would have every Christian young woman speak to these men of blood in the words of the Patriarch, "Instruments of cruelty are in their habitation. Oh! my soul come not thou into their secret." The mothers and daughters of Carolina are involved in a fearful responsibility on this subject. It is in their hands to stop this bloodshed, and in the name of God, I call upon them to do so.

Lastly: I appeal to the ministers of the Gospel in this behalf; to see that "the trumpet gives no uncertain sound" on this subject. Much remains for the ministry to do, and it is in their power to do much. There is one point especially in which we are able to act; that is, to require of every man seeking an entrance into the Church of Christ a special pledge that he will observe the sixth article of the Decalogue. However absurd and paradoxical it may sound to ask a man seeking a place in the Church of the meek and lowly Jesus, that he will pledge himself not to commit murder, yet we all know the fact, and had better affect no ignorance, that it is imperiously required under the existing opinion in this country. Let the man "who loves life and length of days" beware how he comes into the Church to violate the *code of Honour*. This rule might accomplish much good."

But Mr. Wigfall's sermon has another excellence, and that is, his pointing out the true remedy for this crying evil:

"Is there no remedy for this curse? I answer, confidently, there is a remedy; God has not doomed us to turn this fair earth into an Aceldama.

And I call upon his people this day, in the name of the King of Kings, to look well to that remedy—to take heed in time to their responsibility. Where then is that remedy to be found? The strong arm of the Law, has bent before this idol monster, as the rush of the valley before the mountain storm. True. Is our hope then in public opinion? Nay, this is the very Demon that is driving its murderous car over our mangled bodies. Where then is help? In the name of the Most High, I answer, our help, our all sufficient help, is in the CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD.”

We entirely and heartily agree with Mr. W., that the Church is bound to make her influence felt at this crisis. The law appears indeed to have bowed before this monster, and we are not sure that we can deny, as we would fain deny, for the honour of our community, that “public opinion is the very demon that is driving its murderous car over our mangled bodies.” We incline to think that public opinion in the city of Charleston at the late election for a member of the House of Representatives, to fill the place of Hon. W. Aiken, did show some tolerably manifest tokens of horror and disgust with duelling and duellists. Yet we must admit, and we do it with sorrow and shame for our honoured and beloved mother, Carolina, that public opinion amongst us on this subject, wants robustness and vigour. The mass of our intelligent community do not approve of duelling, but neither do they positively and earnestly disapprove it, nor speak out boldly and loudly against it. And because this is so, we quite agree with Mr. W. that the church should take the lead and make her voice and her influence felt. That the pulpit may legitimately speak against duelling, we no more hesitate to maintain, than that it may enforce any other command of the decalogue. And that the pulpit and the church could fortify and give tone to public opinion, if already right, and enlighten and correct it, if wrong, is to our minds perfectly certain and plain. And we also like Mr. W.’s insisting that Christian parents should speak a plain and unequivocal language to their sons upon this subject, and moreover that they should refuse their daughters in marriage to any man of violence and blood. And yet further we agree with him fully that the ladies of Carolina have a great responsibility resting upon them in respect to this matter.

There is only one thing in the extracts above made from which we would dissent, and that is the *special pledge of obedience to the sixth commandment*, recommended to be required from every man who seeks entrance into the Christian Church. We are no friends to special pledges given respecting moral and religious duties to voluntary associations. And we would not like them any better if asked for by the Christian Church. In the first place we think the church has no right to demand such a pledge. She cannot lawfully require anything more than the Scriptures have made essential to church communion. “If thou

believest with all thine heart thou mayest" be baptized, and so admitted into the church. This is the divine rule for entrance amongst Christ's people. All that any church can demand, therefore, is hearty faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. But in the second place, any such special pledge is a poor invention, and would be found a very feeble one. We cannot improve upon our Master's arrangements and regulations. And in the third place no such special pledge is needed for the reform in question. Mr. W. had indicated a sufficient remedy before he suggested this one. The word of God, the truth of God, spoken publicly and spoken privately, and by His blessing made effectual either to convert men or else to restrain them, this is the only, and it is just exactly so far as a sovereign God will bless it, a sufficient remedy for those moral evils which afflict and harass our distempered race. To the end of time there will be Murderers, till then there will be Adulterers, and Fornicators, and Thieves and Liars. But God has given His church the power of discipline, requiring her to expel all such from her bosom; and He has also given her the word of His truth, whereby she can influence and persuade even temporal and human governments to curb and punish those who commit such things.

We add a further extract from this sermon :

"I bespeak your patience, while I make one more appeal to all good men. Modern ages have developed an element in society, either for good or evil, far more potent than the strong arm of the law: an agent not only able to make laws, but to shape and direct public opinion. This power is *combination*. To this remedy I now desire to direct your attention. In the name of the Prince of Peace, I appeal, to every man who professes and calls himself a Christian, to every friend of law and order—to every man who is opposed to the commission of murder, either in high places or low ones to unite for the purpose of arresting this crime. I will not be guilty of the folly in the presence of the intelligence which I address, of entering into an argument to show the power of this combined action. The Jacobin clubs of France, the temperance and abolition associations of our own day: their omnipotent march, trampling underfoot whatever has dared to oppose them, are familiar facts, and need no comment. That the exercise of this power in government is dangerous, I do not wish to disguise. It is a power, however, not evil simply in itself, but which may be directed for good. I appeal then to every good citizen to unite in defence of law and morality. We have had enough blood, I should suppose, to satisfy the cry of "the horse leech." We have been summoned often enough, surely, to mingle our tears over the best blood, and most brilliant intellects of Carolina's cherished sons. Our hearts have once too often been made to bleed by the tears and wailings of the widow and the orphan. For one I must be suffered to cry "enough." If this horror of blood be an unmanly weakness, then I acknowledge my baseness. But I repeat it: I have enough. I raise then my weak voice and my infirm hands, this day, in the Temple of the living God, and implore mercy for my bleeding coun-

try! Let this blood be stanchèd. The smell of it is coming up into our very chambers. Have you no fear, that God in his wrath will soon make our very rivers, like the rebellious Egyptian's, to run red with blood? The spectre of murdered citizens does already drive sleep from the eyes of brave men. Oh Lord, how long shall iniquity reign, and sweep our beloved land with the besom of destruction! Is there no fear of God before our eyes? No fear that "the avenger of blood" will be commissioned to pass through our land? Is there no faith upon earth? Nevertheless "the Lord will be avenged of his adversaries." Is no man responsible, think you, for this rampant iniquity? I am not so young but I can remember when men went into a *corner*, to do these deeds of darkness. But now, the announcement that a citizen of Carolina is to be sacrificed upon the demon altar of Honour, causes no more emotion in a Christian community, than these sacrifices did among the ancient Aztecs.

What will the civilized nations of the earth think—nay, rather what will the Living God think of us? And think you that the blood of the slain is not crying to heaven from the ground against that community? And are we quite free of all responsibility? If directly or indirectly—by word or act, we give our sanction to this system, be assured that God will hold us accountable for this blood. I submit it then to the sense of every one to say if there be not need of combination among good men at this time.

I call then upon every man who thinks with me, to lend his aid in suppressing this crime. And I suggest, as the most effective mode, that an association be organized, to suppress a murderous practice in our country known as duelling. And now let no man think to shirk out of this responsibility by the affectation of humility—his unworthiness: it is our self-conceit, not our humility that stands in the way. If we can, but a moment, put out of sight that defiled image *self*; and remember that we are but "the clay in the potter's hand," then the clay from this pit will do as well as another: and the meaner the instrument the more glory to God. The entire sum of the matter proposed is no more than this: simply, that good citizens agree to aid each other in preserving peace among men—by all proper and lawful means. And who would not be a peace-maker? Since "blessed are the peace-makers for they shall be called the children of God.

"Blest be the men of peaceful life,
Who quench the coals of growing strife,
They shall be called the heirs of bliss,
The Sons of God, the Sons of Peace."

And now let us go forward boldly to our duty, strong in the might of Him who has said, "my strength shall be made perfect in weakness:" let us lay our hands, nothing fearing, upon the pillars of this idol temple, and shake them until they crumble to their base, though we should perish amid the ruins."

We subjoin also what we find appended to this sermon, viz.: the form of combination which Mr. W. urges upon all Christian men for the suppression of duelling:

CONSTITUTION OF THE GRAHAMVILLE ASSOCIATION, FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF DUELLING.

Art. 1. The Officers of this Society shall be a President and Vice President, to be elected by ballot of the members of the Society.

Art. 2. A Secretary and Treasurer shall be appointed by the President.

Art. 3. Any six members of this Association shall form a quorum for the transaction of business.

Art. 4. It shall be the duty of the President, or in case of his absence, of the Vice President, or in his absence, of the Secretary, or should all three be absent, of any individual member, to whom information may come, of the intention of any citizen, or citizens of this parish, or of any other Parish, district or State, coming within its limits, for the purpose of engaging in a duel, or any hostile encounter likely to endanger life, immediately to call together the members of this Association, nearest at hand, to consult upon the proper measures to be taken to preserve the peace. And in case the officer or member to whom such information may come shall be able to procure no aid or assistance from other members, by reason of their absence, or other cause, it shall be his duty promptly to apply to the constituted legal authority for the arrest of the suspected parties.

Art. 5. It shall be the duty of this Association, whenever it shall be possible, to cause parties leaving this parish to engage in a duel, to be arrested wherever they may be found.

Art. 6. It shall be the duty of this association to cause legal proceedings to be instituted against any citizen of this parish who shall kill another in a duel, as a murderer—and also against the seconds as accessories thereto.

Art. 7. Any meeting of this association, called for the purpose of immediate action, shall convene as privately as possible, at the most convenient house of any member.

Art. 8. This association shall convene for general purposes, in the free Church of this village on the first Monday in June, and the second Monday in October of each year.

Art. 9. Any citizen of this Parish, or of the district of Beaufort, desiring to become a member of this Association, can do so by calling upon the Secretary and subscribing his name to the Constitution.

Art. 10. Each person subscribing his name to this Constitution shall be considered as having most solemnly pledged himself, not under any circumstances, to engage in a duel himself, nor to aid, nor abet, any other in doing so; and under all circumstances, to the extent of his ability, to sustain and act under this Constitution, according to the true intent and meaning thereof.

We are not prepared to join Mr. Wigfall in recommending the formation of these associations. The duty assumed by the members of the Grahamville Association of informing against the intended duellist, and of causing his arrest, and also of refusing under all circumstances to engage personally in a duel, is a duty which no such association can bind upon any man in any degree more strongly than the same duty is made previously binding upon him by the very relation he sustains of a citizen or of a

member of the community. Mr. W. argues from the success which has attended the operations of various societies, some of them having a bad, and some a good, end in view. Confining our attention to the latter, we hold that a large and a long experience of such pledges and such associations in this country has demonstrated their futility in the contest with vice. And the reason why they must fail always of any real or permanent victory over vice, is because the thing *vice* which they contend against, is only the issuing stream from an inward principle of corruption, which they do not pretend to influence. Eleven years ago, at Boston, and around Boston, there were occurring repeated instances of barns being set on fire by boys—*by New England boys*—just out of sheer wickedness and love of deviltry. A shrewd observer of men and things gave to us, amazed as we were at these occurrences, the following explanation: The temperance reformation, and others like it, have dammed up the streams of vice which used to flow in those directions, more than the influence of the gospel has really operated on the heart of the community, and because the inward fountain must have vent, it has just now burst out in this new place, and assumed this new form. Now, we do not say that there has been no diminution of intemperance by all the efforts good men have made, but we do avow as our belief, that the good is not without some evil accompanying it, in so far as a *better morality* than the Bible has been preached by many of these apostles of temperance or rather of abstinence, and in so far as a *higher law* than Christ gave to his church, has been thus set up by many both in and out of the Church of Christ. And moreover we hesitate not to affirm that all the good really accomplished, could have been better done, if the zeal and strength of all the Christian ministers and Christian men who have combined to operate through these associations, had been employed by them in their own proper place and sphere as ministers and members of the Church of Christ. And we will add further, while upon this topic (although this remark does not apply to the kind of association Mr. W. is recommending), that in addition to these objections of inexpediency, we have a growing conviction that there is also an objection of principle which all Protestants ought to feel as against some of these associations for moral and religious purposes. The objection is that they seem to usurp the office of the Church of Christ. We hold that there is but one true religion, the religion God revealed by Christ, and by prophets, and apostles. That religion He committed to His Church as its guardian and its teacher, its propagator and its defender. It is not the right of any man to intrude into the Christian ministry unless called of God, and it is not the right of any other association of men besides the Church of God, to set itself up for a moral or religious teacher or reformer among men. Mr. W. speaks of

“that new element in society which modern ages have developed either *for good or for evil*, the element of combination.” There can be no good objection to combination of men for good ends, if they do not intrude upon the domain of moral or religious teaching. Let us have combinations for scientific, agricultural, commercial, and political purposes. If Mr. W. can make it out to be necessary and expedient (both which we think impossible for him to shew) that we should have also associations to inform against duellists, and to prosecute them, well then let us have such associations as these. But surely we want no combinations of men as moral and religious teachers, except that one which Christ has set up. There is no power to be wielded by any such combination men shall form, except the power of those great *ideas* entrusted to the Church as Christ’s representative upon the earth. Not a particle of that power should be dissevered from her. Whatever association of men except the Church of Christ undertakes to wield that power of teaching the truth revealed by Christ (and there is no other moral or religious truth worth the name in all this world) sets itself up as a Church made by man, becomes a counterfeit church, and robs the church of her trust and her rights. The result of any and of all such steps will be infidelity, unless God in mercy overrule the evil with good. The *logical* if not the *actual* termination of them all is infidelity, because they set up human wisdom against the wisdom of God.

But while for the reasons above stated, viz. : that anti-duelling associations are neither *necessary* nor *expedient*, we cannot join Mr. Wigfall in recommending the formation of such associations ; we very cordially agree with him in expressing “a horror of blood.” “The smell of it is indeed coming up into our very chambers. The spectre of murdered citizens does indeed already drive sleep from the eyes of brave men.” Blood has indeed a voice that cries to heaven against that community where it is shed illegally. The ceremonies and the public acts by which God instructed his ancient people to put away from them as a nation the guilt of innocent blood, shed they knew not by whom, and which they therefore could not punish, are very significant of God Almighty’s mind upon this subject, and they must have been very affecting and impressive, and efficient in Israel. The reader will find them described in Deuteronomy xxi. 1-9. We believe that blood still “defileth a land” in God’s sight, and that he will punish the people who do not put a stop to it. We believe Charleston to be forever disgraced before men, and to be also guilty before God, not only because such crimes are committed with impunity within her bounds, but also especially because in the recent case, at least fifty respectable citizens must have known beforehand that the duel was coming on, and yet not one caused the parties to be arrested. We love our mother city, and do not like to publish

her shame. But we fear God's wrath, and we speak in order that the shame and the sin may not go on to increase. What a righteous God may inflict for her past neglect to enforce his law we shall have to bear our share of, but we would, with Mr. Wigfall, lift our feeble voice in tones of expostulation and of warning that at least the future be not suffered to add to our guilt and our retribution.

 CRITICAL NOTICES.

What is Free Masonry? An Address delivered before Richland Lodge, at Columbia, S. C., on St. John the Evangelist's Day. By THEODORE S. GOURDIN, Past Master, &c., &c. Columbia: I. C. Morgan. 1857.

From the various answers collected by the author out of Masonic writers to the question, "What is Masonry?" we select several for the edification of our readers. One says, "the foundation of Masonry is religion." Another says, "the object of it is to better the dispositions of men by enforcing the precepts of religion and morality." Another says, "it is the school of all the virtues." Another says, "it is a system, whether morally or religiously considered, more excellent than any, because partaking of the excellences of all others; more practicable, more productive of effects on its professors, because, free from the austerity yet comprising the best precepts of religion, it removes the thorns in the road to happiness, and substitutes a flowery path to the same goal." All these definitions the author criticises *as good, but deficient*. "Probably the best definition (he tells us) of Free Masonry as it now exists, is that of Reghellini, who terms it the fortunate result of the Egyptian, Jewish, and Christian religions."

In giving his own views of the origin of Free Masonry, the author proceeds "to raise the veil of antiquity and revert to the period when the world was young." And the first announcement he makes to us respecting this remote period, is that "*Fetichism* is supposed to have been the religion of the earliest inhabitants of the earth." We are likewise informed that, "in these early ages of the world the mind of man was enveloped by the clouds of ignorance and superstition." And that the mysteries were instituted by philosophers "to preserve the knowledge of the true God, which they had obtained by years of thought."

We need make no further extracts from this address. Those we have presented exhibit the Free Masons (whether correctly or not we cannot say), as claiming for their society the character of a moral and religious teacher of men; and in fact the character of the best, most excellent, and most successful teacher of men, in these important departments! It is set forth as having its doctrines and its mysteries, its officers and its members. We see not what is wanting to constitute their society a *church* in the eyes of its members, except the idea of its having God for its founder. This we do not understand Mr. Gourdin to claim for Free Masonry. It was the work of Philosophers. It was a product of human reason after years of thought and study. First being Fetich-worshippers, men developed gradually out of their own minds the knowledge of something better, and so rose to an acquaintance with God, and then established the Mysteries of Free Masonry to preserve amongst men the knowledge they had acquired! But so far as we can see, this is the only particular in which Free Masonry is less than a church. But as this is something which does not strike the popular mind, it may be fairly said, that Free Masonry is set forth in this pamphlet by Mr. G., and these other writers, as a *kind of church*, made and established by men—by philosophers!

Now we accord to every man the fullest religious freedom. The Free Masons have a right to their own views. But we also have a right to our opinion of these views. We regard Free Masonry, therefore, under the aspect it assumes in Mr. Gourdin's hand, as an intruder which has invaded the domain of Christ's Church, which was by Him constituted the only depositary of God's truth—the only authorized teacher of it to men. Whether Mr. G. does justice or injustice to the society, it is of course not for us to say, but if he have indeed fairly represented her, she is not simply an intruder into the teaching work of the Christian Church, but her teaching is also anti-Christian. Mr. G., we suspect, has been reading the works of some of the numerous disciples of Comte's Positive Philosophy in England, whose productions are undergoing rapid reprint and circulation in this country; a philosophy which it has been well said, is atheism avowed and undisguised. Pantheism makes everything in the universe to be God; the Positive Philosophy is the very opposite of Pantheism, and "ungods the universe." Comte makes "Fetichism the basis of theological philosophy—the source of theology itself." He denies the fall of man from an original condition of perfection and holiness. He teaches man's progress by the development of his own inherent powers from cannibalism to civilization, refinement, and the final perfection of his nature.

It is a source of real and heartfelt grief to us, that a descendant of the old Huguenots should be found occupying such a theological position as Mr. Gourdin has assumed. Geologists formerly held to the theory of *development*, according to which the creatures of God's hand on this earth were at first of the lowest order, and have been constantly rising ever since. But Hugh Miller upset the *development* theory, and established in its stead the theory of *degradation*, according to which the first creatures were the mightiest and their successors smaller, and feebler, and more degraded. Now Mr. G. believes, it would seem, the theory of development as respects man, while the Scriptures teach, and Mr. Gourdin's glorious forefathers received the opposite doctrine of a religious degradation in man. Surely that is not a religious development which out of the Huguenot produces the disciple of Comte.

History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence, (Deceased Divines): containing the Masterpieces of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, Flechier, Abbadie, Taylor, Barrow, Hall, Watson, Maclaurin, Chalmers, Evans, Edwards, Davies, John M. Mason, &c., &c., with Discourses from Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Augustine, Athanasius, and others among the Fathers, and from Wickliffe, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Knox, Latimer, &c., of the Reformers. Also sixty other celebrated Sermons from as many eminent Divines, in the Greek and Latin, English, German, Irish, French, Scottish, American and Welsh Churches; a large number of which have now, for the first time, been translated. The whole arranged in their proper order, and accompanied with Historical Sketches of Preaching in the different countries represented, and Biographical and Critical Notices of the several Preachers and their Discourses. By HENRY C. FISH, author of Premium Essay, "Primitive Piety Revived." In two volumes. New York: published by M. W. Dodd, Brick Church Chapel, City Hall Square. 1856.

The design of the work, whose enormous title-page we have copied above, is thus briefly stated in the introduction. "It is, first, to render available, to the lovers of sacred things, the great *masterpieces of pulpit eloquence*, and the best discourses of all countries and times, hitherto either locked up in foreign languages, or procured with much difficulty and expense. Secondly, to furnish a *history of preaching* in all parts of the world where the Christian religion has prevailed, from its introduction into each respective country down to the present time, with a view of the pulpit as it now stands. Thirdly

to bring again upon the stage, the great and the good of other days, keeping alive, and promoting their acquaintance, and allowing them to speak to the living; which is done by giving sketches of their lives, and by reproducing their choicest discourses. The arrangement will readily be perceived. The work has both a local and chronological order; the latter is made to determine the former—that is, the country comes first in order which furnishes at the earliest date, some prominent preacher, whose discourse is introduced. Hence, England takes precedence of Germany and other countries, because Wickliffe, the morning star of the Reformation, appears first. For a similar reason, the French precedes the Scottish pulpit, &c. And so of the preachers in each particular country, they are introduced, one after another, according as they arose and took their respective positions.”

The author is very clear as to the need of such a work, and the advantages likely to result from its skilful execution. It supplies, he thinks, a want which is universally felt, and will have the effect of raising the standard of pulpit eloquence, by presenting the best models of preaching, and quickening the impulse to attain true excellence. We must confess, however, that upon these points we are very skeptical. The *want* alluded to, can only be supplied by solid erudition, and it seems to us, that he who from a few extracts and specimens, hopes to master the history of the pulpit, is guilty of as great folly, as he who expects to become a master of classical literature by studying the *Græca Majora*. Such collectanea may awaken occasionally the spirit of inquiry, they may give a *taste* which shall only be gratified by thorough learning—but there is equal danger that the smattering they impart, may be accepted as a substitute for profound erudition. We doubt, therefore, whether any works of the kind are really and permanently useful. They may be very skilfully executed, but they still present only a brick as a specimen of a house. The compilation of Mr. Fish is as good, perhaps, as anything of the kind can be made. The historical and biographical sketches exhibit the marks of patient industry, and the selections are not without judgment and taste, and the criticisms are judicious and liberal. If the purpose had been simply to prepare an interesting book, or to minister to the edification and spiritual improvement of the reader, we should feel authorized to say that the plan was well conceived, and the consummation of it completely successful. But as a history of the Pulpit, and an adequate view of the great Preachers of the world, we must pronounce it to be, what from the very necessity of the case, every similar enterprise must be, a failure. The meagre information it furnishes, is not what the young theologian demands. He must penetrate to the sources of knowledge; he must study the great masters in their own

works, and draw the history of each age from its own records and monuments. We are disposed to look with distrust upon any scheme which has a tendency to dispense with the necessity of original and thorough investigation, which cheapens the learning of the pulpit. We want to see our preachers profound scholars, as well as faithful stewards of the mysteries of God.

It is but justice to Mr. Fish to say, that the apprehensions which we have expressed, have not been generally entertained; that his work has been well received, and has elicited the praises and commendation of men who ought to be, in every way, competent to judge.

Graham Lectures. The Constitution of the Human Soul: Six Lectures delivered at the Brooklyn Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. By RICHARD S. STORRS, Jr., D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1857. Pp. 338. These lectures are preceded by a preface, giving the history of the Brooklyn Institute, which from small beginnings, has grown into a most important instrument of moral and intellectual influence. Among other legacies left to it by Mr. Augustus Graham, was one of twelve thousand dollars, the income of which, is appropriated to the delivery of Sunday evening lectures, at such times as may be deemed most advisable by the Directors or Trustees of the Institute, on the power, wisdom, and goodness of God, as manifested in his works. In conformity with this provision, Dr. Storrs was appointed to deliver the first course in the series, and the book before us is the result of his labours. The department of God's works in which he has sought for the manifestations of power, wisdom, and goodness, is the Human Soul. The topics discussed are the soul as endowed with personal life (Lect. I.); as endowed with faculties for knowledge (Lect. II.); as endowed with faculties for virtue (Lect. III.); as endowed with faculties for beneficent operation (Lect. IV.); as endowed with faculties for happiness (Lect. V.); as endowed with faculties for immortal progress. (Lect. VI.). The theme was a noble one, and the Reverend author has shown himself not insensible to its greatness. Apart, however, from the grandeur of the subject, and the natural desire of speaking in fit terms of this "high argument," there was another motive for aiming at the highest excellence. These lectures were to be the first of a series; they were, consequently, to set the fashion of all that should follow. They were to be models of what the testator designed, and to fix the type in which all future lecturers should cast their lucubrations. It is not strange, therefore, that Dr. Storrs should have been extremely solicit-

ous that his lectures should tall ; he has sought to make them as striking and impressive as possible, and, in this case, as in many others, the undue anxiety for success has defeated its own end. As there are many books of which it may be truly said, that they might have been much shorter if they had not been so short, and much clearer, if they had not aspired to be so clear,* so of these lectures it may be justly affirmed, that they might have been much better if they had not aimed to be so good. The anxiety for effect attends the author like an evil genius, and prevents him from ever becoming so absorbed in his subject, as to lose himself in a natural animation. He has his audience always before him, and seems never to write a sentence without asking the question, how will this take ? The consequence is, that the style is as vicious as it well can be, unnatural, affected, strained. The author is always walking on stilts or flying in a balloon. He apologizes for his style, by pleading that the lectures were intended for a popular assembly. But a style may be popular without being strained. The simplicity of an earnest and natural animation—an animation which results from the intensity of thought, like the glow of the chariot-wheel from the rapidity of its movements, has much more effect than the affected conceits, sparkling phrases, and florid declamation of an artificial rhetoric. The style of Demosthenes was eminently popular, yet it was eminently chaste and natural, and because nothing seems to have been said for effect, every sentence produces an effect. The imagination of Dr. Storrs riots among figures, like a wild horse in a luxuriant pasture. He can hardly pen a line without a trope. We commend his book to Mr. Lord, the editor of the Theological Journal, who has devoted much time and study to the laws of figurative language. He will find examples to his hand, without the trouble of going in quest of them. He has but to open the book, no matter where, and he will meet what he wants. In spite of the extravagances and affectations which mutilate and disfigure the book, there are passages of great beauty and power. It is always, however, the beauty of poetical description, and not the pathos of pure and unsophisticated thought. Hence, though full of declamation, he is never eloquent. He sometimes pleases, but never captivates. He plays around the head, but never touches the heart.

The style which Dr. Storrs has adopted, commends itself to second-rate writers, by the cheapness at which it purchases the praise of fine writing. Its motto is, *videri quam esse malebat*. It takes tinsel for gold, and excess

* Kant, Crit. d. R. V., Pref.

of ornaments for beauty. Instead of making language the instrument and vehicle of thought, it makes it the substitute. Dr. Channing has done more than any man in the country, to encourage the taste for this vitiated species of composition ; his reputation depends entirely upon his style. The whole mystery of his style consists in dressing up thoughts, which seldom rise above the lowest level of common-place, in meretricious, dazzling finery. He seems to be very profound and very earnest, when, after all, he is only juggling with language. Dr. Storrs reminds us of Dr. Channing, not only by the similarity of his style, but by the general tone of his thoughts. The book before us harps upon the same string, which the Unitarian divine was always striking, and makes very much the same music. We rise from Dr. Storrs lectures with much the same impressions of the divinity of human nature, which we receive from the discourses of Channing. With both, man is little less than God. No one would ever dream from their glowing descriptions of his grandeur and glory, his high powers and vast capacities, that he had ever been corrupted by sin ; that he had lost any of his pristine excellence, or that he is now a mass of ruins. Throughout these lectures, the distinction is lost sight of, betwixt the original state and the present condition of the soul. Dr. Storrs seems, indeed, to take it for granted, that sin has given no such shock to the moral and intellectual nature of man, as to incapacitate him for achieving the end of his being. This general impression of the book is deepened by specific doctrines, which are as repugnant to sound philosophy as to the Christian Scriptures. A theory of will is maintained, which, in the language of Sir William Hamilton, "escapes necessity by taking refuge in chance." A sovereignty is attributed to man, which precludes any causal influence from God securing the certainty of events, without entrenching upon the freedom of the subject ; and as the denial of such an influence carries with it a denial of a directing, in contradistinction from an overruling Providence, it is at war with the first principles of Theism. Then again, a theory of virtue is set forth which contradicts the plainest dictates of our moral nature. According to Dr. Storrs, original dispositions, fixed states of the mind, native habits of the soul, are destitute of moral character. Nothing is virtuous but a free determination of the will. The *principle* from which a man acts is nothing, the only thing to be considered is the act itself. It is in volition, and not the states or habitudes of the will, that we are to look for virtue or vice ; hence, of course, there can neither be original righteousness nor original sin, and the whole doctrine of regeneration becomes a simple absurdity. Dr. Storrs has evidently borrowed his theology from the school of the eclectic philosophers, and not from the teach-

ings of Jesus Christ, or his own consciousness. The knowledge of our original constitution is of the utmost importance, but it is of equal importance that we know how to use it, a thing which, as Calvin suggests, has not always happened to the philosophers. "*Illi,*" says this great master, and we commend the passage to Dr. Storrs, and to all the worshippers of the divinity of human nature—"illi," that is, the philosophers, "*dum hominem hortantur, ut se ipsum novent, finem simul proponunt, ne dignitatem excellentiamque suam nesciat; neque aliud ipsum in se contemplari volunt, quam unde inani fiducia intumescat et superbia infletur.*"

Central Africa; Adventures and Missionary Labours in several Countries in the Interior of Africa, from 1849 to 1856. By T. J. BOWEN. Charleston: Southern Baptist Publication Society, No. 229 King st. 1857.—This is a very interesting book, perfectly simple and unpretending, but communicating a great amount of valuable and curious information about a part of the world almost unknown to us. The book is of course all the more interesting to us, because its author is one of ourselves, sectionally speaking; he hails from Georgia. He is evidently a man of piety, of zeal, and of courage. Adhering pertinaciously to a purpose deliberately formed, he pushed his way through difficulties without number, and boldly penetrated into the interior of Africa as a Missionary sent out by the Southern Baptist Missionary Society. We like to see Southern Missionaries going to Africa. Other things being precisely equal, we should give a very decided preference of two Missionaries offering themselves for that field to the Southern man. He will understand the negroes better than the man of the North, and the negroes will understand him better.

We have space to copy only two extracts from Mr. Bowen's work. They are both important testimonies from a competent and trustworthy witness. The first one we commend to the attention of those advocates of the new theory of a diversity of human races, who have sought to give currency to the absurd report of *caudated* men having been discovered in Africa by some French or German traveller. This mode of linking man to brutes through the monkey tribe failing these gentlemen, let them take Mr. Bowen's hint, and try *ears* instead of *tails*. If caudated men cannot be found, long-eared men certainly can be found, and without the trouble of going to the central depths of Africa for them:

"None of my negro and Puloth friends had been very great travelers, excepting now and then a man or a woman who had been a slave in Fezzawn as they called it, or Kassandria. Nasam and others with whom I converted

the most had no personal knowledge of any country beyond Yakobu, Mandara, Kanikè, and the Desert. But the Moors and Arabs, who had been everywhere, had told them wonderful stories of still other countries and tribes far off in the east. Somewhere on the other side of Yakobu is a tribe of people called Alkalere, none of whom are more than three feet in height. The chiefs are a little taller than the common people. The Alakere are very ingenious people, especially in working iron, and they are so industrious that their towns are surrounded by iron walls. Beyond these are a tribe called Alabiru who have inflexible tails about six inches in length. As the stiffness of their tails prevents the Alabiru from sitting flat on the ground, every man carries a sharp pointed stick with which he drills a hole in the earth to receive his tail while sitting. They are industrious manufacturers of iron bars which they sell to surrounding tribes. All the fine swords in Sudan are made of this iron. The next tribe in order are the Alabiwoe, who have a small goat-like horn projecting from the middle of their forehead. For all that, they are a nice kind of black people and quite intelligent. A woman of this tribe is now in slavery at Offa, near Ilorin. She always wears a handkerchief around her head because she is ashamed of her horn. There are other people in this "Doko" region who have four eyes, and others who live entirely in subterranean galleries. These wonders were attested by natives and Arabs. If the 'German surgeon in the French service in Africa,' had heard all this he would doubtless have reported that he had found men at Ilorin with *two* extra vertebræ instead of one. But the most singular *lusus naturæ* of which I have yet heard was the 'French savan,' who fell among the Arabs and heard such vivid descriptions of tailed men, that he went home and reported that he had actually seen one. No savan, as yet, I believe, has published a scientific description of the roc's egg. After all, if there are white men in France with long ears like asses, why should there not be negroes in Africa with short tails like baboons?"

The other extract likewise we make for the entertainment of our friends who repudiate the Scripture doctrine of the unity of the races. It may serve to show them how facts contradict their theory that mulattoes are the hybrid offspring of different species of men, by contradicting their allegation that mulattoes are infertile for the most part and necessarily an inferior and perishing race :

"Many of the Pulohs, and of some other interior tribes, and a few of the Yórubas, Iboes, Nufés, Hausas, Kanikés, Mandingoes and Kroo men, are mulattoes, the descendants of typical negroes and white men. This is proved by several facts. 1. Their colour varies from dark to very bright. Some of the Pulohs cannot have more than one eighth of negro blood, if we judge by their colour. 2. Their hair, though woolly, is long and bushy like that of other mulattoes. I have seen one woman, nearly black, with soft silky hair. Some have a sandy tint of beard and hair as if their ancestors were red-headed. I have seen one with bright blue eyes. Lander saw one on the Niger. 3. Their features, noses, lips, skull, etc., are cast more or less in the European mould. Their hands and feet are frequently small and elegantly formed. 4. The language of the Pulohs of which I have collected about three hundred phrases, containing one thousand words or more,

is not African or Shemitic. 5. The Pulohs affirm that their ancestors were white. 6. And finally, we have evidence worthy of more or less confidence, that the white and negro races have repeatedly come in contact under circumstances which must have resulted in amalgamation." * * *

"Here we may step aside to make two remarks. First, that the burning sun and dry air of the desert have not changed the color or the features of the whites who have been there for three or four thousand years. Their children are still as white as any in the world. Secondly, the mulatto Pulohs must have been mulattoes many centuries ago, and they have intermarried among themselves, 'hybrids with hybrids,' all the time;" otherwise many of them could not still remain as bright coloured as quadroons or even brighter. But the Pulohs are physically and mentally a fine race. They show no symptoms of dying out."

On several important points our opinions do not coincide with Mr. Bowen's. In the first sentence of chapter xxv., on the religion of Africa, his statement seems to us too strong, that 'no man has ever believed in two gods.' That the "practical idolatry" which Mr. B. admits to be "no less natural to man than a belief in one God," may (as in the case frequently of the Jews of old, and generally of the modern Roman Catholics) consist with the acknowledgment of one God, we are perfectly well aware. But we cannot easily relinquish the belief that amongst many races of men the practical idolatry has so far overgrown the knowledge of the ONE GOD as to constitute the people in the strictest sense polytheists. Mr. B. says, they all "look beyond the idol to THE GOD." We think they all put the idol between them and THE GOD, so that they never can look beyond the idol at all. Paul, in Romans, seems to signify that the Heathens once knew God, but not glorifying Him as such, were, in God's righteous judgment, given up to delusions, and so have become vain in their imaginations, and have their foolish heart darkened; so that now instead of the truth of God they hold a lie. We quote Paul against Mr. Bowen, because the latter having been a Missionary, may feel that he can speak with authority on this subject to us who know it not by actual observation like himself, but only by theory and report. Now Paul was also a Missionary, and knew the Heathen personally. And Paul says, "There be Gods many, but to us there is but one God." So too, he says, "We know that an idol is nothing in the world, howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge." Paul speaks also on this wise, "But I say that the things which the gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and not to God." Mr. B. says they look through the idol and beyond the idol to God, but the apostle says they regard only the devils in their worship. Finally, Paul declares that the worship of devils cannot be tributary to, or be mixed with the worship of God. "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils, ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils."

“Polytheism (says Mr. B.) has no existence in Sudan nor yet in Guinea. In Yoruba many of the notions which the people entertain of God are remarkably correct.” Mr. B. has informed us that Mohammedanism has been long established, and is very widely spread in all that portion of the African continent. We would suggest that this may perhaps, account for the general correctness of opinions respecting God which Mr. B. found even amongst the pagan portion of the population. It would be very strange if a strong Mohammedanism should peacefully co-exist in the same country with a vigorous Polytheism.

Another statement of Mr. B. to which we must except is, that “Belief in one God is the result of *reason*,” p. 311. But we will not stop to give reasons for the exception taken. This sentiment, however, accords with and serves to explain Mr. B’s opinions, more fully expressed on another topic, viz. : the necessity of civilization and commerce to the Missionary work. We are not sure that we have a perfectly correct apprehension of the author’s ideas on this subject. We understand him to admit that the greatest savage may be converted to Christ, and here we are heartily at one with him. But, we understand him to deny that a savage people converted truly to Christianity, could remain permanently or long, a Christian people, unless with the Gospel we also give them civilization. He says, in the preface, “We do not believe that natural causes can sanctify the heart, although we hold that civilization is essential to the permanence of the gospel among any people.” On page 322, he says, “Suppose now, that all the people of Africa were converted to-day and left to-morrow to perpetuate their Christianity without foreign assistance. In a few generations they would sink to a level with the Christians of Abyssinia, as unconverted, as superstitious, and as vicious as the very heathens themselves.” On page 326, we read, “Evangelization is our first great object, because the soul is more than the body; but evangelization involves civilization, both as cause and effect, because the body, the intellect, and the affections of man are inseparably united, so as to act and react upon each other, both for good and evil.” On pages 322 and 323, he says, “To diffuse a good degree of mental culture among the people, though a secondary object, is really and necessarily one part of the missionary work in Africa; and he that expects to evangelize the country without civilization will find like Xavier in the East, and the Jesuits in South America, and the Priests in Congo, that his labours will end in disappointment.” And on page 327, “What then shall Christians of this favoured age attempt to do for Africa? The same that we are now attempting. Give the people Missionaries, give them Bibles, give them the

power to perpetuate the gospel amongst them,—or in one word, civilization.”

Now, if Mr. B. means to say, that the written or printed word of God, and the knowledge requisite to its being read by a considerable number of the people in any nation converted suddenly to God, is essential to the permanence of Christianity among them, we entirely agree with him. If, going further, he means to say, that besides the word, it is also essential that such a people have the ministry, and the church, and the sacraments, as else their Christianity will soon die out, we also agree with him heartily. But if going still further and insisting as we understand him to do, that such an establishment of Christ’s Church as we have supposed above, must, necessarily, prove transient unless “foreign assistance,” in the way of the arts and sciences and social improvements, be given to this church of Jesus Christ, we think he commits a serious error. We think, he impugns the power and wisdom of God, which is Christ crucified. We think, he reduces the efficiency of God’s spirit below the feeble strength of men. The church, and the ministry, and the written Word, is all we need *as Christ’s disciples*, to send to the Heathen. This is all He commanded us to carry to them. This is all His apostles carried any where with them. This carried to a people, their civilization will begin at once to be developed out of these elements. Taught their duty to God, and to each other, and to themselves, they are *civilized*, even without the trappings of European or American society.

Holding this idea of reason as the teacher of man in the belief of one God, and holding this estimate of the place of civilization amongst the means of permanently converting the nations, we do not wonder to find that Mr. B. has high hopes of the conversion of the natives around Liberia, by the influence of that colony. All colonizationists, it seems to us, ought to agree with Mr. B. in his idea of civilization as a means of converting men, or at least keeping them converted. Mr. B’s testimony however, confirms what we have stated in another article of this number as to the relations of the colonists and natives :

“But the Liberians cannot be justified generally in regard to the manner in which they treat the natives. Making all due allowance for social and other differences, they regard their barbarous neighbors with too much contempt. Neither do they exert themselves as they might, to improve them in civilization and religion. It is true, that the churches and schools are open to the natives, if they choose to enter them; but the naked and ignorant barbarians do not choose to thrust themselves in among the proud and well dressed Liberians, either to learn or worship. I am glad that some are now making more special efforts to improve the natives, and I have no doubt that persevering, well directed efforts will be successful.”

The feelings of contempt and aversion with which the Liberians generally seem to regard the natives, are precisely what we ought to expect in a colony coming from a distant country, speaking another language, and having different ideas on many points from those which the native Africans hold, and a colony moreover, consisting largely of unconverted men. And so we ought to expect that these feelings will be met with corresponding feelings on the part of the natives. Accordingly, we are not at all surprised to read, in the papers, of the war now actually going on between the colony and the natives, a war which has broken out anew since we wrote the article on Missions and Colonization. These things must inevitably be, and increase. All the power and all the wisdom of men cannot hinder continual collisions more and more serious and destructive between these two peoples, now on the African coast. And the result must be, if all history deceive us not, either the subjugation of the natives by the colony, or the destruction of the colony by the natives.

In like manner, we are not at all surprised by the estimate Mr. B. puts on commerce with Christian nations as an element in the work of Missions to Africa. But we cannot and we need not enlarge on this point.

Westward Empire: or the Great Drama of Human Progress. By E. L. MAGOON, author of *Proverbs for the People*, *Republican Christianity*, *Orators of the American Revolution*, *Living Orators of America*, &c. 1856.—The design of this work is nothing less than to unfold the scheme of Providence in the successive evolutions of human history. The ages selected, as topics of special illustration, are those of Pericles, Augustus, Leo, and Washington, and each is reviewed under the inviting heads of Literature, Art, Science, Philosophy, and Religion. The author is full of hope in relation to his own country. All the past has existed for us,—“if we inquire as to the area and agency of the chief progression in the domain of human history, it will be found that Japhet has been the constant leader, Europe the intermediate track, and America the manifest goal.” “Let us fondly hope that, on the side of the globe opposite to the first Ararat, shall a second be reached by the ark of conservative civilization, whereon human reason and divine righteousness will repose in the sublimest earthly union, and thence send down a perfected race to propagate their virtues and redeem mankind.” The author’s plan is certainly a bold one, and to execute it well within the compass of a duodecimo volume, requires abilities which we

suspect that but few men possess. If we cannot sympathise with the author in all his speculations, if we are sometimes shocked with principles which seem to us to overstep the modesty of truth, we admire his courage, his high anticipations, and his unshaken faith in the overruling providence of God. He is very far from preaching the "philosophy of despair."

A Biographical Dictionary, comprising a summary account of the most Distinguished Persons of all Ages, Nations, and Professions, including more than two thousand articles of American Biography. By REV. JOHN L. BLAKE, D. D., author of *Encyclopedia of Useful Knowledge*, *Daily Scripture Readings*, *Farmers' Every Day Book*, *Farm and Fireside*, and *Home in the Country*. Philadelphia: H. Cowperthwait & Co. 1857.

"This work was first published in 1836, and it contained 1096 pages royal octavo. The calculation was made at the time, that it comprised 10,000 different articles, of which more than 1000 were of American biography. Twelve editions of it have been published. The last one was in 1854. Of the numerous notices and reviews of the work, and of letters relating to it, only one is known to have been otherwise than commendatory; and that one was supposed to have been induced by an individual who had a rival interest. The author has been engaged more than three years in collecting and arranging material to enlarge the work; mainly in bringing in sketches of distinguished persons who have died since 1836; but a few others have been prepared of such as were then accidentally or unavoidably omitted. The whole number of new articles thus introduced, amount to about 2400; 1000 of these are American Biography, the others mostly European; 30 of parties who died in 1856; 102 of them of persons that died in 1855; 95 in 1854; 93 in 1853; 85 in 1852; 80 in 1851; 84 in 1850; 62 in 1849; 55 in 1848; 60 in 1846; and the others about equally divided in the ten preceding years. Of the American articles, 22 are of persons that belong to the State of Maine; 37 to New Hampshire; 30 to Vermont; 100 to Massachusetts; 30 to Rhode Island; 46 to Connecticut; 112 to New York; 31 to New Jersey; 74 to Pennsylvania; 30 to Maryland; 55 to Virginia; 41 to North Carolina; 35 to South Carolina; 20 to Georgia; 18 to Louisiana; 15 to Tennessee; 18 to Kentucky; 50 to Ohio; 15 to Indiana; and the remainder in less numbers, to the other States. Of the new articles of American biography, 145 are of clergymen; 168 of lawyers; 65 of physicians; 60 of merchants; 25 of mechanics; 24 of booksellers and publishers; 30 of printers and editors; 50 of farmers and planters; 80 of authors; 15 of foreign missionaries; 120 are designated as statesmen; 80 as scientific, literary, or classical professors; 20 are of manufacturers; 28 of officers of the American Navy; 60 of officers of the American Army; and about 100 of judicial or executive magistrates. It is apparent that in many instances the same individual comes into different classifications; to wit, lawyers may be statesmen and magistrates, and clergymen and physicians may be professors and authors.

"About 400 articles of the Foreign biography have been compiled from the *Gentleman's Magazine*; 80 from the *Encyclopedia of Universal Biography*,

London, 1854; about the same number from the London Hand-Book of Universal Biography; and the rest from Rose's Biographical Dictionary, in 12 volumes, and the British periodicals. The foreign articles are also enriched with many names of booksellers and publishers.

"Over 100 articles of the American biography have been compiled from the American Almanac; 50 from the American Encyclopedia; but the most of the articles, or about 800, are from correspondents, the periodical press, funeral sermons, and other miscellaneous sources. Among the articles of American biography are philanthropists, who contributed, it is believed, not less than ten millions of dollars to public literary, scientific, and humane purposes. The author has aimed to collect the names of persons in the business and producing classes—those who cause national wealth, and give perpetuity to our public institutions—working men—thinking men—though without scholastic education and conventional rank in society. It is particularly designed for editors, professional men, teachers, and general readers."

Such are the claims of this work as set forth by its publishers. It is a book of intrinsic merit, and will be a valuable manual to the general reader who wishes to know something of the men whose names are mentioned in the records of the past. It is probably less complete in some departments of ancient biography than Lempriere. But a selection must be made to reduce a work of this kind to moderate dimensions. The biographical dictionary of names mentioned in the Greek and Roman writers only, down to the period of the fall of Constantinople, as edited by Smith, extends to three heavy and closely printed octavos. The dictionary of Dr. Blake is rich in American biography, and as such, is especially interesting to our own citizens, and to all who desire information concerning the men of this country.

The Doctrine of Baptisms: Scriptural Examination of the questions respecting, I. The Translation of Baptizo, II. The mode of Baptism, III. The subjects of Baptism. By GEO. D. ARMSTRONG, D. D., Pastor of the Presbyterian church in Norfolk, Va. New York: Charles Scribner, 377 and 379 Broadway. 1857. pp. 322, 12mo. Writers on Baptism have too often deformed their pages with dogmatism, and ill-tempered personalities. We do not remember that we have ever read a book on this subject more free from such blemishes. It is throughout a dignified, calm, clear, able, and convincing exposition of the whole subject of Baptism, as set forth in the Scriptures, as to its import, mode, and subjects. There is learning without the show of learning, fairness of argument, candid examination of the views of those of an opposite faith, and a satisfactory vindication of the doctrine entertained by the Presbyterian church, and common to them and other Protestant communions which practise infant baptism. As to the meaning of *baptizo* when used in the Scriptures as a religious or sacred term, he regards it as

nearly equivalent with the term *to purify*, though more special and limited; that it is used in a technic sense of the rite of admission to the visible church, in a literal sense of *consecration*, in a spiritual sense of *regeneration*. He holds that "to translate the Greek *baptizo* in the Word of God, by the English words *to dip* or *immerse*, or in 'any other language, by words corresponding to our English words *dip* or *immerse*, is to *mistranslate the word of God*." As to the mode, he says, "The conclusion in this whole matter, to which we come, is—

1. That there is nothing in the meaning of the word *baptizo*, nor in the emblematic import of the rite of baptism, to authorize the belief that any particular mode of applying water to the person of the baptized, is essential to the validity of baptism.

2. While we cannot determine, with absolute certainty, whether sprinkling, pouring, or immersion, was the mode of baptism practised in the days of the Apostles, immersion is the least probable of the three.

3. To require immersion in order to admission to the church of God, is to infringe upon that liberty wherewith Christ hath made his people free, to teach for doctrine the commandments of men."

But we cannot follow the author through his arguments. There are a few interpretations contained in the book to which we are not prepared as yet to yield our assent, but to any one afflicted with doubts, or desirous of reviewing the entire subject, it will be found a pleasant and valuable guide.

Plantation Sermons, or Plain and Familiar Discourses for the instruction of the unlearned. By the Rev. A. F. DICKSON, of Charleston, South Carolina. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 170.

Hazael, or Know Thyself. By Rev. A. F. DICKSON, Charleston, S. C. American Sunday School Union. pp. 106.

The first of these volumes has been some time before the public, but we have not enjoyed the opportunity of noticing it before. Its practical utility for the purposes for which it was designed has been well tested by experiment. Happy the man who is, not in pretence only, but in truth, "a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes."

The character of Hazael, with a description of which the second of the volumes above mentioned opens, affords the author an occasion of revealing the subterfuges of the unbelieving heart, and arousing it from its spiritual torpor. The style of Mr. Dickson is full of life, point, and rapid movement. He paints with a quick but graphic pencil, moves onward to his object, not with a stately march, but with a cheerful, fervid alacrity. Such a book is well adapted to rouse the most lethargic from their slumbers.

Sinai and Palestine, in connection with their History. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, M. A. Canon of Canterbury. With Maps and Plans. Redfield: New York. 1857. Pp. 535, 8vo.

The author of this work is well known to the English public by his "Life of Dr. Arnold" and "Bishop Stanley," and more recently by his Critical Commentary on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians. In all these writings he has displayed his learning, taste, and powers of analysis and description. "Sinai and Palestine," to a large extent, is the fruit of the author's own observation. The winter of 1852 and the spring of 1853 was spent by him in Egypt, Arabia, and Syria. It is an attempt to illustrate the relation between the History and the Geography of the Chosen People,— "to point out how much or how little the Bible gains by being seen, so to speak, through the eyes of the country, or the country by being seen through the eyes of the Bible." It is an attempt "so to delineate the outward events of the Old and New Testament, as that they should come home with a new power" to the mind, "so to bring out their inward spirit that the more complete realization of their outward form should not degrade, but exalt the faith of which they are the vehicle." It gives interest to the sacred Scriptures, when the reader can transport himself to the scenes of the events recorded, when he can picture around him, the mountains, *wadys*, cities, villages, forests, and plains, in which they occurred, when he can trace the boundaries of the tribes as given in the book of Joshua, "The Domesday Book of the Conquest of Canaan," when the earliest records of Christianity, "a perpetual narrative of journeyings to and fro, by lake and mountain, over sea and land, that belongs to the history of no other creed," are illustrated by his knowledge of the physical geography of the Holy Land. The book before us, will assist the student of the Scriptures to do all this. The Maps have been framed, not only with the purpose of giving the physical features of the country, but the actual colouring which meets the eye of the traveller at the present time.

Villas and Cottages: A Series of Designs prepared for execution in the United States. By CALVERT VAUX, Architect, late Downing & Vaux. *Newburgh on the Hudson, Illustrated by 300 Engravings.* 1857.—This beautiful book, printed on fine paper, and with large type, if it should have the same effect upon others which a cursory examination of its various designs has produced upon ourselves, may tempt to serious encroachments upon the tenth commandment. We had not the slightest suspicion that our

house was so inconvenient and uncomfortable, until we saw the plans of others. This book has revealed to us wants of which we never dreamed before, and we think it would be nothing more than a just penalty on the artist, that he should be required to appease the dissatisfaction he has created. We are sorry, considering the state of our finances, that we ever saw the book. "If ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise."

Jehovah's Gracious Appeal to the Young: A Sermon, on occasion of the death of Thomas James Earle, of Aberdeen, a member of the Sophomore Class of the University of Mississippi, preached in the Presbyterian Church of Oxford, Mississippi, December 7th, 1856. By JOHN H. WADDEL, D. D., Professor of the Greek Language and Literature.

An earnest, affectionate, and faithful appeal to the students of his charge, under affecting circumstances, by their revered instructor. It is the first production of the author's pen it has been our privilege to read, and reveals the sources of that power over the affections and consciences of his youthful hearers of which we have often heard from their lips.

We are gratified to note the increasing interest with which the study of logic is regarded in this country. We have before us, three recent treatises by American writers, which indicate a decided advance beyond the old textbooks which were in use in our schools and colleges. The first is, *Elements of Logic, together with an Introductory View of Philosophy in general*, by HENRY P. TAPPAN; D. Appleton & Co. The second is, an *Elementary Treatise on Logic*, by W. D. WILSON, D. D., a Professor in the Hobart Free College, Geneva, Western New York; same Publishers. The third is, the *Science of Logic*, by Rev. ASA MAHAN; A. S. Barnes & Co., New York. They all possess merit, but an articulate criticism would require an extended article which we hope soon to be able to furnish.

Early History of the University of Virginia, as contained in the letters of Thomas Jefferson and Joseph C. Cabell, hitherto unpublished: with an *Appendix* consisting of Mr. Jefferson's Bill for a complete system of education, and other illustrative documents, and an *Introduction* comprising a brief historical sketch of the University,

and a *Biographical Notice* of Joseph C. Cabell, J. W. Randolph, Richmond, Va.—We need not add a word to the title page of this volume to insure it the attention of all who are interested in higher education. The University of Virginia is, perhaps, the most prominent institution of the country, and we have here the history of its conception and birth, which throws no little light upon its rapid growth and present maturity. There are features of the plan which we do not think adapted to the condition of the country, and we have seen nothing to satisfy us that it is safe to presume upon diligence, where there are no motives to enforce it. But that to a young man who is ambitious and aspiring, the University offers rare and signal advantages, there can be no doubt. It has a learned Faculty and a well digested distribution into schools. The opportunities are ample, but we fear that too much is left to the discretion of the student. The system of examinations deserves the highest praise, and if some expedient could be found to make every man undergo them, the system would be very nearly perfect.

1. *Why do I live?* American Tract Society. pp. 206.

2. *The Well in the Valley.* "Who, passing through the valley of Baca, make it a well." Ps. lxxxiv. 6. American Sunday School Union. pp. 430.

3. *By whom is the world to be converted?* or *Christians Christ's representatives and agents for the conversion of the world.* Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 108.

The above are from the untiring pen of our Reverend brother, Thomas Smyth, D. D. of Charleston. In sickness or in health he wearies not in literary labour, striving to reach those by whom his voice cannot be heard, in defence of the truth, or in efforts to promote Christian activity, and practical piety. The first of these little books is an earnest, encouraging, and awakening appeal to the Christian heart. Its title may have been suggested by his own stricken health. "The best and most useful lives" says he, "have sometimes been the sickliest; and the feeblest body has often encompassed the happiest as well as the holiest spirit." P. 20. It is the blessed privilege of the children of God, that though their outward man perish, their inward man is renewed day by day. *The Well in the Valley* is designed to exhibit the privileges and obligations of the Lord's Supper. It offers itself as an affectionate guide to those who are enquiring, or should enquire whether they ought not openly to profess Christ, and become united with the visible church. The views it ex-

presses on this point are those of our Directory for Worship. Chap. ix. These unpretending volumes which aim at the heart, may do as good service for Christ and his church, as the larger and more elaborate volumes of the same author. They are all eminently practical, appealing to the religious sensibilities of those to whom they are addressed.

1. A Spiritual Treasury for the Children of God consisting of a Meditation for the Evening and Morning of each Day in the Year, upon Select Texts of Scripture, humbly intended to establish the Faith, promote the comfort, and influence the practice of the followers of the Lamb. By WILLIAM MASON. In Christ are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. Philadelphia Presbyterian Board of Publication. vol. 2, pp. 506, 508.— A beautiful edition of a well known and deservedly esteemed work.
2. A Series of Tracts on the Doctrines, Order, and Policy of the Presbyterian Church. vol. 9.
3. Isabel, or a Sabbath Well Spent. By Rev. JAMES HAMILTON, D. D. London. A Tract.
4. A Treatise on the Right Use of the Fathers. By JOHN DALLIE. pp. 456.
5. A Glance Backward at Fifteen Years of Missionary Life in North India. By the Rev. JOSEPH WARREN, D. D. pp. 256.
6. The Articles of the Synod of Dort, translated from the Latin, with Notes. By the Rev. THOMAS SCOTT, D. D., with an Introductory Essay, by the Rev. SAMUEL MILLER, D. D., late Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. pp. 260.
7. The Wedge of Gold, or Achan in Eldorado. By the Rev. W. A. SCOTT, D. D. pp. 162.
8. Domestic Duties. By Rev. RUFUS BAILEY. pp. 120.
9. The Childs Scrap Book. Compiled by the Editor. pp. 144.
10. Gleanings from Real Life. By S. S. EGLISEA, author of Lizzie Furguson. pp. 180.
11. The Bishop and the Monk. pp. 166.
12. Footprints of Popery. pp. 180.
13. A Method for Prayer. By Rev. MATTHEW HENRY. pp. 273.
14. The World and its Influences. pp. 120.
15. An Explanation of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism. By THOMAS VINCENT. pp. 364.
16. Lessons for the Little Ones. By a Teacher of Infants. pp. 180.

- 17: Children of Abraham: or Sketches of Jewish Converts, being in part a sequel to Leila Ada. pp. 119.
18. Faith and Works. By L. H. CHRISTIAN. pp. 138.
19. Little Nelly and the Dying Irish Girl. pp. 144.
20. The Sower and the Seed. By JOHN HALL, D. D. pp. 127.
21. William Bartlett: or the Good Son. pp. 108.
22. Rhymes for the Nursery. pp. 91.
23. The Presbyterian Juvenile Psalmodist. By THOMAS HASTINGS. pp. 256.
24. The Child's Catechism of Scripture History. By Rev. J WALLACE. Kingstree, S. C. pp. 179.
25. The Duty of Praying for Others. By Rev. WILLIAM ROMAINE. pp. 82.
26. Forgive us our Debts. By JOHN HALL, D. D. pp. 34.
27. The First Sabbath Excursion. pp. 72.
28. Aunt Sarah's Stories. pp. 55.
29. Little Kadore, the Royal Beggar Boy, and Maurice Sullivan. pp. 36.
30. Annie Grey, and Other Sketches. By OLIVE. pp. 72.
31. Death Bed Triumphs of Eminent Christians. Compiled by the Rev. FORBES BURNS. pp. 191.
32. The Classmates, or The College Revival. By Minister. p. 203.
33. Calvin and His Enemies. A Memoir of the life, character, and principles of Calvin. By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D. pp. 180.
34. Witnesses for Christ, or the Poet, the Hero, the Statesman, and the Philosopher. pp. 72.
35. Petra, or The Rock City and its Explorers. pp. 79.
36. Backbiting Reproved, The Visit, and Other Sketches. By CHARLOTTE ELZIABETH. pp. 144.
37. Learn to Say No, or The City Apprentice. pp. 122. Written for the Board of Publication.
38. Daniel Baker's Talk to Little Children. pp. 68.
39. The Paradise of Children, an address to boys and girls. By the Rev. N. MORREN. pp. 72.
40. The Christian in the Church. By JOHN M. LOWRIE. pp. 47.
41. The Transformed Island. A Story of the South Seas. pp. 72.
42. Sabbath School Theology, or Conversations with a Class. By JOHN HALL, D. D. pp. 94.
43. Gems from the Coral Islands, or Incidents between Savage and

Christian Life of the South Sea Islanders. By the Rev. WILLIAM GILL. Rarotonga. pp. 282.

44. Gems from the Coral Islands, Western Polonesia. By the Rev. WILLIAM GILL, Raratonga. pp. 232.

The above are all publications of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, and bear their respected *imprimatur*. We bid them a cordial welcome amongst us. A truly Presbyterian literature must be a blessing both to our church and our country.

THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. X.]

JULY, MDCCCLVII.

[NO. 2.

ART. I.—MIRACLES.

Notes on the Miracles of Our Lord. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, M. A., Vicar of Itchen Stoke, Hants; Professor of Divinity, King's College, London; Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford; and late Hulsean Lecturer. Second ed. London: John W. Parker, West Strand. 1847. Pp. 467.

On Miracles. By RALPH WARDLAW, D. D. "What sign showest thou, then, that we may see, and believe thee? What dost thou work?"—THE JEWS TO JESUS. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 285 Broadway. 1853. Pp. 295.

An Inquiry into the Proofs, Nature, and Extent of Inspiration, and into the Authority of Scripture. By the Rev, SAMUEL HINDS, M. A., of Queen's College, and Vice-Principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford. Oxford: Printed by W. Baxter, for B. Fellowes, Ludgate Street, London; and J. Parker, Oxford. 1831.

ALL the departures from the ancient faith concerning the authority of the Scriptures, which have distinguished modern speculation, may be traced directly, whatever may be said of the perverseness of the heart as the ultimate cause, to an insuperable repugnance to the admission of miracles. The supernatural has been the stone of stumbling and the rock of offence. The antipathy to it has given rise to open infidelity, on the one hand, and to the various types of criticism, on the other, which, in consequence of their agreement in rejecting everything that transcends the ordinary agencies of nature, have been classed under the common name of Rationalism. If the immediate intervention of God, either in the world of matter or of mind, is assumed to be intrinsically incredible, nothing

is left but to discard the records which assert and pretend to give examples of it, as impudent impostures, or to seek, by tortuous interpretation, to reconcile accounts confessedly false with the honesty of the historian, and, what would seem to be still more difficult, with the essential divinity of the religion. The English Deists, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, took the former course, and denounced the Bible in unmeasured terms of vituperation and abuse. They saw no middle ground between the rejection of the supernatural and the rejection of Christianity. They could not comprehend how that could, in any sense, be treated as divine which was made up of a tissue of fables, or how they could be regarded as honest men, who had palmed the grossest extravagances upon the world, as sober, historical realities. Woolston may, perhaps, be deemed an exception. His letters upon the miracles of our Saviour are remarkable for having anticipated the method, in some degree at least, which has been carried out with such perverseness of learning and ingenuity by Strauss and Bauer. "His whole reasoning," we use the words of Strauss himself, "turns upon the alternative, either to retain the historical reality of the miracles narrated in the Bible, and thus to sacrifice the divine character of the narratives, and reduce the miracles to mere artifices, miserable juggleries, or common-place deceptions; or, in order to hold fast the divine character of these narratives, to reject them entirely as details of actual occurrences, and regard them as historical representations of certain spiritual truths." His own opinion is nowhere articulately expressed, but the presumption is, from the general tenour and spirit of his book, that he was really a Deist, who resorted to allegory as a convenient cover for his malignity; and to the spiritual sense, as a protection from the unspiritual weapons with which he was likely to be assailed. He was well aware, if his dilemma could be fairly and conclusively made out, which horn of it the sturdy common sense of Englishmen would adopt. A religion shrouded in figures could be no religion for them. But, with this exception, if exception it can be called, the issue in England was, No miracles, no Christianity; the Bible must be accepted as it is, as out and out divine, or wholly and absolutely rejected; it was, the ancient faith or open and avowed infidelity.

The case was different in Germany. The publication of the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*—an anonymous production of Reimar, which pursued precisely the same line of argument with the English Deists—gave rise to a class of theologians, who have undertaken to retain Christianity at the expense of the historical accuracy of its records. They agree with the Deists in repudiating all that is supernatural, but they cannot agree with them in denouncing prophets and apostles as imposters; or in divesting the biblical narratives of all moral and spiritual significance. The modes in

which they save the credit of the sacred writers, and the divine import of the sacred history, vary with the reigning philosophy, and constitute the different schools into which the class of theologians, commonly known as Rationalists, may be divided. The first of these schools, that founded by Eichhorn, and perfected by Paulus, accepted the authenticity of the Scriptures, as a narrative of facts, by reducing the miraculous to the dimensions of the natural. They were only ordinary events, produced by ordinary agency, which had assumed an extraordinary character in the narrative, either from the omission of circumstances necessary to explain them, or from the style in which the opinions and prejudices of the age led the spectators to describe them. Our Saviour neither wrought nor pretended to miracles; and the evangelists properly interpreted, that is, interpreted in the light and spirit of their own times, record nothing of the kind. All was natural. Jesus was a wise and a good man; and what we are accustomed to consider as his wonders, were "works of benevolence and friendship; sometimes of medical skill; sometimes also the results of accident and good fortune." In this way the history was saved; but what became of the divine? That also was reduced to very small proportions. Jesus introduced a pure and spiritual religion; enforced it by the example of a spotless life, and confirmed it by the glory of a martyr's death. He was called of God, in the sense that providential circumstances favoured the development of his character; and his natural gifts qualified him to become a great moral teacher.

The thorough-going attempt to reduce the supernatural in the New Testament to the dimension of the natural, to make the miracles nothing but the language in which the age signalized ordinary phenomena, is one of the most curious chapters in the history of criticism. It contained the seeds of failure in itself; "and now," says Trench, "even in the land of its birth it has entirely perished."

The approximation to a deeper and more earnest faith was indicated by the systematic effort of Schleiermacher to reconcile religion to nature without stripping it of all divine power. The supernatural, in common with the Deists and the preceding school, he discarded. The low sense of the natural which Paulus contended for, he equally repudiated. He wanted more of God; a religion that should really answer to the description of God manifest in the flesh. The anxiety to escape from anything like a real miracle; and the longing for a system of spiritual life and power; the revulsion alike against a material naturalism and a palpable supernaturalism, is the key to the elaborate christology of Schleiermacher. The conception which he had of Christ, as the archetype of perfect humanity, in whom the consciousness of God existed in absolute strength, led him to attribute to the Saviour an intimacy

of communion with nature, and an access to her secrets, which no other man possessed. He was familiar with her mighty energies, and he could lay his hand upon the springs of her power, and produce effects which, to those immersed in sense, should appear to be supernatural. Still all that he did was to obey her laws. He never rose above her. A profounder knowledge invested him with a deeper power, but it was the same in kind with the power of other men. This, of course, was to deny the miracles without denying the phenomena of the New Testament.

Next comes a school which discards the entire histories of the New Testament, as authentic narratives of facts, and makes them the offspring of the love, admiration, and glory with which the followers of Jesus adorned their recollections of their master. They were unconscious allegories, in which their imaginations, enriched and expanded by the prejudices, and expectations, and habits of thought engendered by the Old Testament, threw their remembrances of their Lord; "the halo of glory with which the infant church, gradually and without any purpose of deceit, clothed its founder and head. His mighty personality, of which it was livingly conscious, caused it ever to surround him with new attributes of glory. All which men had ever craved and longed for, deliverance from physical evil, dominion over the crushing powers of nature, victory over death itself; all which had ever, in a lesser measure, been attributed to any, they lent in larger abundance, in unrestrained fulness, to him whom they felt greater than all. The system may be most fitly characterized," and we cordially concur in the caustic criticism of Trench, "as the church making its Christ, and not Christ his church."

On this scheme the history, both natural and supernatural, is fairly abandoned. There was a basis of facts in the life of Jesus; but what those facts really were, we have no means of determining. He lived and died, and this is about all we can know with any certainty. What, then, becomes of the divine? Is not that abandoned too? By no means, says Strauss. The history is altogether unessential; the absolute contents of Christianity are quite independent of it. The stories of the New Testament are only the drapery in which a grand idea is represented; and that idea may be seized and retained without clinging to the dress in which it was first presented. We may give up the Bible without surrendering aught that is divine in Christianity itself. Here that criticism, which ventures to reject the supernatural and yet call itself Christian, seems to have reached its culminating point. Extravagance could go no farther.

Though the term Rationalist, as a distinctive title, is, for the most part, restricted to the school of Eichborn and Paulus, we have not hesitated to extend it to them all, in consequence of their agreement in radical and fundamental principles. They all

equally reject the supernatural ; they all equally admit no other standard of truth but our own reason ; they all equally repudiate an objective, external, divine revelation. The divine with them is only the true, and the true is that which authenticates itself to our own souls. We believe because we see or feel, and not because the mouth of the Lord has spoken. They all equally make man the measure of his religion. To indicate the differences among themselves, the epithets sensual and spiritual might be chosen ; which seem to be appropriate to the different systems of philosophy they had respectively embraced.

The pretensions to a deeper spiritualism and a profounder life, have given something of currency to the peculiar system of Schleiermacher, have detracted from the historic form in which the christology of the ancient faith is embodied, and served to increase, if not to engender, a secret prejudice on the part of earnest inquirers, against the miraculous features of Christianity. Men have been willing to accept a religion which promises to satisfy the longings of their nature, without demanding an extraordinary faith, which meets their wants without repressing the freedom of speculation.

But the point on which the church has always insisted, and which she makes essential to the existence of a true faith, is, that the scheme of Christianity involves the direct intervention of God ; and that the Scriptures, which record that scheme, are an authoritative external testimony from him. She is not content with a barren compliment to the honesty and integrity of the writers ; nor to the still more barren admission that something of truth, more or less elevated, according to the philosophy of the critic, can be extracted from their pages. She asserts their authority to speak in the name of God ; and she commends their doctrines, not because they commend themselves by intrinsic probability or ideal excellence, but because they are the word of the Lord. The fundamental postulate of the Rationalist of every type precludes the conception of *such* a revelation. A religion of *authority* he as indignantly rejects as the most unblushing scoffer. Such a revelation, being essentially supernatural, stands or falls with the miracle. Let those, therefore, who feel themselves tempted to join in the cry against miracles, and to depreciate them as carnal and earthly ; who would insist upon the divine truths of Christianity to the exclusion or neglect of its equally divine credentials, consider well what they are doing. They are giving currency to a principle which, if legitimately carried out, would rob them of those very truths in which they are disposed to rest. There is not a distinctive doctrine of the gospel, which could be known to be true, independently of just such a revelation as implies the reality of miracles. There are no lines of ratiocination, no measures of experience, no range of intuition, no ideas awakened in the soul,

which could authenticate to us the ends and purposes on the part of God, involved in that series of stupendous facts unfolded in the biblical histories. What elevation of consciousness, or what intensity of moral and spiritual enthusiasm could ever ascertain to us the appointment of a great Mediator, on the part of heaven's high chancery, to bring in an everlasting righteousness, and to open the kingdom of heaven to all believers? The sensible phenomena connected with the life and death of Jesus may, indeed, be apprehended; but their significance in the economy of God it transcends the sphere of our faculties to discover. They are the counsels of His will, which none can penetrate but His own eternal Spirit; and unless He has revealed them, our speculations about them are little better than a sick man's dreams. They must be known by a divine testimony, or they cannot be known at all. The question, then, of miracles runs into the question concerning those very doctrines for the sake of which we affect to slight them. It is impossible to abandon the miracle, and cling to any other Christianity but that which is enkindled in our own souls from the sparks of our own reason. The consciousness of the individual, or the consciousness of the Christian community, awakened and propagated by sympathy, must be the sole criterion of truth. There is no alternative; man must make his religion, if God cannot give it to him.

As the question of an external, authoritative revelation depends upon the question of the truth or possibility of miracles, we have thought proper to contribute our mite to the interests of religion, and (may we not add?) of a sound philosophy, by a calm and candid discussion of the whole subject. We are aware that some would have religion as completely divorced from letters as from politics. But such a separation is as hopelessly impossible, as it is undesirable, if it were possible. Religion and philosophy touch at every point; and we agree with Suarez, that no man can be an accomplished theologian who is not, at the same time, an accomplished metaphysician; and that no man can be an accomplished metaphysician without imbibing principles which shall lead him to religion. Faith and reason are distinguished, but not opposed; and though a superficial culture may have the effect which Strauss ascribes to it, of alienating the mind from the sacred records; yet a deeper and sounder philosophy will correct the aberration. We shall know nothing of sects or parties, but those broad questions which mere sectaries and partizans cannot comprehend, but which pertain to the statesman and scholar are exactly the topics which ought to find a place in a journal like this. We shall feel that we have rendered an essential service to society, if we can succeed, in any measure, in showing that the prejudice against the supernatural, which operates

unfavorably on the minds of many, in averting their attention from divine revelation, is without any just foundation. We hope that religion can be reconciled with science upon a safer and easier plan than the sacrifice of either.

The works named at the head of our article cover the whole ground which we propose to occupy. We shall pursue the method adopted by Dr. Wardlaw, and discuss, first, the nature; then the apologetic worth; and finally, the credibility of miracles.

1. What, then, is a miracle? It is obvious that the definition should contemplate it only as a phenomenon, and include nothing but the difference which distinguishes it from every other species of events. There should be no reference to the cause that produces it; that must be an inference from the nature of the effect. Those who make, as Mill does in his *Logic*, the belief of God's existence essential to the credibility of a miracle, virtually deny that the miracle can be employed as a proof of His being. But there is evidently no reason in the nature of things why the argument here cannot proceed from the effect to the cause, as in the ordinary changes of nature. The miracle presupposes God, and so does the world. But the miracle, as a phenomenon, may be apprehended even by the Atheist. It is an event, and an event of a peculiar kind, and God comes in, when the inquiry is made for the cause. Hence Cudworth and Barrow, as well as the Fathers and Schoolmen, do not hesitate to appeal to miracles as an argument for the divine existence. Considered as a phenomenon, in what does the peculiarity of the miracle consist? Trench does not give a formal definition, and we find it difficult to determine precisely what his notion was. He explains the terms by which miracles are distinguished in Scripture, but these terms express only the effects upon our own minds, the purposes for which and the power by which they are wrought, and the operations themselves—the effect, the end, the cause—but they do not single out that in the phenomenon by which it becomes a wonder, a sign, a power, or a work. In his comparison of miracles and nature, we have either failed to understand him or he contradicts himself. He asserts, first, that the agency of God is as immediate in the ordinary occurrences of nature, as in the production of miracles. The will of God is the only power which he recognizes anywhere, and to say “that there is more of the will of God in a miracle than in any other work of His, is insufficient.”—P. 10. And yet, in less than a page, he asserts: “An extraordinary divine casuality belongs, then, to the essence of the miracle; more than that ordinary, which we acknowledge in everything; powers of God, other than those which have always been working; such, indeed, as most seldom or never have been working until now. The unresting activity of God, which at other times hides and conceals itself behind the veil of what we term natural laws, does

in the miracle unveil itself; it steps out from its concealment, and the hand which works is laid bare."—P. 12. If God immediately produces all events, what can be meant by extraordinary divine casuality? And if the will of God is the sole energy in nature, what are "the powers of God other than those which have been always working?" Has the will of God been seldom or never exerted? If the hand of God was directly in every event, how has it been concealed behind natural laws? There is certainly a confusion here. The two sects of statements must have been written under the influence of different feelings. His anxiety to escape from a dead, mechanical view of nature, and from epicurean conceptions of the indolence of God, may account for his denial of all secondary agencies; the palpable features of the miracle forced upon him the admissions of these same agencies, as a standard by which it was to be tried.

The scriptural term which gives us the nearest insight into the real nature of the miracle, is precisely the one of which Dr. Trench speaks most slightly—the word *wonder*.* It is true that every wonder is not a miracle, but every miracle is a wonder. The cause of wonder is the unexpectedness of an event; and the specific difference of the miracle is that it contradicts that course of nature which we expected to find uniform. It is an event either above or opposed to secondary causes. Leave out the notion of these secondary causes, and there can be no miracle. All is God. Admit a nature, apart and distinct from God, and there is scope for an extraordinary power. The doctrine of nature, as consisting of a series of agencies and powers, of substances possessed of active properties in their relations to each other, by no means introduces a dead, mechanical view of the universe. God has not left the world, as a watchmaker leaves his clock, after he has wound it up, to pursue its own course independently of any interference from Him. He is present in every part of His dominion; He pervades the powers which He has imparted to created substances by his ceaseless energy. He sustains their efficiency, and he regulates all the adjustments upon which their activity depends. He is the life of nature's life. In Him we live, and move, and have our being. But still, in dependence upon his sustaining care and the concurrence of His pervading energy, nature has powers and consists of causes which, in the same circumstances, always produce the same effects. To the following remarks of Dr. Wardlaw, we cordially assent:

"I have already, at the very outset, given a definition of them in other terms—as *works, involving a temporary suspension of the known laws of*

* Nomen miraculi ab admiratione sumitur. Thomas Aquinas, Summa 1, Quest. 105, Art. 7.

nature, or a deviation from the established constitution and fixed order of the universe; or, perhaps more correctly, of that department of the universe which constitutes *our own system*, whose established order and laws we are capable, to the full extent requisite for the purpose, of accurately ascertaining:—works, therefore, which can be effected by no power short of that which gave the universe its being, and its constitution and laws. In this definition, let it be observed, I have called a miracle a suspension of the *known* laws of nature. It is necessary to mark this. Effects, it is abundantly obvious, might be produced, such as, to those who witnessed them, might appear, and might be believed, miraculous, while the persons by whom they are performed are well aware, from their superior acquaintance with the laws, and powers, and phenomena of nature, that the appearance is fallacious, and the belief unfounded. The persons before whom they are performed may be utterly unable to account for them by any natural laws or powers *known to them*:—while, in point of fact, in place of their being suspensions of any law or laws of nature whatsoever, they are actually the product of their operation; so that, in the circumstances, the real miracle would have lain, not in their production, but in their *non*-production. *That* would have been the true deviation from the settled constitution of nature. In such a case, the miracle is a *miracle only to ignorance*; that is, it is *no* miracle. A little further development of the secrets of nature annihilates the seemingly miraculous, and only reads to the previously uninformed mind a new lesson of nature's uniformity. It becomes, therefore, an indispensable requisite to a genuine miracle, that it be wrought both *on* materials, and *by* materials, of which the properties are well and familiarly known; respecting which, that is, the common course of nature is fully understood.];—P. 34–35.

Dr. Wardlaw subsequently criticises, and, we think with justice, the distinctions and evasions by which Trench undertakes to rescue the miracle from being a violation of nature's order: to this point we shall afterwards refer. We cannot forbear to quote a portion of his remarks:

“The truth is, we must understand the term *nature*, in the sense usually attached to it, as relating to the constitution and laws of the physical system of our own globe. It is true, that, in consequence of sin, there have been ‘jarrings and disturbances’ of its ‘primitive order.’ But it does not follow from that, that there are no natural principles and laws in fixed and constant operation. And when an event occurs for which these natural principles and laws make no provision—for which they can in no way account—which is quite aside from, and at variance with, their ordinary uniform operations—it does not to me seem very material, whether we speak of it as beyond nature, or above nature, or beside nature, or against nature, or contrary to nature—whether as a suspension, an interruption, a contravention, or a violation of nature's laws; provided we are understanding ‘nature and nature's laws’ as having reference to the physical economy of our own system. When, in illustration of his position that a miracle is not all ‘the infraction of a law, but only a lower law neutralized and put out of working by a superior,’ Mr. Trench says, ‘Continually we behold, in the world around us, lower laws held in

restraint by higher, mechanic by dynamic, chemical by vital, physical by moral; yet we say not, when the lower thus gives place in favour of the higher, that there was any violation of law, that anything contrary to nature came to pass; rather we acknowledge the law of a greater freedom swallowing up the law of a lesser; he seems to forget that this 'holding in restraint of one law by the operation of another,' is itself *one of the very laws* whose working 'we behold in the world around us;' and that it comes, therefore, among the laws of nature as ordinarily understood, that is as, having relation to this said 'world around us,' to the physical order of our system. But it is manifestly unfair, in interpreting *nature*, to quit our own system, to mount to a loftier sphere, to take in a wider amplitude, to embrace the entire range of being; and then, because a thing, though a manifest contravention of the laws of 'the world around us'—of 'the nature which we know'—may not be out of harmony with nature when considered as embracing the boundless universe, and even the attributes of its Maker, thus bringing omnipotence itself into the range of 'natural causes,' to deny the propriety of pronouncing anything whatever to be *against nature*. For this involves the fallacy of taking the same term in two senses; and, because the thing in question may not be inconsistent with it in the one, concluding that it cannot be inconsistent with it in the other!"—P. 40-41.

2. Having settled that the essence of the miracle consists in the contranatural, or the supernatural, we are now prepared to investigate its apologetic worth. The question to be answered is briefly this—we quote the words of Mr. Trench—"Is the miracle to command, absolutely and without further question, the obedience of those in whose sight it is done, or to whom it comes as an adequately attested fact, so that the doer and the doctrine, without any more debate, shall be accepted, as from God?" In other words, is the miracle, in itself, from its own intrinsic character, a sufficient credential of divine inspiration, or a divine commission?

Trench, in company with the Jewish and pagan enemies of Christianity, and a large body of both Catholic and Protestant theologians, answers in the negative. Dr. Wardlaw answers in the affirmative; and we think that Dr. Wardlaw is right. The assumption on which the negative proceeds is, that a real miracle may be wrought by beings inferior to God. The Jews ascribed those of our Saviour to Beelzebub, the gentiles to magic, and the Scriptures themselves warn us against the lying wonders of the man of sin. The miracle, consequently, establishes, in the first instance, only the certainty of a superhuman origin, without determining anything as to its character. It may be heaven or it may be hell. To complete the proof, the nature of the doctrine must be considered. If that is approved by the conscience, or commends itself to the reason, it settles the question as to the real source of the miracle—and the miracle, thus authenticated as from God, confirms in turn the divine origin of the doctrine. We

acquit this reasoning of the charge which has often been brought against it of arguing in a circle. When it is said that the doctrine proves the miracle, and the miracle the doctrine, it is obvious, as Warburton has judiciously remarked, that "the term, doctrine, in the first proposition, is used to signify a doctrine agreeable to the truth of things, and demonstrated to be so by natural light. In the second proposition, the term, doctrine, is used to signify a doctrine immediately, and, in an extraordinary manner, revealed by God. So that these different significations, in the declared use of the word, doctrine, in the two propositions, sets the whole reasoning free from that vicious circle within which our philosophic conjurers would confine it. In this there is no fruitless return of an unprogressive argument, but a regular procession of two distinct and different truths, till the whole reasoning becomes complete. In truth, they afford mutual assistance to one another; yet not by taking back, after the turn has been served, what they had given; but by continuing to hold what each had imparted to the support of the other."* The whole argument may be stated in a single sentence: The goodness of the doctrine proves the divinity of the miracle; the divinity of the miracle proves—not the goodness, that would be the circle—but the divine authority of the doctrine.

But though we admit that this reasoning is valid as to form, we cannot make the same concession in relation to its matter. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that any created being, whether seraph or devil, can work a real miracle. We hold that this is the exclusive prerogative of God. The only power which any creature possesses over nature is the power which results from the knowledge of, and consists in obedience to, her laws. No finite being can make or unmake a single substance, nor impart to matter or to mind a single original property. Nature is what God made it; her laws what God appointed, and no orders of finite intelligence, however exalted, can ever rise above nature—for they are all parts of it—nor accomplish a single result independently of the properties and laws which God has ordained. They, like man, can only conquer by obeying. They may, through superior knowledge, effect combinations and invent machinery, which, to the ignorant and uninstructed, may produce effects that shall appear to transcend the capabilities of a creature, but they can never rise above, nor dispense with the laws they have mastered. They may reach the *mirabile*, but never the *miraculum*.† It was to set this

* Divine Legation, book ix., chap. 5.

† The distinction between finite power and that by which a real miracle is wrought, and between real and relative miracles, is clearly stated by Aquinas, Summa 1, Quest. 110, Art. 4: "Miraculum proprie dicitur, cum aliquid sit præter ordinem naturæ. Sed non sufficit ad rationem miraculi; si aliquid fiat præter ordinem naturæ alicujus

truth in a clear light, that the miracle, from its very essence, transcends the only species of power that we can ascribe to creatures, that we were so earnest in fixing the definition of it, as something above or contradictory to nature. The power which works a miracle is evidently creative—the same which first gave to the universe its being—to all substances their properties, and to the course of things its laws. It is the power of omnipotence. Hence, wherever there is a real miracle, there is and must be the finger of God. Neither can his power be delegated to a creature. He is, in no case, even the instrument of its exercise. If imparted to him as a *habitus*, it would be, like every other faculty, subject to his discretion; if only as a transient virtue, it would still be a part of himself; and we cannot conceive that, even for a moment, infinite power could be resident in the finite.* The prophet or apostle accordingly never performs the miracle. He is only the prophet of the presence of God. He announces what the Lord of nature will do, and not what he himself is about to perform. The case is well put by Dr. Wardlaw :

“ Another observation still requires to be made—made, that is, more pointedly, for it has already been alluded to; I mean that in the working of a miracle, there is, in every case, a *direct and immediate interference of Deity*. There is no transference of power from God the divinely-commissioned messenger. Neither is there any committing of divine omnipotence to his discretion. The former is, in the nature of the thing, impossible. It would be making the creature for the time almighty; and that, (since omnipotence can belong to none but divinity) would be equivalent to making him God. And the latter, were it at all imaginable, would neutralize and nullify the evidence: inasmuch as it would render necessary to its validity a previous assurance of the *impeccability* of the person to whom the trust was committed; that is, an assurance, and an absolute one, of the impossibility of its being ever perverted, by the improper application of the

particularis: quia sic cum aliquis projicit lapidem sursum, miraculum faceret, cum hoc sit præter ordinem naturæ lapidis. Ex hoc ergo aliquid dicitur esse miraculum quod sit præter ordinem totius naturæ creatæ. Hoc autem non potest facere nisi Deus; quia quicquid facit angelus, vel quæcumque alia creatura propria virtute, hoc sit secundum ordinem naturæ creatæ; et sic non est miraculum.

“ Quia non omnis virtus naturæ creatæ est noto nobis, ideo cum aliquid sit præter ordinem naturæ creatæ nobis notæ per virtutem creatam nobis ignotam, est miraculum quoad nos. Sic igitur cum dæmones aliquid faciunt sua virtute naturali, *miracula* dicuntur non simpliciter, sed quoad nos.” Compare 2. 2., Quest. 178, Art. 2.

* The same doctrine it enunciated by Dr. Hinds in the work mentioned at the head of our article, Part II., § 4, p. 120. It is also found as to its leading thought, in Aquinas, Summa, 2. 2. Quest. 178, Art. 1: “ Operatio virtutum (miracles) se extendit ad omnia quæ supernaturaliter fieri possunt; quorum quidem causa est divina omnipotentia, quæ nulli creaturæ communicari potest. Et ideo impossibile est quod principium operandi miracula sit aliqua qualitas habitualiter manens in anima. Sed tamen hoc potest contingere quod sicut mens prophetæ movetur ex inspiratione divina ad aliquid supernaturaliter cognoscendum; ita etiam mens miracula facientis moveatur ad faciendum aliquid ad quod sequitur effectus miraculi, quod Deus sua virtute facit.”

power, to purposes foreign to those of his commission. Omnipotence placed at a creature's discretion, is indeed as real an impossibility in the divine administration, as the endowing of a creature with the attribute itself: for, in truth, if the power remains with God, it would amount to the very same thing as God's subjecting himself to his creature's arbitrary and capricious will. There is, strictly speaking, in any miracle, no agency but that of the divine Being himself. Even to speak of the messenger as his *instrument*, is not correct. All that the messenger does, is to declare his message: to appeal to God for its truth: and if, at his word, intimating a miracle as about to be performed in proof of it, the miracle actually takes place; there is, on his part, in regard to the performance, neither agency nor instrumentality; unless the mere utterance of words, in imitation of what is about to be done, or in appeal to heaven and petition for its being done, may be so called. God himself is the agent, the sole and immediate agent."—P. 52-53.

The miracle, according to this view, requires no extraneous support in authenticating its heavenly origin. It is an immediate manifestation of God. It proclaims His presence from the very nature of the phenomenon. But how does it become a voucher for a doctrine, or the divine commission of a teacher? Neither conclusion is implicitly contained in it, and notable difficulties have been raised as to the possibility of establishing spiritual truths by material facts. We are far from asserting that miracles are so connected in the nature of things with a divine commission, that wherever they are proved to exist, inspiration must be admitted as a necessary inference. There is no logical connection that the human mind is capable of tracing between the supernatural exercises of power and the supernatural communication of knowledge. It is certainly conceivable that one might be able to heal the sick and raise the dead, who could neither predict future contingencies, nor speak with the authority of God. The relation betwixt the miracle and inspiration depends upon the previous announcement of its existence. The man who professes to come from God must appeal to the extraordinary intervention of His power. That appeal makes known to us a connection, by virtue of which the miracle establishes the doctrine, not in its logical consecution, but by the extrinsic testimony of God—establishes the doctrine, not as a truth internally apprehended, but a matter of fact, externally authenticated. It makes the Almighty a witness in the case. The previous appeal is the great canon upon which the applicability of the miracle as a proof, depends; and whenever it is complied with, the performance of the miracle is as a voice from heaven; it is a present God affixing His seal to the claims of His servant. That this is the case can, we think, be conclusively evinced by three considerations:

1. The miracle is an instance of the reality of that which alone creates any presumption against the claims of the prophet—it is

an *example* of the supernatural. There is obviously the same antecedent presumption against the pretension to work miracles as against the pretension to inspiration. They are phenomena which belong to the same class, and the man who justifies his pretensions in the one case, removes all proper ground of suspicion in the other. He goes farther; he illustrates an intimacy of connection with the Deity which inspiration supposes, and on account of which it is inherently improbable. This argument is clearly put by Dr. Hinds, in the book which we have named at the head of our article :

“In the case of a person claiming to be commissioned with a message from God, the only proof which ought to be admitted, is miraculous attestation of some sort. It should be required that, either the person himself should work a miracle, or that a miracle should be so wrought, in connection with his ministry, as to remove all doubt of its reference to him and his message. The miracle, in these cases, is in fact, a *specimen* of that violation of the ordinary course of nature, which the person inspired is asserting to have taken place, in his appointment and ministry, and corresponds to the exhibition of *specimens* and *experiments*, which we should require of a geologist, mineralogist, or chemist, if he asserted his discovery of any natural phenomena; especially of any at variance with received theories. In this latter case, it would be only reasonable to require such sensible proof, but it would be unreasonable to admit the assertion without it; without seeing the experiment or specimen ourselves, or satisfying ourselves, on the testimony of credible witnesses, that it had been seen by others. Equally unreasonable would it be, to admit any person's claim to inspiration, or extraordinary communion with God, without the appropriate test, the *earnest* of the Spirit.”—P. 9.

2. The miracle, in the next place, is not only a specimen of the supernatural in general, but a specimen of the precise kind of the supernatural which it is adduced to confirm; it is a specimen of inspiration. Here the importance of the doctrine, that God is, in every case, the immediate worker of the miracle—that the power is never delegated to a creature—becomes manifest. He who appeals to the miracle with the certainty of its performance, must know that God will put forth His energy. He is a prophet of the divine purpose, and therefore, really and truly, as the event in question, inspired. As we are indebted to Dr. Wardlaw for this feature of the argument, we shall permit him to speak for himself: *

“For, having said that every prophecy is a miracle, I have now further to say, that every miracle is a prophecy. *The prophecy is a miracle*

* The same thought is found in Dr. Hinds, but it had escaped our notice, until we had read the work of Dr. Wardlaw. It is not so clearly stated by Dr. Hinds as by Dr. Wardlaw, and Dr. Hinds does not seem to have appreciated its bearing upon the testimonial character of the miracle. See Hinds, p. 120.

of knowledge ; the miracle is a prophecy of power. The power by which the miracle is wrought, (as may be noticed more particularly by-and-bye,) being *divine* power, not transferred to the human messenger, but remaining God's and God's alone, and being by God alone directly put forth for its effectuation, it is plain that a miracle, as far as the messenger is concerned whose commission and whose testimony are to be certified, is simply an intimation of such divine power being about to put forth by him who alone possesses it, to produce an effect which he alone is able to accomplish. And, to make this still more manifest : if we only suppose that the production of the miraculous effect is not immediate, not to take place at the moment of its intimation, but fixed in the messenger's announcement for a precise time in the somewhat distant future ; in that case, when the time came, and the power was put forth, and the miracle wrought accordingly, we should have, you will at once perceive, a *miracle* and a *fulfilled prophecy* in the same event ; we should have, in that one event, the evidence of the miracle of knowledge and the miracle of power united."—P. 32-33.

"And there is in connection with the miracle of power, a miracle of knowledge ; consisting in such a secret supernatural communication between the mind of God and the mind of His servant, as imparts to the latter the perfect assurance that God *will*, at the moment, put forth the necessary power ; that he certainly *will* strike in with His miraculous attestation."—P. 53.

The miracle, therefore, being an instance, is a proof of inspiration.

3d. The third consideration is drawn from the character of God. It is not to be presumed that He will prostitute His power to the purposes of deception and fraud ; and yet, if he works a miracle at the bidding of an impostor, He becomes a party to a double lie. He endorses equally the claim to supernatural power and supernatural knowledge. The whole thing becomes a scene of complicated wickedness. First a creature with intolerable audacity professes to be in intimate communion with his Maker ; then, with a still more intolerable profaneness, takes the name of God in vain, by not only pronouncing it upon his lip, but by demanding a manifestation of the divine presence ; and the supposition is that God acquiesces in his blasphemy, succumbs to the behests, and fosters his designs. We cannot conceive of anything more atrocious. The miracle, as we have seen, is, in every case, the immediate operation of divine power. The man is not even the instrument ; he is only the prophet of the divine purpose. Now, to say that God's power shall be subject to his arbitrary dictation, is to say that the Almighty becomes a tool to answer the ends of imposture and falsehood ; a willing instrument to propagate deceit. If a creature, by habitual virtue, were able to effect a miracle, the case would be different. We might not be competent to say how far God's goodness should interfere to restrain its discretion. But the question is of the immediate agency of God himself ; and then it is wicked to think, much less deliberately to propose the problem, how far He

can lend himself as a party to a fraud. This consideration seems to us to conclude the controversy. We concur most heartily in the earnest representation of Dr. Wardlaw :

“If a man announces himself, as having been commissioned by God to propound a certain doctrine, or system of doctrines, *as from him* ; and for the truth of his commission and his communication, appeals to works such as no power but that of God can effect ; if, upon his making this appeal, these works are instantly and openly done at his bidding ; there is no evading of the conclusion, that this is *a divine interposition*, at the moment in attestation of the authority he claims, and of the truth of what is declared. The professed divine ambassador says : ‘ *This is from God* ;’ and God, by the instant intervention of the miracle, sets his seal to it, says, as by a voice from heaven, if not even more decisively, ‘ *It is from me* !’ The sole questions requiring to be answered, in order to the legitimacy of the conclusion, are these two : ‘ *Is the work one which God alone can do ?*’ and ‘ *Is it actually done ?*’ If these questions are settled in the affirmative, there is no reasonable ground on which the conclusion can be withstood.”

The foregoing reasoning as to the testimonial connection between the miracle and inspiration, seems to us to be abundantly confirmed by the example of our Lord. In the case of the paralytic, he claimed, in the first instance, to exercise a special prerogative of God. The scribes were shocked at the blasphemy. They looked upon it as altogether incredible, that a man should be entrusted with any such authority. *And Jesus, knowing their thoughts, said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts ? For whether is easier to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee ; or to say, Arise, and walk ?* That is, which is antecedently the most improbable, that I should be commissioned to forgive sin, or to control the course of nature ? Is there not the same presumption against the one as the other ? Are they not both equally the supernatural, and, in that respect, equally unlikely ? If, now, I can demonstrate to your senses that I have the power in one case, will not that convince you that I have it also in the other ? If, by a word, I can arrest this disease and restore health and energy to this palsied frame, will you not believe that I am likewise commissioned to remit sin ? Their silence indicated that the scribes acknowledged the force of the appeal. They instinctively felt, that if Jesus could do the one, there was no reason for saying that he could not do the other. The intrinsic improbability of both was precisely the same. *But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house. And he arose, and departed to his house.* The effect was electric ; the multitudes felt that he had made out his case, *and they marvelled, and glorified God, which had given such power unto men.* We

venture to say that the same effect would have been produced upon every unsophisticated mind that witnessed the scene.

In this case, all the conditions of our argument are complied with. The miracle is appealed to as the proof of the commission; it is treated as belonging to the same category of the supernatural, as being a specimen of the kind of thing which is claimed, and as pledging the character of God for the truth of what is affirmed.

This case seems to us to go still further, and implicitly to rebuke the opinion of those who make the doctrine vouch for the divine original of the miracle. The Jews were right in insisting upon the exclusive authority of God to pardon sin. It *was* blasphemy for a creature to claim and exercise the power in his own name. No such doctrine could commend itself to a Jew as good. If, therefore, the pretensions of the Saviour, in the case before us, had been tried only upon internal grounds, or if the miracle had been estimated only by the nature of the truth it was invoked to sustain, there would have been some pretext for the blasphemous insinuation, that he wrought his wonders by the finger of Beelzebub. Besides, there are other instances in which Jesus appealed from the internal improbability of the doctrine to the external authority of the miracle. When he announced the truths in reference to his own person, offices, and works, which were so offensive to his countrymen, on account of their alledged discrepancy with the pervading tenour of the prophets, he in no case, undertakes to obviate the prejudices by removing the ground of their objections, and showing that the doctrine was intrinsically excellent, but appeals directly and at once to the miracle, as to that which ought to be an end of controversy. *The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me. If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in Him.* He suspends the guilt of the Jews in rejecting him upon the sufficiency of his miracles to authenticate his mission. *If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin.*

The theory which proves the doctrine by the miracle, is so much more simple, obvious, and direct, and so much more in accordance with the general tone of Scripture and the spontaneous suggestions of our own minds, that no counter-hypothesis would ever have been devised, had it not been for the philosophic error, that real miracles may be performed by a power inherent in the spirits of evil. That error we have exposed, as arising from a wrong conception of the nature of finite power; and the argument may be regarded as complete, that miracles are always the great seal of heaven; infallible credentials of a divine commission. Whoever works them must have God with him.

But it may be objected, that it avails nothing to prove that

God is the only author of a real miracle, and that all such miracles impress the seal of His authority upon the doctrine, so long as it is admitted, that superior intelligences can produce effects which to us, in our ignorance, shall seem to be miraculous. We want a criterion by which to distinguish these achievements of a higher knowledge from the supernatural works of God. Cudworth applies the term supernatural to both classes of effects; though he is careful to indicate that the feats of demons do not transcend the sphere of nature and her laws. "Wherefore it seems," says he, "that there are two sorts of miracles or effects supernatural. First, such as, though they could not be done by any ordinary and natural causes here amongst us, and in that respect may be called supernatural; yet might, notwithstanding, be done, God permitting only, by the ordinary and natural power of other invisible created spirits, angels or demons. As, for example, if a stone, or other heavy body should first ascend upwards, and then hang in the air, without any visible either mover or supporter, this would be to us a miracle or effect supernatural; and yet, according to vulgar opinion, might this be done by the natural power of created invisible beings, angels or demons; God only permitting, without whose special providence, it is conceived, they cannot thus intermeddle with our human affairs. * * *

But, secondly, there is another sort of miracles, or effects supernatural, such as are above the power of all second causes, or any natural created being whatsoever, and so can be attributed to none but God Almighty himself; the author of nature, who, therefore, can control it at pleasure."

The distinction is a just one, though we do not like the application of the terms, miracle and supernatural, to the first class; the broad line which distinguishes them from the works of God, is, that they are within the sphere of nature. But still, may not these achievements of the creature be palmed upon us as real miracles, and are we not in danger of being deceived by them, unless we have some criterion apart from the nature of the phenomena, by which we can distinguish the real from the apparent? Must we not, after all, fall back upon the doctrine to settle the question whether a real miracle has been wrought? whether the phenomena in question is in the sphere of the natural or not? This evidently comes to the same thing with the hypothesis we have been endeavouring to set aside, and if it could be consistently maintained, all that we have said would go for nothing. But among those who concur in our views of the testimonial character of the miracle, the difficulty is commonly solved by appealing to the goodness of God. The thesis, that God will not permit His weak and ignorant creatures to be deceived by counterfeits of His own seal; He will not suffer demons to imitate miracles in cases in which they are likely to mislead; He will

restrain the exercise of their power. This, if we understand him, is the position which Dr. Wardlaw has taken. It is the position taken by Mosheim, in his valuable notes to Cudworth. God will never suffer anything that can be fairly taken for a miracle, or that is calculated to have that effect upon us, to be wrought in attestation of falsehood. We must be permitted to say that the inference here is contradicted by all analogy. We have no means of ascertaining beforehand, how far God is likely to limit the discretion of His creatures, or to prevent the machinations of malignity and falsehood. The argument from his goodness is shown to be lame, from the uniform experience of the world. We see nothing in the distinctions of Dr. Wardlaw to render that experience inapplicable to the case.

The effect of all such prevarications and evasions, is to destroy the value of the miracle as a proof. If it possesses no authority in itself, except as supported by foreign considerations, and if these are neither clear nor obvious, it seems to be of comparatively little use; it is better to eject it from the scheme of evidences at once. But these distinctions are altogether unnecessary. The true doctrine is, that, as the miracle proves by an evidence inherent in itself, no miracles should be admitted as the credentials of a messenger or doctrine, but those which carry their authority upon their face. Doubtful miracles are in the same category with doubtful arguments; and if a religion relies upon this class alone to substantiate its claims, it relies upon a broken reed. There are unquestionably phenomena which, surveyed from a higher point of knowledge, we should perceive at once to be perfectly natural, and yet to us they may have the wonder and the marvel of the true miracle. We can lay down no criteria by which to distinguish in every case betwixt the natural and the supernatural. The effect is, where the line cannot be drawn, that the wonders are not to be accepted. We do not know them to be miracles, and consequently have no right to give them the weight of miracles. When the witness is suspected, we discard his testimony. Let it be conceded that the doctrine is good; that only shows it to be true, and not that God has revealed it. The same superior knowledge which enables a demon to transcend my experience of nature, may enable him to transcend my science; and so, after all, the good doctrine come to me from a very bad source. Devils sometimes speak truth, though not from the love of it. Shall we say that God will prohibit them from trifling with our credulity? This may be a trial of our understandings; the design may be to measure our love of truth, and to see whether we shall narrowly scrutinize the evidence which is submitted to our minds. We know not how far it may be proper that God should restrain His creatures in the exercise of their own energies. Suppose an unprincipled man of science should go among

savages, and find that his attainments could give to him the distinction of being the great power of God, would God arrest his exhibitions, because they were deceiving and cheating the ignorant multitude? Has he ever arrested the frauds of priests who, under the guise of a rare acquaintance with philosophy, have gulled the populace with their marvellous achievements? This hypothesis is destitute of all probability and of all analogy. The only consistent course is to treat all suspected miracles as we treat all prevaricating witnesses. And if there were no other kinds of miracles but these, we should say that no doctrine could be authenticated by such evidence. But as Cudworth has suggested, there are some miracles which carry their credentials upon their face—so clearly above nature and all secondary causes, that no one can hesitate an instant as to their real character. There are some things which we pronounce intuitively to be the sole prerogative of God. Others may be doubtful; but these are clear as light. This is the class of miracles on which a religion must rely. These are seals, where the impression is distinct and legible—about which there can be no hesitation or uncertainty. These are the conclusive arguments to which a sound understanding feels itself justified in adhering. That the criterion of the miracle must be sought in itself, and that, where it cannot be definitely traced, the effect of the miracle as a proof is destroyed, is only the application to this department of evidence of the universal rules of probability. An argument must consist in its own light; and according as that light is feeble or strong, the argument is weak or conclusive. If a man should come to us, professing to be a messenger from God, and produce no clearer credentials than such effects as Cudworth has enumerated—the walking upon the water, the suspending of a stone in the air, or the cleaving of a whetstone by a razor—effects which might unquestionably be produced by higher laws suspending or hold in check the lower—we should feel no more difficulty in rejecting him, than in rejecting a pretended syllogism with two terms, or a prevaricating witness. His pretensions might be true; but we should quote to him the maxim, “*De non apparentibus et non existentibus, eadem est ratio.*”

When we turn to the miracles of the Bible, with a few trifling exceptions, which are redeemed from suspicion by their connection with the others, as doubtful testimony may be confirmed by corroborating circumstances; when we turn to the miracles of the Bible, we feel intuitively that they are of a character in themselves and on a scale of magnitude which render the supposition of secondary causes ridiculously absurd. The scenes at the Red Sea, the cleaving of the waters, the passing over of the Israelites on dry land between the fluid walls, the pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night; the daily supply of manna from the skies; effects

like these carry the evidence of their original on their face. There is no room for doubt. And so, in the New Testament, the conversion of water into wine, the stilling of the tempest, the raising of the dead, the instant cure, without means or appliances, of inveterate diseases; the feeding of thousands with a few loaves, which involves the highest possible exercises of power, that of creation; and, above all, the resurrection of Jesus himself: cases like these have nothing of ambiguity in them. They reveal, at a glance, the very finger of God. The supernatural and the contranatural are so flagrant and glaring, that he that runs may read. We may not be able to say what a devil or an angel can do; but there are some things which we can confidently say that he cannot do; and these are the things from which the miracles of our religion have been chosen.

We have insisted upon this point at some length, because the neglect of the distinction has been at the bottom of all the frivolous evasions which have had no other tendency than to weaken our faith in the divine authority of the miracle.

The place, consequently, which we are disposed as the reader may already have collected, to assign to the miracle, is the very front rank in the Christian evidence. We cannot understand how the question of a revelation or a divine commission can be entertained at all, until the credentials are produced. Mr. Trench laments the stress which has been laid upon them by modern apologists, and thinks it has contributed to obscure or to weaken the spiritual power of the gospel. We are not prepared to deny that many have been strenuous advocates of the miracles, who were strangers to the life of Christianity. It is one thing to believe in miracles, and quite another to believe in the Saviour of mankind. Faith in the divine authority of our religion is not necessarily faith in Christ. We admit all that he has said of the beauty, and glory, and self-evidencing light of the doctrine, and subscribe fully to the sentiment contained in the passage of Calvin's Institutes, to which he has referred us. That passage asserts, what all the creeds and confessions of the reformed churches, and the creeds and confessions of martyrs and saints in all ages of the world, have always asserted, that true faith in Jesus is not the offspring of logic or philosophy; it is no creature of earth, but the gift of heaven, the production of God's holy Spirit. We would detract nothing from the inward light and power of the gospel, or from the need of supernatural grace. Neither, again, do we complain that Mr. Trench has signalized the ethical value of the Christian miracles, as being at once types and prophecies of greater works upon the soul. He has made an important contribution to our literature, by the successful manner in which he has illustrated this principle in his rich and valuable notes. We agree, too, that the appearance of such a being as

Jesus would have been wanting in consistency, if nature had not been made to do homage to his name. An incarnate God could hardly walk the earth without unwonted indications of his presence. Such a wonder must needs draw other wonders after it; and Mr. Trench has strikingly displayed this aspect of the importance of miracles. But still, it does not follow that because miracles are graceful complements of the mission of Christ, that their only use or their chief use is their typical relations to grace, and their harmony with the character and claims of the Saviour. We maintain, on the contrary, that their principal office is to *guarantee an external, objective revelation*, by which we can try the spirits whether they be of God. They are the criterion by which a real is distinguished from a pretended revelation; the mark by which we know that God has spoken, and discriminate His word from the words of men. An external, objective, palpable test is the only one which can meet the exigencies of the case. If men are thrown upon their intuitions, impulses, and emotions, their pretended revelations will be as numerous and discordant as the dialects of Babel. Each man will have his doctrine and his psalm. The necessity of such a test has been universally acknowledged. The Catholic feels it, and appeals to a visible, infallible society, which is to judge between the genuine and spurious; the Protestant feels it, and appeals to his Bible; the Bible bows to the same necessity, and appeals to MIRACLES; these, it triumphantly exclaims, distinguish my doctrines from those of every other book, and seal them with the impress of God. Here, then, is a standard, fixed, stable, certain, with which the experiences of men must be compared. *To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because their is no light in them.* A religion of authority is the only bulwark against fanaticism, on the one hand, and a dead naturalism on the other hand.

We have no doubt that if the miracle should be reduced to an obscure or subordinate position in the scheme of Christian evidences, the result would eventually be, that an authoritative, external revelation would be totally discarded. This was the progress of criticism in Germany. Those who prevaricated with miracles prevaricated with inspiration, we suspect those among ourselves who are offended at the latter, have as little relish for the spirit of the gospel, except when it happens to chime with the breathings of their own minds. We have never had apprehensions of any other species of rationalism in this country, but that which obtains in the school of Schleiermacher. We think that there are symptoms in various quarters, that it is insinuating itself into the minds of those of our scholars and reflecting men, who have not thoroughly studied the grounds of his philosophy. It invites by its warmth, and ardour, and life; it gives a signifi-

cancy to the history of Jesus which falls in with the pensive longings of a meditative spirit ; it speaks of redemption, and pardon, and holiness, and sin ; it employs, except in relation to the resurrection, the very language of piety ; and seems to put on a broad and permanent foundation, the holy catholic church and the communion of the saints. But as it has no external standard of truth, it must repudiate all precise dogmatic formulas, and reduce the doctrine to a general harmony of feeling or pervading uniformity of sentiment. Religion must be a life without a creed. But as the understanding must have something to feed on, each man will be tempted to analyze the operations of his own consciousness of God, and reduce to the precision of logical representation, the inspirations of his own soul. And when it is seen that the religion is supported by a philosophy essentially pantheistic, that the differences betwixt holiness and sin are stripped of all moral import ; and that a stern necessity underlies the whole constitution of things, we may well tremble at the results, should this scheme be introduced in place of an authoritative Bible. It is because we feel that the tendency of every disparaging remark in relation to miracles, is to set aside the Bible in the aspect of authority, that we are so earnest to rebuke it. We love spiritual religion, but we abhor fanaticism. We detest bigotry, but we love the *truth* ; and we believe that there is a truth in religion to God and to ourselves, which ought to be embraced in the form of definite propositions, and not apprehended as vague sentiments. There are truths which are powerful in proportion as they are clear and articulate, and worthless unless they are distinctly understood.

3. We come now to the last point which remains to be discussed—the credibility of miracles ; and here we enter into the very citadel of the controversy between the friends and opponents of divine revelation. Here the question is fairly encountered, can God stand to man in the attitude of a witness to the truth ? Can He declare to other intelligent beings, the creatures of His own power, facts which He knows, as one man can communicate knowledge to another ? Or, if we admit the possibility of individual inspiration, in conformity with the laws of our mental constitution, can God authenticate that inspiration to a third party ? Can He enable others to prove a commission from him ? To answer in the affirmative, is to admit the credibility of miracles. There are certainly no natural laws by which we can recognize any communications as authoritatively from heaven. Whether the miracles be visible or invisible ; a supernatural operation upon the mind, producing an immediate consciousness of the divine voice, or supernatural phenomena addressed to the senses, producing the conviction of the divine presence : no matter what may be the process—it must be evidently miraculous, as out of and against the ordinary course of nature.

It would be obviously impossible to show, by any direct processes of argument, that there is anything in the mode of the divine existence, which precludes the Deity from holding intercourse with his creatures, analogous to that which they hold with each other. We can perceive nothing in the nature of things which would lead us to suppose that God could not converse with man, or make man the messenger of His will.

Analogy, on the contrary, would suggest that, as persons can here communicate with each other—as they can be rendered conscious of each other's existence—as they can feel the presence of one another, and interchange thoughts and emotions, the same thing might be affirmed of God. It is certainly incumbent upon the rationalist to show how God is precluded from a privilege which, so far as we know, pertains to all other personal existences. Capacity of society and converse seems to be involved in the very nature of personality, and it cannot be demonstrated that there is anything more incomprehensible in the case of a divine than of a human testimony. How one man knows that another man, another intelligence is before him—how reads the thoughts and enters into the emotions of another being, are problems as profoundly inscrutable as how a man shall know that God talks with him, and imparts to him truths which neither sense nor reason could discover. It deserves further to be considered, that as all worship involves a direct address of the creature to the Deity, as man must *talk* to God as well as obey his laws, must love and confide in Him as well as tremble before Him—it deserves to be considered how all this is practicable, if the communications are all to be confined to the feebler party. Religion necessarily supposes some species of communion with the object of worship, some *sense* of God; and if this is possible, we see not why the correspondence may not be extended into full consistency with the analogy of human intercourse. Certain it is that the moral nature of man which leads him to converse with God, has in all ages induced him to hope and expect that God would converse with him. Every age has had its pretensions to divine revelations—there have always been seers and prophets. Many have been false—have had nothing intrinsic or extrinsic to recommend them and yet they have succeeded, in gaining a temporary credit, because they addressed themselves to the natural belief that a revelation would indeed be given. Whence this natural expectation, whence this easy credulity, if the very conception of a direct communication from God involved a contradiction and absurdity?

Arguments of this sort are certainly not without their weight. They never have been and they never can be answered in that way of direct refutation. The approved method is to set them aside by the sweeping application of the principle upon which the Sadducees set aside the resurrection of the dead. Revelation and its

proofs are equally supernatural, and whatever is supernatural must be false. "No just notion of the true nature of history," says Strauss, "is possible, without a perception of the inviolability of the chain of finite causes, and of the impossibility of miracles." The first negative canon, which this remarkable author prescribes, for distinguishing betwixt the historical and fabulous, is "when the narration is irreconcilable with the known and universal laws which govern the course of events." He affirms that "according to these laws, agreeing with all just philosophical conceptions, and all credible experience, the absolute cause never disturbs the chain of secondary causes by single arbitrary acts of interposition, but rather manifests itself in the production of the aggregate of finite causalities, and of their reciprocal action." In opposition to this desolating doctrine, we shall undertake to set, in a clear light, the principle that in all cases of competent testimony, where the witnesses have honestly related their own convictions, and where they were in a condition to judge of the facts, possibility is the sole natural limit to belief. We are bound to believe, upon competent testimony, what is not *demonstrably impossible*. The application of this law to all other cases of antecedent improbability but the supernatural, will hardly be questioned, and we shall therefore discuss it with special reference to miracles.

It would seem to be a self-evident proposition, that whatever is, and is, at the same time, adapted to our cognitive faculties, is capable of being known. No doubt but that man is a little creature, and that there and forever will remain things, locked up in the bosom of Omniscience, which his slender capacities are unfitted to comprehend. But, then, there are other things, to which his faculties are unquestionably adjusted—which are not only cognizable in themselves, but cognizable by him. All that is necessary in reference to these is, that they should stand in the proper relation to the mind. When this condition is fulfilled, knowledge must necessarily take place. If an object be visible, and is placed before the eye in a sound and healthful condition of the organ, it must be seen; if a sound exist, and is in the right relation to the ear, it must be heard. Let us now take a supernatural fact; such as the raising of Lazarus from the dead, as recorded in the Gospel of John. There is not a single circumstance connected with that event which lies beyond the cognizance of our faculties. Everything that occurred could be judged of by our senses. That he was dead, that he was buried, that the process of putrefaction had begun, that he actually came from the grave at the voice of Jesus, bound hand and foot in his graveclothes, and that he subsequently took his part in human society, as a living man, are phenomena which no more transcend the cognitive faculties of man than the simplest circumstances of ordinary

experience. We are not now vindicating the reality of this miracle—that is not necessary to the argument in hand. All that we contend for is, that if it had been a fact, or if any other real instance of the kind should ever take place, there would be nothing in the nature of the events, considered as mere phenomena, which would place them beyond the grasp of our instruments of knowledge. They would be capable of being known by those who might be present at the scene—capable of being known according to the same laws which regulate cognition in reference to all sensible appearances. Our senses would become the vouchers of the fact, and the constitution of our nature our warrant for crediting our senses.

The skeptic himself will admit that if the first facts submitted to our experience were miraculous, there could be no antecedent presumption against them—and that we should be bound to receive them with the same unquestioning credence with which a child receives the earliest report of its senses. This admission concedes all that we now contend for—the possibility of such a relation of the facts to our faculties as to give rise to knowledge—such a connection betwixt the subject and object as to produce, according to the laws of mind, real cognition. This being granted, the question next arises, does the standard of intrinsic probability, which experience furnishes in analogy, destroy this connection? Does the constitutional belief, developed in experience—that like antecedents are invariably followed by like consequents—preclude us from believing, subsequent to experience, what we should be compelled, by the essential structure of our nature, to believe antecedent to experience? Does analogy force a man to say that he does not see, what, if it were removed, he would be bound to say that he *does* see?

To maintain the affirmative is to annihilate the possibility of knowledge. The indispensable condition of all knowledge is, the veracity of consciousness. We have the same guarantee for the sensible phenomena which are out of the analogy of experience, as for those phenomena from which that experience has been developed. If, now, consciousness cannot be credited in one case, it can be credited in none—*falsum in uno, falsum in omnibus*. If we cannot believe it after experience, it must be a liar and a cheat, and we can have no grounds for believing it prior to experience. Universal skepticism becomes the dictate of wisdom, and the impossibility of truth the only maxim of philosophy. Consciousness must be believed on its own account, or it cannot be believed at all; and, if believed on its own account, it is equally a guarantee for every class of facts, whether supernatural or natural. To argue backwards, from a standard furnished by consciousness, to the mendacity of consciousness, in any given case, is to make it contradict itself, and thus demonstrate itself to be utterly

unworthy of credit. There is no alternative betwixt admitting that, when a supernatural phenomenon is vouched for by consciousness, it is known, and, therefore, exists—or admitting that no phenomenon whatever can be known. This knowledge rests upon the same ultimate authority with all other miracles.

But, it may be asked, is not the belief of the uniformity of nature a datum of consciousness, and does not the hypothesis of miracles equally make consciousness contradict itself? By no means. There is no real contradiction in the case. The datum of consciousness, as truly given, is that, under the same circumstances, the same antecedent will invariably be followed by the same consequents. It is not that when the antecedent is given, the consequent will invariably appear, but that it will appear, if the conditions, upon which the operation of its cause depends, are fulfilled. Cases constantly happen in which the antecedent is prevented from putting forth its efficacy—it is held in check by a power superior to itself. “Continually we behold, in the world around us, lower laws held in restraint by higher—mechanic by dynamic, chemical by vital, physical by moral—yet we say not, when the lower thus gives place to higher, that there was any violation of the law, that anything contrary to nature came to pass; rather we acknowledge the law of a greater freedom swallowing up the law of a lesser. Thus, when I lift my arm, the law of gravitation is not, as far as my arm is concerned, denied or annihilated: it exists as much as ever; but is held in suspense by the higher law of my will. The chemical laws which would bring about decay in animal substances, still subsist, even when they are hemmed in and hindered by the salt which keeps these substances from corruption.”* When the consequents, therefore, in any given case, are not such as we should previously have expected, the natural inference is, not that our senses are mendacious, and that the facts are not what conscience represents them to be, but that the antecedents have been modified or counteracted by the operation of some other cause. The conditions upon which their connection with the sequences depends do not obtain. The facts, as given by the senses, must be taken, and the explanation of the variety is a legitimate problem of the reason.

Suppose, for example, that a man, un instructed in physical science, should visit the temple of Mecca, and behold the coffin of Mahomet, if the story be true, unsustained by any visible support, suspended in the air, would it be his duty to believe that, because all experience testifies that heavy bodies, left to themselves fall to the ground, therefore the phenomenon, as given by his senses, in the present case, must be a delusion?—or would it not rather be the natural inference, as he could not possibly doubt

* Trench on Miracles.

what he saw—that the coffin was not left to itself—that, though inscrutable to him, there must be *some* cause which counteracted and held in check the operation of gravity? “In order,” says Mill,* “that any alledged fact should be contradictory to a law of causation, the allegation must be, not simply that the cause existed without being followed by the effect, for that would be no uncommon occurrence, but that this happened in the absence of any adequate counteracting cause. Now in the case of an alledged miracle, the assertion is the exact opposite of this. It is, that the effect was defeated, not in the absence, but in consequence of a counteracting cause, namely, a direct interposition of an act of the will of some being who has power over nature, and, in particular, of a being whose will, having originally endowed all the causes with the powers by which they produce their effects may well be supposed able to counteract them. A miracle, as was justly remarked by Brown, is no contradiction to the law of cause and effect; it is a new effect, supposed to be produced by the introduction of a new cause.” A man is, accordingly, in no case, permitted to call into question the veracity of his senses; he is to admit what he sees, and what he cannot but see, and, when the phenomena lie beyond the range of ordinary experience, it is the dictate of philosophy to seek for a cause which is adequate to produce the effect. This is what the laws of his nature require him to do.

It is obvious, from these considerations, that, if sensible miracles can exist, they can be *known*; and if they can be known by those under the cognizance of whose senses they immediately fall, they can be proved to others through the medium of human testimony. The celebrated argument of Mr. Hume, against this proposition, proceeds upon a false assumption as to the nature of the law by which testimony authenticates a fact. He forgets that the credibility of testimony is in itself—not in the object for which it vouches: it must be believed on its own account, and not that of the phenomena asserted. In all reasoning upon this subject, the principle of cause and effect lies at the basis of the process. A witness, strictly speaking, only puts us in possession of the convictions of his own mind, and the circumstances under which those convictions were produced. These convictions are an effect for which the constitution of our nature prompts us to seek an

* Mill's System of Logic. This representation requires to be somewhat modified, as it seems to imply that a previous knowledge of the cause is necessary to render the miracle credible, which is, by no means, the case. On the contrary, every phenomena, whether natural or supernatural, must, in the first instance, authenticate itself, and, after it had been accepted as a fact, the inquiry into the cause begins. All that the constitution of our nature positively determines, is that it must have some cause—that it cannot be an absolute commencement. We do not, therefore, believe the miracle, because we know that there is a cause which can produce it; but we know that there is such a cause, because we know the effect has been produced.

adequate cause ; and, where no other satisfactory solution can be given, but the reality of the facts, to which the witness himself ascribes his impressions, then we admit the existence of the facts. But, if any other satisfactory cause can be assigned, the testimony should not command our assent. There is room for hesitation and doubt. If a man for example, afflicted with the jaundice, should testify that the walls of a room were yellow, we might be fully persuaded of the sincerity of his own belief ; but, as a cause, in the diseased condition of his organs, could be assigned, apart from the reality of the fact, we should not feel bound to receive his statement. Two questions, consequently, must always arise in estimating the value of testimony. The first respects the sincerity of the witnesses—do they or do they not express the real impressions that have been made upon their own minds ? This may be called the fundamental condition of testimony ;—without it the statements of a witness cannot properly be called testimony at all. The second, respects the cause of these convictions—are there any known principles, which under the circumstances in which the witnesses were placed, can account for their belief, without an admission of the fact to which they themselves ascribe it ? When we are satisfied upon these two points—that the witnesses are sincere, and that no causes apart from the reality of the facts, can be assigned in the case, then the testimony is entitled to be received without hesitation. The presumption is always in favour of the cause actually assigned, until the contrary can be established. If this be the law of testimony, it is evident that the intrinsic probability of phenomena does not directly affect its credibility. What is inherently probable, may be proved upon slighter testimony than what is antecedently unlikely—not that additional credibility is imparted to the testimony—but additional credibility is imparted to the phenomena—there being two separate and independent sources of proof. The testimony is still credible only upon its own grounds. In the case, accordingly, of sensible miracles, in which the witnesses give unimpeachable proofs of the sincerity of their own belief, it is incumbent upon the skeptic to show how this belief was produced, under the circumstances in which the witnesses were placed, before he is at liberty to set aside the facts. He must show “how the witnesses came to believe so and so,” if there were no foundation in reality. The testimony must be accounted for and explained, or the miracle must be admitted through the operation of the same law which authenticates testimony in every other case. It is an idle evasion to say that men sometimes lie ; no doubt there are many lies, and many liars in the world. But we are not speaking of a case in which men fabricate a story, giving utterance to statements which they do not themselves believe. That is not properly a case of testimony. We are speaking of instances in which the witness *honestly*

believes what he says; and surely there are criteria by which sincerity can be satisfactorily established. With respect to such instances, we affirm that there can be but two suppositions—either the witness was deceived, or the facts were real. The question of the credibility of the testimony turns upon the likelihood of delusion in the case; and, where it is one in which the delusion cannot be affirmed without affirming at the same time, the mendacity of the senses, the miracle is proved, or no such thing as extrinsic proof exists on the face of the earth.

But it may be contended that although testimony has its own laws, and must be judged of by them, yet, in the case of miracles, there is a contest of opposite probabilities—the extrinsic, arising from testimony in their favour—and the intrinsic, arising from analogy, against them, and that our belief should be determined by the preponderating evidence, which must always be the intrinsic, in consequence of its concurrence with general experience. The fallacy here consists in supposing that these two probabilities are directed to the same point. The truth is, the internal probability amounts only to this, that the same antecedents, under the conditions indispensable to their operation, will produce the same effects. The external is, that in the given case, the necessary conditions were not fulfilled. There is, consequently, no collision, and the law of testimony is left in undisturbed operation. It is clear that Mr. Hume would never have thought of constructing his celebrated argument against the credibility of miracles, if he had not previously believed that miracles were phenomena which could never authenticate themselves; that they were, in their own nature, incapable of being known. This is the conclusion which he really aimed to establish, under the disguise of his deceitful ratiocinations, the conclusion which legitimately flows from his premises, and a consistent element of that general system of skepticism which he undertook to rear, by setting our faculties at war with each other, and making the data of consciousness contradictory either in themselves or their logical results. If he had believed miracles to be cognizable, he would, perhaps, have had no hesitation in admitting, that what a man would be authorized to receive upon the testimony of his own senses, he would be equally authorized to receive upon the testimony of the senses of other men. What is cognizable by others—all having the same essential constitution—is cognizable by us through them. We see with their eyes, and hear with their ears. The only case in which the intrinsic and extrinsic probabilities come into direct collision, is that in which the alleged fact involves a contradiction, and is, therefore, impossible. In all other cases, testimony simply gives us a new effect.

The skepticism of Mr. Hume, and the disciples of the same school, it is almost needless to observe, is in fatal contradiction to

the whole genius and spirit of the inductive philosophy. Observers, not masters—interpreters, not legislators, of nature—we are to employ our faculties, and implicitly receive whatever, in their sound and healthful condition, they report to be true. We are not to make phenomena, but to study those which God has submitted to our consciousness. If antecedent presumptions should be allowed to prevail, the extraordinary as contradistinguished from the facts of every-day life, the new, the strange, the uncommon, the *mirabile* any more than the *miraculum*, never could be established. To make a limited and uniform experience the measure of existence is to deny that experience itself is progressive, and to reduce all ages and generations to a heartless stagnation of science. The spirit of modern philosophy revolts against this bondage. It has long since ceased to wonder, long since learned to recognize everything as credible which is not impossible; it explores every region of nature, every department of existence; its excursions are for facts; it asks for nothing but a sufficient extrinsic probability; and, when this is furnished, it proceeds with its great work of digesting them into order, tracing out their correspondences and resemblances, referring them to general laws, and giving them their place in the ever widening circle of science. When they are stubborn and intractable, standing out in insulation and independence, and refusing to be marshalled into systems, they are still retained as phenomena yet to be accounted for, and salutary mementoes of human ignorance. But no man of science, in the present day, would ever think of rejecting a fact because it was strange or unaccountable. The principle is universally recognized that there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in our philosophy. If Hume's laws were laws of philosophy, where would have been the science of chemistry, or galvanism, electricity, geology and magnetism? With what face could the palæontologist come out with his startling disclosures of the memorials of extinct generations and perished races of animals? What would be said of ærial iron and stones? and where would have been the sublimest of all theories, the Copernican theory of the heavens? The philosopher is one who regards everything, or nothing, as a wonder.

The remarks of Butler are not only philosophically just, but worthy of Bacon himself, when he asserts that miracles must not be compared to common natural events, or to events which, though uncommon, are similar to what we daily experience, but to the extraordinary phenomena of nature. It is nothing worth to say that these extraordinary phenomena may be subsequently explained, in the way in which physical philosophers account for events. That was not known when they were first authenticated to consciousness. They had to be believed before they could be explained. Miracles, too, when we reach a higher pinnacle of

knowledge, may connect themselves as clearly with the general scheme of God, as the wonders of physics. The conclusion, then, would seem to be established, that as the will of God is the sole measure of existence, so the power of God, or the possibility of the event, is the sole limit to the credibility of testimony.

The only question, therefore, which remains to be discussed, is, whether miracles are possible. This is simply the question concerning the existence of a personal God. If there is a being of intelligence and will, who created and governs the world, there can be no doubt, that the same power which at first ordained, can subsequently control the laws of nature, and produce effects independently of, as easily as in concurrence with, the secondary causes which He has appointed. Accordingly none will be found to deny the physical possibility of miracles, but those who deny a great First Cause, or those who resolve the relations of the finite and the infinite into a principle of immanence or identity, totally destructive of all freedom and intelligence, and of all essential separateness of being on the part of what they profess to call God. The worshippers of the supremacy of law, on the one hand, who see nothing in nature but a blind succession of events, and the philosophers of the imagined absolute, upon the other, who have ascended to the fountain of universal being, and traced the process by which the conditioned has been propagated and derived, unite in the warfare against miracles; because, in either case, the miracle is fatal to their pretensions. They cannot reconcile it with the stern necessity and rigid continuity which their speculations imperatively demand. With the avowed atheist, it is useless to contend. It is enough that he gets quit of miracles only by getting quit of God. And if he should be induced to admit their phenomenal reality, he could as easily resort to the subterfuges and pretexts to explain them away, as he can dispense with intelligence and wisdom in accounting for the arrangement and order of the universe. To him whom the glorious wonders of creation and providence, renewed with every morning sun—whom what Philo calls “the truly great production of the heaven, the chorus of the fixed and erratic stars, the enkindling of the solar and lunar lights, the foundation of the earth, the outpouring of the ocean, the course of rivers and flowing of perennial fountains, the change of revolving seasons, and ten thousand wonders more”—reveal nothing of design, the most astonishing exhibitions of supernatural power could appear as nothing but fantastic freaks. As, according to Lord Bacon, God never wrought a miracle to convince an atheist, it would be frivolous to vindicate to him the possibility of such phenomena, or to take into serious account principles which he holds only by the abnegation of his nature. If there be no God, we care very little whether there are miracles or not.

But there is a class of philosophers, whom unlettered Christians are very apt to regard as closely approximating to Atheists, but who themselves profess to be very zealous for the divine existence and perfections, whose poison is as insinuating as it is dangerous, and whose speculations have mainly contributed to undermine the credibility of the miracle. For the purpose which we have in view, they may all be reckoned as Pantheists. It is obvious that those who, with Spinoza, start out from the notion of substance, and, by logical deduction from the elements contained in it, reduce the finite to a modification of the infinite, come to the same ultimate conclusion with those who start out from the analysis of consciousness, and by the phenomena of human knowledge are led to confound thought and existence, and identify the subject and the object. In either case, essential being is one, and the difference of things are only varieties in the modes of manifestation. In the eclectic system of Cousin, both processes are combined: the infinite is the substance; the finite the attributes or affections;—the infinite is the real, the permanent, the unchanging; the finite is the phenomenal, the fluctuating, the variable;—the infinite is the cause; the finite the effect. The one is the complement of the other; neither can exist or be known apart.

The fundamental error of Pantheism is, that it overlooks the fact of creation. Let this be denied, and we see no way of avoiding the philosophy of Spinoza or of Hegel. We must seek a logical and a necessary connection between the finite and the infinite. It must be that of a substance with its accidents, or a mind with its thoughts, or a blind cause with its effects. Deny creation, and you can conceive of no higher existence of the world, than as a thought of the Eternal Mind—an object to the knowledge of God; and contemplated in this light it has no real being—it is only God himself; it is only a subjective phenomenon of the divine nature. Postulate creation, and these eternal thoughts, or, as Plato would call them, these eternal ideas, become realized in finite substances, which have a being—dependent, to be sure—but still a being of their own. They are no longer the consciousness of God himself. But creation, as distinct from emanation or development, necessarily implies the voluntary exercises of power. It is a thing which might or might not be. It is in no sense necessary. Hence the relation of the finite to the infinite, upon this hypothesis, becomes purely contingent. It is a relation instituted by will and dependent upon will. In other words, we have no longer a necessary, but a free cause. This aspect of the case changes the whole problem of philosophy and gives a new direction to the current of speculation. It must now flow in the channels of induction and not of deduction. When we speak of creation as contingent, we do not mean to represent it as arbitrary. The will of God, so far from being analogous to caprice, can never

be divorced from His wisdom and goodness. He must always act like Himself; and if He create a world or a universe, it must be to answer an end worthy of His exalted perfections. But while nothing can be conceived as done by Him unworthy of His name, no knowledge of his attributes can ever conduct us, *a priori*, to the nature of the particular concrete objects to which He might determine to give being. It would enable us to speak of their general character and aim, but it would throw no light upon their specific and individual differences. No man knows what kind of inhabitants there are in the moon, or whether there are any. He cannot deduce from the attributes of God any firm solution of the problem; and yet he is persuaded, that, however solved, these attributes are illustrated. It is one thing to be able to say, that whatever God does must be wise and good; it is quite a different thing to be able to specify what those wise and good things may be. Speculation, therefore, must abandon the law of rigid deduction, when the starting-point is a free, voluntary, intelligent cause, a Person. The question then becomes one concerning the free determinations of a will regulated by wisdom and goodness. It is a question concerning design. Necessity obtains only a relation to its general character—all else is contingent. Creation gives us at once a personal God and final causes. It gives us real existences apart from God, which are precisely what He chose to make them; and final causes give us a plan, which we have no means of knowing in its special adaptations and general order, except as it is manifested in the course of experience, or supernaturally revealed. It is at this fact of creation that the pantheistic philosophy has stumbled; and, in stumbling here, it has as thoroughly exploded design as it has miracles. The argument is as complete in the one case as the other; and we would impress it upon those who permit themselves to be entangled in these cobwebs of transcendental metaphysics, that while they are revolting from the supernatural on the ground that it contradicts their philosophy, and pronouncing all miracles to be absolutely impossible—they are, at the same time, revolting from all manifestations of intelligence, and pronouncing their own most familiar consciousness to be also an impossibility.

Pantheism, in its common illustrations of the universe, has more of poetry than of truth. It represents it as an organic whole, whose unity is preserved by a regular series of separate developments, concurring in a common result. This seems to be the notion, if he had any, which Strauss intended to convey, when he said: "Since our idea of God requires an immediate, and our idea of the world, a mediate divine operation; and since the idea of combination of the two species of action is inadmissible: nothing remains for us but to regard them both as so permanently and immoveably united, that the operation of God on the world con-

tinues forever and everywhere twofold, both immediate and mediate; which comes just to this, that it is neither of the two, or this distinction loses its value." The universe, in conformity with what we take to be the meaning of this passage, is not unfrequently described as a living organism, the properties of matter being strictly analogous to vital forces, the development of which is like the growth of an animal body. This view, we are sorry to say, disfigures that masterly work, the *Cosmos* of Humboldt. The design of his introductory remarks is "not solely to draw attention to the importance and greatness of the physical history of the universe—for in the present day these are too well understood to be contested—but likewise to prove how, without detriment to the stability of special studies, we may be enabled to generalize our ideas by concentrating them in one common focus, and thus arrive at a point of view, from which all the organisms and forces of nature may be seen as one living, active whole, animated by one sole impulse."

Having sufficiently indicated the point at which Pantheism diverges from the truth, and exposed the fallacy of its *a priori* demonstration of the impossibility of miracles, we cannot let it pass without rebuking the presumption of its spirit. In nothing is it more distinguished from the humility of true science than in the magnificence of its pretensions. When we consider the immensity of the universe, and the magnitude and extent of that government, physical and moral, which God has been conducting from the beginning over all His creatures, whether material or intelligent, the conclusion forces itself upon us, that the plan of the universe is a point upon which we have not the faculties to dogmatize. True science accordingly, aspiring only to a relative knowledge of existence, instead of futile and abortive attempts to construct a universe, or to fix the *το πᾶν* as a positive element of consciousness, takes its stand, in conformity with the sublime maxim of Bacon, as the minister, not the master—the interpreter, not the legislator of nature. Professing its incompetence to pronounce beforehand what kinds of creatures the Almighty should have made, and what kinds of laws the Almighty should have established, and what kinds of agency He himself should continue to put forth, it is content to study the phenomena presented to it, in order to discover what God has wrought. Without presuming to determine what *must* be, it humbly and patiently inquires what *is*. The spirit of true philosophy is much more a confession of ignorance than a boast of knowledge. Newton exhibited it, when after all his splendid discoveries, he compared himself to a child who had gathered up a few pebbles upon the seashore, while the great ocean of truth lay undiscovered before him. La Place exhibited it, when he spoke of the immensity of nature,

and human science as but a point; and Butler was a living example of it, in the uniform modesty of his confessions and the caution and meekness of his researches. Shall man, the creature of yesterday, whose mother is corruption and whose sister is the worm—who at best can only touch, in his widest excursions, the hem of Jehovah's garment—shall man undertake to counsel the Holy One as to the plan He shall pursue? Is it not intolerable arrogance in a creature, whose senses are restricted to a point, who is confessedly incompetent to declare what ends it may be the design of Deity to accomplish in creation and providence, who cannot explain to us why the world has sprung into being at all, with its rich variety of scenery, vegetation, and life, who is unable to tell the meaning of this little scene in the midst of which he is placed—is it not intolerable arrogance in him, to talk of comprehending the height and depth, and length and breadth of that eternal purpose, which began to be unfolded, when creation was evoked from emptiness, and the silence and solitude of vacancy were broken by the songs of angels bursting into light, and which shall go on unfolding, in larger and fuller proportions, through the boundless cycles of eternity? Our true position is in the dust. We are of yesterday and know nothing. This plan of God—it is high as heaven, what can we know—deep as hell, what can we do? Our ignorance upon this subject is a full and sufficient answer to the folly and presumption of those who confidently assert that its order would be broken and its unity disturbed by the direct interposition of Omnipotence. Who told these philosophers that the plan itself does not contemplate interventions of the kind? Who has assured them that He, who knew the end from the beginning, has not projected the scheme of His government upon a scale, which included the occasional exhibition of Himself in the direct exercises of power? Who has taught them that miracles are an invasion, instead of an integral portion, of the divine administration? It is frivolous to answer objections which proceed upon the infinitely absurd supposition that we know the *whole* of the case.

But though the idea of a universe as a living, self-developing organism cannot be sustained, though the unity of nature is nothing but the harmony of divine operations, and creation and providence only expressions of the divine decrees, though the whole case is one which confessedly transcends our faculties, yet something we can know, and that something creates a positive presumption in favour of miracles. We know that God has erected a moral government over men, and that this sublunary state, whatever other ends it may be designed to accomplish, is a theatre for human education and improvement. We cannot resist the impression that the earth was made for man, and not man for the earth. He is master here below. This earth is a school in

which God is training him for a higher and nobler state. If the end, consequently, of the present constitution and course of nature can be helped forward by occasional interpositions of the Deity, in forms and circumstances which compel us to recognize His hand, the order of the world is preserved and not broken. When the pantheist "charges the miracle with resting on a false assumption of the position which man occupies in the universe, as flattering the notion that nature is to serve him, he not to bow to nature, it is most true that it does rest on this assumption. But this is only a change would tell *against* it, supposing that true, which, so far from being truth, is indeed, its first great falsehood of all, namely the substitution of a God of nature, in the place of a God of men." Admit the supremacy of God's moral government, and there is nothing which commends itself more strongly to the natural expectations of men, than that He shall teach His creatures what was necessary to their happiness according to the exigencies of their case. Miraculous interventions have, accordingly, been a part of the creed of humanity from the fall to the present hour.

The argument here briefly enunciated requires to be more distinctly considered. There is no doubt that, after all, the strongest presumption which is commonly imagined to exist against the miracle, arises from the impression, that it is an interference with the reign of order and of law. It is regarded as an arbitrary infraction of the course of nature, or a wilful deviation from the general plan of God. It is treated as an aimless prodigy. If this view were correct, it would be fatal to its claims. The moral argument would be so overwhelming that we shall be very reluctant to admit any testimony in its favour. It is to obviate this prejudice that so many attempts have been made, like the one already noticed in Trench, and rebuked by Dr. Wardlaw, to transfer the miracle to a higher sphere of nature. Nitzsch very distinctly states the difficulty, and resolves it in the same way that Trench has done. "If a miracle," says he, "were simply an event opposed to nature's laws—a something unnatural and incomprehensible; and if the human understanding, together with entire nature, experienced, through its agency, merely a subversive shock, then would the defence of Christianity—a religion established by means of a grand system of miracles—have to contend against insurmountable difficulties. But the miracles of revelation, with all the objective supernaturalness essentially belonging to them, are in truth somewhat accordant with natural laws, partly in reference to a higher order of circumstances to which the miracles relate, and which order also is a world, a nature of its own kind, and operates upon the lower order of things according to its mode; partly in regard to the analogy with common nature which

miracles, in some way or other, retain; and finally, on account of their teleological perfection.”*

The same difficulty occurs in Thomas Aquinas;† and his answer strikes us as far more direct and conclusive than any ingenious attempts to divest the miracle of its distinctive and essential character as a supernatural phenomenon. The answer amounts substantially to this; the miracle is against the *order* of nature, but not against the *end* of nature. It is the different way of accomplishing the same ultimate design. There is moral harmony, notwithstanding phenomenal contradiction. As one law of nature holds another in check, as one sphere of nature is superior to another—and the superior rules and controls the lower; and yet as all these collisions and conflicts conduce to the great purpose of God in establishing these laws and systems, so He who is supreme above them all may hold them all in check, when the design of all can be more effectually promoted by such an interference. There is no more confusion or jar in this omnipotent interposition of His own will in contradiction to nature, than when one part of nature thwarts and opposes another. In the sense, then, of disorder, as being a turning aside from the ultimate relation of things to the great First Cause, the miracle is not maintained. It is the highest order—the order of ethical harmony. It introduces no confusion in the universe. It rather lubricates the wheels of nature, and gives it a deeper significance. It breaks the apathy into which unbroken uniformity would otherwise lull the soul. The introduction of miracles into the moral system of the world is analogous in its effects to the introduction of chance upon so large a scale. The fortuities of nature keep us constantly reminded of God, and impress us with an habitual sense of dependence. We are compelled to recognize something more than law. The miracle, in the same way, brings God distinctly

* Christian Doctrine, p. 83.

† “A qualibet causa derivatur aliquis ordo in suos effectus, cum quælibet causa habeat rationem principii; et ideo secundum multiplicationem multiplicatur et ordines, quorum unus contineatur sub altero, sicut et causa continetur sub causa. Unde causa superior non continetur sub ordine causæ inferioris, sed e converso: cujus exemplum apparet in rebus humanis: nam ex patrefamilias dependet ordo domus, qui continetur sub ordine civitatis, qui precedit a civitatis rectore, cum et hic contineatur sub ordine regis, a quo totum regnum ordinatur. Si ergo ordo rerum consideretur, prout dependet a prima causa, sic contra rerum ordinem Deus facere non potest; si enim sic faceret, faceret contra suam præscientiam, aut voluntatem, aut bonitatem. Si vero consideretur rerum ordo, prout dependet a qualibet secundarum causarum, sic Deus potest facere præter ordinem rerum: quia ordini secundarum causarum ipse non est subiectus; sed talis ordo ei subicitur, quasi ab eo procedens, non per necessitatem naturæ, sed per arbitrium voluntatis. Potuisset enim et alium ordinem rerum instituere; unde et potest præter hunc ordinem institutum agere, cum voluerit; puta, agendo effectus secundarum causarum sine ipsis, vel producendo aliquos effectus, ad quos causæ secundæ non se extendunt.” Summa 1, Quest, 105, Art. 6.

before us, and has a direct tendency to promote the great moral ends for which the sun shines, the rains descend, the grass grows, and all nature moves in her steady and majestic course. Miracles and nature join in the grand chorus to the supremacy and glory of God.

The true point of view, consequently, in which the miracle is to be considered is in its ethical relations. It is not to be tried by physical, but by moral probabilities; and if it can contribute to the furtherance of the ends for which man was made and nature ordained; if it can make nature herself more effective, we have the same reason to admit it, as to admit any other arrangement of our Creator, when we make the physical supreme; when we make the dead uniformity of matter more important than the life, and health, and vigour of the soul. This subject is very ably discussed by Dr. Wardlaw, and we close our argument upon it by a pregnant extract:

“Let me illustrate my meaning by a simple comparison—a comparison taken from what is human, but, in the principle of it, bearing with infinitely greater force on our conclusion, when transferred to what is divine. A mechanician, let me suppose, has devised and completed a machine. Its structure in each of its parts, and in its entire complexity, is as perfect as human ingenuity and long-practised skill are capable of making it. All its movements are beautifully uniform. Its adaptation for its intended purpose is exquisite. So far as that purpose is concerned, it cannot be improved. It works to admiration. In such a case, the probability certainly is, that the maker will not think of introducing any change; seeing in a structure thus faultless every alteration would be for the worse. The machine, therefore, would be kept going on as at the first, to the continued satisfaction of the inventor and artificer, and the delight and wonder of all who have the opportunity of examining it. Thus far all is clear. But suppose now further, that circumstances should occur, in which the continuance of the regular movements of the said machine exposed a human life to danger; and that, by simply stopping or changing one of those movements for but a few seconds, that life could be saved; and yet more, that it is in the power of the maker and owner, with perfect ease, to stop or to change that movement, and to do so, without in the slightest degree injuring his machine, or even at all interfering with and impeding the chief purpose of its construction: if, in these circumstances, we knew the maker and owner to be a man of unusual sensibility and benevolence, or even of no more than ordinary humanity, should we not feel it by far too feeble an expression, to say that it was *likely* he would stop to change the movement? should we not think we insulted himself, and maligned his character, if we pronounced his doing so less than *certain*? If, merely because he was enamoured of the beauty and regularity of a mechanical motion, he were to refuse interference, and allow life to perish; what should we think of the man's heart, and what too of his head? Should we not look upon him with equal detestation for his cruelty, and contempt for his childish imbecility? setting him down at once as a heartless monster, and as a senseless fool? And if thus you would think of the fellowman who could

act such a part, what is to be thought of the God, who, when a world's salvation was in the question—involving not the safety of a human life merely, or of hundreds and thousands of such lives, but the eternal wellbeing of millions of immortal souls—should allow that world to perish, for want of evidence of his willingness to save it, rather than allow the order of the material creation to be, in a single moment, interfered with? and that too, although not the slightest injury was, by such interference, to be done to the system? For surely by no one will it be held an injury, to be made subservient to a purpose incomparably transcending in importance any or all of those which, by its uninterrupted regularity, it is effecting.

“Excepting in one particular, the cases I have thus been comparing are closely analogous. The particular in which they differ is this: that in the case of the mechanic, the evil was not by him anticipated, nor, consequently, the need for his interference; whereas, in the case of the divine Creator and Ruler, all was in full anticipation; and the occasional deviations from the order of the physical creation entered as essentially into the allperfect plan of his moral administration, as the laws by which that order was fixed entered into the constitution of the physical creation itself. But such a difference there necessarily is between everything human and everything divine; between the purposes and plans of a creature who ‘knoweth not what a day may bring forth,’ and the purposes and plans of Him who ‘knoweth the end from the beginning.’ It evidently does not, in the least degree, affect the principle of the analogy, or invalidate the force of the conclusion deduced from it.

We cannot conclude these remarks without alluding to the fact that the researches of modern science are rapidly exploding the prejudices which pantheism, on the one hand, and a blind devotion to the supremacy of laws on the other, have created and upheld against all extraordinary interventions of God. The appearances of our globe are said to be utterly inexplicable upon any hypothesis which does not recognize the fact that the plan of creation was so framed from the beginning as to include, at successive periods, the direct agency of the Deity. The earth proclaims, from her hills and dales, her rocks, mountains, and caverns, that she was not originally made and placed in subjection to laws which themselves have subsequently brought her to her present posture. She has not developed herself into her present form, nor peopled herself with her present inhabitants. That science which, at its early dawn, was hailed as the handmaid of infidelity and skepticism, and which may yet have a controversy with the records of our faith not entirely adjusted, has turned the whole strength of its resources against the fundamental principle of rationalism. It has broken the charm which our limited experience had made so powerful against miracles, and has presented the physical government of God in a light which positively turns analogy in favour of the supernatural. The geologist begins with miracles; every epoch in his science repeats the number, and the whole earth to his mind is vocal with the name. He finds their history wherever he turns, and he would as soon think of doubting the testimony of sense as

the inference which the phenomena bear upon their face. Future generations will wonder that in the nineteenth century men gravely disputed whether God could interpose, in the direct exercise of His power, in the world He has made. The miracle, a century hence, will be made as credible as any common fact. Let the earth be explored; let its physical history be traced, and a mighty voice will come to us, from the tombs of its perished races, testifying, in a thousand instances, to the miraculous hand of God. Geology and the Bible must kiss and embrace each other, and this youngest daughter of science, will be found, like the eastern magi, bringing her votive offerings to the cradle of the Prince of peace. The earth can never turn traitor to its God, and its stones have already begun to cry out against those who attempted to extract from them a lesson of infidelity or atheism.

ART. II.—A VINDICATION OF THE SCRIPTURAL MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION OF THE LIII. OF ISAIAH.

The 53d chapter of Isaiah, on which the whole doctrine of atonement is founded, and which is connected with the preceding chapter, speaks of the captive Daughter of Zion; whereas the Temple stood in the age of Jesus. "View of the famous Rabbi Isaac, and other Rabbins."

The 53d chapter of Isaiah speaks of the prophet Jeremiah. 'View of Rabbi Saahdiah Gaon,' quoted by Aben Ezra, in his comment on Isaiah lii and liii.

The 53d chapter of Isaiah speaks of king Josiah, 'view of Abarbanel,' vide comment. in Esaiam.

Before we proceed to show satisfactorily, that these interpretations are a complete departure from the strict and true meaning of this prophecy, and from the received opinions of the ancient Israelites, and were invented merely for a controversial purpose; and that in the Jewish non-controversial books, this prophecy is exclusively applied to the Messiah, it may be profitable to take a bird's-eye view of the whole book, as also of its Inspired Author.

With a strong Evangelical Faith, and a full and affectionate confidence in the certainty of those things which God has declared, Isaiah continued, without interruption, to discharge the office of a

Prophet during nearly sixty-four years.* According to tradition, by birth he was of royal blood, † and by relationship a father-in-law of Manasseh. Yet, neither his royal descent nor relationship to the king, could save him from being very cruelly sawn in two by a wooden sword, by the wicked order of Manasseh, king of Judah. ‡ His body, it is believed by some, was buried near Jerusalem, under the fuller's oak, near the fountain of Siloam; whence it was removed to Paneas, near the sources of the Jordan, and was from thence transferred in the year 422, A. D. to Constantinople, during the reign of Theodosius the younger. §

The name ישעיהו is a compound word denoting the salvation of Jehovah; a name most proper and suitable for a prophet, by whom Jehovah was well pleased to give the knowledge of His great salvation to his people—and especially for this Prophet, whose full and graphic description of the person, offices, sufferings, and kingdom of Christ our Glorious Redeemer, led the ancient Christian fathers to call him the Evangelical Prophet, nay, the fifth Evangelist. || His style is lofty and soaring, and he is esteemed to

* The first sentence of this prophecy, assigns as the period of his ministry the four successive reigns of Uzziab, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. The lowest computation beginning from the year in which Uzziab died, brings the term of his prophetic office to sixty-one years; for Jotham reigned 16 years, 2 Kings, xv, 33; Ahaz 16 years, 2 Kings, xvi, 3; and Hezekiah 29 years, 2 Kings, xviii, 2. Add the years in which he prophesied during Uzziab's and Manasseh's reigns, and there will be, at least, sixty-four. Abulpharagius, in his Hist. Dynast. p. 43, speaks of Isaiah as having lived 120 years, during 85 of which he prophesied.

רבותינו זל קבלו כי אמוץ ואמציה מלך יהודה אחים היו

vide Kimchi, et Jarchi, comment. in Jesaiam, cap. i. 1. Babylonian Talmud, Tracts Megella, fol. x. col. 2, and Sotta, fol. x. col. 2. Nominatur Pater ejus Amoz qui frater fuisse creditur Azariae, (Amaziah) Regis Juda. Unde apparet, Jesaiam fuisse stirpis regiae, et in eo veteres omnes consentiunt. Calv. Comment. in Jesaiam. Vir enim nobilissimus, et principum consanguinitate clarus, &c. Cunaeus, de Rep. Heb. Lib. iii, cap. viii.

‡ מנשה הרג את ישעיהו אמר שם איבלע בארזא אתיוה

לארזא וכסרוה

vide Babylonian Talmud, Tract Jebamoth, fol. xlix. col. 2. Sanhedrim, fol. ciii. col. 2. Jerusalem Talmud, Sanhedrim, fol. xxviii. col. 3. Shalsheth Hakabala, fol. xix. col. 1. . . . τον θανατον Ησαίου, ὃν πρῶτον ξυλινῶ ἐκρίσθη. Justin. Martyr in Dialog. cum Tryphone. p. 349. His patientiae viribus secatur Esaias. Tertullian de patientia, cap. xiv. Esaias, quem ipsi Judaei serrâ consecutum crudelissime necaverunt. Lactantius, lib. iv. cap. ii. Esaias cujus facilius compagem corporis serrâ divisit quam fidem inclinavit.

be, both by Israelites and by Christians, the most eloquent of the Prophets. Jerom says, that his writings are, as it were, a complete epitome of the Sacred Scriptures, a collection of the most uncommon knowledge that the mind of man is capable of; of natural philosophy, morality, and divinity.* Grotius compares him to Demosthenes. In his writings we meet with the purity of the Hebrew tongue, as in the orator, with the delicacy of the Attic taste. Both are sublime and magnificent in their style, vehement in their emotions, copious in their figures, and very impetuous when they describe things of an extraordinary nature, or that are grievous and odious. To say nothing, however, of the illustrious and divine vocation of the man of God, Isaiah is superior to Demosthenes in the honour of illustrious birth. What Quintilian (lib. x, cap. xx.) says of Corvinus Messala, may very properly be applied to Isaiah; viz: that he speaks in an easy flowing manner, and in a style which denotes the man of quality. Caspar Sanctius thinks that Isaiah is more florid, and more ornamented, yet at the same time more weighty and nervous than any writer we have, whether historian, poet, or orator; and that in all kinds of discourse he excels every author, either Greek or Latin.†

That the Prophet Isaiah fully justifies such a character, is fully allowed by all eminent oriental and biblical scholars; and we need only request our readers to *read* Isaiah in the original, and they will very soon see for themselves, that the peculiar sublimity, force, and elegance of his diction, have not as yet been fully represented in any of the various versions extant, that of the celebrated Bishop Lowth not excepted.

It is an undisputed fact, that Isaiah belongs to the cycle of the most ancient Prophets, whose predictions have been preserved in writing. Regarded in the order of time, the writings of Isaiah would form the fifth of the prophetic books; for Hosea, Joel,

Ambrose, comment in Lucam, cap. xx. p. 197. This refined cruelty of the olden barbarous times, is mentioned in 2 Sam. xii. 31. **וַיִּשָּׂם בְּמַגְרָה**; 1 Chronicles, xx, 3. **וַיִּשָּׂם בְּמַגְרָה**; Heb. xi. 37, *ἐπίσθησαν*; Herodotus

ii. 139. *συμβουλεύειν τοὺς ἰρέας τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ συλλέξαντα παντας μέσους διαταμέειν*; and Diodorus, i, 65. *Καὶ διὰ μέσων αὐτῶν διελθεῖν μετὰ βραπείας.*

§ *Vide* Calmet sub nomine Jesaiam.

|| Deinde etiam hoc adjiciendum, quod non tam propheta dicendus sit quam evangelista. Hieron. praef. in transl. Jes. ex Heb. Tom. iii. p.

26. *γὰρ ἔστιν προφητῆς ἅμα καὶ Ἀπόστολος.* Cyrillus, praef. in Jes. Liber autem ejus (Jesaiæ) non tam vaticinia continere, quam evangelia videtur, &c. Cunaeus, de Rep, Heb. lib. iii. cap. vii.

* *Vide* Hieron prolog. in Esaiam.

† *Vide* Calmet, sub nomine Jesaiam.

Amos, and Jonah were his predecessors, and yet is this book most properly placed first in the collection, on account of its extent, and the transcendent importance and the sublimity of the predictions which it contains—containing most of Him to whom all the Prophets bore witness. Indeed, if we except the book of Psalms, we will find more citations in the New Testament out of Isaiah's prophecies, than from any other book of the Old Testament Scriptures. John the Baptist began his ministry with a passage from Isaiah, Matth. iii. 3, Mark i. 3, Luke iii. 4, John i. 23; our Saviour preached his first sermon at Nazareth, out of a passage from Isaiah, Luke iv. 17–21; and it was in the book of Esaias the Prophet, that the Eunuch was reading when Philip came up to him, who from the same scripture, preached to him Christ Jesus. Acts viii. 28–35.

The matter of this book is two-fold: 1. Prophetical; 2. Historical; and the whole of Isaiah's prophecies may properly be divided into 5 parts. Part i. consists of the first 12 chapters, comprising in 7 prophetic discourses a general description of the state and condition of the Israelites, in the several periods of their history; the virgin's miraculous conception; the Messiah's birth and title; the promulgation and success of His Gospel among the Gentiles; the conversion and restoration of Israel, and the coming of Immanuel's kingdom. Part ii. consists of the next 11 chapters, comprising in 8 prophetic discourses the predictions respecting the Babylonians, Philistines, Moabites, Syrians, Egyptians, Tyrians, and other nations with whom the Israelites had any intercourse. Part iii. consists of the next 12 chapters, comprising in 5 prophetic discourses, the prediction of the great calamities which should befall Israel, God's very merciful preservation of a remnant, their restoration and conversion to the Gospel, and the destruction of Anti-Christ. Part iv. consists of the next 4 chapters, comprising the historical portion of the book. Part v. consists of the last 27 chapters, comprising in 12 prophetic discourses, a continuous and unbroken prophecy, embracing the whole period from the Babylonish captivity, and bearing us with eagle flight along the glowing path of prophecy, the prophet transports us to the loftiest pinnacle of vision, and thence discloses to our view in brightest vision, all the future history of the Church, her conflicts and her conquests, till the glorious consummation, when time shall be no longer.

In this part the prophet dwells at considerable length, on the long promised and long expected Messiah; he describes His person, His offices, His work, His sufferings, His kingdom, His glory, and piercing with a poet's imagination, and a prophet's glance, the long vista of ages, he is rapt into future times, and exults in the universal and eternal reign of the Prince of Peace. It is a part which claims our highest regard and interest. It is a beautiful and

glowing description of occurrences in which men of these, and of all subsequent times, will have as deep an interest as they who have lived at any former period.

Our principal object, however, is, as I stated before, to contemplate the person, the work, and the sufferings of our glorious Redeemer, which are so graphically and clearly, so tenderly and impressively, set forth in the portion of scripture we have under review. Indeed, there can be no doubt whatever, but that every unprejudiced mind who is at all acquainted with the history of our Saviour's sufferings and death, will, on carefully reading this chapter, at once confess that it can speak of none but Jesus.

It appears that Cardinal Hugo de Sancto Caro, who flourished about the middle of the 13th century, and whose first division of the Bible into chapters, we now have, did not perceive any connection between the three last verses of the 52d chapter and the beginning of this. Our opponents, however, think that there is a connection, and we think they are right. To have a right understanding of the proper construction of the following chapter, it will be necessary to take into consideration the 3 last verses of the preceding chapter. It is very important, says Dr. Alexander, that the intimate connection of these verses with the following chapter should be fully recognized, in order that the עֶבֶד יְהוָה servant

of the Lord, whose humiliation and exaltation are here mentioned, may be identified with that mysterious person whose expiatory sufferings and spiritual triumph form the great theme of the subsequent context. To the general agreement among Jews and Christians as to this identity, the forced hypothesis of Rabbi Isaac Abarbanel who applies the last 3 verses of the 52d chapter to the Messiah, and not the 53d chapter, may be regarded as the sole exception. The Rabbins, in their statement we now have under review, do fully recognize this identity; only, say they, עֶבֶד יְהוָה the right interpretation of which determines the meaning of the whole passage, to the end of the 53d chapter, means not the Messiah, but the Captive Daughter of Zion.

Our opponent's statement is not only very concise, but peculiarly comprehensive. It includes the entire controversy. It asserts, that the 53d chapter of Isaiah, is the only foundation of the doctrine of atonement; that this prophecy refers to the Captive Daughter of Zion; and consequently, that it does not refer to Jesus our most glorious and only Redeemer. We take each assertion in its order.

1st. It is affirmed, that the 53d chapter of Isaiah is the only foundation of the doctrine of atonement.

Such an assertion, by an Israelite, comes (rather) with a bad grace. An Israelite who would dare to controvert the doctrine of atonement appears to us quite as incomprehensible as an Israelite

denying the hope of the Messiah, or the Divine Mission of Moses; for it is quite impossible to open either the Old Testament, or the Rabinnical writings, or even the prayer book, without finding something relating to this scriptural doctrine. The denial of this one doctrine pronounces the priesthood, the high-priesthood, the Holy of Holies, and the day of atonement, to be useless ordinances; a sentence which every considerate Israelite must allow to be nothing short of blasphemy. For, what is the law of Moses but a great system of atonement? Blot out the passages relating to atonement and sacrifice, and how much of the whole law remains? But, say our opponents, our objection is in reference to the principle of vicarious suffering, and to the nature of the victim. The atonement prescribed in the Mosaic law, was made by the blood of animals, whereas the Christian doctrine represents an innocent and sinless man suffering the just for the unjust; this is inconsistent with the righteousness of Jehovah.

To this we answer, that, until our opponents can show us that God has never taught nor sanctioned the principle of the innocent suffering for the guilty, we shall still firmly believe and teach what Jehovah has revealed in His word. There is no created being, man or angel, that can lay down any abstract position concerning the righteousness or unrighteousness of God's dealings. We cannot possibly determine, a priori, any general truth respecting the right or the wrong of God's dealings, independently of the revelation which He has given; neither can we presume to question the righteousness of any principle or mode of dealing which God has been pleased to reveal. The thing created cannot say to Him who created it, what doest thou? Hence, whatever God is pleased to reveal, we must receive in submission, and acknowledge that the Judge of all the earth does right. To His revelation we turn, and by it we are desirous that the question should be tried. Our opponents cannot help confessing that the whole of the Old Testament plainly sets torth, in principle and in fact, that God does, upon certain conditions and under certain circumstances, punish the innocent for the guilty. We see this principle in the sacrifices of the Mosaic law. There an innocent animal is commanded to be put to death, instead of a guilty man. Might not one urge that this is inconsistent with the righteousness of Him whose mercies are over all his works? No! say the Rabbins. "There is a great difference between a brute and a man." This is indeed a mere shifting of the question; for, injustice is injustice still, whether it be exercised on man or beast; and it is as impossible that a righteous God should be unjust to a brute, as that he should be unjust to a man. Besides we are very ready to maintain that the righteous Judge of men does often punish the innocent man for the sins of the guilty. How many thousauds, if not millions, of unoffending children have suffered the punishment of

death for the first sin that ever was committed? What numbers of children die in infancy, long before there is a possibility of their transgressing any one of the Divine Commandments? Adam sinned, and the sentence passed upon him is executed on many of his unoffending posterity. This is a daily matter of fact. Shall we repine, or accuse God of injustice? God forbid. We understand but a small part of His ways, and we must acknowledge that He is righteous in them all, and holy in His works. The history of the deluge, Sodom and Gomorrah, Israel, Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, present the same principle. The parents were indeed guilty, but the children suffered in the general calamity. Achan's sin was imputed to the whole congregation of Israel, and until he was put to death, they suffered the punishment due to him. David committed a grievous sin in the matter of Bathsheba and Uriah. The Lord forgave him. But how? By inflicting the punishment of death due to him upon his innocent child. Here, beyond all doubt, the innocent suffered for the guilty. Was this unrighteous? No! say the Rabbins. But here the word "atonement" is not used. This is again a shifting of the question. But we have a case on hand in which the innocent men were put to death, and their death accepted as an "atonement" for the sins of the guilty. In the days of David there was a famine for 3 years, successively. To his inquiries of the Lord, he was told, that it was for Saul and his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites. David said unto the Gibeonites, what shall I do for you? and wherewith shall I make an "atonement," that ye may bless the inheritance of the Lord? They demanded 7 of Saul's children to hang them up unto the Lord in Gibeah, of Saul. Their request was granted, and the Lord was intreated for the land. Here we see, first, the Israelites suffering the plague of famine for a sin which they had not committed; and, secondly, "atonement" made, not by the death of the offender, but by that of 7 of his innocent children.

Having thus met the objection as it stands, we feel justified in believing that God has, in the 53d chapter of Isaiah, made known His intention of laying on one the iniquity of us all. And, until our opponents can prove that we have mistaken the Prophet's meaning, it will be most certain that God has ordained the death of His righteous servant as an "atonement" for the sins of the guilty; and no general argument will suffice to set aside the plain declaration of God's holy word.

We feel rather surprised to find the teachers in Israel, ready to depart from the Abrahamic faith, and the received exposition of the Talmud, in which they profess to have an implicit faith, for no other reason than to get rid of the Christian argument, which is wholly based upon the word of the living God. Suppose that Abraham had held it as an axiom, that it is impossible that God should require a human sacrifice, what would he have thought

when Jehovah told him "take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and offer him for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of? He must have said, this is the voice of the evil one trying to deceive me, for I know that such a sacrifice cannot be acceptable to God. Even if Abraham had been silent, would not Isaac have protested against a proceeding so contrary to the principle instilled into him by his father? The silence and submission of both, prove to demonstration, that this modern Jewish doctrine formed no part of Abraham's or Isaac's creed; nor indeed, of the creed of the ancient Jews. In their prayer-book, we find them everywhere deploring the want of sacrifices, and admit their necessity by entreating Jehovah to look upon prayer and fasting, as if they were sacrifices.* Indeed, so deeply is this faith in the necessity of an atonement engraven in the Jewish mind, that in many parts of the world the Jews kill a cock on the eve of the day of "atonement" as a sacrifice, that they may not be altogether without a victim. They not only confess the necessity of the Mosaic "atonement," but also lay down as a truth that the death of the righteous has the same "atoning" efficacy as the sacrifices. Both Jarchi and the Talmud ascribe "atoning"

*

רבון העולמים. אָתָּה צְוִיתָנוּ לְהַקְרִיב קָרְבָּן הַתָּמִיד בְּמוֹעֲדוֹ.
 וְלִהְיוֹת פְּהִינִים בְּעִבּוֹדְתָם. וְלוֹרִים בְּדוֹכָנָם. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמַעֲמָדָם:
 וְעַתָּה בְּעִזְבוֹתֵינוּ חָרַב בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ. וּבָשַׁל הַתָּמִיד. וְאִין לָנוּ לֹא
 כֹּהֵן בְּעִבּוֹדְתָנוּ. וְלֹא לוֹרֵי בְּדוֹכָנוּ. וְלֹא יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמַעֲמָדוֹ. וְאָתָּה
 אָמַרְתָּ וּלְשִׁלְמָה פָּרִים שְׁפָתֵינוּ. לְכֵן יְהִי רְצוֹן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
 וְאַל תְּהִי אָבוֹתֵינוּ. שִׁיְהֵא שִׁיחַ שְׁפָתוֹתֵינוּ חָשׁוּב וּמִקְבֵּל וּמְרֻצָּה
 לְפָנֶיךָ. כְּאִלּוּ הִקְרַבְנוּ קָרְבָּן הַתָּמִיד בְּמוֹעֲדוֹ. וְעַמְדָנוּ עַל מַעֲמָדוֹ:

Sovereign of all worlds; thou didst command us to offer the daily sacrifice in its appointed time; and that the priests should officiate in their proper service, and the Levites at their desks, and the Israelites in their station. But, at present, on account of our sins, the temple is laid waste, and the daily sacrifice has ceased; for we have neither an officiating priest, nor a Levite upon the desk, or an Israelite at his station. But thou hast said, that the prayers of our lips shall be accepted as the offering of bulls. Therefore, let it be acceptable before thee. O Eternal Self Existence, our God, and the God of our ancestors, that the prayers of our lips may be accounted, accepted, and esteemed before thee, as if we had offered the daily sacrifice in its appointed time, and had stood in our station. (Daily prayers, edit. New York, p. 14.)

efficacy to the death of Miriam and Aaron.* It is indeed surprising to hear an Israelite deploring the want of an "atonement," praying for its restoration, and teaching the doctrine of "atonement" by the death of the righteous; and yet in his controversy with the Christians denies and contradicts it all. This is indeed prevarication with the Lord. But we, in the spirit of Joshua, publicly tell them and the world at large, that we have firmly resolved to serve the Lord, and, closely following His Holy word, we are ready to deny in toto any meritorious efficacy to the death of any sinful man; and are equally ready to assert of the Messiah, whose name is the Lord our righteousness, "that He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed."

2d. It is further affirmed, that the 53d chapter of Isaiah does not refer to the Messiah, but to the captive Daughter of Zion.

We have already shown in the preceding argument how the Rabbins deny the fundamental principles of the Levitical priesthood and worship, and contradict both the Talmud and their own public prayers, in order to get rid of the doctrine of "atonement." We shall now show how wilfully they have forsaken the most ancient expositions handed down to them from their forefathers, and again given the lie to their public prayers, in order to avoid the irresistible evidence of the 53d chapter of Isaiah, in favour of Jesus of Nazareth.

למה נסמכה מיתת מרים לפרשת פרה אדומה? לומר לך מה * קרבנות מכפריי אף מיתת צדיקים מכפרת :

Why is the account of Miriam's death immediately given after the chapter about the red heifer? To teach thee that as the offerings make "atonement," so also the death of the righteous makes "atonement." Jarchi's Commentary on the 20th chapter of the book of Numbers.

This axiom of Jarchi is also formally asserted in the Talmud. e. g.

למה נסמכה מיתת מרים לפרשת פרה אדומה? לומר לך מה פרה אדומה מכפרת אף מיתתן של צדיקים מכפרת א'ר אלעזר למה נסמכה מיתת אהרן לבגדי כהונה? לומר לך מה בגדי כהונה מכפריין אף מיתתן של צדיקים מכפרת :

Why is the death of Miriam annexed to the chapter concerning the red heifer? To teach thee that as the red heifer made "atonement," so also the death of the righteous makes "atonement." Rabbi Eleazer says, why is the death of Aaron annexed to the account of the garments of the priesthood? To teach thee that as the garments of the priesthood make "atonement," so also the death of the righteous makes "atonement." Babylonian Talmud, Tract Moed Okaitan, fol. xxviii. col. 1.

Although the above given interpretation of the prophecy is the most prevailing among the modern Rabbins, yet, it is not the only one adopted; for, it has never given universal satisfaction. Hence, the attempt to explain it in various ways. Some apply it to Abraham; others to Moses; others to Ezra; others to Jeremiah; others to Josiah; and others to any righteous person.* We may well ask, what reason have these and other Rabbins for departing from the true interpretation contained in the Targum and many other ancient expositions? We cannot help thinking it is the urgency of the case. If they once admit that this chapter applies to the Messiah, then they would also admit a suffering Messiah, despised and rejected of men, and then, beyond all doubt, Jesus of Nazareth is He. Their extreme anxiety on this subject proves to demonstration that the Christian interpretation is the true one. Indeed, their very singular conduct in having very ingeniously contrived to exclude this portion of the Holy Scripture from the public reading in the Synagogue is a complete demonstration of the plainness with which this chapter speaks of Jesus. In the weekly portions of the Prophets read in the Synagogue, one begins Is. li. 12, and ends lii. 12; another at the first verse of the fifty-fourth chapter. Thus the whole of the prophecy describing the person, the work, and the suffering of the glorious Messiah, comprised in the last 3 verses of the 52d chapter and the whole of the 53d, is altogether excluded. Our opponents, who very evidently felt the force and evidence of the argument, could not give us a more striking proof; and we cannot expect from them a more open confession, that this prophecy is applicable only to the Messiah, and that it has been fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth. When we are led to examine closely the counsels of the Almighty, and compare them with the plans of fallen, erring, and fallible man, we discover a like difference prevailing, as in the works of nature when compared with those of art. The works of art may at first sight appear the most finished and beautiful, but when the eye is enabled to penetrate into their texture, the nicest workmanship is detected to be rough and blemished. Not so with the works of nature. They gain by the most critical examination; and those which at first sight appear to be defective or rude, the more closely they are analyzed, discover the more exact construction and consummate beauty. In like manner the

* Do not all these persons belong to those who must say כָּלֵנוּ כְּצֹאֵן

הַצֹּאֵן "all we like sheep have gone astray?" The very best of men have ever acknowledged this. See Psal. li. 4-6. Is. vi. 5. lxiv. 6. Dan. ix. 4-19. This inconsistency on the part of Jewish controversialists is altogether inexcusable.

system of human speculation and worldly policy, although at first they may seem plausible, and even profound, soon betray in their progress the narrowness of their finite understanding; while the decrees and counsels of Jehovah, which appear to furnish objections, either against the goodness or wisdom of heaven, have, upon more extensive view of their consequences, and upon closer study of the word of life, very often afforded the most striking proofs of both. These, and such like reflections, must suggest themselves to our thoughts the more we study and meditate upon the chapter before us. And, while God manifested in the flesh, was and still is, to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness; we earnestly pray that, unto us He may ever be "the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

After describing in his own majestic and beautiful style the future glory and salvation, the Lord has in store for the captive Daughter of Zion, the Prophet at once proceeds to introduce the person by whom so great a salvation would be effected; not by reason of their righteousness, but of sovereign grace, yea, by the very person whom they rejected, even the Rock of our Salvation, who for our sakes, "took upon Him the form of a servant."

Behold my servant! He shall make wise;*
He shall be raised aloft, and magnified, and very highly exalted. †

* הִנֵּה Demonst. interj. comp. of הִיךְ and הֵּה parag. This part. is employed to direct the reader's special attention. The addition of the final הֵּה parag. (as in this instance) renders this part. pre-eminently more emphatic.

יִשְׁכִּיל Hiph. fut. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab יִשְׁכֵּל to be prudent, to act prudently, wisely; to be successful, to act prosperously; to make prudent, wise. The Hiph. form here must be rendered in the last active sense.

עֲבָדֵי n. mas. sing. with suff. 1st pers. sing. mas. ab עָבַד to work, labour, till the ground; to serve, serve God, i. e. to worship God, serve Him with offering a sacrifice, &c.; to compel to work, bring into bondage; &c. The n. עֲבָדֵי is used as a low epithet, and is applied to common servants and slaves; and, as a very honourable epithet, and is applied to the pious worshippers of Jehovah; e. g. Abraham, Psal. cv. 6, 42; to the prophets; e. g. Moses, Deut. xxxiv. 5. Isaiah, Is. xx. 3; and pre-eminently to the Messiah, as the most distinguished Divine Ambassador, Is. xlii. 1, xlix. 6, liii. 11, Philip. ii. 7. The great mass of Jewish Commentators apply the epithet יְהוָה עֲבָדֵי to the King

Messiah.

In this beautiful description of the Messiah's future very high exaltation, the Prophet fully intimates that He was one with God, as plainly stated in the 10th verse of the 50th chapter :

Who is among you that feareth Jehovah,
That obeyeth the voice of His servant ?

Thus plainly foretelling that Messiah would be God and man—though a servant, yet the Lord—though debased, still exalted—a victim, but Himself the priest—subject, but only for a short time, as the glory would follow, and he would become Prince—involved in death, and yet victor over death—poor, but also rich, and making many rich at the same time—a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief, exposed to infirmities, unknown, and in a state of destitution and humiliation, but also a King, a conqueror, glorious, and altogether lovely. All these apparently contradictory qualities had their fulfillment in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.

Our opponents, however, say, the Prophet here speaks of Israel, not of the Messiah ; certainly not of Jesus.*

רָרַם Kal. fut. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab רָרַם to be exalted, to become high ; to be high, lofty ; to be extolled with praises.

רָנְפָא Niph. pret. 3d pers. sing. mas. with pref. ךְ conv. ab נָפָא to lift or raise up ; to be lifted up, raised, elevated, exalted, &c.

רָבִיבָה Kal pret. 3d pers. sing. mas. with pref. ךְ conv. ab רָבִיבָה to be high, lofty ; to be exalted, elevated, &c. The use of the three verbs רָבִיבָה, נָפָא, and רָרַם is very emphatical, being very expressive of the Messiah's superlative exaltation and infinite glory.

מֵאֵד n. mas. sing. used here as an adv. ab אָדַד to bend, &c. ; to be strong, robust ; hence, מֵאֵד might, power, excess ; hence, adv. very, exceedingly, greatly. It is used here as a predicative particle qualifying the foregoing verb.

† The parallel expressions here are simply correlative, the mutual relation being that of cause and effect. He shall be raised aloft, &c., because He shall make His people wise unto salvation ; endowing them with that heavenly wisdom which involves a prosperity in this world, and eternal happiness in that world of eternal bliss.

הִנֵּה יִשְׁכִּיל עַבְדִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּצֵאתוֹ מִגְּלוֹת אֲדוֹם וְיִשְׁמַעְאֵל הַנְּקָרָאִים*
בְּשֵׁם עַרְל וְטִמְאָה וּמֵאֵד וְאֵילֶךְ יִרוֹם וְנִשְׂא וְגִבָּה מֵאֵד :

Behold, my servant Israel shall make wise, when he goes forth from the captivity of Edom, (i. e. Christendom) and Ishmael, (i. e. the Mohammedan Dominion) who are called by the name of "uncircumsized and unclean." And thenceforward he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high. Chizzuck Emunah. cap xxiii, apud Wagenseil, in loco.

הִנֵּה בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים יִצְלִיחַ עַבְדִּי יַעֲקֹב צְדִיקִים שְׁבוּ :

Here the Rabbins betray their bad taste and judgment in sacred criticism. In the two preceding chapters, the Prophet had addressed the people of Israel collectively, under the figure of a woman:—li. 17, "Awake, awake; stand up, O Jerusalem!" verse 18, "There is none to guide her among all the sons whom she hath brought forth." This figure is continued in lii. 2; after which, the Prophet lays aside the figure, and addresses the people literally as the people: and in liv. 1, he again addresses the nation under the figure of a woman,—“Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear!” Now, it seems (rather) harsh to suppose that the Prophet should pass so abruptly from female to male, and then again to female, and that the same subject should be intended all the time; the change of figure and of gender does, to say the least, seem to intimate that the person spoken of in this chapter is different to the one spoken of in the preceding and following chapters. Who then can be the person spoken of here under the title “my servant?” To this we give the answer in the language of the best and wisest

Behold, in the latter days, my servant Jacob, i. e. those who are righteous amongst them, shall prosper. Jarchi Comment. in Esaiam, in loco.

הַפְּרָשָׁה הַזֹּאת נֹאמְרָה עַל גְּלוּת יִשְׂרָאֵל וְקָרָא אוֹתוֹ עַבְדִּי כְמוֹ שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר וְאַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל עַבְדִּי יַעֲקֹב אֲשֶׁר בְּחִרְתִּיךָ :

This paragraph is spoken of the captivity of Israel, and he is called my servant, as in chapter xli. 8. “But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen.” R. D. Kimchi Comment. in Jesaiam, in loco.

וְהִנֵּה טַעַם עַבְדֵי כָל מִי שֶׁהָיָה בְּגְלוּת מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל וְהוּא עַבְדֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם
Behold, the meaning of my servants is, every one of Israel that is in captivity, even he is a servant of God. Aben Ezra Comment. in Jessaiam, in loco.

וְהַגְּאֹן רַב סַעֲדִיָּה ז'ל פִּירֵשׁ כָּל הַפְּרָשָׁה עַל יִרְמְיָהוּ, וַיִּפְּחֵה פִּירֵשׁ :
And the Gaon Rabbi Saadiah, interpreted the whole of this paragraph, of Jeremiah; and his interpretation is a good one. Saadiah Gaon, apud Aben Ezra, in loco.

וְהַדְּרָךְ הַשֵּׁנִית הוּא שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר הַנְּבוֹאָה הַזֹּאת כֹּרְלָה עַל יְאִשִּׁיָּהוּ מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה :

The second mode of interpretation is, that which appears to me that this whole prophecy was spoken concerning Josiah, king of Judah. Abarbanel Comment. in Esaiam, in loco.

Of all these interpretations, we may say as Abarbanel did of Rabbi Saadiah Gaon's exposition concerning Jeremiah :

בְּאֵמֶת אֵינִי רוֹאֶה אֶפְיָלוֹ פְּסוּק אֶחָד שִׁוְרָה אֵלָיו אִמְתָּתוֹ :
In truth I do not see even one verse that can prove the truth of its application to Him, (and indeed to none other but Jesus.)

Christian Rabbi:—"Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being formed in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Philip. ii, 5, 11. In addition to St. Paul's true commentary on the passage before us, we will also quote the language of the Targum, and the Yalkut Shimoni on this very passage we have under consideration:

הא יצלח עבדי משיחא ירום ויסגי ויזקוף לחדא :

Behold my servant, the Messiah, shall prosper; He shall be exalted and increased, and be very strong. Targum of Jonathan, in loco. *

הנה ישכיל עבדי זה מלך המשיח: ירום ונשא וגבה מאד: ירום מן אברהם, שכתוב בו הרימותי ידי אל יי: ונשא ממשח, שכתוב בו כי תאמר אלי שאהו בחיקך וגבה ממלאכי השרת, שנאמר וגביהם וגובה להם: וכן אומר מי אתה הר הגדול? שהוא גדול מן האבות: והוא מחולל מפשעינו מדוכא מעונותינו, מוסר שלומינו עליו, ובהבורתו נרפא לנו:

Behold my servant: He shall make wise. This is the King Messiah. He shall be exalted, and extolled, and be very high. He shall be exalted more than Abraham, for of Him it is written, "I have exalted my hand to the Lord." Gen. xiv, 22. He shall be extolled more than Moses, for of him it is written, "Thou sayest unto me, extol or carry them in thy bosom." Numb. xi, 12. And He shall be higher than the ministering angels, for it said, "As for their rings, they were so high." Ezek. i, 18. And thus it is said, "Who art thou, O great mountain?" Zack. iv, 7, for he is greater than the fathers: "But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was

*The Israelites believe that Jonathan, the author of the Targum, was a disciple of Rabbi Hillel, who flourished about 30 years before the birth of Christ. Gesenius assigns the 2d or 3d century, as the date when the text of this Targum attained to its present state. Whichever date we take, his testimony is certainly very ancient.

bruised for our iniquities : the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed.”* These two important ancient Jewish testimonies prove to demonstration that the ancient Israelites have interpreted this prophecy of the Messiah, and did firmly believe that, although the Messiah is superior to the three patriarchs, to Moses, and the ministering angels, yet, he was to be a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. One would fancy that the latter testimony is almost an epitome of St. Paul’s argument in the first 2, and a part of the 3d chapters of his Epistles to the Hebrews.

Notwithstanding the irresistible force of the above two ancient testimonies, yet, because they come from a non-controversial side, the Rabbins are disposed to evade them. We will therefore add another testimony which no Israelite who frequents the synagogue can deny, unless he be prepared to confess that, in his prayers to Almighty God, his lips say one thing and his heart another. Annually, at the Passover feast, this portion of the scripture is attributed to the Messiah in all the synagogues in the world, in the following words :—

בְּרַח דּוֹרֵי עַר שׁוֹפּוֹתָ קַץ מַחֲזָה
 חַיֵּשׁ וְנָסוּ הַצִּלְלִים מִזָּה
 יְרוּם וְנִשְׂאָ וְגִבָּה נִבְזָה
 יִשְׁפִּיל וְיִדְכֶיָּה וְגוֹיִם רַבִּים יִזָּה

Fly, my beloved, until the end of the vision speaks.

Hasten that the shadows may flee away.

Let him be exalted, and extolled, and high, that is now despised.

Lethim instruct, and reprove, and sprinkle many nations. †

Here we have 3 verses of this prophecy distinctly quoted, lii, 13, 14, and liii, 3. There can be no doubt about these verses. Nor can there be controversy about the person of whom they are spoken. Every Israelite who is in the habit of saying his prayers knows that they are understood of the Messiah. With what consistency, then, can any Rabbi assert that this prophecy refers to any one else? Is it honest, in prayer to God to apply this passage to the Messiah, and in controversy with man to deny and dispute this application? This strange conduct tends only to confirm us in the belief already expressed, viz: That in the non-controversial writings, and in the solemn and public prayers to

* *Vide* Tanchuma, apud Yalcut. Part II. fol. 53, col. 3. Edit. Frankfurt-on-the Oder. A. M. 5469.

† *Vide* ראשון של פסח Prayers used during the Passover Feast. Page 72.

a heart-searching God, the Israelites throughout the world, unani-
mously apply this prophecy to the Messiah. This is not denied even
by the Rabbins themselves, for, some of them begin their com-
mentaries on this prophecy by mentioning the Christian exposition,
and with an open confession that they wilfully depart from the
ancient Jewish exposition, because the ancient Jews applied this
prophecy to the Messiah.* That this verse was indeed fulfilled in
Jesus of Nazareth is evident from the fact that, there is no sover-
eign or sage, whose glory can be compared with that of our
Saviour, who achieved the greatest revolution recorded in the
annals of the world; and has effected the mightiest moral changes
amongst men. His name has put to flight the hosts of false Gods
that were once the objects of worship; effectually banished heathen
idolatry from a great part of the world; carried with it the light
of Divine Truth, and taught men to worship the Living God, the

זאת הפרשה קשה מאד: אמרו בעלי פלוגתינו שהוא רמז*
לאלהיהם: ורבים פירשוהו על המשיח: בעבור שאמרו קדמונינו
ז'ל כי ביום שחרב בית המקדש נולד משיח והוא אסור בזיקים:

This chapter is very difficult. Our opponents in controversy say that it
refers to their God. Many, however, interpret it of the Messiah, because
our ancient Rabbins, of blessed memory, have declared that the Messiah
was born about the time of the Temple's destruction; and that He is bound
in chains. Aben Ezra, Comment. in Esaiam, in loco.

השאלה הראשונה היא לדעת על מי נאמרה הנבואה הזאת? כי
הנה חכמי הנוצרים פירשוהו על אותו האיש שתלו בירושלם
בסוף בית שני שהיה לדעתם בן האלוה יתברך שנתגשם בבטן
העלמה כמו שמפורסם בדבריהם: ואמנם יונתן בן עוזיאל
תרגמה על משיח העתיד לבא: וזהו גם כן דעת חכמים ז'ל
בהרבה ממדרשותיהם:

The first question is to know of whom this prophecy is spoken; for, behold
the wise men of the Nazarenes have explained it of that man whom they
hanged in Jerusalem, towards the close of the second Temple, who was, ac-
cording to their opinion, the son of the blessed God, and became incarnate
in the womb of the virgin, as is declared in their books. And truly Jona-
than ben Uzziel has interpreted it of the Messiah, who is to come. And
this is also the opinion of the wise men of blessed memory, in many of
their expositions. Abarbanel Comment. in Jesaiam, in loco.

"The outset of these expositions is plainly controversial, and yet contain
a formal confession that the ancient Israelites did apply this prophecy ex-
clusively to the Messiah, because they did believe that He suffered for the
sins of the people."

Maker of heaven and earth ; and, has been, and is now the highest authority for the purest and most beneficial system of morality ever presented to the minds and consciences of civilized and highly cultivated men. This is indeed, a substantial glory—a glory which even His bitterest enemies dare not deny.

As the leading features of this prophecy are profound humiliation, and exalted glory, the Prophet proceeds to say :

As many hissed because of thee ; (saying,)*

* For the better representation of the Jewish conduct towards our Saviour, I have rendered the verb שָׁמַם to hiss. The Jewish main aim was to mock, hiss, and revile ; and not to sympathize or admire. I will let them speak for themselves.

Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth ? Joh. i. 46.

Shall Christ come out of Galilee ? Joh. vii. 41.

Is not this the Carpenter's son ? Matth. xiii. 55.

Is not this the Carpenter, the son of Mary ? Mark vi. 3.

This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them. Luke xv. 2.

We will not have this man to reign over us. Luke xix. 14.

We have no King but Cæsar. Joh. xix. 15.

And they cried out all at once, saying, away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas. Luke xxiii. 18.

And they that passed by railed on Him, wagging their heads, and saying, Ah, thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself, and come down from the Cross. Likewise also the chief-priests mocking, said among themselves with the scribes, He saved others, Himself He cannot save. Let Christ the King of Israel, descend now from the Cross, that we may see and believe. Mark xv. 29-32.

The verb שָׂרַק to hiss, is very often put in parallel with שָׁמַם as both convey the idea of contempt and aversion. e. g.

1 Kings, ix. 8.

כָּל עֵבֶר עָלִיו יִשָּׂם וְשָׂרַק

וְשָׂמַתִּי אֶת הָעִיר הַזֹּאת לְשָׂמָה וְלְשָׂרָקָה כָּל עֵבֶר עָלֶיהָ יִשָּׂם וְיִשָּׂרַק

Jer. xix. 8.

עַל כָּל מִפְתָּהָ

xxv. 8.

וְשָׂמַתִּים לְשָׂמָה וְלְשָׂרָקָה וְלִחְרָבוֹת עוֹשֶׂה

xxix. 18.

לְאֵלֶּה וְלְשָׂמָה וְלְשָׂרָקָה וְלִחְרָפָה

וְהָיְתָה אֲדוֹם לְשָׂמָה כָּל עֵבֶר עָלֶיהָ יִשָּׂם וְיִשָּׂרַק עַל-

xlix. 14.

כָּל-מִפְתָּהָ

li. 37.

שָׂמָה וְשָׂרָקָה מֵאִין יוֹשֵׁב

2 Chron. xxix. 8.

וַיִּתְּנֵם לְזִעְרָה לְשָׂמָה וְלְשָׂרָקָה

“The Israelites generally consider these two verbs as synonymous.”

His appearance is so disfigured,* more than that of man ;
And so is his form disfigured, more than the sons of men.†

This verse contains a very exact description of the Jewish apostacy. Alas! no sooner did Jesus announce Himself as the Lord's Servant, as coming to finish the work which His Father gave Him to do, than He was hissed at and treated most contemptuously by those whom he came to save. "He came unto His own, and His own received him not."‡ The parallel expressions in this verse are like those of the preceding verse, being simply correlative, the mutual relation being that of cause and effect. The Jews hissed at Him, because of His appearance being so disfigured, &c. i. e. His sufferings. They thought that the criteria by which they were to know the true Messiah, would be His immediate glory and exaltation, His illustrious birth and fame, His valour and ability, as well as readiness to deliver Israel from bondage, and avenge all their enemies; forgetting all the while that that pertained more strictly to His second, than to His first Advent. Hence the rejection, for a while, of the natural branches; and, the admission of the Gentiles into Christ's fold; or the engrafting of the wild olive tree into the place of the natural branches, which were broken off because of unbelief. This admission or engrafting is fully described in the following verse:

So shall He sprinkle many nations: |
Before Him shall Kings shut their mouths ;
For what was not before declared to them, they shall see,
And what they had not heard, they shall attentively consider.

* מְשֻׁחָת n. mas. sing. const. of מְשַׁחַת ab מְשַׁחַת to destroy, ruin; to injure very greatly; (hence, to disfigure, as in the text;) to corrupt, to act corruptly.

† The preposition מְ in the words מְאִישׁ and מְבִינִי has a comparative sense; "more than."

‡ Joh. i. 11.

|| יִרְדֶּה 3d pers. sing. fut. Hiph. ab יִרְדֶּה to exult with joy; to be sprinkled.

Hiphil יִרְדֶּה fut. יִרְדֶּה to sprinkle, be sprinkled; to "expiate." (This last sense is given in Davidson's and Castelli's Lexicons.) Gesenius, in his Lexicon, Bagster's edition, cites this verse, and in rendering it, he departs from the existing punctuation in the text. Both he and the lxx join עֲלֵיךְ to רַבִּים and render the passage as follows:—Gesen. So shall he fill many people with joy, because of himself. lxx. οὕτω θαυμάσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπ' αὐτῶ; whilst the vulg. Chald. Syr. and Arab. follow the existing punctuation. The lxx. have not only departed from the punctuation, but also from

That this passage refers to the conversion of the Gentiles is very evident from Romans xv. 22, where St. Paul quotes the latter clause of the verse before us, verbatim from the Septuagint. Οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἔβοντα, καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασι συνηθουσι. "To whom He was not spoken of, they shall see: and they that have not heard shall understand." Thus this prophecy has been fulfilled to the very letter, and is still in the course of fulfillment until the Church of the Living God shall embrace within her pure communion all the inhabitants of this earth. And, whilst the great mass of the Jewish nation to this very day, with God's oracles in their hands, trample under foot the precious blood of the Lamb, and literally hiss at the very mention of the name Jesus; Gentile Monarchs, Princes, Nobles, and whole nations, count it their highest privilege, to glorify, adore, and worship the name of Jesus. The Messiah's exaltation here described, is indeed bearing more than a due proportion to the humiliation which preceded it; for, in spite of all the universal contempt with which the "one" Jewish nation treated Christ, yet, never has mortal attained to such a pitch of glory as did Jesus of Nazareth. To His name the whole civilized world has for centuries bowed. Him the greatest names that have adorned the history of mankind have confessed. Before Him the most enlightened of the nations have worshipped, and Him they exalt as their God and Saviour. Where is the parallel in the annals of the world?

יִדְדֵהוּ Seems too allude to the typical sprinkling, appointed under the Old Testament dispensation, and particularly to those performed by the high priest, who was commanded to sprinkle the blood of the victim offered in sacrifice, for himself and the people.* These, however, were but the shadows of good things to

the reading. They probably took יִדְדֵהוּ for יִשְׁאֵהוּ as in the phrase נִשְׁאֵהוּ Is. ix. 15. which they rendered thus: τα κρίσωπα θαυμαζοντας. They also read a plural number for the singular יִדְדֵהוּ; θαυμάσονται, being the 3d pers. pl. fut. of θαυμάσσωμαι, mid. of θαυμάζω. The Syr. rendering of יִדְדֵהוּ is to purify, and the chald. to scatter. Many Rabbins think that יִדְדֵהוּ is expressive of speaking, or dropping the word, which is often compared to rain and dew. See Deut. xxxii. 2. Ezek. xx. 46, xxi. 2. Hab. ii. 14.

יִדְדֵהוּ 3d pers. pl. pret. Kal ab יִדְדֵהוּ to see. } These
 יִדְדֵהוּ 3d pers. pl. pret. Hithpal ab יִדְדֵהוּ or יִדְדֵהוּ to discern. } two
 preterites have a future sense, agreeable to rule. See Gesen. Gramm. Sect. 124, rule 4.

* Levit. iv. 6.

come; hence, we may very safely infer that, in this prophecy, an allusion is made to the ordinance of Baptism, and the sprinkling of our hearts with the precious blood of the Lamb, emphatically denominated "the blood of sprinkling,"* which being effectually applied by the Holy Ghost, "cleanses from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit,"† and purges the conscience from dead works, to serve the Living God.‡ גְּוִיִּים רַבִּים. In this expression, the Prophet predicts, that, as a "single" people had despised and rejected Him, so the whole world should admire and receive him. That His willingness to communicate the inestimable benefits resulting from his passion, to people of all nations, will induce the mightiest monarchs to lay their hands on their mouths, in token of the profoundest humiliation and veneration. And, that the doctrine concerning the conversion and salvation of the Gentiles, will induce them reverently and attentively to hearken to the mighty voice of His Gospel which is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."¶

After this general report concerning the great and wonderful exaltation of the Messiah, the Propet interrupts his predictions of success and triumph to bewail the discouragements and disappointments which should intervene, in the following words:—

Who hath believed our report?§
And to whom was the arm of the Lord manifested?

* Heb. xii. 24.

† Heb. ix. 14.

‡ 2 Cor. vii. 1.

¶ Rom. i. 16.

§ לְשִׁמְעָתֵנוּ n. fem. sing. with pref. לְ and suff. נָה 1st pers. pron. from

שְׁמָעָה that which is spoken, or heard; ab שְׁמַע to hear. It may also be taken for the fem. part. passive, meaning that which is heard. The lxx's rendering is ἀκοή:—τις ἐπιστεύσας τῆ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν? The suff נָה is to be taken actively. So the Targum: לְבַסוּרְתֵנוּן לְמַהֲמַיִן who believed our preaching?

רִצְרוּץ n. com. sing. with ך conj. arm, strength, power. } These 2 n's.

יְהוָה The most sacred name of God. } generally

designate the Divine omnipotence, as manifested in the Messiah's mission. The doctrine of the Gospel is expressly called the power of God. 1 Cor. i. 18. Christ is called the arm or power of God. 1 Cor. i. 24. Isaiah uses this figure, "Arm of the Lord," more than once, for the Redeemer. "Jehovah made bare His Holy Arm in the eyes of all the nations. Is. lii. 10. Therefore His Arm brought salvation unto Him. Is. lix. 16.

That this verse refers to the Jewish unbelief, is evident from Joh. xii. 38, and Rom. x. 16, where both our Saviour and St. Paul, thus expound it. Although Jehovah did manifest many visible tokens of His mighty power in those most stupendous miracles by which He gave Testimony to the gracious mission of Jesus and His disciples, yet how few Jews were convinced by them? The fact, that, there was a little flock who heard the Shepherd's voice and followed him, proves to demonstration that the question does not imply an entire negation, but simply expresses astonishment in view of the comparative small number of Jewish believers. To these few the *עֲבָרָה* i. e. the report or doctrine of the incarnation atonement, sufferings, and death of the Redeemer, served as objects well-fitted in their nature to excite their most profound adoration and wonder; whilst to the great mass of the Jews, the doctrine of the Cross was a stumbling-block. *נִגְלָתָהּ* manifested or revealed; not outwardly, for it is evident from the context that Christ was revealed and preached to vast numbers; but inwardly and with power to their minds and hearts. So the Apostle speaks of Moses, though revealed to the eyes and ears of the Israelites, yet, he was

Therefore mine own Arm brought salvation unto me. Is. lxiii. 5." The almighty power of Jehovah was both seated in, and declared and exercised by Jesus of Nazareth in His powerful words and mighty deeds.

נִגְלָתָהּ 3d pers. sing. fem. pret. Niph. ab *גָּלָה* to make bare, to open, to disclose, reveal a secret, &c. The use of *עַל* in this place, with this verb, is thought by Hengstenberg, to imply a supernal revelation. For, says he. this verb is everywhere else construed with *אֶל* and *לְ*. Unless he means the Niph. form, I would respectfully suggest the two following passages, where the verb is construed with *עַל*:—*עַל עֵרְוָהּ*:—*עַל עֵרְוָהּ* Lam. ii. 14.. *עַל חַטָּאתֶיהָ* Lam. iv. 22.

Martini, Jahn, and Rosenmuller consider this verse as a confession of the heathen nations, acknowledging their error with respect to Israel's sufferings. This is precisely the interpretation given by the Jewish controversialists, centuries before a Martini, a Jahn, or a Rosenmuller came into existence. The bitter opponents of Christianity little thought that after the lapse of centuries, they would find defenders of their arbitrary and pernicious system of interpretation, in the persons of Christian professors! The very singular paraphrase of this verse by Rosenmuller is entirely Jewish:—hear him:—*Cui tale Jovanae potentiae documentum unquam innotuit, quale nos jam videmus in admiranda hac populi Hebraei vicissitudine?* It is well for us to call to our minds our Saviour's gracious caution: "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits." *Matth. vii. 15, 16.*

and is to this day, unrevealed or hid from their minds and hearts. 2 Cor. iii. 14.

Having referred to the Jewish unbelief, the Prophet proceeds to describe their wicked and carnal prejudices which induced them to reject the Lord's suffering Anointed:—

For He grew up before Him like a sucker, *
And like a root out of a dry ground:

* **יָרָעַל** 3d pers. sing. fut. with **וְ** conversive, ab **עָלָה** to come up, to ascend, to arise; to spring or grow up. The Eng. rendering of this word as a fut. prop. is entirely precluded by the **וְ** conv., and gratuitously violates the uniformity of the description, which presents Christ's humiliation as already past.

כִּירוֹקֵךְ n. mas. sing. with pref. **כֹּ** for **כָּה**, a sucker, sprout, shoot. from **יָנַק** to suck; Hiph. **הִינִיק** to give suck, to suckle.

לְפָנָיו n. mas. sing. with pref. **לְ** and suff. 3d pers. sing. mas., in his presence, i. e. under his eyes; referring to the foregoing **יְהוָה** by whom the Messiah was taken notice of, though not by men; and in whose sight He was precious, though despised by men.

וְכִשְׁרֵשׁ n. mas. sing. with pref. וְ conj. and כֹּ prep. for כָּה , a root.	} This figure
מֵאֲרֶץ n. fem. sing. with pref. מִ prep. earth, land, ground.	
צִיָּה n. fem. sing., drou't.; אֲרֶץ צִיָּה land of drou't., i. e. dry land.	

strikingly sets forth the reduced and obscure state of David's family at the time of our Lord's appearance; a family which was once like a lofty tree in elevation and splendour; and the very depressed condition of the Messiah, who in reference to His state of exaltation, He is compared to a lofty and splendid cedar, under which all the fowls of heaven are to be lodged. Ezekiel xvii. 22, 23.

תֶּאֱרָא n. mas. sing., form, personal appearance; handsome form, beauty.

מְרֵאָה n. mas. sing., a seeing, looking; sight, vision, appearance, form. These two nouns are used for comely form and comely appearance. So in Gen. xxix. 17, **וְרַחֵל הָיְתָה יֹפִית הָאָרֶץ וְיֹפִית מְרֵאָה**, but Rachel was beautiful and well-favoured. In 1 Sam. xvi. 18, David is called **אִישׁ תֶּאֱרָא** a comely person.

As **וְיָנִיק מִן־הָאָרֶץ** and **וְיָנִיק מִן־צִיָּה** mark the end or object, the connective particle **וְ** in both words should be rendered "in order that, to the end that;" and as equivalent to a relative past, i. e. a future form with **וְ** conversive. The want of form and beauty described in this verse, is to be referred to the whole state of Christ's humiliation, and spiritual kingdom, in which there was to the eyes of men, "no form, no splendour, no magnificence."

In the absence of positive tradition concerning Christ's personal ap-

He had neither form nor splendour, that we should regard Him:
Nor appearance that we should desire Him.

Here we have not only a comprehensive and minute description of the Messiah's humble condition, but also a very exact description of the unbelieving Jewish mind. We find it in the whole train of their arguments and reasons for rejecting Jesus of Nazareth. Their blind unbelief reasoned thus:—The true Messiah is very properly designated "Jesse's branch, and Jesse's root"* in other words, "David's son and David's Lord;"† a plant of renown;‡ but "Jesus grew up like a root out of a dry ground." A more insignificant and unpromising object cannot be imagined than a solitary shrub in an arid soil, and under a sultry sky. The true Messiah is also designated "The desire of all nations;"§ "The Messenger of the Covenant,"|| in whom Israel should delight; but Jesus had no such "appearance that we should desire Him." "His appearance was so disfigured, more than that of man; and so is His form disfigured, more than the sons of men."¶ The

pearance, some fathers thought that He was deformed, others, that He was a person of extraordinary comeliness. The only legend of antiquity which pretends to depict Christ's personal appearance, is the extraordinary letter of Publius Lentulus, to the Emperor Tiberius, in the days of our Saviour. As this letter may be interesting to the curious, who are not already acquainted with it; I therefore transcribe it here.

Lentulus Hierosolymitanorum Praeses.

S. P. Q. ROMANO S.

Apparuit temporibus nostris et adhuc est homo magnae virtutis, nominatus Christus Jesus, qui dicitur a gentibus propheta veritatis, quem ejus discipuli vocant filium Dei, suscitans mortuos et sanans languores. Homo quidem staturae procerae, spectabilis, vultum habens venerabilem, quem intuentes possunt et diligere et formidare: capillos vero circinos et crispis aliquantum caeruleos et fulgentiores, ab humeris volitantes, discrimen habens in medio capitis juxta morem Nazarenorum; frontem planam et serenissimam, cum facie sine ruga ac macula aliqua, quam rubor moderatus venustat. Nasi et oris nulla prorsus est reprehensio, barbam habens copiosam et rubram, capillorum colore, non longam, sed bifurcatam, oculis variis et claris existentibus. In increpatione terribilis, in admonitione placidus et amabilis, hilaris servata gravitate, qui nunquam visus est ridere, flere autem saepe. Sic in statura corporis propagatus, manus habens et membra visu delectabilia, in eloquio gravis, rarus, et modestus, speciosus inter filios hominum. Valet.

This text is that of J. Jac. Grynæus, as found in his *Monumenta S. P. orthodoxographa*, Basil. 1569, fol.

* Isaiah xi. 1, 10.

† Psal. cx. 1.

‡ Ezek. xxxiv. 29.

§ Hag. ii. 7. || Mal. iii. 1. ¶ Isaiah. lii. 14.

majesty and grace of the Messiah's person and Kingdom, as so sweetly sung by the sons of Korah, in the forty-fifth psalm, did not at all correspond with the outward appearance of Jesus of Nazareth. "He had neither form nor splendour, that we should regard Him." He had no robes of royalty, no diadem adorning His brow, no splendid retinue, no gorgeous array. Like the prince of this world, by whom they are influenced, they are disposed to quote only a part of the word of truth; leaving out of sight all the prophecies relating to the Messiah's sufferings, but dwelling very minutely on those relating to His glory. Jesus indeed, did not come heralded by any pomp of worldly circumstances, but nevertheless accredited by the voice of heaven, which announced 700 years before, that such would be His first appearance; and, the very fact that such was the appearance of Jesus of Nazareth, fearlessly challenges the infidelity of all, be they Jews or Gentiles, to gainsay this irrefragable testimony.

From the general description of the Messiah's humiliation, the Prophet passes to a more minute account of his sufferings:—

He was despicable and the meanest of men, *
 A man of sorrow, and acquainted with grief,
 And as one who would hide his face from us;
 He was despicable, and we regarded Him not.

* נִבְזָה part. mas. sing. Niph. ab בָּזָה to despise, to contemn, to spurn.

הִתְחַלַּף adj. mas. sing. const. of הִתְחַלַּף ab הִתְחַלַּף to cease, cease to be, to forsake, fail; intrans. to be made destitute. הִתְחַלַּף אִישִׁים He who ceases to be a man, or to be reckoned among men; equivalent to the most abject among men. So Aben Ezra:—עִם אַנְשִׁים ceased to be reckoned among men.

מִכְאָבוֹת n. mas. sing. with pl. fem. term. from מִכְאָב ab כָּאָב to be pained, be in pain, be sorrowful. As in Prov. xxix. 1., אִישׁ הַזְּכֻחוֹת means one who has chastisements, as it were, for his peculiar possession; so אִישׁ מִכְאָבוֹת means one who has sufferings, as it were, for his peculiar property.

יָדָעָהּ for יָדָעָהּ part. mas. sing. kal. const. of יָדָעָהּ ab יָדָעָהּ to know, to be acquainted with.

חָלַי in pause, for חָלַי n. mas. sing. ab חָלַי to be weak, sick, pained, grieved.

The following extract from Rabbi M. Alshech, proves to demonstration that the ancient Israelites did firmly believe that the very sufferings of the Messiah which did furnish many with objections, are the strongest arguments in favour of His true Messiahship, inasmuch as they were precisely such as had been foretold by their holy prophets:

The carnal Israelites, still argued against recognizing Jesus as the true Messiah. He was not the personage described by the wisest of men, (Cant. v. 10-16.) or as spoken of by David (Psal. lxxii.) and Isaiah (Is. ix. 6. 7. xi. 2-9) for, "He was despicable and the meanest of men," "a friend of publicans and sinners." He was not the **בֵּר אֱלֹשׁ** spoken of by Daniel; (Dan. vii. 13, 14.) for, instead of asserting His prerogative as sovereign, subduing the world, and advancing Israel; He was as one who would hide His face from us." He would not make himself known, whenever He performed a miracle, He charged either those who were healed, or his disciples to tell no man; and, when the people actually made up their minds to make him King by force, He hid Himself from

הנה רז'ל פה אחד קיימו וקבלו כי על מלך המשיח ידבר.....יש
 יסורין על עון ויש יסורין של אהבה שסובל הצדיק על עון הדור
 והנה על זאת ישתומם האיש אשר לא ידע עד היכן מתן שכרן
 מגיע באמת באמור הירצה ה' שאיש אחד יחטא או הדור כל
 ועל איש צדיק תמים אשר לא חטא יקצוף להעמים עליו את
 עונות כל עושי רע שיהיו הם שמחים וקצדיק עצב הרשעים
 בריאי אולם והוא נגוע ומוכה והמה לפעמים שמחים לאדר
 ומלעיגים על צרתו ביין משתיחם אשר הוא מוכה עליהם על כן
 להסיר דאגה מדבר זה בא האלהי במקראות אלו להודיע עד
 היכן יד זכות סובל יסורין על הדור מגעת ומביא ראיה ממלך
 המשיח אשר הוא סובל עונות בני ישראל והנה שכרו אתו :

"Behold, our Rabbins with one mouth have confirmed, and received by tradition, that king Messiah is here spoken of.....There are some chastisements on account of sin; and there are other chastisements of love, which the Righteous One bears on account of the sin of the generation. Hence he who does not know how far the giving of reward extends in truth, is astonished, saying, can God be willing that one man or a whole generation should sin, and determine to lay upon an upright and just man, who has not sinned, the iniquities of all the evil-doers? That they should rejoice, and the Righteous one be afflicted? That the wicked should be fat and strong, and He smitten and stricken? That they should sometimes rejoice at His calamity, and over the wine of their feasts mock at the affliction with which He is smitten on their account? In order to remove anxiety from this matter, God comes in these scriptures to make known how far the merit of Him who bears the chastisements for the generation extends; bringing a proof, even the King Messiah, who bears the sins of the children of Israel, and behold His reward is with Him."

them. (Joh. vi. 15.) The Israelites, alas! did not give heed to the "sure word of prophecy." They could or would not understand that the Messiah must die for the sin of the world—that no man's heart can be turned to God by outward pomp or splendour—that no saving change can be brought about by any might or power, but by the spirit of the Lord of hosts. (Zach. iv. 6.) How many thousands of professing christians, alas! practically join too often the carnal Israelites, in considering the Saviour despicable and unestimable, as one on whom it is scarcely worth their while to bestow a thought? How most awful is the neglect, the contempt, the coldness, and the formality which they manifest towards that Holy Pattern of unspeakable disinterestedness and indiscribable humility? May the Holy Ghost enable us to pray fervently and without ceasing for the mind which was in Christ Jesus. (Philip. ii. 5.)

From the description of the sufferings of the Servant of Jehovah, the Prophet proceeds to say that these sufferings were most perversely construed—that the carnal minds of men have altogether misunderstood the very end for which the Messiah was to come; for, these sufferings did not only pertain to the work which Jehovah had committed to the Messiah, but constituted the most important part of it:—

וּבְמִסְתָּר part. mas. sing. Hiph. with pref. ה conj. and כ prep. for מִסְתָּר ab כְּתָר to hide, to conceal. This and the next word, are thus paraphrased by the author of the Targum:

וּבְמָא דְהִרְתָּ מְסִלְקָא אִפִּי שְׁכִינְתָּא מִנְנָא : And the presence of the Shechina was as it were departing from the midst of us. "This is a significant expression of the Divinity of the sufferer here spoken of."

מִן מְנַר prep. comp. of מִן and suff. 1st pers. pl. mas. ab מִן an unused root. Arab. مَن to divide, apportion. מִן is properly the const. of the n. מִן a part of anything. Hence a partitive prep. denoting a part taken out of a whole. This expression forcibly illustrates the fact that it was not all Israel, but a part who refused to recognize the Lord's suffering anointed; for, notwithstanding the most inflexible obstinacy and inveterate hostility of the great mass of the Jews, yet, from among them, there was a little flock who heard the shepherd's voice and followed Him. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔστι κεκαλυμμένον το εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἔστι κεκαλυμμένον, (2 Cor. iv. 3.) meaning those only who are fully under the power of sin, having the veil yet upon their hearts, through the prevalence of pride, prejudice, and ungodly lusts.

כְּבֹדָה וְלֹא This epithet is the same as the one at the beginning of the verse, having the addition of a negative prep., which the Hebrew idiom requires, in order to give greater energy to any declaration of this kind.

וְהַשְׁבִּיחָהּ kal pret. 1st pers. pl. with suff. 3d pers. mas. sing. ab חָשַׁב to think, regard, esteem, value.

Surely they were our griefs which He bare, *
 And our sorrows with which He burdened Himself;
 Yet, we regarded Him plagued,
 Smitten by God, and afflicted.

Since the fall to the first Advent, the Messiah's suffering and Atonement for our sins, formed one of the grand themes of all inspired penmen. Moses in the plainest terms asserts that it is blood alone which makes atonement for the soul, and constantly directs our attention by all the rites and sacrifices of his economy

* אָכַן (prop. inf. abs. Hiph. for הָכִין establishing, ab כָּרַךְ to confirm, establish, maintain.)—particula affirmativa, surely, certainly, truly—particula adversativa, but, yet.

חָלְיִיכָהּ for חָלְיִיכָהּ n. mas. pl. (of חָלִי) with suff. 1st pers. pl. pron. ab חָלָה to be weak, sick, pained, grieved.

נָשָׂא kal 3d pers. pret. sing. ab נָשָׂא to lift or raise up; to bear, carry; to bear any one's sin, i. e. to receive the punishment of sin upon oneself, as אָבִי בְעוֹן הָאָב מִדַּע לֹא-נָשָׂא הִבֵּן בְּעוֹן הָאָב "why doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father? בֶּן לֹא-יִשָּׂא בְעוֹן הָאָב וְאָב לֹא-יִשָּׂא בְעוֹן הִבֵּן "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son. Ezekiel xviii. 19, 20; to take away any one's sin, i. e. to expiate, make atonement for sin, as עוֹן הָעֵדָה לְשָׂאתָ אֶת-עוֹן הָעֵדָה "To atone for the sin of the congregation. Levit. x. 17; to pardon sin, as וְאַתָּה נָשָׂאתָ עוֹן חַטָּאתִי "And thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." Pss. xxxii. 5.

מִמְכָּאֵיבֵיכָהּ n. mas. pl. (of מְכָאֵב) with pref. הַ conj. and suff. 1st pers. pl. pron. ab כָּאֵב to be in pain, either of the body or the mind; to be sorrowful, pained, grieved. Both חָלִי and מְכָאֵב mean external and internal pain—pain of soul; and represent the external and internal sufferings which the Messiah was to undergo in our stead, and thereby free us from the punishment of sin.

סָבַלְמָם kal 3d pers. pret. sing. mas. with suff. 3d pers. pl. mas. pron. ab סָבַל to bear; to bear griefs, sins, i. e. to receive the penalties which another has deserved, as וְאִנְחֵנוּ עוֹנֵי תִיהֵם סָבַלְנוּ And we have borne their iniquities. Lam. v. 7.

הִשְׁבֵּנוּהָ kal 1st pers. pret. pl. with suff. 3d pers. mas. sing. ab הִשְׁבָּה to think, regard, esteem, value.

to the Just who died for the unjust.* David in the most touching terms very minutely depicted the Messiah's suffering, even His death upon the Cross upwards of a thousand years before He actually appeared and suffered.† Isaiah in his peculiar and brilliant style endeavors to rivet our whole attention, not only on the reigning, but also on the self same suffering Messiah in a language free from all symbolical veil.‡ Zachariah, whilst describing the extent of the Messiah's kingdom, never lost sight of His sufferings and humiliation, and boldly asserts that it is the blood of the Covenant that sets the prisoners of Israel free.§ Daniel, who was so exact in his dates, fixed even the year of the Messiah's suffering, and emphatically adds, "but not for Himself."§ Thus we plainly see that the very circumstances which gave offence to the carnal mind of the Jews, and over which they stumbled and fell, were and are in reality the most powerful arguments for Christ's Divine mission—in accordance with Moses, the Prophets, and the Royal Psalmist of Israel. With what pathos should we then acknowledge—

נָגַע kal. pas. part. mas. sing. ab נָגַע to touch; to touch with force and violence, to smite, to strike, especially to strike with a plague (used of God.) יָדוּ נִגְעָה בָנוּ His hand did strike us heavily, i. e. plagued 1 Sam. vi. 9.

מָכָה Hoph. part. mas. sing. const. of מָכָה ab נָכַח to smite; to be smitten, to be smitten by God, smitten with a plague. הִכּוּ בַעֲפָלִים They were smitten with the Emerods 1 Sam. v. 12. Bellarminus, Galatinus, and other Romish divines, favouring the abs. form מָכָה as found in some manuscripts, read מָכָה אֱלֹהִים a smitten God, and used the phrase as a proof of the Messiah's Divinity.

הִמְעָנָה Pual part. mas. sing. with pref. ה conj. ab עָנָה (for עָנָה a verb הִמְעָנָה) to be afflicted, oppressed, depressed, humbled.

The same vicarious sense expressed in the verbs נָטָא and סָבַל is, in this case, applicable to the verbs נָגַע, נָכַח, and עָנָה; for the Messiah was plagued, smitten, and afflicted for "our" sins, Himself being without sin.

* See the accounts of the Mosaic sacrifices in the Pentateuch.

† See Psal. xxii. and xli.

‡ Isaiah l. 5, 6, and the whole of this chapter.

§ See Zachariah ix. 9, 11.

§ See Daniel ix. 25, 26.

“Surely they were our griefs which He bare, *
And our sorrows with which he burdened himself!”

This is indeed the most appropriate expression for all sinful men into whose corrupt heart the celestial rays of the Sun of Righteousness did penetrate. And, it becomes us, in whose heart the regenerating influence, which emanates from the Holy Ghost, is remarkably manifest, to confess with shame and confusion of face,

Yet, we regarded him plagued, †
Smitten by God, and afflicted.

There is a great deal of genuine remorse in this exclamation, more than is apparent at first sight. The converted man seems bewildered when contemplating the baseness of his ingratitude for all the mercies that were shown towards him, and the intenseness

* The application of this verse in Matth. viii. 17, has created no small degree of perplexity; and whilst several biblical critics attempted to explain Matthew's application, Bishop Pierce, dissatisfied with all expositions, is led to concede the possibility that the passage in Matth. is an interpolation. A reference, however, to Matth. xx. 28, will fully convince us that St. Matthew, far from denying the doctrine of vicarious atonement, he boldly asserts that the Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many. In chapter viii. 17, he only teaches us the palpable “cause and effect” as regards “sin and sorrow,” or “sin and sickness;” the diseases of the body being emblems of the sin of the soul.

† The following passage from the Babylonian Talmud—a work contemplated about the beginning of the sixth century, and is of undoubted authority to the Rabbinic Jews, furnishes a demonstrative evidence against the unnatural and forced interpretation of this verse, as given by the Jewish controversialists, and German rationalists:

ר' יוחנן אמר לא אברי עלמא אלא למשיח : מה שמו ? רבנן אמרי
חיוורתא דביר' שמו שנא' אכן חליינו הוא נשא ומכאובינו סבלם
ראנחנו חשבנוהו נגוע מוכח אלהים ומעונה :

Rabbi Johanan said the world was created only for the sake of the Messiah. What is his name? The Rabbies said His name is the Leprous of the house of Rabbi, as it is written,

“Surely they were our griefs which He bare,
And our sorrows with which He burdened Himself;
Yet, we regard Him plagued,
Smitten by God, and afflicted.”

See tract Sanhedrin, Perck Cheleck. fol. xcvi. col. 2.

of his ignorance of the indisputable fact that, unless Christ died, the Just for the unjust, all of us would have been lost to all eternity by reason of our sins, for in Adam we all died—a fact acknowledged even by the Jews who were under no controversial pressure.*

The following verse is an inspired paraphrase of this. In this verse is contained the melancholy but faithful confession, that we deserved to be put to continual griefs, but the Messiah, with amazing pity did bear them instead—that we deserved to be oppressed and crushed by reason of our richly merited sorrows, but the Son of God, through His boundless love and condescension, burdened Himself with them instead; and in the following, we are told what these griefs and sorrows are:—†

But He having been pierced on account of our transgressions,
 Having been bruised on account of our iniquities,
 Our entire chastisement was put upon Him,
 And by reason of His contusions we were healed.‡

* In the book of Zohar, which, if not a testimony from the first century of Christianity, is, to say the least, an authority of very great weight amongst the Rabbinical Jews, both in the east and in the west; we find the following:

וּלְמַלְאָא דְאִיהוּ אַקִּיל מֵעֲלֵיהוּ דִּישׁ וְנָטִיל עֲלֵיהּ לֹא חוּי בַר נֶשׁ
 דִּיכֹל לְמַסְבֵּל יִיסוּרֵיהוֹן דִּישׁ עַל עוֹנְשֵׁי דְאִוְרֵיהֶּא הַה' אַכֵּן
 חֲלִינּוּ הוּא נֶשׂא וּמְכַאֲבֵנוּ סְבֻלָּם וְאַנְחֵנוּ חֲשַׁבְנוּהוּ נְגוּעַ מוֹכַח
 אֱלֹהִים וּמַעֲרֹנָה :

And unless He (Messiah) took them (the chastisements) away from Israel, and transferred them to Himself, there would be no man who could bear the chastisements of Israel, on account of the great heaviness of the punishments pronounced in the law; and this is what is written:

“Surely they were our griefs which He bare,
 And our sorrows with which He burdened Himself;
 Yot, we regarded Him plagued,
 Smitten by God, and afflicted.”

See the Commentary Zohar, on Exod. fol. xcv. col. 3. Edit. Lublin.

† The two oldest translations seem to have anticipated Isaiah's interpretation; for, instead of the words “our griefs,” they have the words “our sins:”—lxx. : Οὐτως τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέροι.

Targum:—בְּכֵן עַל חוּבְנָא הוּא יְבַעֵי וְעָוִיתָנָא בְּדִילֵיהּ יִשְׁתַּבְּחוּן

“Because of our transgressions He makes intercession, and through Him (or for His sake) our sins will be forgiven.”

‡ מְחַלְלֵל for מְחַוְּלֵל Pual. part. sing. mas. ab חָלַל to perforate, transfix or pierce through, having special reference to mortal wounds; hence חָלַל pierced through, i. e. mortally wounded. See Deut. xxi. 1, 9.

Here we behold the Messiah in the capacity of an Almighty and most affectionate physician, who, in order to save His patients, by some extraordinary process, transferred their maladies to Himself.

מִפְּשָׁעֵיכֶם n. mas. pl. with pref. מִ causative, prep. and suff. 1st pers. pl. pron. ab פָּשַׁע to sin, transgress; to turn away from God; to be in a state of rebellion against God.

מִדְּבַא Pual part. sing. mas. ab דָּבַא to bruise, break in pieces, to crush in pieces. Figuratively, it is used to denote the most severe internal and external sufferings. This is very expressive of the excessive severity of our Saviour's sufferings.

מִמְעֹרֹתֵיכֶם n. mas. pl. with pref. מִ causative, prep. and suff. 1st pers. pl. pron. ab עָוָה to act perversely, to sin; hence, עָוֹן perversity, depravity, a depraved action, a crime, a sin; a punishment as the penalty of sin.

מִבְּרֹחַ n. mas. sing. const. of בְּרַחַב ab יָסַר to correct by blows or stripes; to chastise very severely. See Dent. xxii. 18, 1 Kings, xii. 11, 14, Prov. xxii. 15, xxiii. 13. To correct by words, hence to admonish; to instruct. This verb differs from הִזְכִּירָה Hiph. of יָרַח, in applying primarily to the more severe discipline, and thence transferred to that which is milder; whilst הִזְכִּירָה applies primarily to the milder discipline of admonition and reproof, and thence transferred to the more severe, as that of stripes and punishment.

שָׁלוֹמְךָ n. mas. sing. with suff. 1st pers. pl. pron. ab שָׁלוֹם a derivative from שָׁלַם to be whole, sound, safe; to have peace, friendship with any one, to be at peace with any one.

עָלֶיךָ prep. comp. of עָלַ and suff. 3d pers. sing. mas. pron. ab עָלָה to go up; to be high, lifted up; hence עָלַ upon, over. The construction of the n. מִבְּרֹחַ with this prep. utterly precludes the idea of mere warning or instructing, suggested by the Jews and the Rationalists; and shows that the chastisement or punishment which has accomplished our salvation, did lay as an oppressive burden, not on us, but upon the sufferer. This establishes the doctrine of the Messiah's vicarious satisfaction.

אֲבִתְבְּרֹתָי n. fem. sing. with pref. אֲ conj., ב prep. and suff. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab בְּרָהָה put here collectively for stripes, contusions; from בָּרַחַב to be marked with stripes, i. e. with the traces of stripes and blows.

נִרְפָּא Niph. pret. 3d pers. sing. ab רָפָא to cure, heal; in a spiritual sense, to pardon, forgive. Niph. נִרְפָּא was healed, is used here impersonally. It was healed לָכֶם to us, we were healed.

Rather than we should perish forever, "Christ laid down His life a ransom for many. This furnishes us with a view of the desperate state of mankind before Christ did so. But for Him, who took upon himself the burden of our exceedingly great sins, we would have been lost to all eternity. But for His infinite love which induced Him to have our entire chastisement put upon Him, we would have been crushed under the heavy weight of our accumulated transgressions. Though sin has so far affected us with disease, that our whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint; from the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness in us, but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores; yet, by reason of His contusions we were healed; for, "in Him we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace."*

* Ephesians i. 7.

[TO BE CONTINUED IN THE NEXT NUMBER.]

ART. III.—THE TEACHINGS OF THE DEAD.

Obituary of Mrs. ELIZA LELAND, consort of Rev. A. W. LELAND, D.D., Professor of Theology in the Seminary at Columbia, S. C., and epitaphs from the burial place. Charleston: Steam press of Walker, Evans & Co., No. 3, Broad street. 1857. Printed but not published.

Circular letter of the bereaved consort, in reply to letters of condolence, on occasion of the death of Mrs. LELAND. Printed but not published.

In Memoriam, obituary notices of Mrs. SARAH E. ADGER.

The clay that is moistened sends back no sound. Yes, Death is silent to the ear, but it ever speaketh to the heart.

HERVEY GILES.

The good and the true,
Never die—never die;
Though gone they are here
Ever nigh—ever nigh.

There is a voice from the tomb sweeter than song; there is a remembrance of the dead, to which we turn even from the charms of the Living. These we would not exchange for the song of pleasure or the bursts of revelry.

Thou art not lost,—thy spirit giveth
Immortal peace, and high it liveth!
Thou art not mute—with angels blending,
Thy voice to me is still descending.

Thou art not absent,—sweetly smiling,
I see thee yet, my griefs beguiling!
Soft o'er my slumbers art thou beaming,
The sunny spirit of my dreaming.

Thine eyelids seem not yet concealing,
In death, their orbs of matchless feeling;
Their living charms my heart still numbers,
Ah! sure they do but veil thy slumbers.

As kind thou art; for still thou'rt meeting
The breast which gives the tender greeting!
And shall I deem thee altered?—Never!
Thou'rt with me waking—dreaming—ever!

THE SPEAKING DEAD.

BY H. W. LONGFELLOW.

When the hours of day are numbered,
And the voices of the night
Wake the better soul that slumbered,
To a holy, calm delight;

Ere the evening lamps are lighted,
And, like phantoms grim and tall,
Shadows from the fitful firelight
Dance upon the parlor wall;

THE TEACHINGS OF THE DEAD.

Then the forms of the departed
Enter at the open door ;
The beloved, the true hearted
Come to visit me once more :

He, the young and strong, who cherished
Noble longings for the strife,
By the roadside fell and perished,
Weary with the march of life!

They, the holy ones and weakly,
Who the cross of suffering bore,
Folded their pale hands so meekly,
Spake with us on earth no more !

And with them the being beauteous,
Who unto my youth was given,
More than all things else to love me,
And is now a saint in heaven.

With a slow and noiseless footstep,
Comes that messenger divine,
Takes the vacant chair beside me,
Lays her gentle hand in mine.

And she sits and gazes at me,
With those deep and tender eyes,
Like the stars so still and saint like,
Looking downward from the skies.

Uttered not, yet comprehended,
Is the spirit's voiceless prayer ;
Soft rebukes in blessings ended,
Breathing from her lips of air.

O, though oft depressed and lonely,
All my fears are laid aside,
If I but remember only
Such as these have lived and died. •

CHRISTIANITY is distinguished from all other forms of religion in all that is essential both to the well being of the life that now is and of that also which is to come. But in nothing, perhaps is this contrast more striking than the aspect in which it regards sorrow, bereavement and death. These constitute the mystery of life, and the mastery of all human wisdom and philosophy ; hovering over humanity in fearful darkness ; terrifying us by the loud and incessant crashes of their thunder ; and ever and anon bursting in storms of devastating fury. And as all other religions have stood aghast, mute and motionless before such appalling phenomena, Christianity demonstrates its inspiration and divinity by at once resolving the mystery, and imparting peace and consolation to the troubled spirit.

The earth, as Christianity teaches us, is now enveloped in a murky atmosphere of cloud and sunshine with its ever varying lights and shadows, as emblematic of the blighting curse of sin of which all sorrow is the shadow and all death the penalty. The present dispensation and government of the world is therefore, Christianity

teaches us, temporary and not final, partial and not complete, preparatory and not perfect, probationary and not retributive. It is purely a disciplinary dispensation, where everything is made to work together so as to form, develop, and mature character, whether evil or good, in view of a state, and life, and world, everlasting. The race of man is not now in its pristine and perfect condition. The earth is not what it first was. The relations between God and man are not those of a father infinitely wise and benevolent rejoicing over his children in whom He sees everything good. Men are now fallen, sinful, guilty, imperfect and helpless creatures; and God is now revealed, as having in Christ, devised a scheme of infinite mercy, whereby He is reconciling sinners unto Himself, reinstating them in holiness, and fitting and preparing them for full and final happiness in His heavenly kingdom.

All events are therefore subordinated to this gracious purpose, and to be interpreted by this light. And is it not a blessed light? Does it not at once dissipate all darkness, bring order out of confusion, impart joy to sorrow, hope to despair, life in death, and brighten every cloud of grief with a tinge of heavenly wisdom and unspeakable tenderness. Sickness and sorrow now become handmaids to virtue; tutors and governors training and educating immortal minds for the maturity of perfect men in Christ Jesus. Death is not an end. It is only a transition, a stage in our journey, a step on the onward march to immortality, a halt in the pilgrimage through the desert: on our way to the heavenly Canaan, a passage over the Jordan, or a transformation out of this earth-worm, chrysalis condition, to the seraph-winged beauty of a spiritual and angelic nature.

All other religions have considered death as an end, a cessation of existence, an awful catastrophe, the annihilation of the body, and the vanishing of the soul into thin air—to roam in dreary sadness through the gloomy shades and by the turbid waters of some unknown region of the dead.

Moschus sung thus mournfully :

“ Ah, Mallows in the garden die,
Parsley, and blooming Dill,
Yet waken'd by the vernal sky
Again their course fulfill.

While we, the wise, the strong, the brave,
Have no fresh spring in store;
But silent in the hollow grave
Sleep on for evermore.”

Homer is not less plaintive :

“ Men fade like leaves” that drop away
Beneath the parent shade,

Others again succeed, but they
Are in oblivion laid.

So spake the sire of Grecian song ;—
Through each succeeding age
The words are caught and borne along
By poet, saint, and sage.

“ Better” said Achilles,

“ be slaves on earth
Of some poor hind than king of all the dead.”

So doth man’s sinful nature deem
With ill-foreboding gloom,
And strays as in a fearful dream
In realms beyond the tomb.

For want, disgrace, and servitude
Seem nothing in that hour,
When Death’s huge pinions o’er us brood,
We feel his chilling power.

Christianity alone has brought man’s immortality to light, revealed and illustrated it, and endeared it to us by bright and beautiful descriptions of it. Christianity alone, has demonstrated that death is a portion, not the end of life ; a change, not the destruction of the earthly house of this tabernacle ; a development, not a decay of strength and beauty ; or to employ its own peculiar and exquisitely attractive representation, a sleep from which the weary and troubled spirit shall awake refreshed and invigorated, rejoicing in the clear dawning of a celestial day.

All other religions also consecrated pride, passion, stoical indifference, insensibility to grief and pain, and forgetfulness of the dead. It was only thus they could, in any measure, escape from the power of these evils, and blunt the point of their severity. And hence, while ordinarily, they carefully concealed and ignored their existence, we find that on occasions of social festivity, they were wont to introduce them in their ugliest form of representation, in order that by the combined hilarity and excitement of the company, they might triumph over their awful power, and make them subservient to their greater excess of riot.

“ Religion showed her head from realms above,
Threatening mankind with visage horrible.”

’Twas thus that clad in storms of yore
She spread her awful mein,
And in dread lightnings ope’d the door
Of the eternal scene.

Sad shades and shapes were there revealed
 In dismal vision clear,
 While conscious Guilt the pencil held,
 And dark—portending Fear.

But Abram saw his children throng
 Like stars in heaven at night,
 Those stars they heard the angelic song,
 And from their orbs of light
 Came Bethlehem's star, which with us dwells;
 Since when they nearer roam,
 But seem to walk, like sentinels,
 Around our earthly home.

Christianity, therefore, consecrates sorrow, and leads us to the house of mourning. It quickens and refines our sensibilities, that we may be the more susceptible to their hallowed influences. It opens up to them the deepest recesses of the heart, and every principle in our nature. It eliminates from these scenes of trial and these pangs of nature, an elevating, refining, purifying alembic, with which to restore health to the soul and comfort to the disconsolate. It crowns with the diadem of valour—patience in tribulation, and fortitude in adversity. It exalts as the greatest hero the greatest sufferer, who is made perfect through manifold afflictions, and who in hopeful confidence presses on to the kingdom of God. Instead of hopelessly drawing from these sufferings and sorrows provocations to abandoned self-indulgence in present pleasures, christianity regards them as incentives to self denial, humility, activity in well-doing, and a hearty consecration of the life that now is, to a fitting preparation for the great hereafter.

Other religions buried their dead out of sight that they might soon pass out of mind; covered them with the pall of silence, and left them in eternal darkness.

Catullus, to give point to one of his ditties, thus sentimentalizes on a brother's death.

“Horatius, now unceasing sore distress
 From the Aonian maids withdraws my mind,
 For how can it the muses' theme express,
 Which toss'd by its own woes no rest can find?

For lately has my brother cross'd the strand
 Where Lethe flows by his dear pallid feet;
 He on the Retian shore in Trojan land
 Lies buried, and mine eyes no more shall meet.

No more to speak to thee! no more to hear!
 No more to see thee! from my bosom torn
 My brother! unto me than life more dear!
 Still will I ever love thee, ever mourn."

Even the atheistic Lucretius is haunted by the same fear of death, and painfully portrays the efforts of mankind to escape from it.

Then Avarice and Ambition, passions blind,
 "Which beyond bounds of right urge on mankind,
 Associates and ministers of crime,
 To labour nights and days upward to climb.
 These rankling wounds that tend on mortal breath
 Are but occasion'd by the dread of Death:
 For shame, contempt, and poverty severe
 Apart from sweet and stable life appear,
 "Dwelling beside Death's portals. Hence men fear,
 And far, far off to flee them with false dread
 They strive, as from the dwellings of the dead;—
 In flame sedition, civil wars, and heap
 Wealth upon wealth, slaughter on slaughter, steep
 Their hands in citizens' and in kinsmen's blood,
 And find no safety but in solitude."

Thus each man from himself attempts to flee,
 But bears within him that same enemy
 From which he would escape, then frets the more,
 Nor doth of his disease the cause explore;
 Which did he well discern, he soon would cast
 All other things aside, and to the last
 The nature of man's being strive to know:
 For 'tis not one short hour for weal or woe
 That is at stake,—but all eternity,
 All after death—the life that is to be.

Christianity on the other hand, cherishes the dead. She keeps them alive in undying memories. She communes with them spirit with spirit. She consecrates their graves, adorns and beautifies the place of their repose, and plants it with flowers and trees of heaven. This is to her a place of frequent resort. She loves to wander there, to read the past, to bring up the dead, to converse with them, and though dead, to hear them speak in the still small but thrilling voice of sainted purity. Here in her earliest times, she was sure to be found when hunted by the bloodhounds of persecution, and how often did the christian mourner water with her blood as well as tears, the grave of departed piety. And when driven from the *face* of the earth by relentless and inexorable in-

humanity, christianity took refuge within its bosom, and there amid the labyrinthine passages of catacombs, buried her dead, and amid their corpses slumbering peacefully in the surrounding niches of those subterranean walls, worshipped their common Saviour, sung praises to Christ as God, and made the caverned vaults resound with the songs of glory to Him who had abolished the reign of death, disarmed it of its sting, and the grave of its victory, and united the living and the dead who die in the Lord, in inseparable, blissful union.

And so it is now, and every where, and always. Satisfying every natural instinct and affection of the heart, christianity recognizes and sanctifies our yearning for our departed friends. How beautiful is the memory of the dead, as seen in her mellowing light ! What a holy and chastening influence does it exert upon the human heart ! Is there one who has not some loved friend gone to heaven, with whom he delights to live again in memory ? Does he not love to sit down in the hushed and tranquil hour of silent meditation, and bring before him the face and the form so familiar and cherished—to look into the eye which mirrored not more clearly his own face, than the soul which he loves, and to listen to the tones that were once melody in his ear ?

In a recent visit to a family burying ground, now with its deserted Church abandoned to decay, a writer beautifully illustrates this spiritual communion with the dead, by which christianity hallows and endears the place of their last repose.

There, in that quiet churchyard, dear reader, we first heard the burial service—then new to us—alas ! how familiar now.

We can recall that warm and sunny October day. A cold, still figure, lay in our home ; weights were upon the closed eyes to keep down the lids ; and the white, rigid hands, lay as they had been placed, on the still bosom. Tears had wetted the pillow—warm lips had strove with kisses, to melt the gathering ice of death, and a voice, made sharp with anguish, had gone up to Heaven pleadingly.

But all in vain !

We could not comprehend why, on this day, we were dressed in a black slip and black sleeve-knots ; and as our childish feet wound through the open gate into the graveyard, we sometimes stooped from the guiding hand to pick up the tufts of scarlet and yellow leaves, which made this place of graves strangely gay. The coffin was set down beside an open grave, while the procession trailed through the long grass, and circled slowly around. The burial service for the dead was read, and then they laid the coffin upon ropes and gently lowered it. There was a harsh grating against the hard earth, then a shovel-full of loose soil was thrown upon the coffin. We recall, even now, the fearful, shivering, tightened clasp of a cold hand that drew us up to the grave's brink, as those cold clods fell upon the loved

bosom. But neither the anguish of the form at our side, nor the clinging clasp of the cold hand could win one answering sigh from that shrouded form.

They filled up the grave, and placed green sods upon the mound they raised, and when all was done, we went away and left the coffin deep in the quiet earth, where the bleak winds could not reach its inmate. The next day we were chasing the runaway bees, or playing with toys in our baby-house, or wondering why a pale, sad face, was all the time weeping.

October went by, and the trees put on their russet; long spires of pallid grass waved to and fro heavily; the wind awoke with a shiver, and marked its course with sobs and wailings; the brooks grew bluer, and chillier, and then the bare trees were wreathed in white; and that mound of earth, lost beneath the deep snow of winter, was forgotten by all but the stricken family. One mourner kept a path well trodden, and though we could not then comprehend why her face bent tearfully over that grave—we learned in after years (ah how bitterly) what it meant. We have comprehended, since then, what it is to have a coffin and a heap of earth between oneself and the author of one's being. Oh! it is a sorrowful thing to make the grave the only door to a meeting with one in whose bosom we have nestled.

Many an hour, in blissful childhood, we passed in that quiet graveyard with only one companion. Many a lesson was taught us beside that green mound—lessons of a bright spot, with flowers all fadeless, and sainted ones, and white winged throngs we were then told of. One who watched over the "widow and the fatherless," in their helplessness—counted all their tears and lightened all their burdens.

Long years have wheeled their weary round,
Since dark and deep they laid
Thy coffined form, and heaped the earth,
And bowed their heads and prayed.

Yet, Father, I have felt thy care,
In danger o'er me thrown;
And when cold hearts were gathering near,
I have not been alone.

Thou seem'st to clasp me in thine arms,
And hold me to thy breast;
When by the thronging cares of earth
I'm wearied and oppressed.

I seem to close my aching lids,
And sleep upon thy arm,
Which used to seem enough to me,
To shelter from all harm.

Yes, let us, as we may well do, talk pleasantly of the pious dead, as of those who no longer suffer and are tried. With them the fear and the longing, the hope, the terror, and the pain, are

passed. The fruition of life has to them begun. How unkind, how selfish, how unnatural, were it, when we inter their bodies to cease the utterance of their names—the tender-hearted dead, who so struggled in the parting from us—and more for our sakes than their own—why should we speak of them with awe, and remember them only with sighing! Very dear were they when hand clasped hand, and heart responded to heart, and why are they less dear, because grown perfect in loveliness and in loving kindness? By the hearth side, then, and by the grave side, in solitude and amid the multitude, let us speak cheerfully and lovingly of the dead.”

Our beloved have departed,
While we tarry broken-hearted,
In the dreary empty house;
They have ended life's brief story,
They have reached the home of glory
Over death victorious.

Hush that sobbing, weep more lightly,
On we travel, daily, nightly,
To the rest that they have found.
Are we not upon the river,
Sailing fast to meet forever,
On more holy, happy ground?

Whilst with bitter tears we're mourning,
Thought to buried loves returning,
Time is hasting us along,
Downward to the grave's dark dwelling,
Upward to the fountain welling
With eternal life and song!

See ye not the breezes hieing?
Clouds along in hurry flying?
But *we* haste more swiftly on—
Ever changing our position,
Ever tossed in strange transition—
Here to-day, to-morrow gone!

Every hour that passes o'er us
Speaks of comfort yet before us,
Of our journey's rapid rate;
And like passing vesper-bells,
The clock of time its chiming tells,
At eternity's broad gate.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE DEAD.

On we haste, to home invited,
 There with friends to be united
 In a surer bond than here;
 Meeting soon, and met forever!
 Glorious hope! forsake us never,
 For thy glimmering light is dear.

Ah! the way is shining clearer
 As we journey ever nearer
 To the everlasting home.
 Friends who there await our landing,
 Comrades round the throne now standing
 We salute you, and we come.

The dead are still with us. There is a communion more real and more satisfying than that of mere bodily, physical and social presence. We are, by original constitution, more mental, moral, emotional, and spiritual beings, than we are sensitive, sensual, and physical. And were we now what we were intended to be, that is, sinless beings—the body with its appetites and wants would be subordinated and kept under, and occupy but a small place in our estimation and regard. The subjugation of our affections and souls to the craving power and tyranny of bodily appetites and desires is that vanity to which the creature is now, by reason of sin, reduced, and in consequence of which the whole creation groans and travails in pain together, so that even the children of God groan within themselves, being burdened. Christianity hears the despairing cry, “oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death,” and brings deliverance. Grace elevates and ennobles man’s nature just in that proportion in which it reigns and rules within us. It purifies the moral atmosphere, dissipates the rank vapours of sensuality, and imparts to the faculties of memory, association, and imagination, power of abstraction, an ideal life, and a capacity to roam the future, bring near things distant, and clothe with reality things invisible and spiritual.

Oft when we pine afar from those we love
 More close we knit the spirit’s sympathies,
 By mutual prayer, distance itself doth prove
 A greater nearness. With such stronger ties
 Spirit with spirit talks, that when our eyes
 Beheld each other, *something sinks within,*
Mocked by the touch of earth’s realities.

This wondrous capacity of the soul to hold communion with far distant friends is sometimes so vivid, as to give a realizing

sense of their presence and power over us. The experience alluded to is very graphically described by a recent and very pictorial tourist in Europe.

“Thus o'er the sea, as slumbers turned to dreaming,—
That so mocks real life with vivid seeming,—
On spectral journeys, e'en in rest advancing,
I saw in prospect hills and rivers glancing :

When, lo ! a hand I feel my steps arresting,
And hear a strange, dumb, ghostly voice, requesting
My quick return, the track unfinished leaving ;
Whereat my soul, as in a swoon, sank grieving.

Wide through the world's eclipse again outreaching,
That vision of the night repeats its teaching ;
With sense of baffled will vague sorrow feeding,
My waking wit to understand exceeding.

Would earth or sky disclose for me a meaning ?
Were angel-forms of mortal towards me leaning ?
What summons thus subdued me to obeying
A shadow in my moving or my staying ?

Ah, shadow cast from life remote, retreating ?
Ah, cry from kindred heart more slowly beating !
O God ! so distantly could I be learning
For sight of me its fond and frequent yearning ?

Was spirit's ear, so fine, from spirit hearing
The whisper of a soft and tender fearing,
Lest never more should come, in earth's beholding,
What lay so deep within the bosom's folding ?

Where'er I went, went still the dream pursuing,—
My daily thoughts the nightly show reviewing ;
While naught I knew, howe'er I strove at knowing,
But only as it urged my feet were going.

Mystic conductor humbly not refusing,
Homeward I blindly sped, no moment losing ;
For solemn tidings at my door confessing
To what I owed affection's farewell blessing.

We are therefore made capable of a communion far deeper than that of bodily presence, or even of memory. It is a spiritual communion. It is that fellowship of which all that is material

all of the eye, and lips, and hands, all that constitutes our daily and most endearing social intercourse, are but the symbols. These are only interpretations of an interior intercourse, the sensible proofs of an insensible affection, pledges of its reality, means through which the spirit communes with spirit. They are therefore necessarily imperfect and unsatisfying. They are found, after all, to be barriers and interruptions to that closer and more endearing sympathy which their very intervention renders impossible. And hence it is, that they leave behind them an unappeased, quenchless longing for a nearer, dearer, and more perfect fellowship. The brightest hopes are darkened by their realization. Expectations the most enlarged are crushed by the felt poverty even of the richest luxuriance of earthly good, and feelings the most intense, which a letter read in absence will kindle into a flame, often die away into slumbering ashes upon the hearth stone of our homes. How much more soul-stirring is our communion with some gifted author, when we read his works, than when we see him face to face? And when we peruse the letter of a friend long dead, how powerfully beyond all personal presence, do they stir up the fountain of our deepest emotions.

And thus by some celestial art
 With friends that are apart,
 Associate feelings will awake,
 Or thoughts responsive break :
 As if some spirit of the skies
 Convey'd their sympathies !

Moves there 'mid minds some unseen power,
 Like bee from flower to flower ?
 With intermingling of their kinds—
 From each to each it winds,
 The seed, or dust, or honey brings
 On loaded thigh or wings.

Thus also it is that in the perusal of the Bible, in prayer, in worship, in the ordinances of the Lord's house, and especially in the Lord's Supper, the soul enjoys such near and living and delightful communion with that adorable and ever blessed Saviour, whom having never seen, it nevertheless loves, and in whom though now it sees Him not, it rejoices with joy unspeakable and full of glory. And so also is it found, that in the upper chamber where brethren are gathered together with one accord for prayer, and praise, and mutual exhortation, that heart blends with heart, and all are melted together as unto one living, loving soul.

Prayer ! mighty accent—language winged—supreme—
 Which in a single sigh blends all of love,
 Which makes a thousand loved ones, scattered far,
 Seen by the heart, and present before God ;

Making among them, by fair virtues boon,
 The viewless interchange of heaven's best gifts,
 One general speech, which swells unto the sky,
 And rises higher to be better heard.
 Incense unquenchable, which doth perfume
 Him who receives and him who lights the flame.
 For thus does soothing hope her powers employ,
 Sweet visions of long severed hearts to frame,
 Though absence may impair or death destroy,
 Their constant presence draws us still the same.

Such also is our permitted communion with the dead. Though dead, they yet live. They yet speak to us. They are near and round about us. We see them not. We hear them not. We feel them not, though even this one sometimes seem to do in sweet visions of the night. But we think of them. We conceive their well known forms. We remember all their love, all their natural features and manner and character. We believe them to exist and to be still identical, still personal. We believe that they also retain though purified and enlarged, these same powers and affections. They abide with them imperishably and forever. They must therefore be exercised towards us as ours are towards them, and thus produce mutual and real communion of souls and hearts, of memory, love, and hope. Wherever they are, and whatever may be their condition, we know of the pious dead that they are happy and holy, that they are with Christ in paradise, that they remember us, and pray for us from beneath the throne.

The dead. The dead are with us :
 And they throng around our way,
 And the greenness of their memory
 In our hearts can ne'er decay.
 When round the hearth we gather,
 We know that they are there ;
 And with them our spirits worship
 In the holy place of prayer.

Around our couch at midnight,
 Their forms flit slowly by,
 And in olden tones they speak to us,
 Ere they fade into the sky.
 At twilight, when the dew falls,
 They walk with us and sing,
 And their voice is like the murmuring
 Of swallows on the wing.

And when in social circle
 We join the merry band,
 Or in the hour of sorrow,
 Sit silent hand in hand.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE DEAD.

They come and sit beside us,
 And gaze into our eyes ;
 And we listen to their voices then,
 With a calm and mute surprise.

The departed—the departed,
 They crowd around me now,
 And a sweet and cheerful light of peace
 They shed upon my brow.
 I know they have not left me,
 Tho' no more I see their forms ;
 And their presence 'mid the strife of life,
 Is like sunshine seen in storms.

The beautiful, the beautiful,
 All silently they stand,
 Within the chambers of my soul,
 A fair and shadowy band ;
 And from out those chambers now and then
 This cheerful voice is given,
 "Oh! faint not, while ye walk below
 Ye dwell with us in heaven.

No earthly sorrow blight us,
 No chill misfortunes pain ;
 Then weep not, tho' with you no more—
 In form we walk again.
 Ye feel that we are with you—
 When ye wander by the streams,
 And ye see our faces as of old,
 In the pleasant light of dreams.

And when in twilight musings
 Ye think of us as dead—
 And o'er our grassy resting place
 The sweet spring flowers ye spread.
 Remember, for the soul that *lives*
 There can no ending be—
 Remember that the soul once born,
 Lives thro' eternity."

The dead, therefore, still speak to us. They soothe and comfort us with a present, a living, and a loving communion, and with the hope of a perfect personal union in that better world where we shall see eye to eye, and know even as we are now known. They draw our hearts after them. They are not gone where we never expect, or wish, to go, but to a better country than this, a country which is ours also—to which we have an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, reserved for us—and to which we have even now secured to us an indisputable title.

We remember when a boy, seeing a much elder brother jump from the wharf into the boat which conveyed him to the vessel that bore him to this foreign land. He was the first link severed from a large family, and the event was sadly impressive. How anxiously did we watch the receding sail until it was finally lost in the blue horizon. How often afterwards when walking along the sea shore did we feel consoled by the thought that the same Atlantic ocean which spread itself out in magnificent beauty before us, rolled its waves to this further shore, where he might be also treading—that the sun which was sinking beneath the western horizon, would in the morning rise upon the eastern—and that the same moon and stars which kindled glory in the evening sky, attracted the upward gaze of the distant wanderer. When we met around the family altar, how refreshing was it to mention his name, to remember him in prayer, and to feel that around the mercy seat however separated in body, we could mingle our spirits and our petitions. And as one brother after another were attracted to this land of promise, how were the affections of those behind centred here! How home-like did America become! And how gradually were all remaining ties of home and kindred loosened, until they were willingly, though sadly, severed, in the hope of a reunion here. And thus is it when friend after friend departs to the celestial land. They are not lost, but gone before. They are not dead, they only sleep bodily in our dust, while their spirits have returned to God. They are now with him. They are where we wish soon to be, and where alone we can be fully and abidingly happy. They are gone to prepare a place for us, that where they are, we may also be. And we cannot but feel more and more weaned from earth as we think of them, and commune with them, and as we become more and more desirous to depart and be with Christ and them, which is far better.

Were earth our home, our rest, our end, these severings of heart-strings, these separations of commingled souls by the blank wall of death through which we cannot see, and over which we cannot pass, how dreadful would they be! But if this world is but our place of probation, discipline, and preparation for our true homes and rest, oh how needful are these bereavements to sever our affections from the things of earth, around which, like parasitic plants, they so luxuriantly entwine, and thus open up to us that heavenly radiance they had so much obscured. How sweetly does Fanny Forrester depict these earth loving ties of every human heart.

O do not let me die! the earth is bright,
 And I am earthly, so I love it well;
 Tho' heaven is holier, all replete with light,
 Yet I am frail, and with frail things would dwell.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE DEAD.

I cannot die! the flowers of earthly love
 Shed their rich fragrance on a kindred heart;
 There may be purer, brighter flowers above,
 Yet with these ones 'twould be too hard to part,

I dream of heaven, and well I love those dreams.
 They scatter sunlight on my varying way;
 But 'mid the clouds of earth are priceless gleams,
 Of brightness, and on earth O let me stay.

It is not that my lot is void of gloom,
 That sadness never circles round my heart;
 Nor that I fear the darkness of the tomb,
 That I would never from the earth depart.

'Tis that I love the world, its cares, its sorrows,
 Its bounding hopes, its feelings fresh and warm,
 Each cloud it wears, and every light it borrows,
 Loves, wishes, fears, the sunshine and the storm.

I love them all; but closer still the loving
 Twine with my being's cords and make my life;
 And while within this sunlight I am moving,
 I well can bide the storms of worldly strife.

Then do not let me die! for earth is bright,
 And I am earthly, so I love it well—
 Heaven is a land of holiness and light,
 But I am frail, and with the frail would dwell.

And as no one has learned by more touching sorrows and be-
 reavements their heavenly power to wean the renewed soul from
 earth, and assimilate and uplift its desires to heaven, so no one
 has more beautifully and feelingly portrayed it than this same
 writer.

Yes, let me die! Am I of spirit-birth,
 And shall I linger here where spirits fell,
 Loving the stain they cast on all of earth?
 O make me pure, with pure ones e'er to dwell.

'Tis sweet to die! The flowers of earthly love,
 (Frail, frail spring blossoms) early droop and die;
 But all their fragrance is exhaled above,
 Upon our spirits evermore to lie.

Life is a dream, a bright but fleeting dream
 I can but love; but then my soul awakes,
 And from the mist of earthliness a gleam
 Of heavenly light, of truth immortal breaks.

I shrink not from the shadows sorrow flings
 Across my pathway ; nor from cares that rise
 In every foot-print ; for each shadow brings
 Sunshine and rainbow as it glooms and flies.

But heaven is dearer. There I have my treasure ;
 There angels fold in love their snowy wings ;
 Their sainted lips chant in celestial measure,
 And spirit fingers stray o'er heav'n-wrought strings.

There loving eyes are to the portals straying ;
 There arms extend a wanderer to fold ;
 There waits a dearer, holier One, arraying
 His *awn* in spotless robes and crowns of gold.

Then let me die. My spirit longs for heaven.
 In that pure bosom evermore to rest ;
 But if to labor longer here be given,
 "Father, thy will be done!" and I am blest.

Were this communion with the dead more constantly and believably maintained, would it not have much influence in learning us to live better and happier and holier lives. Selfishness, self-will, and many painful infirmities of disposition and peculiarities of character interfere, to a very unhappy extent, with social enjoyment and happy fellowship even in families and kindred. In the daily intercourse of life, these occasion many a harsh jar and dissonance of feeling, and mars the harmony of the best concerted spirits. They lead us sadly to undervalue the sweet charities of love, and kindness, and self denial and forbearance. They lead us to dwell upon the rough and ugly, or at least unlovely features in each other's character, and to think less of those which may be lovely and attractive. Alas for us, we are blind and ignorant as to what the real happiness of earth is, until it is forever taken from us. This is one chief reason why in absence our affections are so much deepened. We cease to think so exclusively or frequently of what is imperfect and unlovely. All that is good and true and beautiful, comes before us as they do to the poet's and the painter's eye, enshrine the ideal picture on which we so fondly gaze, and make us wonder that in communion with such a character, we should not enjoy perfect union of heart and sympathy. But it is only, as has been said, when those whom we love pass away, that, realizing a great loss, we learn how vital was that relation, how inestimable the privilege which is withdrawn forever. How quick, then, is our regret for every harsh word which we have spoken to the departed, or for any momentary alienation which we have indulged! This, however,

should not reduce us to a morbid sensitiveness, or an unavailing sorrow, seeing that it is blended with so many pleasant memories; but it should teach us our duty to the living. It should make our affections more diligent and dutiful. It should check our hasty words, and assuage our passions. It should cause us day and night, to meet in kindness and part in peace. Our social ties are golden links of uncertain tenure, and, one by one, they drop away. Let us cherish a more constant love for those who make up our family circle, for "not long may we stay." The allotments of duty, perhaps, will soon distribute us into different spheres of action; our lines, which now fall together in a pleasant place, will be wide apart as the zones, or death will cast his shadow upon these familiar faces, and interrupt our long communion. Let us, indeed, preserve this temper with all men—those who meet us in the street, in the mart, in the most casual or selfish concerns of life. We cannot remain together a great while, at the longest. Let us meet, then, with kindness, that when we part, no pang may remain. Let not a single day bear witness to the neglect or violation of any duty which we owe to our fellows. Let nothing be done which shall lie hard in the heart when it is excited to tender and solemn recollections. Let only good-will beam from faces that so soon shall be changed. Let only pleasant and fragrant feelings spring up in those hearts over whose common grave nature will soon plant her tributary flowers.

With what patience and thankfulness also, do the dead teach us to enjoy the blessings which are still continued to us, and to bear with thankful resignation the trials and discomforts which are mingled with our lot. Imperfect in ourselves, nevertheless, with monstrous inconsistency, expect perfection in others, and while unhappy and discontented within ourselves, we are easily worried and fretted by trifling inconveniences around us. We take but little account of our multiplied mercies, in our undue regard to incidental evils. It is only when some loved one is taken from our family circle, that we realize how, in comparison with the loss of that child, or wife, or husband, or parent, all the inconveniences and trials of life are as nothing, and less than nothing, and vanity. We could now cheerfully endure a thousand ills greater than any we have borne, if only borne in fellowship with the departed one. But in Him as by one devastating wave, everything has been swept away, and the earth has become a dreary waste. What was before great, has become of little value. What we most coveted, ceases to attract. And the trifles which annoyed us, have sunk into insignificance. Let us then lay this to heart. Let us learn and ponder upon the needful lesson. Let us turn our thoughts to the friends still spared to us. Let us duly estimate their priceless value. Let us practically feel the evanescent, temporary, and incidental nature of all our possible trials.

And remembering how soon God can desolate our hearts and our houses, by one single visitation of His bereaving providence, let us prize one another as our chiefest earthly treasure, and find in each other's society, hallowed by pure and undefiled religion, the only antidote to all our earthly cares, the compensation for all our trials.

AH! GRIEVE NOT SO.

"Godliness with contentment is great gain."—1 Tim. 6, 6.

"Nicht so traurig, nicht so sehr."

Ah! grieve not so, nor so lament
My soul! nor troubled sigh,
Because some joys to others sent
Thy Father may deny;
Take all as love that seems severe—
There is no want if God is near.

There is no right thou canst demand,
No title thou canst claim;
For all are strangers in the land
Who bear the human name:
Earth and its treasures are the Lord's,
And He the lot of each accords.

How thankless art thou, child of man!
For favors that abound;
Thy God has given thee eyes to scan
The glory all around;
Yet seldom for this priceless sight,
Hast thou been heard to praise aright.

Number thy limbs, thy members tell,
And ask thy thankless soul,
If another thou wouldst sell
Even the smallest of the whole.
There is not one from which thy heart
Would willingly submit to part.

Now, go and search the depths of mind,
Explore its wondrous power,
New proofs of benefits to find,
That meet thee every hour;
More than the sand upon the shore,
And ever rising more and more.

He knows, who lives on Zion's hill,
What we in truth require;
Knows too how many blessings still
This flesh and blood desire;
And could He safely all bestow,
He would not let thee sorrowing go.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE DEAD.

Thou wert not born that earth should be
 A portion fondly sought ;
 Look up to heaven, and smiling see
 Thy shining golden lot !
 Honours and joys, which thou shalt share,
 Unending and unenvied there !

Then journey on to life and bliss,
 God will protect to heaven ;
 And every good that meets thee is
 A blessing wisely given.
 If losses come, so let it be—
 The God of heaven remains with thee.

That these lessons may have all their impressiveness, let us remember that the dead constitute a multitude, in comparison with whom, all the living are as nothing. There are alive upon the earth some one thousand millions of human beings. How many, then, have lived and died during the six thousand years that have elapsed since man first became an inhabitant of earth. Their number is legion. It is past finding out. Could they return to this world, it would not be able to contain them. Could they encompass it round about, they would darken all the sky. And we shall see them, one and all, on the great final day of the gathering together in one, of the quick and the dead, before the throne of final judgment. At death we enter among them in one or other of their present habitations, where they await in longing hope, or fearful apprehension, the consummation of all things. And even now, they soar round about us, though we see them not, as a great cloud of witnesses, if not, also to some extent, perhaps, as ministering spirits. With what a pressure of the powers of the world to come, ought, then, their testimony to be heard. How much more ought it to impress us than any utterances of the living, beguiled as they are by sin and satan, and unwise and evil ways ?

And with what unanimity does the whole multitude of the dead, testify by the brevity of their lives and the necessity of their death, that life is vanity except as spent in preparation for eternity ; that death is certain and near ; that health is but the sap of the tree, which the winter's blast will soon drive again to the earth ; that beauty is only the blossom of the flower, which even in blooming fades ; that fame is but the fragrant perfume which exhales and disappears as soon as it is given—and that all the lusts of the flesh, and the lusts of the eyes, and the pride of life, are less than nothing and vanity, sunbeams sparkling upon the waters of death ! With what overpowering emphasis, also, do the dead, one and all, exclaim, " Prepare, O man, to meet thy God. Live not for self, or for sin, or ease, or wealth, or pleasure, or for any thing seen and temporal, for what shall it profit you to gain all these and lose your undying soul."

In thy heart there is a chamber,—
None but God and thou hath seen it—
Darkened by the sombre shadows
From the folds of thought that screen it.

On its walls are many pictures
Painted by the hand of time,
Sketches of those mystic regions
In the Infinite sublime.

There are portraits of the faces
That have passed away from earth,
Glimpses of those sunny places
Sacred to thy childhood mirth.

Of the homestead, old and mossy,
Close beside the meadow green,
Where the brooks like threads of silver,
Wound their graceful curve between.

And, it is a haunted chamber,
There the ghosts at midnight stray,
Silent as the stars that wander
Down the white-pav'd Milky Way.

You behold the light forms trembling
In their pure robes like a bride,
And they look so like the living
You forget that they have died.

You forget the marble features
Of the friend you laid to rest,
You forget the pale hands folded
On a pulseless, soulless breast.

But you see him slowly walking
'Mid the glow life's sunset weaves,
When his lips dropp'd farewell blessings
As the trees their autumn leaves.

Thus comes he long since departed,
Reaching out his hands to thine,
And his lips unto thee murmur
In a tone which seems divine.

In this chamber stands a mirror,
Mem'ry's lamp hangs overhead,
Throwing down a soften'd radiance
On those pictures of the dead.

In its clear depths we distinguish
 What we were, and what we are,
 There our inner life reflected,
 Shows us hideous or fair.

Oh! 'tis in this secret chamber
 That we learn a solemn truth,
 As in links of spirit union,
 Age is join'd again with youth.

It is true that this testimony of the dead is given in mute silence. They speak to us but not in words. They utter their voice, but it is in a silence far more powerful than any language—in a way which is equally understood by every speech and language, and by every human heart. How silent, and yet with what mute eloquence speaks the vacant chair of the departed; the banquet hall now empty, cold, and damp, the silent woods, the mouldering ruin, the deserted house, the starry night with its eternal solitude! Who has ever felt such deep and soul-absorbing emotion, such soul-stirring and multitudinous thoughts, as when he has stood in the chamber where the good man breathes his last; when every eye is intent upon the slumberer sinking calmly into the untroubled sleep of death, when every breath is hushed, and an unearthly awe rests upon every spirit? But how much deeper still is the awe profound, when the mourners enter the room where that sleeper, whom the peal of a thousand cannons could not now disturb, lies still and motionless; and when they gather round the opened grave, and hear the clay rattling upon the coffin lid of the loved form so lately by their side.

Oh let that silent noise with which the dead so touchingly speaks to us, impress our hearts. Let us give it earnest heed. Let us open to it the ear of our inmost soul. Let us ponder and weigh it well. They tell us that with them all of life is now finished, and that, with death, is finished the all of every man's probation for eternity. Death closes the account and ends the harvest. Were it otherwise, would not He who loved the world with such an infinite love, have revealed it to us? He *has* revealed to us the future of the earth, the future of heaven and hell, and had there been any other probationary scene than this present life, would God not have made it known; would He not have allowed the angelic messengers, or some spirit among the just made perfect, to impart the consolatory truth? Life, then, and this life *only*,

— is the time to serve the Lord,
 The time to insure the great reward;

Since—

In the cold grave to which we haste,
 There are no acts of pardon past;
 But darkness, death, and long despair
 Reign in eternal silence there.

On him who dies in his sins, unpardoned, the wrath of God abideth forever, while they who die in the Lord, are blessed from henceforth and forever.

Thus do the dead yet speak to us. They tell us that as they were born, and lived, and died, individually, and not in companies or corporations, or churches, but each one alone and by himself, so did they all stand severally before the judgment seat of Christ, and there receive, according to their course in this world, whether good or evil. The dead also proclaim to us with united voice, the immutability of the divine law—God's impartial and un pitying justice, and the unerring certainty of retribution. Not one of all these myriads has escaped death, the penalty of God's violated law, except two, who were miraculously taken up to heaven, to prove to us that death is neither natural, nor necessary, nor final, to man. They teach us, therefore, that not one of all the generations yet unborn, shall be delivered from death. Not one of those now alive can pass by death into eternity. Just as certain as our birth and life, is also, our death. And as we live alone, individually, each one responsible for himself, his life, his character, his principles, opinions, and conduct, and for all these, as it regards man, and God, and Christ, the Savior, and the Holy Spirit—so must we one by one, die alone, and be judged alone, and be either damned or saved alone.

The dead also teaches us the all-important truth that death is no certain criterion of real piety. It ought to be such. It is naturally such. If ever a man is candid and sincere, he is so when all the motives for concealment, and all the influences of a worldly nature, must to a great extent cease to operate. This is generally the case. Death is the great teacher, and also the great revealer of secrets. And when death is met in a calmness, in full possession of reason, with a perfect knowledge of its near and inevitable approach, it will generally bring out the real character and disposition and principles. But it will not change a man's real character and fixed principles. These may be atheistic, infidel, pharasaic pride, self-righteous confidence, ignorance of the gospel, and reliance, therefore, on some refuge of lies, whose insecurity may be only discovered at death. Or a man may exhibit confidence in death from a reliance on the prayers of others, or baptism, or attendance at church, or what is called respect for religion, or a mere outward, formal, and worldly profession of religion. Or the character exhibited in death may be, as it often is, open, abandoned, hardened impiety, blasphemy and indifference. Death, in order to be felt as terrible, must be fully realized in its nature, and consequences, and dread alternatives. There is nothing in death itself, or in the mere pain of ordinary dying to terrify or alarm. The great majority of men probably meet death in a state of physical insensibility and mental weak-

ness or aberration. Many die just as the beasts that perish. Many die as the fool dieth, utterly thoughtless of the future. And many meet death while wholly at ease and quiet, and without any bands in their death. God gives many, also, up to damnable delusion, that they may believe a lie, so as to repose upon it as upon a bed of ease, even in death. God leaves men to die in all variety of forms, both of faith, feeling, and hope, in order that the living may not trust to a dying hour, or to dying experience, or to any dying expressions. In themselves, these are nothing, and worth nothing. At the very best, they only tell us what the man is, and thinks, and believes. But as often as otherwise, all such dying calmness and confidence are hollow and insincere, assumed and not real, the offspring of fear and alarm, or the desperate attempt of the cowardly and terrified spirit to keep up its courage, and to brave it out. Death is terrible not because it is painful. Sin is the sting of death, and it is only in proportion as this sin is realized, that the thought of death is alarming. The law which denounces and inflicts death as the penalty of its violation, is that which gives strength and vigour to this sting of death which is sin. It is this consciousness of guilt which inflames the conscience, kindles up fear, and terror, and a certain looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, since these all depend upon the clearness of our knowledge of the holiness and spirituality and breadth and immutability of God's law.

Of this law and of all sin involving guilt and punishment, all men have some knowledge, and therefore some fear; and although a man may drown that fear of death in wickedness, and pervert his conscience by false philosophy, and keep down a sense of guilt and a dread of death by pride, and conceal and try in every way to escape from it, and succeed too often in thus searing conscience as with a hot iron, and dying in utter stupidity—yet very often, in the worst and most ignorant of men, as for instance, in Pharaoh, in Nebuchadnezzar, in Belshazzar, in the sailors of Jonah's vessel, God awakens the sleeping conscience, and lets loose the dogs of hell, the worm that never dies, enkindles the fire that is never quenched, to torment them before the time, in order to demonstrate in the body in this life, and in this world, the nature and the beginning of that misery that shall hereafter be the portion of all who die in their sins. Of this, from time to time, God gives public and awful examples, as in the case of Voltaire, of Spira, of Paine, and of multitudes in private life, who are driven away in their wickedness, and with terrible apprehensions of their certain perdition. The experience and the testimony of one such sinner, dying in his reason, and with the full knowledge of all his previous atheism or infidelity, or unbelief in hell and damnation, is an irresistible proof of the reality of such fears and forebodings in the human soul, and of their certain premonition of the terri-

ble hereafter. They are otherwise utterly inexplicable, while the fact that in the majority of cases they may not be felt, can easily be accounted for on the principles already explained.

And we are here led to remark that just as it is with the teachings of the dead in their dying hour, so is it with their teachings after death. We have seen what death should teach to all, and that the dead should speak to all. But even as the ears of the dead are often closed, so that they cannot hear and therefore cannot feel aught, even so is it with the living. The ears of multitudes are closed, so that they will not hear, and their eyes shut, so that they cannot see, and their hearts hardened so that they cannot feel. To them the dead forgotten lie:

Their memory and their sense are gone,
Alike unknowing and unknown.
Their hatred and their love are lost,
Their envy buried in the dust;
They have no share in all that's done
Beneath the circuit of the sun.

But while this condition is common among men, it is abnormal—even unnatural. And while it is proverbial, that “dead men tell no tales,” yet if our relation to them has been one of crime, they haunt and terrify with their continual and unappeasable cry. Being dead they speak, and though not audible to others, their still small cry is louder than a peal of thunder to the terrified and self-tortured spirit. Better face ten thousand living foes than one dead victim of our crime.

This power of the dead to influence and terrify the prosperous living, is powerfully depicted by Shakspeare in many characters, and among others, in that of Claudius, king of Denmark. But perhaps no one has ever more truthfully portrayed the power of the dead over the guilty living than Hood, in his Eugene Aram.

And long since then of bloody men,
Whose deeds tradition saves;
Of lonely folk cut off unseen,
And hid in sudden graves;
Of horrid stabs in groves forlorn,
And murders done in caves.

And how the spirits of injured men
Shriek upward from the sod—
And how the ghostly hand will point
To show the burial clod;
And unknown facts of guilty acts,
Are seen in dreams from God.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE DEAD.

He told how murderers walked the earth
 Beneath the curse of Cain—
 With crimson clouds before their eyes,
 And flames about their brain;
 For blood had left upon their souls
 Its everlasting stain.

Nothing but lifeless flesh and bone,
 That could not do me ill;
 And yet I feared him all the more,
 For lying there so still;
 There was a manhood in his look,
 That murder could not kill.

And lo! the universal air
 Seemed lit with ghostly flame—
 Ten thousand thousand dreadful eyes
 Were looking down in blame;
 I took the dead Man by his hand,
 And called upon his name.

Oh God! it made me quake to see
 Such sense within the slain!
 But when I touched the ghostly clay
 The blood gushed out amain.
 For every clot a burning spot
 Was scorching in my brain.

My head was like an ardent coal,
 My heart was solid ice;
 My wretched, wretched soul, I knew
 Was at the devil's price;
 A dozen times I groan'd; the dead
 Had never groaned but twice.

And now from forth the frowning sky,
 From the heaven's topmost height,
 I heard a voice—the awful voice
 Of the blood-avenging sprite;
 "Thou guilty man! take up thy dead,
 And hide it from my sight!"

So wills the fierce avenging sprite,
 Till blood for blood atones!
 Ay though he's buried in a cave,
 And trodden down with stones,
 And years have rotted off his flesh—
 The world shall see his bones.

Of this terrific power of the dead to haunt and torment the living, the Bible gives many illustrations, both in its preceptive and historical books. Take one scene.

Behold, the price of courtly dance,
The fruit of the forbidden glance,
The head of Christ's great harbinger!
The voice which did repentance call,
From sylvans rude to palace hall;
Hush'd is that voice and tongue, and ne'er again shall stir.

Nay, is that tongue forever stilled?
Nay, it anew his ears hath fill'd,
That they can nothing hear no more;
Abroad the Baptist's shadow stalks,
In secret to his spirit talks
Of that incestuous crime more sternly than before.

He saw, and startled back, I trow,
When on that glittering festive scene
Death's silent image looked forth now
From that same majesty of brow,
Reproving, gray, serene.

We have seen what death is to thoughtless and unbelieving men, and how, while its teachings are too generally unheard and unheeded, in other cases they are heard in wailings of despair, and yells of premonitory damnation. Nor does death cease to be death, and therefore dreadful, to the Christian. To him also, death is the king of terrors—the last enemy that shall be destroyed—through fear of whom he is more or less in bondage all his life. To him as well as to others, and indeed in an eminent and peculiar degree, there is everything to make death fearful. He has a deep consciousness of sin, a clear knowledge of the law, and therefore a realizing conviction of guilt, of death as the penalty, of a coming judgment, and of an everlasting perdition. To meet death calmly, quietly, hopefully, or exultingly, with such a faith, and in the full possession of his reason, is only to be conceived of as possible on the supposition of a perfect self-deluding hope, or a certain inward, spiritual experience of the power of a divine Redeemer. True Christians are therefore living and dying witnesses for the truth and certainty, and sufficiency of Christian faith, hope, peace, and joy, not only to outride all the storms of life, but to hold us fast, and secure for us a glorious entrance into the haven of eternal felicity, amid the thunderings and lightnings and tempestuous hurricane of death itself.

How important, then, how inestimably valuable is the teach-

ings of the dead, especially of those who die in the Lord. They are signs and seals of the covenant of promise. They are epistles in which the sure mercies of God are seen and read of all men. They are like the setting of the sun in glory and in beauty, gilding the whole horizon of life with an unearthly splendour, and giving the promise of a coming morn more bright and beautiful. They are links between the spirit land and ours, already shining with its radiance, speaking with its tones of melodious sweetness, and imparting to us some earnest and foretaste of its seraphic joys. By their lives they taught us how to live, and by their death they teach us how to die. They were lovely in life, and beautiful! very beautiful in death! In them death appeared transformed from a spirit of darkness into an angel of light, from an executioner into a messenger, from an enemy into a friend, from a curse into a blessing, and from a terror into a triumph.

And these pious dead are still ours—still with us—and still speak to us. The blessed dead! how free from all sin and selfishness and stain of corruption, is the love we now cherish towards them. The earthly is all buried with that which in them was earthly, and the spiritual and unearthly in us now rises towards them as spirits of the just made perfect in heaven. There they shine, fixed immutably in purity and peace, and joy. They are ours forever—beyond all need of our sympathy, all sorrow for their sufferings, and all anxiety for their final salvation. They now await our coming in mansions of rest prepared for our common in-dwelling. We shall find them waiting for us in their garments of beauty, and with everlasting joy upon their heads.

How glorious and exalted are they! How reverently do we take their names into our sin-polluted lips! How do our hearts burn within us when we remember all the words they spake to us, the counsels they left behind, and the lessons they still enforce.

The immortal dead! how unchanging, how purified and enlarged is their love for us! With what ineffable tenderness do they look down upon us! With what unspeakable concern do they await the end of our course, and the last faithful and victorious conquest over sin and satan. And in view of the coldness of all, the formality of many, the worldliness of the most spiritual and the backsliding of the most devoted, how do they invoke us to walk humbly, to watch unto prayer, and to give all diligence to make our calling and election sure.

Hark! a voice, it cries from heav'n,
 Happy in the Lord who die;
 Happy they to whom 'tis given,
 From a world of grief to fly!
 They indeed are truly blest;
 From their labours then they rest.

All their toils and conflicts over,
 Lo! they dwell with Christ above;
 O! what glories they discover
 In the Saviour whom they love!
 Now they see him face to face,
 Him who saved them by his grace.

'Tis enough, enough for ever,
 'Tis his people's bright reward;
 They are blest indeed who never
 Shall be absent from their Lord!
 O! that we may die like those
 Who in Jesus then repose!

In such experience our church is rich. We have had a long line of faithful confessors who have gone up with a shout, and are now entered into their rest. We are well represented among the elders round about the throne, the servants of God, who serve Him day and night in His temple, and the innumerable multitude who worship before Him, and sing the new song of Moses and the Lamb. We have had a few apostates—alas for it—but we have had *many* martyrs. We may enrol upon our list of members *some* who have gone back, but more, many more that have followed the Lamb whither soever He led them, until they were translated by Him to His celestial fold. And while some have left our earthly abode, who, dying, gave no sign, no sure pledge and token of their safety, many have there been, whose dying, like their living, was sweet, and whose memory is yet fragrant with the odour of sanctity.

Among these not a few have left us within the last few years and to their happy number God has added two during the past year, to whom for our argument sake, and the benefit of the living, and the glory of God displayed in their lives and deaths, some allusion is due. One of these was a mother in Israel in one of our churches—who united with its first worshippers, watched with interest every step in its progress, celebrated its dedication, became by public profession a member of it in Feb., 1812—has ever since, for almost forty-five years, continued an humble, holy consistent, and zealous disciple, ever ready to co-operate in any good work, and never more happy than when the ways of her beloved Zion prospered, and when its children, and children's children were seen entering into covenant with their fathers' God, making His church their home, and His service their delight. To her, as to many, the very walls and stones and surrounding trees and cemetery, were dear and sacred. And for years past, when growing deafness prevented her from uniting in the service, she was still as desirous as ever to be present among

us, to commune with us in spirit, and in the silent meditations of her heart, often visible in the movement of her lips and the upward glancing of her eye—worship Him who seeth in secret, in spirit and in truth.

Of Mrs. Adger we may truly say, that no one ever knew her who did not love her, and feel attracted by her gentle, loving, and generous nature. With this she combined in rare union, firmness, wisdom, and good understanding, by which she was enabled, with divine assistance and blessing, to attach and yet to govern, to melt and at the same time mould the character of her nine children, eight of whom lived to mature age; one of whom is a herald of the cross, another of whom was "the beloved elder," another of whom occupies his place, of whom all have been long fellow-members with her in the church, and were around her bed-side, day and night during the four weeks of her gradual sinking into the sleep of death, and to every one of whom she is now a presence and a power, an atmosphere of love, a magnetic centre of irresistible attraction, and a fountain of sweet memories and blissful hopes.

Though it was not our privilege to be with her and them, in these weeks of wasting weariness to her decaying body, but of peace and quietness and assurance to her calm and heavenly spirit, we were permitted to receive with others, her dying farewell, and to rejoice in spirit with her and those around her, that through the loving kindness of her God and Saviour, death was to her gain, and the grave a blessed rest, where she awaits in hope the glory of God, that her last end was peace, and that she finished her course with joy.

She has left behind her the companion of fifty years to whom by her combination of attractive powers, meekness, sweet compliance, and tender persuasion, she has been indeed a help meet for him, to whom from behind the curtain of death she still stretches out the hand of love saying, yet a little while and where I am you shall also be. Be thou also faithful unto death and thou shalt receive with me a crown of life.

"Never couldst thou bear to grieve us—
Dearest mother, why to-day?
Wherefore wilt thou thus forsake us,
Why, oh! why refuse to stay?"
"Were it but our Father's will,
Gladly had I tarried still."

"Mother, see the bursting anguish
Of thy dear ones, loved so well;
See our eyes with grief o'erflowing—
Grief which words refuse to tell!"
"Children, bid me not remain:
Let me with my Lord remain!"

“ Ah ! and art thou really going
 To that dark and distant shore ?
 All *our* cares, our joys, our sorrows,
 All forgotten, shared no more !”
 “ Children, think not, say not so—
 To the land of *love* I go.”

“ From the circle of affection,
 Mother, must thou next depart ?
 Ah ! how many a link is broken
 Once uniting heart to heart !”
 “ Closer draw that gentle chain
 Round the lov'd who yet remain.”

“ Canst thou then so gladly leave us ?
 Is our grief unheeded now ?
 For thine eye is brightly beaming,
 Calm and cloudless is thy brow.”
 “ Yes ! for faith, and hope, and love,
 Draw me to my Lord above.”

“ Yet even there, in bliss undying,
 When thou numberest thine own,
 Mother, shall not *we* be wanting—
 We, who here in bondage groan ?”
 “ Come, beloved ! quickly come,
 Join me in our heavenly home !”

To the name of Mrs. Adger has been added that of another mother in Israel, Mrs. Leland, consort of Rev. A. W. Leland, DD. who has recently passed from among us at a well advanced, though not an old age.

“ The latter part of her life was passed in Columbia, in the quiet discharge of her appropriate duties. She walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, as blamelessly as one may walk who is subject to the infirmities of human nature, and has not yet arrived at the perfection of the heavenly state. Her life was a practical exposition of the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel ; one of those living arguments for the reality of the Christian Religion which no Skepticism has ever met, and in the presence of which the confidence of Infidelity itself is shaken. The holiness of the Gospel—a holiness which no earthly system of Philosophy, and no human education ever produced—was the pervading state of her soul, and the *fruits* of holiness hung in golden clusters about her character, and illustrated it in the eyes of all beholders. To her, the name of Jesus was the symbol of all that is lovely, and all that is glorious. Her love of Christ was not a mere sentiment ; it was a passion. His name was as ointment poured forth, which perfumed and enriched the smallest

offices of life. Seldom did she pen a letter or a note in which there was not "*aliquid Christi*," a sweet savour of Christ, which hallowed her counsels, and imparted the spirit of His Religion, and the dignity of His name to the minutest details of domestic life. She has gone to behold Him "whom having not seen she loved;" to "look upon that head which was crowned with thorns, and that face which was spit upon for her."

"Another conspicuous feature of her character was, a faith in the special providence of God, and in the promises of the everlasting Covenant, which no vicissitudes of life, no shocks of affliction, and no tempest of cares could shake. It rendered her calm when others were perplexed, and peaceful, when others were disturbed. And hence she was enabled to maintain a tranquil equanimity amid all the changes of her earthly circumstances. She seemed to lean, with the most perfect repose, upon that "righteous, omnipotent Hand," which had upheld and guided her through all her pilgrimage. Thus, though subject to often infirmities and sicknesses of body, she became a stay for others; a pillar of support, and a minister of consolation to her family and friends. She has received the end of her faith, and now enjoys the rest which remaineth for the people of God; but, alas, the pillar of support has crumbled to dust, the staff of strength is broken, the ministering angel is gone; and naught of her remains but the precious legacy of her example; the fadeless memory of her love; and the mute and touching memorials of a departed wife and mother.

"But the element of character which chiefly distinguished her, was her unselfish and untiring devotion to the interests and comfort of others, especially her family and friends, and as a consequent, a most fervent spirit of intercessory prayer. In serving others, she seemed to forget herself. It mattered little that she was sick, if others were well; if her rest was broken, that theirs might be enjoyed; the midnight hour was frequently passed while she toiled for their comfort; and how often did she prevent the dawning light, that the stranger, who had lodged within her gates, or the friend, who had slept under her roof, might be refreshed for early travel, and receive her parting words of kindness and affection. The poor and friendless student for the ministry was ever welcome to her hospitable board and fireside, and received from her the sympathy of a mother and a friend. The needy and the destitute found her door open to them, and her hand of charity extended for their relief. Her domestics were treated rather as children, than as servants; as is attested by the fact that she contracted her last illness from exposure and fatigue, undergone while nursing one of them in sickness. But who may describe the watchful assiduity, the exhaustless patience, and the tender and yearning affection with which she ever ministered to the temporal and spiritual wants of her beloved husband and children. "In all

their affliction, she was afflicted," and all their joys were enhanced by the fact that she shared them. It was such a love as this which formed the source of appeal from which a covenant-keeping God has drawn, in order to illustrate His own unchanging affection for His people. "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb?"

"Before closing this long letter," says her bereaved husband, "I feel it my duty to record my solemn testimony, as to some facts and traits of character, which distinguished my beloved wife, and which are fully known to myself alone. I do not make these statements to her praise, from any vain-glorious reference to her connection with me; for alas, that connection, however endearing and ennobling, has ceased forever. "*Hinc illae lachrymae.*" But these graces of the Spirit should be known *below* to the praise of God's glorious grace, as they will be proclaimed *above* for the same purpose.

"I mention first, an utter forgetfulness of self, and an unremitting zeal for the good of others. In more than forty years I have never seen an indication of any regard to self-interest or self-indulgence. She lived for others, and found her happiness in their enjoyment. An other remarkable trait was a most generous liberality towards all around her, united with a rigid economy towards herself. All her resources were lavishly bestowed to aid and comfort all within her reach, while it was difficult to persuade her to supply her own necessities. Habitually she withheld the price of her own comforts, to bestow it upon the needy. Untiring laboriousness in duty was another striking characteristic. In the domestic offices of her large family, her diligence and efficiency were almost unexampled. And yet at the close of every busy day, she devoted her hours often until midnight, to reading, writing and devotion. In these seasons of quiet and solitude, as one instance of her devotional reading, she read all the volumes of Scott's Commentary thrice through in course, and had begun the fourth perusal, when she was called away to nobler employments. She composed four volumes of a closely written Diary or Journal, for the guidance of her children after her decease; and for several years she wrote more than four hundred letters of affectionate counsel each year, to her absent children. Of her heavenly intercourse and communion at a throne of grace, the record is on high. Most of these works were done in the hours of night. Her devoted love to her children was marked by one leading feature. Their spiritual interests, the safety of their souls, so engrossed her solicitude, that she hardly regarded anything else. As to her Christian character, her spirituality and heavenly mindedness, I am utterly unable to express my honest convictions. I will only say that a spotless *Purity* of heart and motive, *Kindness* in feeling and action, *Benevolence* in its most exalted exercise, pervaded and governed her whole soul. But

while her experience of the sanctifying power of Divine grace was so remarkable, she was no less distinguished for a low estimation of her own attainments, and a profound humility which prostrated her continually at the footstool of mercy, as the chief of sinners. A thought of any other position or claim never seemed to have entered her mind.

"Equally distinguished was my blessed wife for her kindness and charity to the poor and the afflicted. To her truly belonged the title which the Roman Pontiff arrogantly assumed, *servus servorum*. For to the relief and comfort of servants, not only in her own family, but in others, much of her daily attention, care and toil, was sacredly devoted. And the sad event was in unison with her constant habit, when her mortal sickness was caused by a night exposure, during extreme cold weather, in attendance upon the sick couch of a servant woman; and this, with the distinctly expressed apprehension that the effect might be fatal.

I must add one more particular. Whatever money she received, she never thought of using a shilling for her own comfort, till all the benevolent subscriptions were paid, and all the claims upon her private charity were fully met. I often thought she carried this too far, but I now see that she was wisely making an investment, which she now enjoys. A few days before her decease, she received her last payment of money, and before the sun went down half of the amount was given away."

In concluding his circular letter, Dr. Leland records the following remarkable dream which Mrs. L. had about fifteen years ago, making a very deep impression at the time, and preserved in most vivid recollection to the last. While she did not believe in any supernatural influence in the case, she had an invincible persuasion that the solemn and scriptural directions and encouragements which seemed to be addressed to her by a messenger from the world of spirits, demanded her most special regard. And it is certain, that those imaginary communications did exert a mighty influence upon her subsequent conduct.

It should be stated, that at the time of this dream, she was surrounded by nine sons and daughters, in childhood and early youth, whose moral perils and exposure to evil examples filled her anxious, loving heart with intense solicitude and apprehensions.

She dreamed that she was wandering on the seashore, where the retiring tide had left a wide expanse of the beach only partially covered with water. At some distance from the sand on which she stood, she seemed to see a land turtle, surrounded by a group of her young, making her way to the dry land. The animal appeared distressed in guarding her little ones, which were continually straying from her, and running into danger. Sometimes she would have to cross a rivulet so deep that she could on-

ly secure her charge by taking them upon her back, and bearing them through, though she sometimes sunk out of sight with her burden. At length, however, after long toiling and most anxious struggles, she seemed to reach the safe, dry sand, with all her little charge. At this moment, the dreamer seemed to behold at her side her own sainted mother, who had been in Heaven for ten years, and to hear from her lips such words as these; words never to be forgotten, and never remembered without profound emotion. "My child, you see there a mother, and a fit emblem of yourself. You have marked the care and toil, the ceaseless watchfulness and distressful anxiety of that poor animal, to preserve her helpless brood; and after all her fears and terrors in guarding and guiding them, you have witnessed the success which has crowned her strivings to conduct them to a place of safety. Regard this, my daughter, as indicating your own difficulties, responsibilities and obligations. To your charge are committed the precious immortal interests of all your thoughtless, perishing children. Under God, their salvation depends greatly upon yourself. O, make it your one great business, to watch over their precious souls. Pray without ceasing, and labour without intermission, for their conversion. Imitate the example of this poor turtle, and you may hope, like her, to rejoice in the consummation of your hopes, in seeing your children safe at the Saviour's feet." Such was this memorable dream. And its effects were equally memorable. Previously, my dear wife had exhibited more than ordinary devotedness to maternal duties; but afterwards, she cherished a severe conviction that "she had *one thing to do*," and that was to devote her undivided energies, her time, her efforts, her whole soul, to the spiritual good of those who called her mother. She felt as if a message had come to her from the spiritual world, and the consequent obligation pressed upon her continually. And nobly and gloriously did she obey the mandate. I never witnessed, and never expected to witness such devotedness, such entire consecration. This object governed her conduct by day, and was the inspiring motive of her habitual midnight studies and labours. She desired to live only that she might bless her household. She sought no repose, no cessation in the strenuous exertion of all her powers, in the work assigned to her. Nor was she left without precious tokens of divine favour. She had the unutterable joy to see blessed fruits of her prayers and tears. Successively her beloved children gave hopeful evidence of vital piety, and were received into the communion of the church. At length, her wrestling at a throne of grace, for her youngest son, seemed to have prevailed. And when the tidings reached her from a distant State, that he had hopefully become a subject of grace, she evinced a rapture of joy wholly unusual to her, and in-

stantly wrote, in one of the last letters she ever penned, *my work is done*; feeling evidently that she had nothing to do but to die.

"Her body was taken to the town of Mount Pleasant, where she had passed her early days. The funeral service was attended by the friends of her youth; and her remains, accompanied by her family and some of her friends, were borne to the burial ground, about seven miles from the town, called "Cook's Field." There, according to her own wish, beside the graves of her beloved parents; remote from the bustle of life; in the silent forest; and amid the tears of her kindred, her precious dust was committed to its final resting place. Fit spot for the last sleep of the saint, whose life had been gentleness, and whose end was peace! No rude foot will tread upon her grave; the morning and the evening dew will fall upon it; and the sweet voices of nature, in this still retreat, will hymn her gentle requiem. Many bodies of Christ's dear people there rest in death—a goodly company. The sacred spot has been further signalized and hallowed, by receiving the dust of this noble and excellent mother in Israel; and not the least among those who shall there rise at the sound of the archangel's trump, and the call of the descending Saviour, will stand the glorified form of our departed friend.

It was truly affecting to see her venerable partner, who, like Abraham, bearing the body of his illustrious wife to the field of Machpelah, had come with *his* dead, to this quiet spot, to discharge for her the last mournful offices of affection. The light of his dwelling has been extinguished; the prop of his age has been withdrawn; and the noble heart that had beat with ineffable love for him and his children is still; but may He, who has promised that He will be with His people when they "pass through the waters," and "walk through the fire," and that "even to hoar hairs," He "will carry them," graciously comfort and sustain him under this sore and heavy trial."

How precious is the sacred spot.
In yonder burial ground,
Where my endeared, departed wife,
A last repose hath found!

Full twenty summer suns have shone,
Since heart and hand she gave,
And kindly pledged her love to me,
Till parted by the grave.

Alas! these years have sped away;
That happy time is flown!
But, year by year, her plighted love
Has sweetly bloomed and grown.

In prosperous times, when all was fair,
And comfort reigned the while,
Each blessing high in value rose,
Augmented by her smile.

Affliction's stormy winds might blow;
And dire distress portend;
But what were they—since she was mine,
My loving wife—my friend?

A mother, pious, prudent, kind,
In her my children had;
Who made their cares and griefs her own,
And in their joy was glad.

Her presence was our light and joy,
The blessing of our store:
But ah! that source of joy is gone,
That light can shine no more!

We mourn our loss, and well we may;
Our home is blighted now!
Our dearest, kindest friend away!
But, Lord, to Thee we bow.

With tender, aching hearts we bore
Our precious dead away;
And left her with her kindred dust,
In hope of endless day.

Pass on, ye wintry tempests, pass;
Why linger with your gloom?
Go, let the early spring flowers rise
To deck her couch with bloom.

Blow soft; ye gentle breezes, oh!
Blow softly cross her grave:
Ye dews of evening, kindly fall,
As her lone bed ye lave.

Angelic guardians, watch with care,
Her peaceful, hallowed tomb,
Until that glorious morning dawn,
When Christ, the Judge, shall come.

Dear wife, thine absence we deplore;
Our hearts with grief are riven;
We weep: and yet we should not weep,
Since thou art blest in heaven.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE DEAD.

We loved thee with affection true,
That never knew decline ;
In weal or woe, in ease or pain,
Our warmest love was thine.

But oh ! we never prized thee more
Than since thy parting breath
Announced our loss, and made us feel
The majesty of death.

Oh ! may we tread the heavenly path,
Which thou hast trod before,
And meet thee, in yon world of love,
Where we shall part no more !

These, and other beloved mothers and sisters in the Lord, have recently been taken from the church and their families on earth. But they have left behind them their example, their life, their character, their works and their death, that we may walk in their steps and be stimulated to holy zeal and heavenly ardour. And we cannot but thank and praise the Lord—not that they were taken from us, but that they were taken at a time when the moral power of their example in life and in death, was so needful. In them we have an illustration of the reality, the power, the benign and holy influence of the Gospel, which all will admit, and none can question—a life and character and death for which *only the Gospel can account*. In them we see the legitimate effect of the Gospel so far as it is truly received and sincerely obeyed in purifying, elevating and perfecting the character. The failure of one, or of a few, or of any number of professors to maintain a practice in all things according to their profession, and in conformity to the immaculate purity and probity required by the Gospel, is therefore no valid argument against the Gospel or the church since it is in direct contrariety to the principles of both. Membership in the church is constituted by a *profession* of the Gospel. That profession is all of which either minister or elders can judge, since it is evident that a clear possession of real piety is a fact which God alone can certainly discern. The inconsistencies and unchristian conduct of members of the church, is only evidence, therefore, so far as it goes, of the insincerity of their profession, or the gross inconsistency of their lives. It is no argument against either the church or the Gospel. But on the other hand, every professor of religion, whose life and conversation and conduct are in spirit, in purpose and in constant effort, conformed to the Gospel they profess, is a demonstration of its truth and of its infinite and paramount importance ; and for this simple reason, that while to act contrary to the Gospel, is easy, natural, and

agreeable to the pride and selfishness and sensuality of the heart, to live in conformity to the Gospel, is an opposition to them all, a denial of self, a humiliation of pride, a crucifixion of the flesh, a mortification of lust, and, in many things, an abandonment of pleasure and of profit.

Mrs. Adger and Mrs. Leland, therefore, being dead, yet speak. All those among us, who, like them, have lived and died in the Lord, and all those still living, and of the sincerity of whose profession you have no doubt, speak to us. They speak, O, sinner, to you, and they tell you that the Gospel is a divine reality, that it is life and power, and Salvation to them that truly believe and obey it, and that it is condemnation and death, and everlasting destruction to them that believe and obey it not, whether they are professors or not.

They speak also to those who are professors of religion, and they tell us that a mere profession will not save us, because it will neither justify nor sanctify us. They tell us that a profession made from worldly, selfish, or ambitious motives, and used as a cloak for covetousness, and hoarding avarice, and penurious giving, or for vice, dishonesty, or any other course of sin, is an aggravation of guilt, and will entail a deeper damnation. They tell us that such is the abounding worldliness, and covetousness, and ambitious desire for wealth and prominence, even among professors of religion, that hardly can any professor enter the Kingdom of God, scarcely can even a righteous man be saved, and that it becometh even the oldest disciple, and the most honoured elder or deacon, yea, and the most faithful minister, to fear lest after all they may be cast away, and to work out their salvation with fear and trembling. And let him that hath ears to hear heed what is thus spoken to him by the dead with whom he is soon to stand in judgment.

REJOICE,

Rejoice, all ye believers,
 And let your lights appear ;
 The evening is advancing,
 And darker night is near.
 The Bridegroom is arising,
 And soon he draweth nigh.
 Up ! pray, and watch, and wrestle—
 At midnight comes the cry !

See that your lamps are burning,
 Replenish them with oil,
 And wait for your salvation,
 The end of earthly toil.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE DEAD:

The watchers on the mountain
 Proclaim the Bridegroom near ;
 Go, meet Him as He cometh,
 With Hallelujahs clear !

Ye wise and holy virgins,
 Now raise your voices higher,
 Till in songs of jubilee
 They meet the angel-choir.
 The marriage-feast is waiting,
 The gates wide open stand ;
 Up ! up ! ye heirs of glory—
 The Bridegroom is at hand !

Ye saints, who here in patience
 Your cross and suff'rings bore,
 Shall live and reign for ever,
 When sorrow is no more.
 Around the throne of glory,
 The Lamb ye shall behold,
 In triumph cast before Him
 Your diadems of gold !

Palms of victory are there ;
 There, radiant garments are ;
 There stands the peaceful harvest,
 Beyond the reach of war.
 There, after stormy winter,
 The flowers of earth arise,
 And from the grave's long slumber
 Shall meet again our eyes !

Before dismissing our readers, there is one point on which these beloved mothers in Israel, though dead, yet emphatically and very encouragingly speak to us, and that is the intimate and divinely appointed connection between maternal piety, consistency and gentle loving conduct towards her husband and her children, and the conversion of her children, and the conversion and spiritual advancement of her husband.

Of this principle, the ministry, both living and dead, and the membership in the church in all ages, churches and countries, are standing proofs. Mothers, not only pious, but prudent, not only holy, but happy, not merely gracious, but gentle, not less firm than faithful,—mothers in whose heart is the law of love, drawing with the cords of a man the most reluctant hearts, and on whose lips is the law of kindness and persuasion, and in whose conscience is the law of heaven's purity, and in whose hands is the rod of

correction, and the staff of authority—such women have ever been the nursing mothers of the church from the days of Hannah and Louis to the present time, and must continue to be the hope of the church, and of the State for all time to come.

“There was once,” says Rev. Dr. P. H. Fowler, “an obscure and pious woman living in the south of England. History is silent respecting her ancestry, her place of birth, and her education. She had an only son whom she made it her great business to train in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. In the seventh year of his age, his mother died, and a few years later the lad went to sea, and engaged at length as a sailor in the African slave-trade. He was soon an adept in vice, and though among the youngest of the crew, he was the most proficient in guilt. But his mother’s instructions sent their echoes to him, and though at first he sought to deafen himself to them, they grew louder and louder, until listening to them at last, he became a fervent Christian, a successful preacher, the author of books which the church will never let die, and a writer of hymns the use of which is co-extensive with our tongue.

“This wayward son whom his mother, though dead, addressed and reclaimed, was the means of the conversion of Claudius Buchanan, so distinguished for his labors in the East Indies; and the ‘Star in the East,’ a book published by Mr. Buchanan, first called the attention of our Judson to the missionary work, and sent him an apostle to Burmah.

“The sailor, turned preacher, was also the means of delivering the Rev. Thomas Scott from the mazes of ruinous error, and introducing him to the way, the truth, and the life. Mr. Scott prepared the Commentary known by his name, and which still continues its mission of converting and sanctifying power.

“The influence of this same minister and author, in connection with that of Doddridge, was principally instrumental in making Wilberforce the Christian he was. To Wilberforce’s ‘Practical View of Christianity,’ the conversion of Legh Richmond may be ascribed, and Legh Richmond wrote ‘The Dairyman’s Daughter,’ and other tracts, which have contributed to the salvation of thousands of souls.

“Such are some of the results of that voice from the dead which spoke to John Newton; and what a small portion of the whole sum has yet been revealed!”

A young man of Virginia, in the joyous flush of youth, and all the vigor and promise of life’s morning, was as in a moment laid low, and a minister, who only knew that the young man had been sceptically inclined, was sent for. The minister entered the chamber apprehending a mournful scene of unpreparedness for the solemn change; but to his surprise and joy, he saw the countenance of the dying man lighted up with that celestial radiance

which naught but a well-founded hope in Christ can impart to the last trying scene. He drew near, and tenderly inquired whether or not he felt ready and willing to depart, if such should be the Divine Will.

"Oh, yes," exclaimed the dying man; "for me to die is gain; I long to depart and be with Christ." The minister inquired how long this blessed hope had been his, and to what instrumentality he referred this happy change in his views and character.

"It was only a few days before I was taken sick that I was brought to submit entirely to Christ," said the young man; "and I owe it all, under God to *my sainted mother's prayers*, and her godly life. While in college, I imbibed, from corrupt associates, their sceptical views, learned to doubt the authenticity of the Bible, and stumbled at many of the doctrines of revealed religion, because I could not, with an unrenewed nature and a heart at enmity with God, comprehend them. But while thus setting at naught God's holy word, and the message of his servants, there was one thing I could not get over, and that was, my mother's holy life, a constant, living, breathing epitome of the religion she professed, which to my inmost soul whispered a refutation of all my scepticism. One thing was ever ringing in my ears and setting at naught all my arguments against Christianity—the memory of my mother's prayers for her prodigal son. I tried again and again to put them from me, but they would be heard; and at last, unable to continue the conflict longer, I was brought in humble penitence to the feet of Jesus, and there found peace and joy in believing in Him."

Christian mother, are your prayers the best refutation of your son's scepticism? Is your life a living, breathing epitome of the gospel you profess? The weal or woe, for time and for eternity, of those you love, may hang upon you. Your faithfulness may elevate them to heaven, place a crown of glory upon their heads, and a tuneful harp in their hands, with which to swell Emmanuel's praise to all eternity; or your inconsistency and heartlessness may send them down to the blackness of dark despair, "where there is weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth."

Oh, let mothers hear and heed the teachings of the dead, and then may they hope when surrounded by their weeping children as they gather into her dying chamber to comfort and soothe their latter hours, saying unto them

What mean ye by this wailing,
To break my bleeding heart?
And if the love that binds us
Could alter or depart!
Our sweet and holy union
Knows neither time nor place,
The love that God has planted
Is lasting as His grace.

Ye clasp these hands at parting,
 As if no hope could be ;
 While still we stand forever
 In blessed unity !
 Ye gaze as on a vision
 Ye never could recall,
 While still each thought is with you,
 And Jesus with us all !

Ye say, " We hear, that yonder,
 Thou goest, and we stay !
 And yet Christ's mystic body
 Is one eternally.
 Ye speak of different journeys,
 A long and sad adieu !
 While still one way I travel,
 And have one end with you.

Why should ye now be weeping
 These agonizing tears ?
 Behold our gracious Leader,
 And cast away your fears.
 We tread *one* path to glory,
 Are guided by *one* hand,
 And led in faith and patience
 Unto *one* Fatherland !

Then let this hour of parting
 No bitter grief record,
 But be an hour of union
 More blessed with our Lord !
 With Him to guide and save us,
 No changes that await,
 No earthly separations
 Can leave us desolate !

Let us all listen to the teachings of the dead, and then shall the
 dead be still ours and we theirs, and heaven our common and
 eternal home.

Meet again ! yes, we shall meet again,
 Though now we part in pain.
 His people all
 Together Christ shall call.
 Hallelujah !

Soon the days of absence shall be o'er,
 And thou shalt weep no more ;
 Our meeting day
 Shall wipe all tears away.
 Hallelujah !

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1857.

Now I go with gladness to our home,
 With gladness thou shalt come ;
 There I will wait
 To meet thee at Heaven's gate.
 Hallelujah !

Dearest ! what delight again to share
 Our sweet communion there !
 To walk among
 The holy ransomed throng.
 Hallelujah !

Here, in many a grief, our hearts were one,
 But there in joys alone ;
 Joy fading never,
 Increasing deepening ever.
 Hallelujah !

Not to mortal sight can it be given
 To know the bliss of Heaven ;
 But thou shalt be
 Soon there, and sing with me.
 Hallelujah !

Meet again ! yes, we shall meet again,
 Though now we part in pain !
 Together all
 His people Christ shall call.
 Hallelujah !

ART. IV.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1857.

THE GENERAL Assembly which lately convened at Lexington, was said to be the most numerous assembly of our church that ever met. Many who have had large experience, also, pronounced it a very harmonious assembly. Its members were sent there by Presbyteries extending from Northern Indiana to Texas, from

California to Maryland ; and yet, while their discussions, on many points, were earnest and spirited, not an un-christian word was spoken, and not an unbrotherly sentiment expressed. It was likewise, if we mistake not, one of the least protracted of all our assemblies, for it adjourned on the tenth day. That a very harmonious body should be able to despatch its business with rapidity, is, of course, quite natural ; but that a very large assembly should be remarkable for harmony and despatch, is a little singular, and perhaps not very easy to be explained. Was there less business than is common ? Were there fewer cases than is common of *Cacoethes Loquendi* amongst the members of this assembly ? Had we a better Moderator than most of his predecessors ? The first question we would answer negatively, and the second affirmatively. As to the third, we say unhesitatingly, that while the best friend of Dr. Van Rensselaer would not claim that he had excelled all who ever moderated before him, yet, on the other hand, his worst enemy, (if such a man as he have any enemies at all) must admit that he presided with dignity, ability, impartiality, courtesy and firmness. We think it a very possible thing for a presiding officer to communicate his own spirit, in some measure, to the body. And yet why need we seek any other explanation of the matter than the power and influence of the good hand of our God upon us ? Our King and our Head is the God of all grace, to whose name be the glory of all the excellency or beauty that ever shines in his church !

ELECTION OF THE MODERATOR.

There is one observation, however, which ought to be made regarding the election of Moderator in the last Assembly. This is believed to be the first time that nominations have been accompanied with argument. Judge Fine, in nominating Dr. Van Rensselaer, allowed himself to urge his election as the due reward of Dr. Van Rensselaer's long and faithful services ; and the Rev. Mr. McIlvaine, pleading the example which had just been set before him, detailed some of the important services of the venerable man whom he nominated,—in particular, his having been the father of the Board of Foreign Missions ; and earnestly enquired, “if it were not time he should be properly honored for all this ?” We suppose the venerable father has been, and is honored properly and truly by the church, though never elected Moderator of the Assembly. And we are sure the Master will reward him, of His infinite grace, for every service he has rendered. It is belittling to the services of Dr. Swift and Dr. Van Rensselaer, and it is dishonoring to the men themselves, to talk of their being *rewarded* by compliments or by offices. Still more it *demoralizes* the Assembly itself to have some of its

most respected members set up as candidates, whose friends are to make speeches of recommendation for them to the House.

ATTENDANCE OF RULING ELDERS.

The roll of the Assembly presents us 278 names. Of these, 152 were ministers, and 126 elders—that is, the elders were fewer than the ministers by only 26 names. Surely this looks like some progress and development of the idea that the Ruling Elder is the aboriginal Presbyterian. It is plain that not simply in the church at large, but also amongst the elders themselves, there is a conviction, now at length, of this aboriginal Presbyterian's having a higher end in attending her courts than simply (as Dr. Breckinridge says it used to be understood) that he might “let down the bars for the minister to pass through.” Perhaps the time will come when they shall be of use in keeping up bars which ministers may be too willing to let down for themselves.

ORGANIZATION OF THE ASSEMBLY.

In the appointment of the Standing Committees and the Committees on Synodical Records, we notice that the Moderator succeeded in distributing the duties to be performed amongst nearly all the members of the Assembly. We have found a few names of ministers on more than one committee, and a few names of elders on no committee at all. But to a greater extent than has been customary, as we suppose, the work to be done was divided out amongst all present at the beginning. We regard this a matter of importance. In addition to this, it is unquestionably very desirable that for several days, at the outset, the Assembly should hold no afternoon meeting. By dividing the whole work to be done amongst the whole body, and then giving time for the committees to meet and consider carefully what is referred to them, the business of the church might be done with despatch, and at the same time with due deliberation. We think, one reason why the house got to the end of the docket at Lexington in ten days, was, that, to a certain extent, it adopted this plan. But without doubt, every man present is aware that during the last three days, many things were too rapidly despatched.

A large part of the reports from the Committee on Bills and Overtures, were reports only from single individuals of that committee. After the third day, the Assembly refused to give up the afternoon to committees; whereupon the Committee on Bills and Overtures, unwilling to quit the Assembly during its regular meetings, divided what remained of their business amongst the individual men that composed it. Accordingly, instead of the well-considered judgment of a large and able committee upon the difficult and important matters committed to them, the Assembly had the individual judgment of one man; and accordingly, also,

the matters in question were either discussed by the whole house at a great sacrifice of time and patience, or else were very unceremoniously passed over.

OPENING SERMON.

In the absence of Dr. M'Farland, the last Moderator, Dr. Hoge preached to the Assembly a very edifying sermon from the text: "Lo I am with you always even to the end of the world." Christ's presence always with His ministers and His church, was the subject of discourse, and it was handled with delightful simplicity, solemnity, and unction.

PLACE OF NEXT MEETING.

Cincinnati, Rochester, Philadelphia and New Orleans, were nominated. The chief contest lay between the two last named points. The advocates of New Orleans, besides the usefulness of our meeting there to the cause of the Presbyterian Church in the South West, seemed to urge nothing else except that it would not involve any real danger to the valuable lives and the precious health of the members of the Assembly. The speakers adverse to New Orleans, did not express any fear of carrying the Assembly thither, but the speakers for New Orleans seemed instinctively to harp upon this one point in her defence, as though they knew that that was considered to be the real point of weakness in their case. No doubt they remembered how, in Buffalo, the Assembly had preferred Nashville to New Orleans expressly on the ground of danger from Yellow Fever! At the same time in favour of Philadelphia, it was maintained to be peculiarly appropriate, that the Assembly should meet there next year, because it will be the hundredth anniversary of the union on that spot, of the Synods of New York and Philadelphia. "Thither (said the speaker) let us go, and there let us raise our Ebenezer, God having blessed us for these hundred years." "But," (it was replied,) "there is no special importance in celebrating that historical event in Philadelphia. If it would be pleasant and interesting to go to Philadelphia, where the church was born and cradled, for the celebration of that centenary, so, also, in another aspect, it would be striking and impressive to go out and celebrate it in those remote regions to which the church has since advanced. And after all that had been heard on that floor, it was of great importance to go to New Orleans, expressly that the Assembly might not again exhibit an unworthy timidity. - We encourage our Missionaries to go out into the dark and dangerous places of the earth, and it does not become the Assembly to suffer the fear of yellow fever to be continually hunting it like a ghost and frightening it from its propriety. Let us go down to New Orleans, and at that outpost celebrate the great things God has done

for us during these hundred years. We took flight first from Philadelphia; let us go and take a second flight from the far off regions of the South West!"

Upon taking the vote, New Orleans had a clear majority of nine over all the other nominations put together, and its friends testified their gratification by audible applause, which the Moderator very properly checked at once. We confess to a very decided feeling of satisfaction with the result, quite independent of any share we had personally in the discussion. We viewed it as a distinct deliverance of the house specifically to this effect, that we will hold the next General Assembly, God willing, at the Crescent City, all former fears about yellow fever to the contrary, notwithstanding. The question having come directly before the Assembly as a question of faith in God's providence, it would have been a sad thing, had the church said again, that she could not trust herself in New Orleans, in the month of May, which is just about two months before the fever ever begins there. We regret the change of the time of meeting, which was subsequently made, as being a small result of the same fears which on this occasion had been overcome. As to the matter of suffering from the heat of the weather in New Orleans so late in May, which we heard enlarged upon, in private, by the dwellers in the far North and North West, we opine it will be found to be true in the case of our brethren next spring, as it generally is, that persons from the North, in ordinary health, bear a first summer in the South, better than the Southern people themselves; just as it is a fact that persons from the South, in ordinary health, bear a first winter at the North better than the Northern people do themselves. If our country, our whole country, be, indeed, the field of the Old School Presbyterian Church, as is now more than ever her peculiar hope and rejoicing, let us accept the mission cheerfully; and let the General Assembly go from time to time, North and South, East and West, as Providence may direct.

" No burning heats by day
Nor blasts of evening air
Shall take our health away
If God be with us there.
We'll go and come
Nor fear to die, till from on high
He calls us home."

DELEGATES FROM CORRESPONDING BODIES.

The only delegate from New England to the Assembly, was the Rev. Mr. Butler, of Vermont. He read a respectful address to the body, expressing kindness and Christian love for us, and acknowledging that our church is "resting in glorious truths," "abounding in blessed examples of living piety," and "doing a

great work in the vast field we occupy." He hinted inoffensively at the subject of slavery, saying that if compelled now, as in the beginning, to differ in some things, the same charity which animated their fathers and ours ought to prevail betwixt us their sons. But he appeared to us, we confess, to employ a spice of something like arrogance and assumption when he said, Vermont has "no rich prairies for the golden harvest; no sunny land for the palmetto and magnolia; no deep waters for the ships of the sea and the commerce of the world, but only a cold climate and a rugged soil, and that her people are, almost by consequence, industrious, frugal, and moral, robust, enterprising, loyal and liberty-loving." Also that her "distinctive mission appears to be, to build school-houses and raise men." If their cold climate and rugged soil involve *almost as a consequence* their industry, morality, love of liberty, and other like moral qualities, of course the rich soil and the sunny sky which he ascribed to us, involved, about as consequentially, that we should be indolent and immoral and should hate liberty. In like manner, if their "distinctive mission" is to build school-houses and raise men, of course we can have no just claim to any education, unless we have imported it from Vermont, and must be all a race of bearded boys instead of men, except in so far as there may be found amongst us a sprinkling of Green Mountaineers. The Moderator evidently perceived this slight odour of arrogance, for, while very kind and courteous in his reply to Mr. Butler's address, returning the olive branch of peace for the evergreen, which Mr. Butler presented us, he yet said to him bluntly, "You tell us your mission is to raise men. Do not suppose you have the monopoly of that business; we, also, are trying to do something in the same line, and are glad to have you for fellow-workers. You tell us that you are a liberty-loving people. We also love liberty, and we appreciate in others that love of it which is loyal and conservative." Yes! Presbyterians do love liberty, and have always been foremost amongst its defenders. It was so in Geneva, and in Scotland, and in England, and it was so when these free and independent States were British colonies. And so must it be always, from the very nature of the principles of Presbyterians. And yet, is it equally true and manifest, that Presbyterians, the old and genuine school of them, are the greatest foes of Abolitionism in all this land. The explanation of the paradox is, that Presbyterians know that liberty is a good thing only in certain circumstances; and that oftentimes restraint is better for men than freedom. They know that liberty is not the right of all men, but, like property, is the right of those only who are born to it, or who have legally and honestly acquired it. The liberty loved by Presbyterians, is not that wild, radical, licentious thing, which levels down all to one equality of baseness, but it is that distinguishing and ennobling *inheritance* which

free sires hand down to free sons, or else that distinguishing and ennobling *acquisition* which God, in His good providence, enables and permits a virtuous and intelligent people to wrest from the tyrant's hand, who seeks to rob them of those rights which belong to them even under his oppressive rule. The liberty which Presbyterians love, is rational, regulated, constitutional freedom, the gift of God to but few of the nations, for which few of them are prepared, and which belongs, of right, therefore, but to those few. As for the Presbyterians of the South, the only Presbyterians who are connected with American slavery, the only ones who know it, and the only ones responsible for it, we will undertake to say for them, that in a certain sense, they love slavery as truly as they love liberty. If you take slavery to be the Synonyme of cruelty and oppression on the master's part, and of ignorance, licentiousness, suffering and misery on the part of the slave, of course they do not love nor admire it. But, regarding the term as expressive, simply, of the *relation* which subsists between the two races that occupy these Southern States; that relation, by which the one race governs and regulates, civilizes, elevates and improves the other; that relation, by which the combined skill and industry of the two races, by which their combined capital and labor is making the swamps of the South support the commerce and the manufactures of two continents and clothe the world; that relation, which makes of these two races, so dissimilar from each other, and yet in the inscrutable providence of the all-wise God so closely and so inseparably fastened together, one harmonious whole; that relation which constitutes the white man a kind protector and the black man his loyal and affectionate dependant; that relation, which makes these two races (unlike the free negro and the white hireling of the North) to have one interest, and to be not antagonists, but friends; we say, regarding slavery, in this, its real and true aspect, the liberty-loving Presbyterians of the South love slavery too. You may find individual cases of hardship under this relation; you may find abuses of the relation which ought to be reformed, but to fasten your eye on them is not to take a large, and just, and comprehensive view of the subject, in which view we are contemplating it, when we say the relation is good and not evil. As regards *abolition on the soil*; as regards this *alternative of slavery*, whether contemplated as a near or a distant event, whether to be effected by sudden or by gradual means, we think Southern Presbyterians all contemplate this with horror, as necessarily involving the destruction of one, and the injury of both races. Once made antagonists, there could be no more peace between the two. And woe to the negro race if once the stronger people should believe it necessary to exterminate them! A worse than the red men's fate must be the

doom of the black man; if ever, on this soil, put in opposition to the Anglo-Saxon.

At the time of the Rev. Mr. Butler's friendly and respectful address to the Assembly, with its compliments about "resting in glorious truths, and abounding in blessed examples of living piety," few, perhaps none, of the men whom he addressed, were aware that the body which sent him to us, had at their last meeting, adopted the following resolution, viz.: "That if the delegate from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church,* has inferred from his courteous reception *here*, that in our judgment, slavery is less a wrong than polygamy, he has mistaken the sentiments of this body." Now, it is certainly a curious thing, for an ecclesiastical body to send us a delegate to tell our church about its "resting in glorious truths, and abounding in blessed examples of living piety," and for the same body at the same time to pass a resolution telling us, that if they had been civil to our delegate, we must please not to forget that we deserved the very contrary treatment; as though a gentleman should receive his guest with many expressions of friendship, but take a sly opportunity to whisper in his ear that he must remember how richly he deserved to be kicked out of doors! We cannot conceive, how any man with such a reception given him, as our delegate must have received, and without the subsequent sly insinuation dropped into his ear, could fail of making just the very "*mistake*" referred to in the resolution. The General Assembly seemed to regard this resolution of the Vermont Convention as, indeed, a very curious specimen of good manners, for there was evidently but one emotion in the whole house when the resolution was read; an emotion that showed itself in a universal smile. But is there not something more to be seen here, as we now have time to review the whole affair, than merely an original kind of politeness? Is this not also a singular specimen of consistency, of frankness, and of honesty? What! Receive with courtesy the visit of one, whom you feel you ought to turn out of doors, and then return his visit next day, and praise him to his face as a gentleman and a Christian! Is this Green Mountain candour? Is this Vermont Congregational truthfulness? And does Vermont claim it to be her peculiar mission to *raise men*? We would much rather allow, that she, like her sister, Connecticut, has a call to *raise nutmegs*.

This resolution of our Vermont friends, well illustrates to how great an extent, abolition is an unreal thing—a sham, a fiction, a manufactured sentiment, and not a true and genuine one. Here is a body of grave divines, resolving that they regard slavery just as they regard polygamy. Now if this were anything more than

The Rev. Dr. Bowman, of Georgia.

a mere *wooden nutmeg*, if it were designed for anything else than "Buncombe," what made them continue the correspondence with men who practise the abomination? Dr. Bowman, a well known slaveholder from Georgia, is sent to them, and they receive him courteously, yet afterwards they gently insinuate that they do really loathe him as they would a bigamist or a polygamist! It is not true! They try to think so, and to persuade others to think so, but they are manufacturing sentiment, not *feeling* it. Would they have courteously received a Mormon from Utah into their Convention? Do they really mean to say they would have entertained Brigham Young as they did Dr. Bowman? And that they are willing to send a delegate to a Mormon Council to tell them that they are "resting in glorious truths and abounding in blessed examples of living piety?"

We have seen many like illustrations of the unreality and fictitiousness of a large part of abolition, showing that after all, it is, to a great extent, simply a device, an *invention*, a means to an end, viz., sectional growth; and that end itself a means to another end, viz., the sway of the power of this government to lay taxes, raise revenue and distribute the same! But we will drop the subject, after presenting our readers with the calm and dignified report on the subject of Delegates to New England, which the Assembly adopted.

"The Committee recommend that no Delegate be sent for the present, to any of the Congregational bodies of New England. One of them has expressly informed us that the correspondence is discontinued by its own act. Others have so far entertained the same design as to refer the question of discontinuance to their district associations for ultimate decision; and none of them is, in fact, represented at this Assembly except the Evangelical Convention of Vermont. And although it is due to Rev. J. F. Butler, to record our great satisfaction with the eminent courtesy and the fraternal spirit, with which he has represented his Brethren here; yet the Committee have been grieved to find, in the published Minutes of that Consociation at their last meeting, a very offensive resolution, as well as proceedings of a secular and political bearing, which the sense of our Ecclesiastical Assemblies seeks to avoid."*

* Note. From the official Narrative of the same General Convention of Vermont, which passed the resolution aforesaid, we take the following paragraphs. The italics are ours:

"In adding up the statistics of the year, results stand before us which should move our souls. A few revivals have indeed been named and cause us joy; and some churches in most of the Associations have had a small increase; but in the aggregate our membership has been diminished 70. Nor should we forget that our number has been annually less, for ten years, with a single exception; and we now have in our churches about five thousand less than we had 20 years ago. Not a startling loss for any one year,

THE REFORMED DUTCH CHURCH.

From this much respected body of Presbyterian Brethren, the Assembly was favoured with a cordial and fraternal address by their delegate, the Rev. Dr. Abeel. He concluded his pleasant and eloquent speech with the hope, that as our church "covers the whole land, it might be the means of counteracting all unholy influences that tend to embitter different portions of the country against each other, and might serve to bind the whole together." Our Moderator, Dr. Van Rensselaer, himself of Dutch descent, pleasantly offered, on the part of our Assembly, "to smoke the pipe of peace" with Dr. Abeel and the Dutch Church. He also said, "We understand the subject to which you have alluded, and are glad that your church sees eye to eye with ours." The Rev. John Woodbridge was appointed Delegate to the Reformed Dutch Church Synod, and the Rev. J. H. Lepo his alternate.

THE ASSOCIATE REFORMED SYNOD OF THE SOUTH.

The Rev. N. M. Gordon, on behalf of this Synod, was introduced to the Assembly. If the body he represented were small, he hoped her fidelity to the truth was enough to commend her to the kind regards of the Assembly. She had sixty ministers, one hundred churches, a College, and a Theological Seminary, and is doing something both for Home and Foreign Missions. The Southern Synod had, of late years, been virtually excluded from the fellowship of her own Sister-Synods of the North and West by the action of these latter, on the subject of slavery. She had taken no new ground on that subject, but stood where she had always stood, and had been left alone to preach the gospel to masters and slaves. In regard to a union with the Presbyterian Church, some progress had been made in the way of removing difficulties. The Associate Reformed Church had always been jealous of every thing like unsound doctrine, and accordingly the position taken by the Presbyterian Church Old School, had commended her to the confidence of his Synod. He must say there ought not to be any insuperable bar to a union. But allow-

it being less than one and a half per year to a church, still, to go on thus for only about three-score years would blot us out!"

"What can arrest this course of declension, and diffuse prosperity throughout our bounds? What can expel worldliness from the churches, raise their tone of piety, and infuse new life into all their doings? What can roll back the tide of error, gather the young into the fold, and multiply candidates for the ministry? Nothing less than a general and thorough revival of religion!"

"The external and agitating questions of the age, important though they may be, have diverted us from attention to personal piety, from duty in our closets and families, and from direct individual efforts to save souls."

ance must be made for the convictions of each party, and mutual forbearance exercised with respect to their honest differences. The Synod would hold its next meeting in Old Providence Church, Augusta Co., Virginia, where they would be glad to see a delegate from the Assembly.

The Moderator answered with a cordial welcome to Mr. Gordon, on behalf of the Synod. "A church that holds the truth may be small, but cannot be insignificant. We hope some day to be one, but that whole subject must be left to the committee having it in charge. We are glad to hear that you are preaching to the colored people. There are not less than one hundred men on this floor who devote a portion of their time to this good work. Our church and yours agreeing on that subject as well as in doctrine, will be the better prepared to be united, if God, in His providence shall open the way. We hope and pray, that the union may be consummated. May the God of all grace bless you and the body which you represent. Carry to your Synod our cordial salutations and our best wishes."

In respect to the desired union, the Assembly adopted the following Report of the Committee on Foreign Correspondence:

"In relation to the report of the Rev. Edwin Oater from the Committee appointed by the last General Assembly to open a correspondence, and confer about a closer union with the Associated Reformed Synod of the South, we recommend that the same Committee be continued, with the assurance, that this General Assembly is gratified with the progress already made in their good work; and desires that even if a closer union with that evangelical body be not consummated, the interchange of delegates and expressions of fraternal love, so pleasantly begun, may be perpetual."

THE LETTER FROM THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

In respect to this matter, the Assembly adopted the following report from the Committee on Foreign Correspondence:

"In relation to the Reformed Presbyterian Church, from which a letter has been received, of remonstrance against our settled principles of discipline on the subject of slavery, the committee would remind the Assembly, that thirty years ago, that body declined to sanction the arrangement of any correspondence with the General Assembly; although unanimously agreed to by this body. And we do not deem it our duty, in this case, to send them a reply, especially as the position of our church, on the subject referred to, needs no further explanation.

But we fully reciprocate the expressions of fraternal regard and of confidence in our order, and the steadfastness of our faith which the letter conveys, and would rejoice to have the bonds of

Christian fellowship with that body made closer, if it could be done consistently with the claims of truth and peace."

BOARD OF DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

The Report of this Board showed that we have now in commission, 590 Domestic Missionaries, being an increase in the number of 24 over last year. The number of churches and stations supplied by the Missionaries, is 904. The receipts of the year, from all sources, were \$93,248.99; add the balance on hand at the beginning of the year, and the total resources of the Board during the year amounted to \$114,382.16. The amount paid out during the year, was \$95,121.76, leaving on hand, a balance of \$19,250.10. But the amount due to the Missionaries, is \$12,964.86, so that the real balance on hand, is \$6,295.64. The aggregate receipts from March 1st, 1856, to March 1st, 1857, have been *less* by nearly \$4,000, than the receipts of the year previous. At the same time, the appropriations have exceeded those of the previous year, by nearly \$9,000. The available balance on hand, March 1st, is considerable, but should not be misunderstood by the church. At the season of the year when the report is made, the balance on hand is always larger than at any other period. Without such a balance *then*, the operations of the Board could not be carried on through the rest of the year. The present unexpended balance, is, indeed, less than it was last year, and the appropriations being on a larger scale, enlarged contributions are indispensable, if the church would not leave the Board involved in debt.

Upon the subject of *Non-Contributing Churches*, we quote the precise language employed by the Board, and would recommend our readers to look at it with attention :

"In accordance with what seemed to be the general wish of the Church, the Board of Domestic Missions like the other Boards, of the Church, has been trying the experiment of what is called "*the Systematic Benevolence Plan*," and has dispensed with collecting agents altogether. We have no doubt that *if all the pastors themselves* would present the cause of Domestic Missions to their people, and all the churches would take up collections for the Board annually; and especially if arrangements were made in every congregation to procure subscriptions from every individual connected with them to be collected regularly and at stated periods, it would be the most economical and efficient plan that could be devised. Perhaps the experiment, thus far, has worked as well as could be reasonably expected, for, as stated by the last General Assembly, "It was not to be expected that so great a change in our benevolent operations, involving the change of habits which have obtained amongst us for so many years, could be made at once, and without difficulty." It is cer-

tainly encouraging to find that the number of contributing churches to the Board of Domestic Missions is increasing, though very slowly, from year to year. In 1855-6, the increase over the previous year was about 100, and last year, 1856-7, the increase over the former year was about 153.

This result, although encouraging, is far from being satisfactory, while the number of non-contributing churches continues to be so large. According to the Minutes of the General Assembly of 1856, the number of churches, connected with the Assembly, was 3,146. The number of churches which contributed to the Board, during the past year, was about 1503; thus showing that at least 1643 churches contributed nothing to the Board of Domestic Missions during the past fiscal year: we say, at least, because we have taken no account in this estimate of the churches which were organized during the year and which may considerably swell this number. No doubt a much larger number of churches than we have mentioned will report to the General Assembly that they have made contributions to *the cause* of Domestic Missions during the year: but none of their contributions came into our treasury, and the Board, as such, derived no pecuniary assistance from them.

If, then, *more than sixteen hundred* organized churches contributed nothing, during the past year, to the Board of Domestic Missions, ought there not to be continued and more earnest effort made to induce them to discharge their duty? Who are chiefly to blame for such delinquencies? Would not the greater part of those delinquent churches have contributed to the Board if their pastors or stated supplies had brought the cause before them and given them the opportunity of giving? We have no doubt they would, and fearful indeed is the responsibility of those ministers of the gospel who have not discharged this duty. "In the practical working of this system," said the last General Assembly, "we are persuaded that all failures are owing mainly to the neglect or timidity of the ministry, in not bringing the subject fairly and prominently before the churches; and hence they resolved, "That all our pastors and stated supplies be earnestly requested, for our Lord's sake, to give to every member of their churches the opportunity to contribute something for the glory of God, presenting the claims of the various objects ordered by the Assembly, publicly and prominently from the pulpit; and that the Presbyteries be earnestly requested to see that the same privilege is afforded to all their vacant churches, and that they report their action on this subject, and the success of it, to the next General Assembly."

The timidity of ministers in presenting the claims of the Board is to us surprising, not merely because, as the ministers of Christ, they are bound to discharge their duty, whether men will

hear, or whether they will forbear, but also because we have reason to believe that the people, with very few exceptions, are kindly disposed to give, and are gratified when the opportunity is afforded them of doing so. We have heard of a very few instances in which *church-sessions* have prevented pastors from taking up collections for the Board; but such cases are happily very rare, and they ought to be brought, by the pastors, to the notice of their Presbyteries, that they may discipline the elders who thus presumptuously and wickedly rebel, not only against the solemn injunctions of the superior ecclesiastical courts of the Church, but also against the supreme authority and plain precepts of Christ himself. There are, however, very few sessions that would not consent to the presentation of any object ordered by the General Assembly, so that the neglect of this duty is almost in every case justly chargeable to the pastor or stated supply."

Our readers will observe that the Board, in this extract, distinctly take the ground, that although a "much larger number of churches than 1643, will no doubt report to the Assembly, contributions made by them *to the cause* of Domestic Missions, yet, inasmuch as none of their contributions came into the Board's treasury, and the Board, as such, derived no pecuniary assistance from them, therefore these churches are delinquent churches, and the responsibility of their ministers is a fearful one, and also that church sessions who prevent pastors from taking up collections for the Board, ought to be brought to the Presbyteries, that they may discipline the elders who thus presumptuously and wickedly rebel, &c." The position officially taken by the Board, then, is that contributions to the cause of Domestic Missions, if not made through the treasury of the Board, do not shield a church from censure as *delinquent*, nor its pastor from *fearful responsibility*, nor its session from discipline as *presumptuously* and *wickedly rebellious!*

Our readers will also observe, that the resolution of the Assembly quoted by the Board, falls far short of sustaining it in this position. The Assembly in their call "for our Lord's sake upon all pastors and stated supplies, to give the churches the opportunity of contributing something for the glory of God," had been careful to use the expression *to the various objects*; and the reason was, that the Assembly well knew that many of its churches and Presbyteries prefer to dispense themselves their own funds for Domestic Missions. In the judgment of the Board of Domestic Missions, however, giving to the object of Domestic Missions is nothing, except it be done through their treasury!

When the standing committee on the report of this Board, came to make their report, the chairman, in presenting a series of resolutions, said: "While we meet here and exchange friendly

greetings, must not a feeling of shame arise, that so many of our churches have been delinquent in this great duty? It is not for want of intelligence, wealth or enterprise, but for want of deep piety, that 1600 of our churches have made no report during the past year." And one of the resolutions affirmed that a particular church, which does not "contribute regularly to the Boards, should be considered to have forfeited its good standing."

Will our readers consider it strange, that upon such a demonstration from the Board of Domestic Missions, the voice of warm and earnest remonstrance should have been raised in defense of the church from these objurgations of her own servants?

Dr. R. J. Breckenridge quoted the statement of the secretary, that in 1855-6, there was an increase of contributing churches to the number of 100, and in 1856-7 to the number of 153. Here was encouragement enough to render unseasonable the tone of censure which ran through the report. Besides, the ground taken is, that the failure of 1600 churches to contribute to this Board, is an evidence of a want of piety, and that they will hasten to perdition unless it be remedied. This is not true, and he would never sanction such a statement. Good-standing is a term dear to us, because it expresses all we hold valuable in the character of a church. He would not vote to say that every church lost its good standing, because it failed to make a contribution to each specified cause in a given year. "Take care, sir! (said he) take care how you criminate the church, the Lamb's wife! Take care how you make her sad whom He hath not made sad!"

The writer of this Review said, "The resolutions call on us to adopt the principle that every church is bound under pain of censure to contribute yearly to all the Boards. But it ought not to be ignored any longer by the Boards and their advocates, that a large and increasing body of Presbyteries and churches do not like and will not co-operate with the System of Boards, as it is attempted continually to be forced and fastened upon us. He would tell the Assembly of a Presbytery, which he considered a model, viz Harmony Presbytery in South Carolina, which supports two Domestic Missionaries in its own bounds and then sends its surplus funds of \$400 or \$500 annually to the Board. They do not go through the vain ceremony of sending funds to Philadelphia just to be sent back to them again; nor of applying to the Board to commission a man whom they know well, and the Board does not know, to labor in a field with which they are familiar, and the Board entire strangers to it. Harmony Presbytery looks upon its Presbyterian bounds, just as every particular Minister and Session look upon their Parochial bounds, as given to them to cultivate, and they are doing their own business in their own bounds, without the needless intervention of a Board away off at Philadelphia. Yet Harmony Presbytery just because it feels

its own responsibilities to its own field, and is earnest in meeting them, is enabled on that very account to have a surplus which it sends on to the Board. He then contrasted with Harmony Presbytery, the Presbytery of South Carolina which had become "auxiliary to the Board"—a strange expression indeed! The church becoming auxiliary to its own officers! The consequence is, as it is likely always to be from such arrangements, that the Presbytery leans on the Board, and depends on them to do the work. There is a Board in Philadelphia whose duty it is to carry on Domestic Missions, and so Presbytery being always hurried with other business, this great interest is overlooked. In this way our Machinery is seen to be cumbrous, and the whole arrangement of a Board at Philadelphia, to supervise the work of Domestic Missions in an established Presbytery, is evidently an illogical, an unnatural, and a monstrous thing.

Furthermore, the Report censures many of our best churches, because there are many such, whose doings for the cause of Domestic Missions are direct and the Board does not know any thing of them. When a church for the negroes costing \$7,000 was built in Charleston, it was done *directly*; and when a Brother Minister of ours annually receives \$2,000 for preaching to them it is done *directly*; and are we to censure such doings because not done indirectly through the Board?"

The report was re-committed, and upon amendment was adopted unanimously.

We desire to call the attention of our readers to the precise mode in which this discussion arose. The occasion was the effort by friends of the Board system, to procure a vote of censure from the Assembly upon every church which does not give its contribution for the cause of Domestic Missions through the channel of that Board. Our whole action on that subject must be by one great central wheel, and all the means and powers and influences of the body must be forced into a channel which shall move that wheel. Some will say, there must have been a misunderstanding of this matter by the committee which reported the objectionable resolution, and that they could not have designed, deliberately, to set forth the principle which the Assembly so decidedly repudiated, viz: that all contributions to Domestic Missions are to be reckoned as no contributions except when sent through the Board. But there stands the well-deliberated language of the Board's Report, showing exactly what is the doctrine of the powers that be upon this subject. "Many churches will no doubt report to the Assembly that they have contributed to the cause of Domestic Missions, but their contributions did not come into our Treasury, and more earnest efforts must be made to induce them to do their duty. These are delinquent churches. Pastors are under a fearful responsibility. Their sessions are presumptuous

and wicked rebels and deserved discipline." Such was the occasion which forced opposition upon those not altogether enamoured of the Boards. At Buffalo, and at Nashville, the measure urged on the minority was *increase of Boards*. At Lexington, the measure urged was *censure upon all* who would not employ the one big wheel. So that, now as before, the minority was still on the defensive against an ever aggressive majority. Instead of the "constant irritation of our public officers" and the "constant, underhand, stealthy stabbing of them," which a distinguished member of the Assembly at Nashville said, that "his soul loathes," there was witnessed at Lexington, as there had been witnessed before, nothing else but just the setting of this alternative before the minority, either to yield up their cherished principles, or else fairly and earnestly to oppose the measures of the Domestic Missionary Board.

If the Board have any body but themselves to blame for the misfortune which happened to them at Lexington, we judge it to be a certain very high authority, which reviewing the Assembly at Buffalo, not only pronounced the whole discussion to be about a "matter unworthy of debate," "a *jus divinum* theory in its dotage," a mere question of "splitting of hairs;" but also set it down for certain that the controversy could never be renewed. And which again reviewing the very next Assembly, when the controversy *was earnestly renewed*, again assumed "that this whole matter is set at rest." "Giants," indeed, had sought to give momentum to the matter, but the matter was nothing but a feather, and so, of course, the more vigorous the throw, the less was the effect." The giants had failed, "not from the want of strength, but from the inherent weakness of their cause." Was it any wonder that the Board should rely on these assurances, should believe the question settled, and ignoring the manifest difference of opinion which exists in the church should expect the Assembly to pass that vote of censure?

Gradually, we suppose, the Board and other influential parties in the church will come to understand that there are two sets of opinions amongst us on this whole subject. And Presbyterians being free men and independent men, it will probably be found a controlling consideration with our churches and presbyteries, if *they* think sufficient for them the objections to the existing system, whether the powers that be, regarded those objections as serious or as slight. With the highest respect for those who have pronounced these objections to be mere "cobwebs," we propose to state them distinctly, but briefly, once more, having great faith in the reiteration of a true testimony.

1. This machinery is not Presbyterian. It is a relic of our old congregational bondage. It presents us all the *paraphernalia* of the voluntary societies. It exhibits the committee of a church

court, in the singular attitude of electing presidents and vice presidents for itself, and selling the privilege of its membership for thirty, and its dictatorship for fifty dollars! Had we never been under New England influence, we had never had Boards, but single committees of the Assembly. Every one of our courts, like every organized body of men has an inherent right to commit the doing of certain things to committees. When it is necessary—when the thing to be done can not otherwise be accomplished, they may also, by inherent right, appoint a commission to do it. In matters like Domestic and Foreign Missions, nothing more is necessary than simple committees. A Board or Commission can do nothing in these matters, which the Assembly could not better do of itself. There being no necessity for a delegation of the powers of a Board or Commission of Domestic Missions to a portion of its members, the Assembly has no right to delegate them. Much less has it a right to transfer them to another body composed, perhaps, in no case, of its own members, but of gentlemen scattered all over the land. Least of all has it a right to delegate them to a body organized and constituted after a congregational and not a Presbyterian fashion. If the Assembly may delegate the conduct of these matters to other bodies than itself, then it may delegate the conduct of them to the Boston Board and to the Home Missionary Society. But the church is God's agent to do His work, not to see it done by other bodies. And He having given her a work to do herself, she is not to constitute herself His counsellor, nor is she to undertake to mend His plans with her opinion that she can better accomplish the work by delegating it to an organization devised by herself or borrowed from others. She has no such wide discretionary power as all this involves.

2. This machinery gives us not only an unlawful but an inefficient substitute for the direct action of the church. It is not only an unnatural and monstrous thing, a mongrel product of two different species, but it is also a weak thing and inoperative of any good. How can one hundred men, selected from all parts of this country, ever be expected to meet together? How can even one-fourth of their number ever be expected to assemble? Their control, therefore, of the business committed to them is nominal. The whole thing is a *sham*; and it is none the less a miserable one, because enacted by a great church; nor the less to be condemned because a substitution of an invention of man for God's divine workmanship.

3. This machinery is not only inefficient for good, but it is directly and positively injurious. The Boards have been described as a useful break-water in times of storm; as a needful intermediate body between the Executive Committee and the Assembly to protect the latter from possible impositions by the former.*

*See Bib. Repertory, for July 1854., p. 561.

This description of them is true, in so far as it calls them an "intermediate body between the Assembly and the committee; and in so far as it shows that they can and do keep the two apart. Protect the Assembly from the committee forsooth! And are they not, then, of equal force to protect the Committee from the Assembly? Yes! they are a separating wall between the church and her benevolent operations. They obstruct the flow of sympathy between the two. "The Assembly is the heart and centre of our church and the zeal there kindled passes to the extremities of the whole body, and makes the whole body one in sympathy and energy and aim." Of all things else with which it has to do, let us not choose to separate the Assembly from these works of the church's benevolence. Let it rule and direct in them with the most immediate and uninterrupted sway, so far as may be consistent with the highest efficiency of the Presbyteries in respect each to its own immediate field. Let not this "intermediate body," or as it was still better called in the Nashville Assembly, "this intermediate barrier," come in and check the flow of sympathy from the Missions of the church, whether at home or abroad, through the Committee directly to the Assembly, and then from the Assembly to every Presbytery and Session and Church!

But the damage which the church suffers from this machinery is not confined to its influence *upon the Assembly* and upon the church through the Assembly. It is also injurious to the church in its influence *upon the Presbyteries*. It is directly in the way of their doing their own proper work. It also affords them encouragement to neglect that work. If the Board could do this work of the Presbyteries, the evil would not be so great. But it is perfectly impossible for a company of brethren at any centre to carry forward the Missionary work of our church in the bounds of all our Presbyteries. Whether you have a Board or a simple committee at the centre they never can cultivate all these fields with efficiency. It is perfectly absurd to make the attempt. The sole use of any organization, whether complicated or simple, for Domestic Missions, is to operate in the frontier and destitute settlements, where either there is no Presbytery, or else a very feeble Presbytery. As soon as the Presbytery is self-sustaining, it ought to be left to manage its own field entirely by itself. In this way only can the energies of our system be developed. So long as it is understood to be the business of the Board to conduct the whole Domestic Missionary work of our church in the established Presbyteries as well as outside of them, there will be both a failure to do the work, and a failure to draw out the church's energies, and the greater the wheel at the centre—the more noise it makes; the more it is made to attract attention by the numerous D.D's. and other vain gewgaws and orna-

ments with which you bedeck it—the more will it be in the way of the earnest action of the Presbyteries, because they will rely all the more on it for the doing of their proper work. This is, in part, the explanation of the fact that many churches do nothing for Domestic Missions. The Board does not reach them; and the Presbytery does not reach them, because Domestic Missions is not the business of the Presbytery, but of the Board. And then another unpleasant consequence follows, as was witnessed in the last Assembly, viz: that the Board *objurgates*. The engineer labours in vain with many distressing contortions to strain up the machine a little tighter, and to make it grind out better results. The attempt is both disagreeable and dangerous. Better would it be to alter and to simplify. The machinery is badly arranged. The power is applied in the wrong place. One big wheel is employed, while the case demands the use of a number of smaller wheels.

4. There is at least one more objection to this system of Boards, viz: that it is a system of centralization, inconsistent with our principle of parity. *In the first place*, three of the four Boards have their centres in one point, and the whole power of each is actually and inevitably centred in the hands of a few of its members living at or near that one point. But, *in the second place*, there is, in the case of the Domestic Missionary Board, a vast centralization of power in the hands of one man. We now have nearly 600 Domestic Missionaries, all of whom receive their commissions, and in part their support from this Board, of which the whole power and influence is centred, to a very great degree, in the hands of its Secretary! This Secretary, it has been well said, is “less dangerous to the church than Dr. Peters was in 1837, only because he is a friend instead of an enemy—only because he is orthodox and not heretical!” His personal character is our only guaranty of safety! His position is, in itself, a dangerous one for the church. All power involves danger, but there is no case like this in our whole church. Every centre of power is a dangerous thing; but there is no centre of power in our church equal to this, and none where the existing power is not divided between several men. Our largest Seminary has not 150 Theological Students in it, and four Professors divide the influence amongst them. Our Foreign Board has only about 70 Missionaries, and three Secretaries divide the influence amongst them. But here are nearly 600 Missionaries and one Secretary to communicate with them all!

Abolish all the Boards and you get rid of all these difficulties, disadvantages and dangers at once. You secure at once the direct action of the church, and her direct action in connection with her schemes of charity and love and zeal and duty. You obtain her regular and lawful and efficient action. You cease enacting a humbug. Instead of all this “*Lumber*,” these cumbrous *Boards*, this awkward worthless machinery, you have central committees, conferring

no dangerous power upon one man, and only serving to equalize and distribute the resources of the church between the strong and the weak parts. And then, better still, you have the Presbyteries all doing their own work in their own fields. You encourage the healthy development of our boundless resources, and, by the grace of God, you get every church and every individual at work.

As to the *Agency system* (which Dr. Musgrave desired the Assembly would in some degree at least, resort to again, because as he "ventured to say, the new plan would not succeed unless there were some men to superintend the machine and get it fairly in operation,") we rejoice to believe it a dead thing, past galvanizing into life again. It never did reach any of our churches except the large and rich ones. The small and poor ones were not worth looking after by Agents, and so their benevolence and charity got no cultivation by that miserable system. We expect to see a very different operation from the influence of those grand principles of God's word (that "giving is a grace, and offerings of money for the support and propagation of the gospel, an act of worship") to which this Assembly on various occasions testified in reiteration of the testimony of the Assemblies at Buffalo and Nashville. But we confess to some little surprise that the Secretary of the Board of Domestic Missions seems on all occasions to lose sight of the circumstance that these are *principles* and not *plans* nor *expedients*. Throughout his speech before the Assembly, as in the extract from the Board's Report quoted above, it was always "*your plan*," "*your new plan*," "*your systematic benevolence plan*." It was a "machine" which "if you did not have some men to superintend" there would be a complete disappointment of all our expectations from it! The Secretary's hands have been full of "*machinery*" for a long time. But has he not a head and a heart to see and to feel the power of *principles*? We call on him to take notice that what he calls "*your new plan*" is just a doctrine of God's word, a precept and a truth of the New Testament; one of those things which has an essential and an indestructible vitality, and the power of which depends, with the Holy Spirit's grace and blessing upon its being simply repeated in the ears of men.

BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The following paper was presented from the Committee on this Board's Report.

"Our church, which numbers 2,320 ministers, and 233,755 members, now has, as her representatives in all the heathen world, only about seventy preachers of the everlasting Gospel. Our contributions for the support and propagation of Christianity among the heathen, amount, during the past year, to only about \$207,000, less \$41,000 received from the United States Government for the American Indians, that is only about \$166,000.

Our Board report a balance against their treasury of \$11,000. They also report a wide and effectual door opened for us in India, China, Siam, Africa, and our own Indian tribes. They report a pressing necessity for more money to support the work as it now stands, and more men and money to extend the work, as a good Providence is opening the way for it to be extended. And this Assembly is asked to adopt such measures as will place this great matter on a proper footing before our churches, not only relieving the Board from its present debt, but enabling it to enlarge its operations.

I. The Assembly would respond to this call by reiterating to, and before all our churches, the testimony of the Assembly at Buffalo, and the Assembly at Nashville, that liberality in giving for the support and propagation of the Gospel is a grace of the spirit; that it is a fruit, and an evidence, and a means of grace; also by reiterating the testimony of those Assemblies, that offerings of money for the services of the Lord, are acts of worship which ought to be systematically and solemnly performed in all our churches, and by every Christian.

II. The Assembly would also declare, (speaking to itself in the ministers and elders here present, and through them to each and every minister and elder in all our bounds,) that not only is it our individual duty to exercise this liberality and to make these offerings, but moreover, that it is the official duty of every one of us, to set forth this testimony in our several churches, until they all practically receive the same.

III. Applying these general principles to the particular matter of Foreign Missions, this Assembly would recommend the following, amongst other modes and ways of training our people in the grace of giving:

(a.) That our Sunday-schools be enlisted by pastors in the good work of contributing for Foreign Missions. The aggregation of many particles is always a mighty thing; and in this case, the many small streams would, by flowing together, make a great river. But far more than this, the children of the church would thus be receiving an education in benevolence and beneficence.

(b.) That our ministers preach systematically and frequently on the subject of Foreign Missions, teaching the people that it is their duty to give more and more money to this cause, in order that the work may grow and spread, and in proportion as it does grow and spread, because the knowledge of the Lord must fill the earth, even as the waters fill the sea; that our ministers also teach that it is needful to increase greatly the number of missionaries in heathen lands, and that, to this end, more of our young men must willingly offer themselves to this work, being thereto moved by the Holy Spirit, and therein honoured by the Great Head of the church; that our ministers also teach that it is the joyful privilege of pious parents, filled with faith and the Holy Ghost, to dedicate their children to this most glorious, exalted and happy service. Moreover, the first Sunday evening in every month or on other occasions, and from time to time let the people hear from their minister, detailed accounts of various Foreign Missions in succession, with a description of the religious condition of the people, and the beginning and progress of the church's work amongst them.

(c.) That, to this end, our Ministers take pains themselves carefully to read the *Home and Foreign Record* and *Foreign Missionary*, so as to

know what is being done by our missionaries ; and that they also further the circulation and encourage the reading of these publications in their congregations.

IV. With respect to the debt of \$11,000 which has been reported, this Assembly is perfectly well aware of the difficulty and embarrassment into which debt must always bring the Board. The credit of the Board and the progress, nay the very existence of the missions, we know, requires that the church, from year to year, should furnish all the means which the exigencies of our great Foreign enterprise demand. The church has manifestly not furnished this year all that some peculiar circumstances, and still more, the general and healthy growth of our missions made needful. But this Assembly in humble yet cheerful confidence in our Great Head and in His people, would solemnly bid the Board, in His name, go forward and enter every door which He sets before them. The work of Foreign propagation of the faith must not stop, nor be even checked, yet on the other hand the Assembly would call upon the churches, as they would deliver their agents, the Board, from the present difficulty, and from the certainty of yet greater embarrassments at the close of the current year, immediately and considerably to enlarge their gifts and offerings. Let those who have heretofore given, now, if possible, give twenty-five per cent. at least more, for it is a blessed thing to give—a more blessed thing to give than to receive. Let every minister aim to increase the contributions from his church, so that they shall amount to at least one dollar a year on the average for every church member. Let us bring all the tithes into store-houses and see if the Lord will not pour us out a blessing so that there shall not be room enough to receive it."

The Secretary, Dr. Wilson, urged the propriety of the Assembly's giving to this subject a due share of attention. The Assembly (said he) will spend twelve or fourteen days in considering the spiritual interests of our single country, but as to this great World, compared with which, our own population is a handful, is it right that their claims should be dispatched in an hour? Ought not every Assembly to appropriate at least one day to this subject? Dr. Wilson's desire was gratified. The Assembly spent nearly the whole day of Monday in the consideration of this matter. It was a great privilege to be there. Dr. Wilson's speech was full of encouraging statements and moving appeals. More than 150 conversions of Heathen at our missionary stations during the past year were reported. Our churches have increased their contributions some \$6,000 or \$7,000. A Pastor of an important church has quit his charge and gone into the field as a missionary. A Ruling Elder of high standing, has gone and taken with him five members of his church; and from another church, in the same neighborhood, one Ruling Elder and two members have gone; and these churches have since been blessed as never before. The speeches made on this occasion brought out distinctly the ideas that the missionary work aims to subjugate the whole world to Christ, and that our present doings are but a

small beginning of it. This is a day of preparation for a brighter day that is soon to shine. We are to train the church, and very particularly *the children* of the church for a constant advance in this work. And the way to train the church to this duty is by instruction in the facts and in the principles of the case. Our people need to be preached to respecting the state of the heathen world, and the progress of the gospel amongst them. They need to be taught that *giving* is an evidence and means of grace as well as a fruit of it, and that this giving is worship acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. One of the evidences that the present is a time of preparation is that this work is now regarded by the church to a certain extent, in its true relation and just proportions. It is no longer on the one hand a romantic enterprise, something which we must be wrought up to engage in, by excitement. It is no longer on the other hand an enterprise only of the martyr spirit. It is no longer viewed as a great and dreadful privation, but a great honor and happiness to be a missionary. It is now looked upon as a part of the organized life of the church, and of the whole church. To feel no interest in Foreign Missions is now held to be as inconsistent in a Christian, as not to pray. It has come now to be a part of the worship of God. Whatever agency we exert in any work of benevolence, is homage paid to God. And when this Assembly, representing our whole church, is engaged in devising plans for the promotion of this work, it is one great act of worship, one grand doxology. Is it not a great revival when we no longer look upon Foreign Missions as something outside of the church, but something intrinsic and essential to her very life?

Another sign of preparation for great things, is the amazing concentrative interest awakened in all parts of the church, in regard to candidates for the ministry.

Another is, the revival of certain important principles long obscured, through the influence of which, God seems to be preparing the means of sustaining the men that He is raising up. The principle is laid down that giving is worship. And now how much are we to give? Two of the rules of political economy may be brought in to help us out with an answer, one is the law of demand and supply. A demand is never held to exist at all, until those who make the demand have desires, so intense as to make them willing to meet all the costs the supply of these desires may impose upon them. Now, this is true in the kingdom of God. There is no demand for an increase of labourers, unless we have such desires for them, as make us willing to meet all the expenses of a supply; the expenses of educating and supporting them, whether at home or abroad. Now just such a real demand God appears to be producing in our Zion. The other rule is that saving is a means of increasing capital. This is true in political

economy, and true also in the kingdom of God; but in order to try and also to increase our faith, there is connected with this rule in its application to God's spiritual kingdom, a natural improbability to contradict our natural convictions, and God tells us that not *the saving* but the *liberal* soul shall be made fat. But as God is Governor both of the natural and of the spiritual world, He arranges His dealings with us so that we shall find that our givings never do impoverish us.

With respect to the debt of \$11,000 reported by the Board, the Assembly passed a resolution calling on the churches for a special collection to remove it. And subsequently on motion of two of our most venerable fathers, a collection was taken up in the Assembly which yielded over \$1200.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

This Board reported 383 candidates for the Ministry on its roll, which is one more than last year. In funds, it reported a considerable increase over any previous year, and that, without any agents sent out to collect money. If we cannot agree with the officers of this Board in the views they still hold regarding secular education, we may congratulate them upon the increasing liberality of the church on behalf of their endeavors to educate faithful ministers of the Gospel. Without agents to beg for them, and without ob-jurgatory speeches or reports, the church, it appears, gives them every year more and more money. We join the Board in the prayer that God may increase a thousand fold the number of candidates for the Ministry, and of labourers in the field. We do not anticipate, however, any very large increase of the operations of this Board. The matter of supporting and of overlooking our young men who are candidates for licensure, is one which the Presbyteries, we feel sure, will more and more desire to keep in their own hands. They ought to keep it there. Each Presbytery owes this to itself and to its churches. The Presbytery takes the young men of its different churches *under its care* as candidates for licensure. Presbytery therefore ought, in all cases, to direct and superintend their course of study. As to the support of candidates, each Presbytery can far more easily raise the funds for its own candidates, than a Board or a central committee can do this for all the candidates of our whole church. And each Presbytery needs to retain in its own hands, this powerful lever of personal interest and of individual sympathy, in order therewith to draw forth the mighty energies of the whole church, which from the nature of things, no central committee and no Board can do.

THE BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

This Board reported the issue of 45 new books and 14 new tracts, in editions amounting to 73,000 of the former, and 27,000

of the latter; also reprints of former publications to the number of 677,500 copies besides 18,000 copies of selections from Rouse's Version of the Psalms. They have sold during the year past 193,578 volumes and 477,441 pages of tracts. This is an increase in the sale of volumes over the previous year, to the number of 22,062. In the department of Colportage there has been great enlargement and peculiar encouragement. In the receipts of the Board, also, there has been a very gratifying increase this year from every source.

CHURCH EXTENSION COMMITTEE.

This committee reported funds received to the amount of \$23,265.61—a large increase over the year previous, when they collected only \$9,751.31. The number of contributing churches has increased from 167 to 502. These results have been reached without any salaried, collecting agent. The appropriations made during the year ending April 1st, 1857, were to churches in nineteen States. Of these, Ohio and Iowa each has had *twelve* appropriations, Illinois *nine*, Pennsylvania *eight*, Wisconsin, Indiana and Missouri each *five*, and New York *six*. Eleven other States have received some *two* and some *one* appropriation. The other twelve States of this Union have received *none*.

The funds contributed have come from twenty-nine Synods. New York contributed \$8,518, Missouri 2,055, New Jersey \$760, Wheeling \$607; Albany, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Pittsburg, Chicago and Mississippi each over \$500; Ohio, Cincinnati and Virginia Synods each over \$400, and the remaining Synods little or nothing.

The history of this committee begins with the Assembly which met at Buffalo in 1854. The minority in that Assembly steadfastly refused to take any step towards the separation of this object from the general interests of the Domestic Missionary work. Apparently beaten by the majority, they did really gain the victory, as is the case so often with minorities. The subject was referred again to the Board of Domestic Missions, and all that the majority gained was a vote of instructions to that Board to enlarge their Committee of Church Extension—to appoint a Secretary for this department, if they should deem it necessary—to bring the matter before the churches in such way (that is, by such agencies) as the Board should deem it best to employ—and to report separately the receipts and disbursements of this fund. The Board deemed it best to do nothing upon this basis, showing that the victory so vaunted of, was thus confessed to be of no value.

In the next Assembly the subject again came up, and the result was still more significant as to the growing dislike of the system of Boards. Dr. Backus, Chairman of the Committee on the Domestic Board's Report, himself a strong Board man, moved

“the election of a Committee of Church Extension to consist of — ministers and elders and to be located at the city of ———,” and then gave reasons why a *Committee* was recommended rather than a *Board*. “If (said he) we had thought a Board would be more desirable, we would have reported a Board.” It was then moved to recommit with instructions to report a fifth Board. After a long debate that motion was lost, a large portion of the *warmest friends of the Boards voting against the measure for a new Board!**

Some desired to refer the whole matter to the several Synods. Others desired to transfer the existing committee, still being in connection with the Board, to St. Louis. And yet others preferred rather to transfer the Board itself to some other place than Philadelphia. Finally, the Assembly determined to have a *Committee* of Church Extension separate from the Board, and to locate it at St. Louis. Then it was endeavored to get this committee called a Board. But the Assembly was positive that it would neither have a fifth Board, nor give that name to this committee. Then the strenuous Board party sought to have the committee a large one, so as to be as much as possible like a Board, and successively the numbers 99, 85, 80, 65, &c. &c., were proposed and rejected, until they came down to 24, which the Assembly accepted—twelve ministers and twelve elders, elected by the Assembly, one-third every year.

The result reached was evidently a compromise between two opposite opinions. The Assembly distinctly refused a fifth Board, and even the name of Board; yet, under the name of Committee, created a Board on a small scale. It is still an intermediate body or barrier between the Assembly, and the work of building churches which he have undertaken. And it is constituted upon the same principle, as all the other Boards, viz: that of selecting for its members, not those who shall be able to meet and do its business, but prominent men from various parts of the country who never can assemble together! It is really pitiful to see our brethren, the lovers of Boards, clinging with such desperation to this poor device. Of the dozen of ministers who now compose this committee, Natchez, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Philadelphia, Pittsburg and New York each furnish one. What is the sense, or the use of this kind of thing? The *real* members of the committee are those who reside at St. Louis? Why not let them be the only members of it? The Assembly resolved to locate a Committee of Church Extension at St. Louis. How can a committee be *located at St. Louis*, when two-thirds of its members are not, and probably never will be, there?

Of all the interests which our church seeks to promote, we

*See Biblical Repertory, for July 1855.

think this one of Church Extension, or rather church erection, is the one least adapted to be well managed by any central organization whatever. When a meeting-house shall be built, and where it shall be built, are just what no remote central committee can ever decide wisely. It is just in regard to this particular matter, of all others, that a great church like ours, in a great country like ours, will find one big wheel at the centre most fatally inefficient. The work of church-building is just that work, of all others, which must be left to the people themselves in every locality to carry forward in the best way they can. They must get their meeting-houses as they get their dwelling-houses. They must build first a log church if they can do no better, just as they build first a log house to dwell in, if they can do no better. Leave the whole business to them, and as they have always done the business somehow, so they will somehow do it still. And what they cannot do, none of your central committees can do for them. What does the Church Extension Committee expect to do for any one church? Only to give the people two or three hundred dollars, when they shall have collected themselves all the rest of the funds! And if they can secure all but that trifle, can they not secure that too? The best church-builders are good ministers. We have now about eight hundred more churches than ministers. And the ministers are not gaining on the churches, but the contrary; and this, (as it has been well said by Dr. Breckinridge,) whilst the increase of churches has been a spontaneous thing, but the increase of ministers a thing of the most earnest effort for a long time. The building of church edifices, is therefore not the great thing which needs fostering, except, indeed, it may be in one particular region of the church, the cold north-west, to which thousands of emigrants from the east are hurrying, and where without comfortable churches a congregation cannot assemble in the winter. And accordingly we find, as stated above, that Ohio, Iowa and Illinois have had the largest portion of all the funds appropriated.

Notwithstanding the encouragements in their work which this committee were able to report to the Assembly, it was nevertheless evident that they have begun to find that serious difficulties encompass the attempt to supervise by a central organization such a purely local concern as church erection. Hence their endeavor to induce the Assembly to pass a resolution approving a further condition to be annexed to all their appropriations, viz: that "churches aided should not directly or indirectly apply for aid to any church or member of our denomination outside of its own community without the consent of the committee." "The committee *will be crippled*," (said its chairman,) if incessant applications can be made to the very churches to which we must look for funds. Those Presbyteries which have rich churches will be worn out with applications. A New York pastor had lately

written them that he had had six applications in one week. These churches will not give to the committee unless we will pledge ourselves to keep off from them these constant applications." So the rich churches in New York wish to convert the Committee of Church Extension into a bull dog to keep off troublesome applications, and will, no doubt, pay them well for the service! The committee say in their report: "This difficulty was very forcibly set forth some years ago in a letter from a very liberal and distinguished pastor to the late Committee of the Board of Missions." He says: "To-day a brother *comes*, to-morrow another *writes*, perhaps and most probably for aid to build a church. The whole affair is getting oppressive. Can you do any thing at your office to relieve us?" And so to relieve the liberal and distinguished pastor who is ready to faint, because "the whole affair is getting to be oppressive," and still more to relieve his rich church, the committee must bark loudly and sharply at the poor churches, and the Assembly must be made to bark at them too! What for shall these poor churches not be allowed to apply directly or indirectly to those rich ones? The committee's answer is, because by their "going to those from whom the committee had reason to expect contributions, means will be turned away which would otherwise have flowed into our treasury." "If individual appeals should cease, the committee's income would rapidly approximate to the more pressing necessities of the work." Yet the committee expect only to give two or three hundred dollars to each church after it has raised perhaps its thousands. In each particular case, the committee has to raise a little and the poor church a great deal; and must the Assembly drive away the church from the full fountains just to let the committee drink? What help is it to the general cause, if those who have to raise fourteen-fifteenths of the cost of each meeting-house are to be kept from begging money, because their begging interferes with the success of others who have to raise only one-fifteenth of it?

In the debate upon this resolution Dr. Thornwell pointed out to the Committee of Church Extension the suicidal character of their effort to pass this resolution. Its inevitable result would be, that the feeble churches would make choice between individual applications and the committee, and would of course choose the former; and then the committee would soon find its occupation gone, and its treasury empty. Moreover, this resolution strikes a blow at the Communion of Saints, and it will also cut off the Church Extension Committee from sympathy. Your doctrine is, that giving is worship, and the churches will not consent to ask a St. Louis committee whether or not they shall exercise that privilege. As to the numerous and vexatious applications, just let the rich churches say that they already give through the committee. They have their remedy in their own hands.

The resolution was stricken out.

COMMITTEE ON SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE.

This is one of the Standing Committees of the Assembly. It presented the following report which, after a single amendment, was adopted. We mention the amendment, because it was one of the numerous indications made in this Assembly, of the progress of sound views amongst us. In Recommendation, No. 2, the report as presented called on the Presbyteries "*to provide as soon as possible an efficient superintendence within their bounds of this business, &c.*" It was objected, that this signified the appointment of some agent to set the machine in motion. Accordingly with the cordial assent of the Rev. S. S. Laws, Chairman, the Assembly amended the report so as to read "*to provide as soon as possible for the exercise of an efficient superintendence, &c.*"

"The Committee on Systematic Benevolence would respectfully report: That communications have been received from the stated clerks of the following twenty-four Presbyteries, viz: Londonderry, Troy, Albany, Mohawk, Ogdensburg, Green River, West Jersey, Raritan, Philadelphia, Newcastle, Northumberland, Alleghany, Beaver, Alleghany City, Columbus, Palestine, Logansport, Louisville, Transylvania, Greenbriar, Lexington, Fayetteville, Knoxville, and South Carolina.

These papers indicate: 1. That the practice of systematic benevolence is gradually spreading through our church. Only three of the Presbyteries heard from last year are reported this year; and the most of these new names appear as showing an increase in the number of Presbyteries which have taken action on this important subject. Whilst some of them heard from have not as yet adopted any plan of benevolence, on the other hand it is manifest that many Presbyteries have a system in operation, but have failed to send up any reports. And were the names preserved on record so that a comparison could be extended back for two years, it is believed that the result would only the more plainly show the growth of this cause, notwithstanding so few reports have been received. Moreover, it shows that the heaven is at work, when it is observed that the Presbyteries from which reports mostly favorable have been received, in the last two years, lie within the bounds of twenty-three Synods; and also, that although the action of the Assembly of 1854 specifically aimed to turn the attention of the Presbyteries to this subject, yet eleven Synods, viz: Wheeling, Ohio, Cincinnati, Indiana, Northern Indiana, Illinois, Chicago, Wisconsin, Iowa, Missouri and Georgia, have adopted plans of systematic benevolence, embracing each of the several enterprises under the General Assembly; whilst several other Synods, as Pittsburg, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Virginia, and South Carolina, have severally agreed on definite times for raising funds for one or more objects. All these go to show that system in the matter of benevolence is gaining ground in the churches.

2. So far as the papers in the hands of the committee suggest an inference, it is likewise indicated that, whenever a plan of benevolence is adopted, it generally works well, securing increased contributions, and in some instances seeming to be the means of calling down the gracious

influences of the Spirit of God. Some Presbyteries and churches, it is stated, had plans prior to the action of this Assembly on the subject, and as the choice of the particular method to be adopted was left by that action to be determined by the exercise of a wise discretion, considerable diversity prevails, nor does absolute uniformity appear to be practicable. In this, however, as in other matters, the adoption of an imperfect plan or system is found to be better than no system, just as an imperfect government is better than none. Some of the papers speak of only partial trials of defective schemes having worked so well as even to induce special efforts to rectify and mature them. Experience and perseverance alone can reach perfections in a matter of this kind.

3. But it is likewise evident, from the fewness and contents of the papers placed in the hands of the committee, that there is great need of this whole subject of systematic benevolence being again earnestly and affectionately urged upon the attention of the Presbyteries, and kept before them until all of them take some definite action, and report the same as soon as possible to the General Assembly.

The principal thing now demanded in this very important department of the church's labor, appears to be, that such personal efforts be made by individuals, and measures devised and put into operation by Synods, Presbyteries and Sessions, as shall secure, as far as possible, the actual adoption of system in the matter of benevolence, and bring forth its legitimate fruits. And as means of carrying into prompt and full effect the original intention of the General Assembly on this subject :

1st. It is urged upon each stated clerk to see that *systematic benevolence* is placed on the docket of Presbyterial business every spring, and send, as his regular annual report to the General Assembly, an attested minute of the proceedings of the Presbytery on the subject. [See Minutes of the Assembly, 1855, p. 296, resolutions 2, 3.]

2d. It is recommended to the Presbyteries that have not already done so, to take action to provide as soon as possible for the exercise of an efficient superintendence, within their bounds of this business, so as to bring about a thorough inauguration and maintenance of some plan of benevolence in all their churches.

3d. The Secretaries of the Boards are again invited and urged to give increased aid by personal labors and correspondence, in realizing all that is contemplated in this movement of the church.

4th. That special attention be given by pastors, elders and others to the training of children and youth in the family, Sabbath-schools and other institutions of the church, to habits of cheerful and conscientious systematic benevolence.

5th. That in the appropriate exercise of discretion in the choice of any particular method, it be borne in mind how important it is in order to efficiency :

1st. That given objects of benevolence be definitely determined upon, especially the four Boards and the Church Extension Committee of this Assembly and the Bible cause.

2d. That at stated times, an opportunity be given to all the members of the churches and congregations to aid these several objects.

Thus will 'gatherings' be made of what may have been laid by in

store according to the apostolic injunction—' Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches in Galatia, so do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him.'

6th. That the doctrine and duties of Divine stewardship be more distinctly and fully recognized, more frequently and earnestly inculcated, as underlying this whole subject. Glorify God in your bodies, and in your spirit, which are God's. In this, as in all cases, the blessing follows the performance of the duty. 'Honor the Lord with thy substance and with the first fruits of all thine increase; so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine.' 'Bring ye all the tithes into the store-house, that there may be meat in my house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven and pour out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it.'"

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

The forty-fifth annual report of Princeton Seminary was presented. Fifty new students had been received within the past year, of whom six are members of Baptist churches, two of the German Reformed, one of the Associate Reformed, one of the Associate church, and one of the Lutheran church. The whole number of students during the year was one hundred and ten. Twenty-six had received certificates of having completed the course of study. The funds are in a highly satisfactory condition. One gentleman has given lately \$10,000 to be used as a sustentation fund for students. The condition of the Institution is every way prosperous and flourishing.

The Western Theological Seminary reported thirty-one new students. The whole number on the roll was eighty-one. The Directors asked the Assembly to increase the number of that Board to *forty*, to be divided into four classes, one of which to go out every year.

The Danville Seminary reported the whole number of students to be thirty-six, of whom twelve graduated at the end of the session and received diplomas. The Professors suggested that all students should be required to put themselves under the care of some Presbytery at an early period, and to apply for licensure at the end of the second year in the Seminary; also to be present from the beginning of every session to its close. The Directors asked for a fourth Professor to be appointed by the Assembly. They reported funds to the amount of about \$11,000 and urge the completion of their endowment as soon as possible.

The Union Seminary, Virginia, reported twenty-five students, of whom ten were new students. The funds amount to \$82,300. They can accommodate about seventy students in their buildings. They have three scholarships endowed, and are endowing a fourth. They have increased the salary of the Professors.

The following is the report of the committee to whom all these documents were sent. The report was adopted at once, except the resolution concerning the Western Seminary which was docketed, and came up subsequently for debate.

1. *Resolved*, That the churches be urged to complete the endowment of those Seminaries that are not yet fully endowed, to increase the number of scholarships, and to furnish funds for the repair and erection of suitable buildings, and the enlargement of the libraries.

2. *Resolved*, That candidates should be required to put themselves under the care of Presbyteries as soon as possible, and receive careful supervision during their entire course, and that whatever arrangements the Presbyteries may deem expedient to facilitate their training, these arrangements should not be such as will tend to shorten the full term of study, or induce an absence from their classes, at either the opening or closing exercises of the Seminary's sessions.

3. *Resolved*, That the following persons be appointed Directors of the Princeton Theological Seminary, until May, 1860, viz: *Ministers*—J. N. Campbell, D.D., George Potts, D.D., John McDowell, D.D., D. V. McLean, D.D., William Neill, D.D., H. A. Wilson, D.D., John Thompson, D.D., *Ruling Elders*—John Fine, Ebenezer Platt, Ira C. Whitesides.

4. *Resolved*, That the Board of Directors of the Western Theological Seminary, at Allegheny, be enlarged to forty, and divided into four equal classes, one of which shall go out of office annually.

5. *Resolved*, That the following persons compose the class of Directors to serve for three years, viz: *Ministers*—Francis Herron, D.D., Elisha P. Swift, D.D., W. M. Paxton, W. B. McIlvaine, John Kerr, James Alexander, Cyrus Dickson. *Elders*—Luke Loomis, Alexander Johnston, James Carothers, M. D. To serve for four years, the following: *Ministers*—Thomas Creigh, D.D., James S. Woods, D.D., A. S. Hall, D.D., James Hodge, D.D., John P. Caldwell, James M. Platt, S. M. McClung. *Elders*—Lucas Flattery, Dr. H. A. True, A. Cameron.

6. *Resolved*, That in the matter of the will and legacy of about twenty thousand dollars, of the late Judge Henry P. Broadnax, of Kentucky, the Assembly judge that the proper disposition of the funds bequeathed by him to the Trustees of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian church, and by a codicil to his will, directed to be used at Danville, in Kentucky, in connection with the Theological Seminary there, is that the said funds ought to go into the hands of the Board of Trustees of said Seminary, to be appropriated by them under the discretion granted in the said will, according to the intentions of the generous testator; and that the Trustees of the Board of Education ought to perform any legal act, to which they are competent, and that may be necessary in affecting this disposition of the said funds. If the Board of Trustees of the Danville Seminary, in the exercise of their legal discretion, think proper to endow a Professorship with said funds, in that case the Professorship so endowed shall be the second on the list, and shall be called the Broadnax Professorship, of Biblical and Ecclesiastical history.

7. *Resolved*, That, considering the great liberality of Samuel Laird, Esq., of Kentucky, who has generously contributed to the funds belonging to the said Danville Seminary, the sum of twenty thousand dollars, it is here.

by directed that the first Professorship on the list shall be called the Laird Professorship of Exegetic and Polemic Theology.

8. *Resolved*, That, considering these two instances of munificent charity, by two members of the church under their care, which have been reported during our present sessions, as bestowed on an institution which this body is endeavoring to erect to the glory of God, and their satisfaction in such great proofs of the approbation of good men; and while we rejoice to be almoners of God's poor, in gratefully accepting and carefully using their humble contributions towards promoting every good work; upon which the Lord calls us to embark; we call earnestly upon those whom He has specially blessed with this world's goods, to remember that their charity should bear an exact proportion to His beneficence. How immense might be the impulse to every work of the church, if the conduct of Samuel Laird and H. P. Broadnax were the rule and not the exception, in the bestowment of charity, by the followers of the Lord of glory.

9. *Resolved*, That the following Directors of Danville Theological Seminary be appointed to serve until 1860, viz: *Ministers*—John T. Edgar, D.D., R. C. Grundy, D.D., John C. Young, D.D., I. W. Green, D.D., B. M. Hobson, James H. Brooks, John Montgomery, R. A. Lapsley, D.D., A. V. C. Schenck. *Ruling Elders*—William Richardson, John Watson, James S. Hopkins, John D. Thrope, O. Beatty, William Prather, Glass Marshall, James Barbour, John McKeage. To serve until May, 1859: Ezekiel Forman, in place of James Coe, deceased, and Ben Monroe, in place of T. E. West, deceased.

10. *Resolved*, That inasmuch as the charter of Danville Seminary (Section 6) confers upon the General Assembly the right, when meeting in Kentucky, to change one third of the Board of Trustees, and fill all vacancies then existing, it is expedient to exercise this right, that no advantage may ever accrue against it from non-use, and that the Board of Trustees of Danville Seminary be composed of the following persons, viz: John R. Ford, James S. Hopkins, John B. Temple, Mark Hardin, Robert A. Johnstone, R. J. Breckinridge, A. A. Hogue, W. L. Breckinridge, John Montgomery, J. T. Boyle, Charles Caldwell, W. J. Moberly, Stuart Robinson, J. P. Curtis, E. P. Humphrey, R. C. Grundy, W. M. Scott, James Barbour.

11. *Resolved*, That the Assembly elect a fourth Professor, in Danville Seminary, to fill the chair of Oriental and Biblical Literature, and that this election be the order of the day for Monday morning at eleven o'clock.

The Rev. Stephen Yerkes, Professor of ancient languages in the Transylvania University was subsequently elected to fill the fourth chair at Danville. For the chair in the Western Theological Seminary, the Rev. Samuel J. Wilson, was elected. Dr. Breckinridge, with a frankness and candor which, in his peculiar circumstances, we think, did him great honor, objected to this last nomination on the ground of Mr. Wilson's youth and inexperience in the *active duties of the ministry*. How could he be qualified to train men who are to be Pastors? He had not seen the truth pass through the souls of men. The logical faculty itself,

without this experience, is not competent to a Professor's task. He begged the brethren to look over our more than two thousand ministers, and see if there were not some experienced man who has had the cure of souls, that might be put into his place.

Upon the question of the Directors nominated for the Western Theological Seminary, Dr. Scott, of Cincinnati, suggested that there is an impropriety and a danger in going outside of the bounds heretofore understood as belonging to this institution. Heart-burnings and jealousies would be introduced and the various seminaries set to scrambling in all directions. He moved the recommitment of these nominations, with instructions to the committee, to confine themselves more within the territory of Allegheny.

The Rev. Messrs. McIlvaine and Hays suggested reasons for the nominations objected to, and disclaimed all idea of interfering with Princeton.

Dr. Scott's motion was laid on the table. The Rev. Dr. M'Gill then nominated four ministers, resident near to Allegheny, in place of the four who had been understood to be dwellers of the region beyond her territory. He urged, that there is injustice to Princeton in the contemplated election. Why should Western Pennsylvania go outside of herself for help, when she possessed the densest, strongest, staunchest set of Presbyterians in the United States, and perhaps in the world.

Dr. Moore, of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee on Seminaries, denied that Princeton was being invaded, and objected to the nominations of Dr. M'Gill, as too near to Allegheny. It was desirable to push out and create an interest elsewhere. He thought the policy of confining the Seminaries to territorial limits, as advocated by Dr. Scott, a very dangerous one, tending to sectionalism and other evils. On the other hand to mingle the friends of all the Seminaries is to cement and bind them all together.

Dr. Breckinridge considered this a matter of great importance and believed that discussions of this sort cannot help doing good. He could not appreciate the difficulties of gentlemen on either side. For his part, if it were thought desirable for either or both Allegheny and Princeton to have half a dozen directors each from Kentucky, we are just the men to furnish you with them, and he thought those seminaries could hardly do better than to try it. He was gratified to hear his excellent friend, Dr. Moore, deliver his mind so clearly against the principle of confining each seminary to a territory, inasmuch as the Synod of Virginia had last year passed a sharp resolution on the other side which seemed to him to be leveled at Danville, because we had stolen six of their students. He had nothing, however, to say against Virginia. He was himself a Virginian by descent—a Virginian as far as a Ken-

tuckian could be one—as far as an improved breed could be part of the original stock.

As to the question of territory, their experience at Danville is precisely against what the Allegheny brethren desire, i. e., the increase and the scattering of their directors. The true policy is to concentrate the directors within narrow limits, for otherwise they will not attend to their duty.

As to students we cannot restrain them from going to any seminary which they may think the best, no matter whether it is near them or far off; and he would never say anything else, even if it should leave Danville with nobody there except himself and the man that takes up the ashes. You ought to make all your seminaries just as good as possible, and then let your young men go where they please. He would not intentionally strengthen the natural tendency to localization.

On the other hand, if you begin to mix up your directors for purposes of electioneering you make trouble. He would consider it a great outrage for Princeton to ask a director from the city of Allegheny, or the Western Seminary one from the town of Princeton. That was an extreme case, but things might grow to that extreme, if this principle of elective affinity were encouraged.

Just here, he desired to deliver himself of the heresy, that it is no advantage to any seminary to have a large number of students. He would rather have fifty than one hundred. He never wanted to see more at Danville than he could become well acquainted with; and he supposed indeed there was no danger of there being a great number at Danville, so long as he was there. He wanted to be able to know all about every student that he ought to know, and to feel so free with the students that he could go to any one of them who should err, and lay his hand upon his shoulder and say to him, "my son you have done wrong." It is a great evil when a seminary has so many students that there is any coldness, distance or indifference between the students and the professors; and you would better multiply your seminaries than endure this evil. What the church wants most of all things in this world is a great deal better article of preachers than us old ones, and it may be a somewhat better article than you young ones. And she will give money liberally to that end whenever more seminaries are needed. He thought there should be a new seminary for every surplus of fifty students. And if South Carolina and Georgia Synods would only wheel into line and make theirs a seminary of the whole church, he would be willing, for his part, to give them any territory they might desire, except Kentucky.

Dr. M'Gill having withdrawn his nominations, the nominees of the committee for directors of the different seminaries were subsequently, on motion of Dr. Breckinridge, elected by acclamation.

RELATIVE POWERS OF DEACONS AND ELDERS.

This subject came up by overture from an individual in St. Louis, asking: "Has a church session any control over the funds in the hands of the deacons for the poor of the church? or, does the control belong to the deacons? or, what power has the session in the premises?" The committee on bills and overtures recommended that the first answer be in the negative; the second, in the affirmative; and that the third be, that the session may advise. The occasion of this overture was stated by Mr. Drake, ruling elder from St. Louis, to be as follows: The collections made at communion seasons in the 2d church of that city, for the poor, had accumulated until there was a surplus in the deacons' hands of \$350. The session ordered the deacons to transfer \$300 of this money from the poor fund to the support of some candidates for the ministry belonging to that church. The deacons promptly refused to do it; and this circumstance brought the question to the Assembly.

We doubt the propriety of seeking from the highest court a deliverance upon a general principle just to suit a particular case. It had been fairer and better every way, we think, for the issue to have been made before the Presbytery to which the session and the deacons belonged, as an open issue upon this particular case.

As to the principle involved in the question, Dr. M'Gill argued that the office of the deacon is one of *service*; that when money was sent to the poor of Judea, even after the appointment of deacons, it was sent to the *ruling elders*, and that, in the Second Book of Discipline of the Scotch Church, it is distinctly said, the deacons are to act *under the judgment of the eldership*.

Dr. Anderson, on the other hand, viewed this as an adjudicated case. He referred to the Digest, p. 38, where it is said the deacons have the distribution of the poor fund, but that their office gives them no control over any other funds. In some portions of the church the deacons are claiming the power to control the taking up and the use of all collections. He wished the Assembly to go further than the committee's answers, and define more fully the relative rights and powers of deacons and elders.

Dr. Breckinridge, Chairman of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, insisted that the question submitted to us is a very narrow one, as narrow as the edge of a sword. When funds are already in the hands of the deacons for the use of the poor, can the session then control their use? The committee say no! but that even then, the session may advise. If, however, the Assembly saw fit to go into the examination at large of the office of deacon, he was willing. The matter was becoming more and more important. That office was long lost in our church. Many

of our churches are still without deacons. He had even heard it argued in the Assembly that we do not need them ; that the ruling elders, or the ladies, or some body else can do their duties.

Mr. Drake contended that it is the right of the Eldership to exercise government and discipline, the former meaning, of course, something different from and more than the latter, and extending, within certain well defined limits, to every thing that concerns the well being of members of the church in all their relations, as such, to the church. On the other hand, deacons are no where recognized as part of the government of the church, but simply officers charged with certain defined and limited duties. Whether they were to be appointed at all in a particular church depended upon the order of the session ; and whether, when appointed, they shall have any funds to distribute, depends upon the session's order also. How then could they in the case supposed, set themselves above the very government that called them into being, and entrusted them with certain funds ? And Mr. Drake then related the circumstances above given, which had occasioned the overture.

Dr. Breckinridge thought it a poor sort of business for the Assembly to be legislating on individual grievances. But this very case proved that the committee's answers were the correct ones. He honored the deacons of the second church, St. Louis, for standing square up and saying "excuse us, we cannot give you up this money." The real object was to divert the poor funds to another use, which neither deacons nor elders had a right to do. And why could they not in the great city of St. Louis find poor people enough needing those three hundred dollars ? We are not to be confined to the poor of our own denomination. For their relief it had not been worth while to erect such an office as the deacon's. We have very few Presbyterian poor of any kind, and he had never in his life seen a soundly converted calvinistic Presbyterian beggar. The Lord Jesus Christ when he established his church appointed all necessary officers for it. He gave preachers to convert the nations, elders to govern and care for the flock, and deacons to relieve the temporal sorrows of men. And no one class of these when in the discharge of their proper duties are to be interfered with by the others. No one class is simply the servant of another. To be the servants of elders was not the object for which the deacons were set apart with the laying on of hands. If this were the object, then the session in Lexington might have a negro, and in St. Louis a Dutchman to do their deaconage. When you attempt to say the deacons can do nothing except as dictated to them by the session, you show that you have a wrong conception of our principles. Are not the deacons to speak words of consolation to the prisoner, to the widow, the orphan, the hungry, the houseless ? Are they just to dole out the alms of

their particular church to its particular poor, and that too as another body shall dictate to them? As to what the second Book of Discipline of the church of Scotland might say, it was but Andrew Melville's opinion. But he would undertake to show that that Book declares just what the report of your committee says. He had always been a friend of the ruling elders, had been one of them himself; and had stood up for their rights when all the ruling elders forsook him. But whilst he stood up for the rights of ruling elders, he would not agree that they should make a raid upon either the ministers or the deacons.

The committee's report was adopted.

PREACHING BY RULING ELDERS.

In connection with the question of the elders' power over the deacons we introduce the matter of their preaching. In the Assembly of 1856, (at New York,) the committee which examined the records of the Synod of Mississippi, report as follows :

On page 10, vol. iv. of these minutes, Synod takes exceptions to the minutes of the Louisiana Presbytery; because this Presbytery consider it not inconsistent with the principles of our church for ruling elders, in the absence of the pastor, to read the Scriptures and explain them, and endeavor to enforce the truth upon the conscience by suitable exhortations. The Assembly believe the Presbytery of Louisiana were right according to the xxi chapter of our Form of Government."

The Tombeckbee Presbytery sent up this year a protest against this action of the Assembly of 1856, but as a protest was not in order, Dr. Waddel, who had been entrusted with the document in the absence of their delegate, asked leave simply to read it as a request to the Assembly to reconsider the subject. Leave being granted, the writer of this article submitted the following minute for the adoption of the Assembly, but, on motion of Dr. Steele, the whole subject was laid on the table:

"Whereas the last Assembly, near the close of its meetings, and probably, therefore, with some degree of haste in adopting the report of their committee on the records of the Synod of Mississippi, did sanction the principle that a ruling elder, in the absence of the pastor, may read the Scriptures and explain them, and endeavor to enforce the truth by suitable exhortations; and whereas the notice of this body has been called to the subject by representations on the part of a Presbytery of that Synod: Therefore be it resolved by this Assembly, that explaining the Scriptures, and enforcing the truth by exhortation, form no part of the official duty of ruling elders as elders. At the same time it is earnestly recommended by this Assembly, in the language of the twenty-first chapter of our Form of Government, that every vacant congregation meet together, on the Lord's day, at one or more places, for the purposes of prayer, singing praises, and reading the Holy Scriptures, together with the works of such approved divines as the Presbytery, in whose bounds they are, may recommend, and

they may be able to procure; and that the elders or deacons be the persons who shall preside and select the portions of Scripture and of the other books to be read, and to see that the whole be conducted in a becoming and orderly way."

It will be observed, that the Presbytery of Louisiana and the Assembly at New York stand distinctly on the ground, that in the absence of the pastor, and, *therefore, as his substitute*, the ruling elder may expound the Scriptures and apply the truth by exhortation. This, it appears to us, is "*a raid upon the ministers.*" What more can the minister do in the very pulpit than explain the Scriptures and then apply the truth by exhortation? The Assembly of 1856 makes ministers, therefore, of all the ruling elders in the land? Without being taken on trials by any Presbytery for ordination to the work of the Gospel ministry, they may nevertheless do all that ministers can do! And they may do it all in the absence of the pastor, and as his substitute, on the Lord's day, in the great congregation!

The report adopted in manifest haste, by the Assembly of 1856, not only set forth an erroneous principle, but it made the curious blunder of referring, as the basis of its doctrine, to the xxi chapter of our Form of Government, which very distinctly and carefully limits the duty of elders (and deacons are joined with them in it) on occasions of the absence of pastors, to prayer, singing, and reading the Scriptures, and the works of divines approved by the Presbytery.

We confess that our own minute was also drawn up in some haste. It should have contained a clause guarding against any discouragement of ruling elders from doing all they legitimately can, for the advantage of their respective churches. We hold firmly and earnestly to the doctrine that the ruling elder is the aboriginal Presbyter; that the essence of the Presbyterate is *ruling*; and that, in the beginning, it often happened that amongst those ruling elders who were ordained in every city over the little flocks gathered first by the apostles, there was one or more whom God afterwards called to preach as well as to rule; and so it came to pass that the function of preaching was super-added then, as now, to a portion of the rulers of God's house. Accordingly, we admit that *practically* a certain degree of freedom is to be allowed to such a high officer in the church as the ruling elder; and that he ought to be *apt to teach*; and that being made by the Holy Ghost an overseer or bishop of the flock he must *feed* the church of God with sound doctrine. We suppose the eldership, generally, is in no need of being kept back from taking too much upon them in the way of public exhortation. We would they might assemble all our vacant churches and exhort and pray with them; in this way, and by reading approved sermons, we have known elders to minister greatly to the edification

and prosperity of vacant churches, and for a period of years to keep such churches and congregations together, until in God's mercy, they were again favoured with the authorized teacher of the Word. But all this being admitted, it is still proper that the resolutions and reports adopted by the Assembly should not contradict the express language of our book; and that when the Assembly is about to state articulately the true doctrine respecting the rights and duties of elders, it should not mix and confuse them with those of the minister of the Gospel. How are our own people—to say nothing about other people besides ours—ever to understand our system of church government, if the Assembly is made to mislead them with all manner of contradictions? And what hope is there of any other than hasty resolutions and confused reports, when one of the oldest and most venerable members of the body could move and influence them to lay upon the table, without a moment's discussion, a minute designed to correct a serious and palpable blunder!

ELDERS TO BE ELECTED FOR THREE YEARS.

In connection with these other questions about elders, we here introduce also the action of the body respecting this point. An overture was presented from the Rev. D. X. Junkin, D.D., asking that our form of government be so changed as to provide for "a system of rotation among the ruling elders and deacons so that they shall *serve three years and go out in classes.*" The Assembly declined to consider the proposed amendment to our constitution. When next brought up, we hope the proposition will, for consistency's sake, be made to include ministers also. Why should not they, as well as the elders and deacons, *serve three years and go out in classes?*

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

An overture from the Presbytery of Carlisle (desiring the Assembly to send down to the Presbyteries the question of altering the law of our book on this subject, for the reason, that "it is not executed by our sessions and Presbyteries,") was reported by the committee of bills and overtures without any expression of opinion. On motion the subject was laid on the table. This action was good, so far as it went. We should have preferred a vote of the Assembly, not to overture the Presbyteries for a change of the law, but to require them and the session to execute the law as it stands.

UNION WITH THE INDEPENDENT PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Dr. Leland stated to the Assembly that the Independent Presbyterians have three ministers and twelve or fourteen churches, most

of them in the bounds of Bethel Presbytery, S. C., and the rest in the bounds of Concord Presbytery, N. C. They originated with Rev. W. C. Davis nearly fifty years ago, who published a book called the Gospel Plan, for errors in which he was deposed. Being a popular preacher he formed a new denomination. Of late years most of their ministers and all their churches are anxious to be incorporated with our body, and this feeling is strongly reciprocated by Bethel Presbytery. The churches and the ministers adopt our standards, but the difficulty is, that the latter claim the right to retain their peculiar views.

Rev. Mr. McCormick, of Bethel Presbytery, regretted that any thing had been said of their past history. They do not acknowledge the teaching of Davis's Gospel Plan. Bethel Presbytery has entire confidence in the soundness of these brethren. The people of God in both denominations unanimously desire the union. The tenets of Mr. Davis were: "That the active obedience of Christ is no part of his satisfaction; that the forbidden fruit was the condition of the covenant of works; and that the first act of faith is not a holy act." But while the Independent Presbyterian ministers still claim the right to hold these views, they explain them away in a manner that is satisfactory to Presbytery, and they also engage not to make these views prominent in their preaching. If brethren are coming back to the old paths let us do nothing to deter them.

Dr. Thornwell said the course recommended, by the committee of bills and overtures, is the best that can be taken. We cannot receive into our ministry any who claim the right to teach doctrines not in our standards. This, those ministers do claim, although Bethel Presbytery says they are sound. These churches in the main are sound, but some parties in them retain their attachment to Mr. Davis's tenets. Our proposed action is just to say, we cannot receive you unless in good faith you adopt our standards. This is as much as we can do, or as ought to be asked. As to the ordination of their ministry that is a question our Assembly has adjudicated. It is not lay ordination.

The minute reported by the committee of bills and overtures was adopted unanimously, and is as follows:

"While the General Assembly is greatly gratified with the spirit of charity and brotherly love, which the overture indicates as subsisting between the Presbytery of Bethel, and the Independent Church, and would sincerely rejoice at the consummation of the proposed union, it yet cannot sanction the precise terms of the covenant which has actually been made. The privilege claimed by the Independent ministers of holding and teaching doctrines not in harmony with the confession of faith, is a privilege, which even if harmless in this particular case, might be abused as a precedent and lead in other quarters and relations to serious mischief. The Assembly expresses the desire that these ministers, may soon be able to embrace our standards

without reservation, and, in that case, the Presbytery of Bethel is hereby authorized to ratify the union without further application to this body, but in the event that the Independent ministers and churches cannot relinquish their peculiarities with a good conscience, this Assembly will cherish them in the bonds of Christian love, but cannot see its way clear to embrace them in the same denomination."

REVISION OF THE BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.

This subject came up by an overture from the Presbytery of Philadelphia, asking for a revision of the constitution in regard to judicial proceedings in our church; and also by an overture from Dr. Breckinridge, proposing a change of our representation in the Assembly from Presbyterial to Synodical, and a reduction in the number of the delegates. The latter paper is as follows:

1. The General Assembly shall consist of not more than fifty ministers, and not more than fifty ruling elders. These shall be elected by the Synods respectively, at their last stated meeting, next preceding the annual meeting of the Assemblies.

2. The ten succeeding Assemblies, after the constitutional adoption of the change in the constitution now proposed, shall consist of one minister for every fifty ministers, and one ruling elder for every minister elected a commissioner. The tenth General Assembly, and every tenth General Assembly thereafter, shall re-assign the ratio of representation, and apportion the number of commissioners amongst the Synods.

3. Every Synod shall have a separate representation even when the number of its ministers may be less than the ratio.

Dr. Breckinridge said, our very prosperity as a church is the occasion of the practical difficulties which beset our Assemblies in their judicial proceedings. As our church increases, the numbers and the business of the Assembly both increase. But we should make no changes unless they are absolutely necessary, and unless they are certainly for the better. And before we undertake improvements, we should distinctly apprehend where we stand and what we can and cannot do. We cannot invent any new principles of government. Government is a strict science. This is especially true of Presbyterian government. We can make no new laws for Jesus Christ. Whither he leads, we must follow, and where he stops, we must stop. The church has no right to make new laws. We have no legislative, but only an expository and declarative power. Nine times out of ten, when you get an English or an American lawyer into a church court, he is lost. The reason is, that our discipline was made by Scotchmen, whose ideas of law were ideas of the Roman civil law, with a Scotch stamp upon them, and who mixed up their law ideas with their Scriptural and Presbyterial tenets. It has been suggested that we alter our judicial rules so that the lower courts

only should try all questions of fact and that appeals be taken to the highest court upon no questions but those of law and principle. But in the highest civil courts of the country, in the courts of equity which resemble our church courts in being courts of conscience, the law is never decided by any chancellor without knowing and considering all the facts of the case. No such alterations of our forms of proceeding will remedy the evil we are now considering.

The second overture strikes at the great difficulty which besets us, and that is the size of the body. You must reduce your number, which you can only do by a change of the representation from Presbyterial to Synodical. And then you must reduce your business by establishing commissions to try judicial cases.

Objection is made to transferring the representation from the Presbyteries to the Synods, but it is impossible we should much longer continue the plan of Presbyterial representation; impossible if the Master continue to bless and to increase us. We have a boundless territory to fill up, and our Presbyteries are destined, we hope, to an endless multiplication. And unless the representation be transferred, the Assembly which is now already very unwieldy, must ere long, be composed of some five or six hundred members! Now, for obvious reasons, you cannot remedy the evil by enlarging the ratio of representation as applied now to the Presbyteries. The only remedy is to transfer the representation to the Synods. As to the rightfulness of such a transfer, it is unquestionable. Every church court is a Presbytery. The session is a Presbytery, and so is the Synod, and so is this Assembly; all are the same thing, differing only in size. All are composed of the same constituent elements. And if the Synod is a Presbytery, then, without any sacrifice of general principles, we may transfer to them the representation in this the largest of all our Presbyteries, where we see the whole church met together in its two classes of officers who bear rule.

By this transfer of the representation, you will reduce the size of the body, and by the commission, you will reduce the amount of your business. A commission differs from a committee, in that the latter is appointed to examine and report, and the former is appointed to examine and conclude. He was opposed to any changes in our mode of judicial proceedings. The overture from Philadelphia does not go deep enough. It does not go to the root of the evil. He thought justice never could be secured in a judicial case before a large Assembly. Such an Assembly is necessarily compelled to conduct its judicial cases in scraps of time, by scraps of testimony, and with scraps of speeches; with other things coming in continually to interrupt them. For years past, he had refused to take any part in any judicial case, because he felt satisfied whatever the rest of the Assembly were able to do, he

was not competent to do justice to any case, upon any such plan of procedure as this. If put on trial himself, he would rather be led in blindfold, and take for his judges the first ten men he might happen to touch, than to take the whole three hundred of the Assembly. We are practically, a church without discipline, and we must make a great change, or be forsaken of God. He was in favour of appointing men in whom we have confidence to consider the whole matter, and report to a future Assembly.

The Rev. Dr. J. H. Jones said he was from the Presbytery which sent up the overture as to judicial proceedings. Dr. B. has expounded with great force the very difficulties his Presbytery had felt.

Dr. Scott was in favor of facilitating our methods. We should be able then to go on for a series of years, even though our church and this body should continue to grow. The constitution of the higher courts, the whole process of conducting judicial cases, and various other matters need to be re-examined and adjusted. Our discipline needs to be made harmonious with itself and with the fundamental principles of our form of Government. He moved that a committee be appointed to revise the Book of Discipline, and report to the next Assembly.

Judge Allen preferred a committee to enquire whether any and what things are necessary.

Dr. Hoge said, it is now nearly forty-years since any alteration of consequence has been made in the Book of Discipline or form of government. He would advocate no change of principle, but thought it would be well to put both these books into the hands of a suitable committee to report necessary amendments. He therefore moved to amend by inserting, also, the form of government.

The Rev. Dr. Swift would not object wholly to this proposal but would have it embrace only minor matters.

The Rev. Mr. McIlvaine was opposed to this whole thing. Let well enough alone.

Dr. Thornwell was opposed to including the form of government in the revision. The Book of Discipline had been discussed in the church at large, and we are, therefore, prepared perhaps to undertake some modifications of it. But, as to the form of government, there has not yet been sufficient attention given to the subject by the church generally, to warrant us in attempting to amend it. His own mind is clear that no revision of it will suffice, which does not fully embrace the principle of commissions. Yet the mind of the church is not settled about even that question. Let us begin with the Book of Discipline, and by the time we have finished that, we may be ready to go further. In church matters, even more than in state reforms, *festina lente* is a good maxim. Let us attain the ends of justice first. He thought Dr. Hoge's amendment premature.

The amendment was lost, and Dr. Scott's motion was then put and carried by 108 votes against 76.

On motion of Dr. McGill both the overtures discussed, were referred to the committee now to be appointed for revising the Book of Discipline. It was determined that the committee should consist of nine members. The following were appointed, Drs. Thornwell, Breckinridge, Hoge, Hodge, Swift, McGill and Judges Sharswood, Allen and Leavitt.

The subject is one of incalculable importance and the debate was, for the most part, of very great ability, and awakened the liveliest attention, even at the latest period of the meeting. The committee is a most able one. We fervently pray God to illuminate their minds by his grace. Nothing said or done by the Assembly exceeds in importance this action. But one other subject approached this one in the interest excited by it. We believe it quite impossible to secure the administration of justice in our Assembly and Synods; and nearly impossible in our Presbyteries. The latter are small bodies enough, but they are always in too much haste, and have too many other subjects before them, for the calm, uninterrupted, deliberate, just and wise adjudication of difficult, personal questions. We are not of those who complain much about the Book of Discipline, but if the committee can improve it, we shall rejoice. But most earnestly do we favor the use of commissions in judicial cases, and the reduction of the Assembly to one hundred members. Such a body would do more business in less time, and do it better than any Assembly of two hundred and fifty men can ever be expected to accomplish. The General Assembly is our highest court; we want it to be the highest possible in every attribute of wisdom, calmness, and efficiency. We want it to have all the moral weight and force of all our synods combined. Such a body as the General Assembly cannot afford to make blunders; it cannot afford to present a spectacle of over haste in the discharge of its high functions. We need to have for our highest court such a General Assembly as no man should expect to be sent to, who had not acquired great experience in ecclesiastical affairs and the utmost confidence of his brethren at home; and such as, whoever were sent to it, would feel himself so honoured by the choice of his Synod, that he would be perfectly willing to remain in the discharge of his duty as a member, not only two weeks, but if needful, four. And then for the adjudication of cases of discipline, we need a commission, whose stern justice, calm deliberation, and impartial wisdom, should become a proverb in the land, as much as we fear our superior judicatories are likely to become, for their haste and inconsideration, and their tendency to yield like all popular Assemblies to their feelings on the one side or on the other.

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.

Dr. Breckinridge presented the following overture without any expression of opinion by the committee in reference to it.

1. The American Bible Society has, by the terms of its constitution, no legitimate right to alter, in any way, the common and accepted standard English scriptures, as they stood at the creation of that society.

2. Concerning the said English Scriptures, the American Bible Society has full power to print and circulate them, and to collect and manage funds for those purposes. But it has no power to edit them—in any other sense than to keep them in the exact condition in which the standard English Bible stood at the formation of said society.

3. This General Assembly and the church it represents, are, and from the beginning have been, warm and unanimous supporters of the American Bible Society. And it is in this sense we feel called on to say that we neither do nor can allow, on our part, of any, even the smallest, departure from the original principle on which that society was founded; and to express the settled conviction that the continued support of that Society, by the Presbyterian church, depends upon the strict adherence of the society to those clear and simple principles.

4. The Board of Publication of the Presbyterian church will consider and report to the General Assembly a plan for the preparation and permanent publication, by it, of the common English Bible, in a form suitable for Pulpit use, with the standard text unchanged, and the usual accessories to the text commonly found in Pulpit English Bibles from 1611 to 1847.

Dr. B. said he had never performed any duty in his whole ecclesiastical life with more regret than the one he was now undertaking. His friends know well, that from the first, he had viewed the church of God as a different thing from what most people thought her. He had always believed she had power given her to carry on all her own proper work; and had always been jealous of the assumption by the voluntary societies of any of the powers of the church. These societies were a class of Christians whom he had looked on always as predestinated to mischief. But he had regarded the Bible Society as an exception. The work of publishing and circulating the Scriptures was peculiarly appropriate to an organization in which various denominations could unite. From the beginning and down to this day, he had been an earnest friend of that society. It was in his heart next to his own church. And if we shall be compelled to withdraw from this society, he did not see what we are to do next.

There are two ideas in the overture. It asserts that the society is the printer, and not the editor of the Bible; and it recommends a standard text of the English Bible, just as all governments keep standard weights and measures. We do not want to enter into any competition with the Bible Society. But when the Board of Publication was first organized, having then had some apprehensions respecting the Bible Society, he had offered and Dr. Alex-

ander had seconded, in the Assembly, a resolution that that Board should publish a Standard Bible, which, he believed, they had done something towards accomplishing.

The overture grants more power to the Bible Society than their own constitution grants. That specifies that the "sole object of the society is to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment." But we concede that circulating includes also printing, and what we deny is, that the society can lawfully do one earthly thing in editing the English text. The duty of an editor and the duty of a printer are widely diverse.

What is the standard text of the English Bible is a question as easily settled as any literary proposition whatever. It is near five hundred years since Wickliffe first translated the Bible into English. Various other translations were subsequently made. Under the reign of King James, fifty-four scholars were appointed by him to translate the Bible, or rather to collate those various English translations. It was done by them with great labour and care, and published in 1611. All we have to do now, is to get the text of 1611 and print it; and the British Bible Society not long since actually republished the Bible of 1611, to show that what they now publish is the genuine version. Again, in 1769, Dr. Blaney, under the authority of the Oxford and London authorized presses, brought out an edition that was adopted as the standard English text, and is the standard to this day. Now, all the Bible Society has to do, is just to take the Blaney Bible, or that of 1611, and publish it. These have been accepted by the English speaking people, and their Protestant Churches throughout the world.

How was the late movement of the American Bible Society originated? It came not from the church of God, from any public clamour, from thrones of kings, nor from the breasts of scholars. An unknown superintendent of printing spoke of some errors in the Bible to a secretary of the society, and he to the managers, six and thirty laymen in the city of New York; and the result was a Bible edited, printed and stereotyped, a new standard Bible! Here is a question of the *purity* of the English text, rising up in a society organized solely to *print and circulate the Bible!* Without any call from any church, or any call whatever from without, a question like this, which may rend Protestantdom in pieces, is taken up and carried through on the movement of a *nameless printer!* The Christian public knew not aught hereof until too late. True, it has been done for these five years past, and they have not yet spoken. But five years is a little while for the people over all this land to find out the nature and grounds of so great a matter. And yet it has been claimed that this step has been sanctioned by the churches, because they have been silent regarding the matter. They shall have that to say no longer. He would lift up his voice against it, though none here should concur with him;

and the Christian church should answer and say whether a voluntary society, on the suggestion of a printer, and under the control of one new school man, one old school man, and some other one man are to be justified in making all these alterations.

I love this society next to the church of God, but let them stand on the pedestal where they were placed. They have a sublime, glorious mission just there. The English Bible has been blest in saving more souls than the original Hebrew. It is a bold, but a true statement. Hence the great importance of the matter under consideration; much is at stake, for English is to be the language of the world. And the Bible is the greatest classic in the language. And in this aspect of the case, the society had no right to meddle with it. Would any printer, with three other men at his back, undertake to revise and change Shakspeare? Moreover, the English Bible is one of the strongest and most tender ties that bind together the English speaking people, and the two greatest nations of the earth. What do you gain by a few changes of capitals, italics, captions and spelling, (and these gentlemen say this is all they have done,) if you destroy the longer union of these Christians in this blessed book? Is there any advantage here that can justify this tinkering with the time-honored English Bible? This Bible, too, is the standard of our language. Who are this printer, preacher, and their colleagues, that they should take it upon themselves to amend this standard of our noble English tongue? We do not hold them competent for that work. If that work is to be done at all, we must go higher than they for the doers of it.

The matter derives some additional interest from the fact, that another society is declaiming all over the land against the English Bible, and calling for its revision; and when we object to their schemes, we are told that the American Bible Society is doing the very thing which we object to on their part.

What is the Bible? It is the gift of the Lamb to his wife. It is God's next greatest gift to His church, after that of the Saviour and the Spirit! And are we to stand by and see a voluntary society, a few private persons, establish the precedent that they may do what they think best with this blessed gift? Is that a power which ought to be committed to such a society? Never! But they say they have not done any thing. We say they have. They say they had power to do all they did. We say they had not. They never were organized for that. We never gave them our money for that. It establishes a precedent that the text is under their control, which we never can allow.

"Dr. B. then examined in detail the explanatory report of the society, contending that however unimportant some of these changes may be, these were not the men to make them, and that, at the same time, others of these changes do involve glosses and

comments, and are of importance, as the society itself admits. Many of the things done may be right enough in themselves, but it was not right for a society organized simply for *printing the Bible*, to make even these changes. That is not their vocation. It was simply a question of *power*, and he did not intend to discuss the merits of the changes made, but to deny their right to make any changes whatsoever.

The report admits their having done two things, first, changing *the text*, and, secondly, changing the *accessories of the text*. Under the *first head*, they admit having made changes in *words, orthography, particles of exclamation, proper names, compound words, capital letters, italics, punctuation, parenthesis, brackets.*

Under the *second head*, they admit having changed the *contents of chapters, the running heads of columns, the marginal references, &c., &c.*

Dr. B. considered that making changes under all these heads, involves every conceivable principle of editing, except the adding of notes and comments. They had changed some of the very *words* of the text. This is actual translating, and goes down deeper than even an editor can go. Then they had changed *the spelling* of the Bible. He had a great reverence for New England English, but we had a better English before New England was born, and he trusted we would still have it, when New England English was run out. Then they had changed *the italics* of the text, and that is a change of the Bible. If it was not a change, what was the use of making it? If it was a change they had no power to make it. Even their changes respecting *O* and *Oh*, involves commentary and translation by them, for they say they have printed it one way when the original signified *prayer*, and another way when the original signifies a simple vocative. *Punctuation* also affects the sense. The society itself says, they "believe" there are five cases in which they have altered the sense. If we could only know all the other changes in punctuation which they have made, perhaps we might "believe" the same was true of many more of them. One of their alterations they admit was never found in any edition before, it is bran, span new! As to *the headings of chapters*, it is true they are no part of the text, but is what the society puts in place of them, a part of the text? Why discard these captions which had been acquiesced in for two hundred years?

Dr. B. was firm in his conviction that this movement, if persisted in, will ruin the society in less than ten years. There is a wide, deep, subdued feeling of anxiety over all our land in regard to this matter. It is not a feeling in the breast of one man or of a few men, and it must spread. All that the society has to do is just to go back to where they were before. If they do not retract there will be a new Bible Society. This Assembly is a church of

God, and if we regard the Bible as in danger, we are bound to rise up in its defence.

The Rev. Mr. McNeile, one of the corresponding secretaries of the society, being present was, by resolution, allowed the privilege of replying to Dr. Breckinridge's speech. He sketched the great work done by the society in giving the Bible to our own country and the world; and then asked what has this society done, *which has done so much*, that it should now be arraigned? If it has done all that is charged, it has done wrong and he would pledge the board of managers to repentance. But it has not done all that has been charged upon it. It has not touched King James' version. It claims no right to do so. If you can prove that they have changed the sense of that version they will undo all they have done. He would be willing for himself to take either of the first three editions of King James, but they were printed in black letter, and would be very difficult to read now. The American Bible Society bound itself, by its constitution in 1816, *to print and circulate the version now in common use*. It did not bind itself to any one edition of that version, but only to the version. They were left by their constitution to get the best edition of that version which they could find. He contended that, in every case, they went according to the edition of 1611, except where it was a printer's error. All the changes which had been made in the text he could count upon the fingers of one hand. Every particular change made in words had been specified in the report, and he could count them all upon the fingers of one hand. There were four cases, he admitted, where they had corrected manifest errors. This may have been editing, but he thought not. They thought these must have been errors of the press, and that they had a right to correct them. This, however, had been recommitted to the committee with instructions to re-examine it more than a month since. He supposed the changes would be restored when the committee came to make their report. He then took up all the other changes the committee had made in regard to orthography, punctuation, &c., and defended them on the same general principles. He concluded by asserting, that the present edition of the American Bible Society, with the exception of the spelling, conforms more nearly in its text to the edition of 1611 than any other edition now extant. As to the accessories of the text, of course, that was a different affair. There was no sacredness about them. In fine, the few small changes made shall not stand in the way of the co-operation of this Assembly, or of any other Christian body. Do not, I beseech you, lay violent hands upon, or cripple, in any way, a society which is doing so much to spread the Word of God through the world.

Judge Fine moved that the overture be referred to a committee of five to report to the next General Assembly.

After various other speeches had been made, Dr. Breckinridge moved to lay the resolution, to refer, upon the table. There were 117 votes for laying it on the table, and 127 against. The vote was then taken upon referring the matter to the next Assembly. There were 128 votes for referring, and 114 against. So the matter was referred.

In the opening remarks of Rev. Mr. McNeile's speech, we find a singular statement of the argument from the past history of the society. The American Bible Society has done such and such great and good things, and shall this Society, which has laid the church and the country and the world under such great obligations, be now arraigned as a wrong doer? This was Mr. McN's argument. And this was the spirit of some of the speeches in the Assembly, and this has been the spirit of some of the letters, &c., written since the Assembly upon this subject. The society is, and has been, our benefactor and the world's benefactor. It is sacred and holy. You must not touch it. It has ever been published, that a "reproach would have fallen upon us even by a small minority voting to disapprove and condemn the proceedings of the committee," and that this caused the effort, made but too successfully, as we think, in the Assembly, to avoid a direct vote upon the merits of Dr. B's overture. It comes, then, to this, that the American Bible Society, a mere voluntary society, may tamper with the English Bible, but a church of God, in her delegates assembled together, may not, even a small minority of them, in defence of God's Word, venture to disapprove that society's proceedings without being covered with reproach and disgrace! The Word of God, and the Church of God, alike must bow at the feet of this voluntary society, and even if we disapprove their doings we must not speak out; must not speak out even for the sake of our Bible itself, lest we be overwhelmed with disgrace! But may we not be permitted, with all due reverence for the society, to enquire of Mr. McNeile, where it got the money for doing all it has done? Did not the churches and the people of this country furnish all the funds? If they even furnished at least some of them, so that they have not been absolutely indebted to the society for its gratuitous benevolence towards them; and still more if they furnished them all, we suppose those churches and people, and the old school General Assembly, as one of them, may, with a perfect recognition of the faithfulness of the society, as indeed their good old servant, point out to them, with all freedom, and in all kindness too, whatever faults we think they have committed.

The balance of the Rev. Mr. McNeile's speech was made up, as our readers will notice, of acknowledgments, in one breath, of the society's error, and, in the next breath, a partial or complete retraction of the acknowledgments. If they had done all that was charged they had done wrong, and he pledged them to repent-

ance. Well, the charges made against them, by Dr. Breckinridge, were simply that they had changed words, orthography, interjections, italics, punctuation, captions, &c., and all these charges are just the statements of their own report! Therefore, according to Mr. McNeile, they had done wrong and he pledged them to repentance; yet, immediately, he denies that they have touched King James' version. Then again he admits a few touches, as many as he could count upon the fingers of one hand. But they had done right, as they thought, in making these, for they were only corrections of printers' errors. Yet these four changes had been recommitted more than a month since, and he supposed they would restore the words changed when the committee should report!!

We regretted (with Dr. Breckinridge) to hear Mr. McNeile say the changes made by the society were few, when the report says they are specimens of many more. His zeal in defending the society led him much further, on this point, than the committee go themselves. He said he could count all the changes of words and meaning on his four fingers. The language of the report is: "The committee deem it important, in this connection, to lay before the Board *some specimens of the variations and discrepancies* in respect to which they have been called to decide, *and of the changes* which they have seen fit to adopt, both *in the text and its accessories.*" The italics in this quotation are made by us.

Mr. McNeile represented the committee better when he came to speak of the accessories of the text. He said there was no sacredness about them. And so, in effect, do the committee say in their report, p. 26. Our opinion is, that although they are at perfect liberty to print some editions of the English Bible with, and some without these accessories, yet they have no right to alter them. If they undertake to print them, they must give them to us as they stood when the society was formed in 1816. The arrogant and daring spirit which they display upon this subject increases our hostility to their tampering with the text. Had they exhibited a modesty which was unwilling to handle even the accessories of the text, we should have much more confidence in their reverence for the text itself. The committee needed to have much more of that "superstitious veneration (as we have heard it called) for the English Bible, which the best part of this nation feels. That Bible was good enough as it stood, with all the "twenty-four thousand variations and discrepancies solely in its text and punctuation" which the committee detected, but of which not one, they confess, mars the integrity of the text, or affects any doctrine or precept of the Bible." Why did they needlessly multiply these variations by their plan of collating with the original version of 1611, one American and four English copies of the Bible, all of which had been derived from Blaney's edition

of 1769? Why did they not collate Blaney alone with the original copy of 1611? Why did they not go to the fountain whence these five streams issued, and take water directly from the spring head itself, in order that we might have a fair sample of its qualities?

But we say, that any one of these six copies, which they found to have altogether twenty four thousand variations (all of them of no consequence); any one of these six, with its proportion of these unimportant variations, is good enough for us; and if that were the only alternative, we should prefer any one of them to be issued by the society, rather than to have the society tamper with the Bible and shake the confidence of this nation in its integrity. But what? Are we willing to have the word "*assuaged*" spelled in our English Bible "*aswaged*"? Can we bear such antiquated spelling as that? Yes! we have borne it all through our childhood and youth, and now we do not want to see even that spelling changed. And were any changes to be made, it is not a society of printers that we would allow to make them. That is a business only to be done, if done at all, by men appointed by the various churches expressly to do it. Does any author, fit to write a book, allow his printer to alter his manuscript in Spelling, in Punctuation, and in the Words themselves? And shall the churches allow a printing society to make alterations in so sacred a production as the English Bible? Shall we even allow them with a presumptuous and profane hand to change the accessories of the text? Suppose the Messrs. Harper, instead of the American Bible Society had contracted with the different churches, to print the English Bible, and they had undertaken without express leave, but by the aid of the very same sub-committee, to make these very changes; would the Christian public have tolerated it? So far as concerns the English Bible, we admit no difference between the American Bible Society and the Harpers, except that the Harpers would work for a profit and the society, of course, make no money by the business; and except that perhaps the six and thirty managers of the society may be all evangelical Christians, and perhaps the Messrs. Harper may not be Christians at all. It is quite possible, however, that the very opposite may be true, both of the six and thirty managers, and of those other gentlemen.

We admit, and so did Dr. Breckinridge admit distinctly and respectfully, the society's right to collate various editions of the English Bible with a view to giving us King James' version or Blaney's improvements of it. Mr. McNeile's statement we assent to heartily; "They are left by their constitution to get the best edition they could of that version." Of course Dr. B. does not mean any more than Mr. McNeile means, that they were to give us the black letter and the antiquated spelling of 1611. Neither of these is found in Blaney's Bible. Neither of these existed in

any editions of 1816. What the society ought to do is just to give us the text as it stood in 1816, and the accessories to the text just as they stood in 1816. If they say they cannot do these things, because they do not know what is the "*text as it stood in 1816*," we ask how have they then been doing it all along from 1816 to 1851? Any one of their editions that was an honest effort to give us the English Bible unaltered, is better, in our judgement, than their recent collation with its changes of words, orthography, italics, punctuation, &c., &c. If they still say, they are so puzzled by the thousand of variations, that they cannot give us the text as it stood in 1816, then let them call on the churches to appoint collators. Let them move this nation and the English nation to undertake the great and responsible work. We think they would get an answer that would send them back to do with quietness the work originally given them to do, or to resign it to other hands. Assuredly, they knew well, that if they should ask the great English-speaking people for leave to collate the Bible and do just what they have done, it never would be granted. And so they took the leave without the asking.

We all know very well that our English Bible is not a perfect translation. If we Presbyterians were translating the Bible, we would doubtless wish to see some things expressed differently. But so, of course, would the Episcopalians, and the Methodists, and the Baptists, and so would the Unitarians, &c., too, all like to make some changes. But the question for all Evangelical men who really believe in and love the Bible, is, whether it be not better to bear with some few imperfections in the version, having a learned ministry at hand to correct anything which any of us may dislike in the version, than to unsettle the foundation of all religion amongst us, by various conflicting translations. And if we would not unsettle these foundations even for the sake of some few important corrections, is it to be expected we should suffer a society, that we support, to unsettle these foundations, merely to gratify their little trifling ends of mere taste? If we should suffer these agents of ours to do this much unrebuked, who can tell what would be the end of this beginning?

There is but one course, therefore, for the American Bible Society to pursue, and that is to go right back to their former position respecting this whole matter. It is of little consequence to them that some very respectable persons, and some highly influential bodies of men should stand by them. Their prosperity demands the approval of all parties. Let some, let many approve heartily what they have done, and only wish they had gone much further in the way of amending the Bible! If those who now object to their course cannot be satisfied, another Bible Society, and then, perhaps, another and another will be the consequence. There is but one ground upon which this Society can stand, and

that is its old ground of being mere printers and circulators of the English Bible as it was in 1816.

We have offered these remarks in no spirit of unfriendliness to the Society. The writer and every member of his family have long been members of a Bible Society auxiliary to the American. He has given many years of his life to the work of the Bible Society in a foreign land, and has permanently impaired his eyesight in translating the Scriptures for them. He claims the right to speak with the greater freedom of their doings, because he cannot be regarded in any light but that of a sincere friend.

BIBLE UNION REVISION.

Two overtures were presented, one from Lake Presbytery, and the other from Central Mississippi, respecting a new translation of the Scriptures proposed by the Bible Union.

The committee recommended that the assembly distinctly disavow all manner of connection with the revision alluded to, and declare that they have no sympathy with it, but on the contrary an entire disapprobation of the whole movement.

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE ASSEMBLY.

Of these we heard but two, those of Rev. Dr. Hunphrey and Rev. Stuart Robinson. The former was a very elaborate and finished discourse on Foreign Missions. We anticipate with impatience the opportunity of reading this elegant and thoughtful production. The other discourse was delivered upon occasion of the inauguration of Professor Robinson. Prayer was offered by Dr. Edgar, President of the Board of Directors of Danville Seminary, and then after the singing by a vast congregation of the 137th Psalm, he read the very solemn pledge which each professor is required to sign. We have, perhaps, never witnessed a more solemn ceremonial than the public subscription of his name to this pledge by the professor. The Assembly and the congregation sat and looked on in breathless silence, while this servant of the church took on him the vows which she was imposing. Dr. Edgar afterwards gave a brief and appropriate charge, and then the professor delivered his inaugural discourse. It was a vigorous and masterly exhibition of the doctrine of the church, as a Calvinistic theology, necessarily leads us to conceive of it. The central idea of the Calvinistic theology is the Eternal purpose of God, of which purpose all revelation is but a manifestation; and so the central idea in the true conception of the church is, that that Eternal purpose was to redeem, not myriads of isolated men, but a *body*, a kingdom, whose head is Christ. Accordingly, Mr. Robinson views Christ's kingly office as holding in the Scriptures, perhaps, the most prominent place. He is prophet and priest in order to his being king.

Thus the ἐκλεκτοί, chosen ones, of the Eternal purpose, became the κλητοί *called ones* in time. But as these are called both by the internal κλησις call, of the Spirit and the external κλησις of the Word, thence arises the external ἐκκλησία *church*. The ἐκκλησία then must begin as soon as the revelation of the purpose in time begins. And so does the Scripture actually hold it forth. It is the same church from beginning to end of the revelation, under the same Head, embodying in her ordinances the same theology, under the very same symbols, and administered by the very same officers, viz: *the elders*. And this it is which gives the Bible its wonderful unity of idea throughout.

This being the fundamental conception of the church, as gathered by Professor Robinson from the Scriptures, the doctrine of his discourse was treated under these heads:

1. The abstract principles which underlie the structure of the church visible, as a separate government on the earth.
2. The concrete form in which these principles embody themselves on the polity, attributes, functions and relations of the church.
3. The ordinances and agencies through which the life of the church manifests itself, and by which its great end is to be accomplished.

Among the inferences were these: 1. That all which pertains to government and ordinances in the church must be of Divine warrant.

2. That the order and ordinances established by Christ must be obligatory on every part of the church.

3. That in respect to ecclesiology, as in respect to theology, it is an open question how far departure from the truth may consist with being part of the true church. Nor does this view *unchurch*, any more than our claim of Divine warrant for the *doctrines* of theology.

Professor Robinson closed by declaring his purpose in teaching to go just where the Word of God goes, and to stop where it stops.

We congratulate the church on her securing, for the seminary at Danville, such a man as Stuart Robinson to be professor of church government. And we congratulate him, our beloved and honoured brother, in being called, in God's providence, to so noble a field of study and instruction as the doctrine of the church. It is in many respects the question of this age. May he be long spared to fill the chair into which we saw him inducted, and may God, in mercy to that portion of our church and country, send many students of theology to be trained by him and his colleagues!

CONCLUSION.

So far as we can learn, the impression made by our last Assembly has been both decided and happy all over the church and country. We deem it both an honour and a happiness to have been a member of that body. In our humble opinion all, or very nearly all the action taken, was in the right direction. There has evidently been within a few years past a very great progress of right opinions amongst us as was exhibited very plainly on various occasions in this Assembly. There is manifestly a growing confidence in our Divine system of government—in the sufficiency of what our king Himself has given us. We would thank God and take courage. The church is again upon her onward march. All who love her must make up their minds to follow on with her, or be left behind. Some of the things which have been clogs to her progress, she is preparing, so we judge, to cast aside. Let all concerned make ready for the coming change. Her last Assembly was one more upward step for our dear church in the sight of all men; one more powerful exhibition, not only of the steady advance of right views in her bosom, but of the manifest power and depth and completeness of the evangelical spirit which accompanies those views; one more evidence that God approves and blesses the aims and the spirit of the men who have, during so many years and amidst discouragements as well as encouragements, constantly and steadfastly laboured to reform the evils and to fortify the good things which have been so mixed up in the Presbyterian church. Some of them have gone to their reward, and some of them remain to this day. Of one of these, in particular, we feel impelled to say: May he never want faithful sons, nor faithful friends, nor faithful servants, who, whether as a son, or a friend, or a servant of the church, has always proved himself faithful! May his bow long abide in strength! Long may he live to assist in training that improved ministry the church so much needs! And distant far be that night of gloom from the many who love him so well, when his eloquent voice shall be hushed in death, and his fearless heart shall cease to beat!

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Annals of the American Pulpit, or Commemorative Notices of Distinguished American Clergymen of various Denominations, from the early settlement of the country, to the close of the year eighteen hundred and fifty-five. With Historical Introductions. By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D.D. Vol i. and ii. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1857. These two volumes are but a part of a voluminous work, to which Dr. Sprague, with indefatigable industry, and indomitable energy, has committed himself. Nothing short of an enthusiastic passion, could sustain any man in the prosecution of such a task. We rejoice that God has imparted this to Dr. Sprague, and has enabled him to accomplish so much already.

In these two volumes, we have the memorials of orthodox Congregationalists for the last two hundred and twenty-five years; those for the first one hundred and fifty years, being compiled by Dr. Sprague from previous biographies, and the remainder from similar sources, with letters also, from living writers, to whom the individuals referred to, were severally known.

The work is one of incalculable value, and must increase in interest and importance, as the original materials perish and are forgotten.

The work is not less patriotic and national. No class of men deserve better commemoration by a grateful posterity, than the early clergy of this country; men of missionary zeal, hardy endurance, self-sacrificing toil, faithful labour, and evident piety. Many of them were giants in ability, erudition, and far-sighted Christian policy.

New England may well be proud of the long procession of her noble ministers here brought in review, and the whole Christian church may truly rejoice in a succession of these devoted men of God, who did so much to build up the wall of our republic, and from whose writings and lives, she may derive many lessons of wisdom and experience. May a degene-

rate race not basely sell for a mess of fanatical and carnal policy, the noble birthright inherited from these New England worthies.

As a book of reference, the work will be rendered greatly more useful, by the addition of a general very full and comprehensive index to doctrinal, practical, experimental, and textual subjects; and this, though involving much labour, will, we trust, be provided for the completed work.

In view of the great labour and expense of the work, we hope individuals or churches will see that these volumes are put into their pastors' libraries.

The American Sunday School and its adjuncts. By JAMES ALEXANDER, D.D.

Children are the hope of the church and the State, and the religious training of children in the principles and practice of Christian piety, is their only hope for a useful life and a happy eternity.

This has ever been a fundamental principle in the Church of God, through every dispensation—the *mode* of training being adapted to the state and condition of the church. This duty rests primarily on parents, but more emphatically upon churches of which parents and their children are, or ought to be members.

To feed Christ's lambs is, therefore, the most important and hopeful work and missions of the church—first disciplining, and then teaching them "all things whatsoever Christ has commanded."

The Sunday School is that method by which, under the leadings of God's providence, and of Christian experience, the church has been led to undertake and accomplish this great work more efficiently than ever before. It is to the church, what the Bible and Tract Societies are to Evangelical Christian effort—a powerful helper.

Indeed, the Sunday School prepared the way for, and made necessary and practicable, these great Christian agencies, since it was to supply the wants of Sunday Schools they were first created.

This volume unfolds the nature and relations of the Sunday School to the family, the church, and the world; vindicates it from all supposed interference with the obligations of parents; and points out with striking power,

its vast importance as the only adequate instrumentality by which the growing spirit of irreligion and vice can be resisted and a leaven of healthful, preserving and purifying vitality be diffused through the rising generation of American citizens.

The supreme importance of the subject and the vivacity and power of the style and thoughts, abundantly demand for this book the careful study of our pastors and patriots.

THE

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. X.]

OCTOBER, MDCCCLVII.

[NO. 3.

ART. 1.—THE SABBATH CONTROVERSY.

THE importance of the views entertained by the Christian world concerning the obligation to observe the Lord's day, or Christian Sabbath, is perpetual. But circumstances occasionally give this subject a temporary prominence before the public mind. Such circumstances were found in the recent agitation of the question of Sabbath amusements in Great Britain, and in the British Parliament. The victory gained there by Christianity encourages us to hope that this is a season not unpropitious to recall this great subject before the attention of our readers, in order to review the grounds on which, as Presbyterians, we assert the strict and proper consecration of the first day of the week. We have declined to place, at the head of this article, a list of the leading publications lately issued on this subject in Great Britain, simply referring the reader to such notices of them as have met the eye of all intelligent persons.

There is, perhaps, no subject of Christian practice on which there is, among sincere Christians, more practical diversity and laxity of conscience than the duty of Sabbath observance. We find that, in theory, almost all Protestants now profess the views once peculiar to Presbyterians and other Puritans; but, in actual life, there is, among good people, a complete jumble of usages, from a laxity which would almost have satisfied the party of Archbishop Laud, up to the sacred strictness of the "Sabbatarians" whom he and his adherents reviled and persecuted. It is a curious question: how it has come about that the consciences of devout and sincere persons have allowed them such license of disobedience to a duty acknowledged and important; while on other points of obligation equally undisputed, the Christian world en-

deavours, at least, to maintain the appearance of uniform obedience. The solution is probably to be found, in part, in the historical fact of which many intelligent Christians are not aware—that the communions founded, at the Reformation, were widely and avowedly divided in opinion as to the perpetuity of the Sabbath obligation. A number of the reformation churches, including some of the purest, professed that they saw no obligation in the Scriptures to any peculiar Sabbath observance; and the neglect of every thing except attendance on the public exercises of Christianity, and that cessation of secular labour required by secular statutes was, in them, at least consistent. Now the descendants of these communions, in this mixed country, live dispersed among the descendants of Presbyterians and Puritans; and while they no longer defend the looser theory of their forefathers, they retain the traditional practices and customs in their use of the sacred day. Thus, by example and the general intermingling of religions, a remiss usage is propagated, which is far beneath the present professed theory of Protestant Christendom. And hence, we conceive that it will be interesting and profitable to give a history of opinions on this subject, before we proceed to that full discussion of the whole grounds of our belief and practice which we shall attempt.

I. It may be stated then, in general terms, that since the primitive times of Christianity two diverse opinions have prevailed in the Christian world. The first is that adopted by the Romish, Lutheran, and most of the continental communions in Europe, including, it must be confessed, those founded by Calvin. This theory teaches that the proper sanctification of one day from every seven was a ceremonial, typical, and Jewish custom, established when the Levitical institutions were introduced; and, of course, abrogated by the better dispensation, along with the rest of the typical shadows. The Lord's day is, indeed, worthy of observance as a Christian festival, because it is the weekly memorial of the blessed resurrection, and the example of the primitive Church commends it; not because its obligation is now *jure divino*. The cessation of our worldly labours is a beneficent and commendable civil institution; and while the magistrates enjoin it, is, for this reason, of course to be practised by all good citizens. Public and associated worship is also a duty of Christians; and, in order that it may be associated, it must be upon a stated day and hour; and what day so appropriate as this, already famous for the great event of the new dispensation; and set apart by civil laws from the purposes of business. But this is all. To observe the whole day as a religious rest, under the supposition of a religious obligation, would be to *judaeize*, to remand ourselves to the bondage of the old and darker dispensation.

The second opinion, is that embodied in the Westminster

symbols, and, to the honour of Puritanism be it said, first avowed in modern times, even among Protestants, by the Puritans of England. This is, that the setting apart of some stated portion of our time to the special and exclusive worship of God, is a duty of perpetual and moral obligation, (as distinguished from positive or ceremonial,) and that our Maker has, from the creation, and again on Sinai, appointed for all races and ages, that this portion shall be one day out of seven. But when the ceremonial dispensation of Levi was superadded to this and the other institutions of the original patriarchal religion, the seventh day did, in addition, become a type and a Levitical holy-day; and the theory admits that this feature has passed away with the Jewish ceremonial. After the resurrection of Christ, the perpetual Divine obligation of a religious rest was transferred to the first day of the week, and thence to the end of the world. The Lord's day is the Christian's sabbath, by Divine and apostolic appointment, and is to be observed with the same religious spirit enjoined upon the patriarchs, and the Israelites, abating those features which proceeded from its ceremonial use among the latter, and from their theocratic government.

Among the advocates of the first opinion is to be adduced first the Roman Catholic communion. This statement must, however, be made with qualification; for the "Romish Catechism" of Pope Pius V., embodying the opinions of the Council of Trent, (P. III., Ch. iv.) treats of the Lord's day more scripturally, in some respects, than many Protestants. But this correctness of opinion is grievously marred by the doctrine that the other church holidays are sustained by equal authority with the Lord's day; the authoritative tradition of the church. Bellarmine also argues, that it must be allowable to the true church to make the observance of sacred days of human appointment binding on the conscience; because, otherwise, the church would have no sacred days at all, since none whatever are enjoined in the New Testament. This reasoning obviously proceeds upon the assumption that there is no other sort of obligation for the Lord's day than for a church festival. The well known practice of Romish Christians, prevalent in all Popish countries, and unrebuked by the priesthood, sustains exactly that theory of Sabbath observance which we first described. After the duties of confession and hearing mass are performed in the morning, the rest of the holy-day is unhesitatingly devoted to idleness, amusements, or actual vice.

The Lutheran communion, as ordered by Luther, Melancthon, and their coadjutors, held that it was lawful and proper for church authorities to ordain days and rites, not contrary to the letter or spirit of Scripture, but additional to those appointed therein. It was, indeed, one of the most constant and noble parts of their

testimony against Rome, that it was spiritual tyranny for any church authority, however legitimate, to ordain any thing contrary to the letter or spirit of Scripture, or to enforce any ordinance of human authority, however innocent, as binding on the Christian conscience, or as necessary to acceptance with God. But they taught that the rulers of the church might lawfully institute rites, ordinances, and holy-days, consonant to the Word of God, though additional to those set down in it: and that they might lawfully change such ordinances, from time to time, as convenience and propriety required. But they could only invite, they could not compel the compliance of their brethren; and this compliance was to be rendered, not of necessity, but from considerations of Christian comity, peace, and convenience. When days or ordinances additional to Scripture were thus enjoined, and thus observed, it was held proper, lawful and praiseworthy, in both rulers and ruled. And the Lutheran symbols expressly assert that it was by this kind of church authority, and not *jure divino*, that the observance of the Lord's day obtained among Christians; and that it could not be scripturally made binding on the conscience of Christians any more than the observance of Easter or Christmas, or of any other day newly instituted by a church court, in accordance with Christian convenience and edification. They also teach that the Sabbath, with its strict and enforced observances, was purely a Levitical institution. Before proceeding to substantiate this statement from their symbols, it may be remarked in passing, that we have here an explanation of the fact that Neander and other German antiquaries so heedlessly surrender the apostolic authority of certain church usages, which they, in common with the Luthern church, yet retain. The historian just mentioned says, for instance, that he finds no evidence that the baptism of infants was ever practised by the apostles. But this admission does not, to him, carry the consequences which it would involve with an Immersionist, Independent, or Presbyterian. He can still defend and practise the rite, as seemly and lawful, because he holds that church authority is a sufficient warrant for the observance of a rite so consonant to the spirit of the apostles. It is a pity that Immersionists do not tell this part of the story also, when they ignorantly quote his opinions concerning baptism.

But to return. In the 28th article of the Augsburg Confession, which treats of "the power of the bishops or clergy, we find the following: [We will take the liberty of *italicising* those phrases which we wish to be particularly weighed.] "What, then, should be held concerning *Sunday and other similar church ordinances* and ceremonies? To this our party make the following reply: That the bishops or pastors may make regulations, in order that things may be carried on orderly in the church, not in order to obtain the grace of God, nor yet in order to atone for sins, or to

bind the consciences of men with them, to hold them as necessary services of God, and to regard them as if they commit sin, if they break them without offence to others. Thus St. Paul, in the Corinthians, ordains that the women in the congregation should cover their heads; 1 Cor. 11 : 5. * * * * *

"*In like manner is the regulation concerning Sunday, concerning Easter, concerning Pentecost, and the like holy-days and rites.* Those, then, who are of opinion that the regulation of Sunday instead of the Sabbath, was established as a thing necessary, err very much. For the *Holy Scripture has abolished the Sabbath*, and it teaches that all ceremonies of the old law, since the revelation of the Gospel, may be discontinued. And yet, as it was of need to ordain a certain day, so that the people might know when they should assemble, *the Christian church ordained Sunday* for that very purpose, and possessed rather more inclination and willingness for this alteration, in order that the people might have an example of Christian liberty, that they might know that neither the observance of the Sabbath, nor of any other day, is indispensable." Melancthon, in the 8th article of his "apology," (*"Of human ordinances in the church,"*) briefly asserts the same view. "Further, the most ancient ordinances however in the church, *as the three chief festivals, Sundays, and the like*, which were established for the sake of order, union and tranquility, we observe with willingness. And with regard to these, our teachers preach to the people in the most commendatory manner; in the meantime, however, holding forth the view, that they do not justify before God." In Luther's *Shorter Catechism*, (which, singularly enough, follows the common Popish arrangement of merging the second commandment under the first, so that the fourth becomes the third,) is the following :

THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt sanctify the Sabbath-day.

What does this imply?

Ans. "That we should fear and love God, so that we may not despise the preaching of the Gospel, and his word; but keep it holy; willingly hear and learn it." Here there is a marked generality of language, and evasion of every thing like the injunction of a Christian Sabbath. And, in Luther's *Larger Catechism*, under the third commandment, it is said expressly: "This commandment, therefore, with respect to its outward and literal sense, does not concern us Christians; for it is wholly an external thing, like other ordinances of the Old Testament, confined to certain conditions, persons, times, and places, which are now all abrogated through Christ. But, in order that we may draw up for the uninformed, a Christian sense of what God requires of us in this commandment, it is necessary to observe that we keep the Sabbath

day, not for the sake of intelligent and learned Christians—for these have no need of it—but, in the first place, on account of physical reasons and necessities, which nature teaches and requires for the common mass of people, men-servants, and maid-servants, who attend during the whole week to their labour and employments, so that they may also have a day set apart for rest and recreation; in the second, mostly for the purpose of enabling us to embrace time and opportunity on these Sabbath-days, (since we cannot otherwise embrace them,) to attend to Divine service, so that we may assemble ourselves to hear and treat of the Word of God, and afterwards to praise him in singing and prayer.”

Luther, however, adds that no one should deceive himself by supposing that the duty of associated rest and worship is fulfilled by simply leaving off labour, and presenting their bodies in the church, while, like the Papists, they indulge a stupid inattention to the service.

Such then, is the theory of the great Lutheran community, distinctly and intelligently avowed! Nor is there any reason to suppose that it is not as explicitly held at this day by many of their divines, perhaps by the bulk of them; while the almost universal laxity of Sabbath observance in Protestant Europe (continental) shows that the theory bears it legitimate fruit in practice. It was related a few years ago by an eminent American, that when visiting the pious Neander, he took the opportunity to enquire of him whether the rumour were true, which had been spread concerning Gesenius, the great Hebraist; that he was accustomed to come down from Halle to Berlin at the end of the week, in order to enjoy the Sunday night's theatricals in the Capital; which were more brilliant that night than any other of the week. Neander answered that it was true; but the offence would not strike German christians as it would Americans. For himself, he said, he would not go to theatricals on any day, because he considered them unfriendly to spirituality; but he should not scruple to do on the Lord's day, any thing which it was right for a Christian to do on any other day. And in accordance, he did actually secure the attendance of his American visitor (unawares on his part) at a sober convivial entertainment the very next Sunday afternoon!

The evangelical Christians of Germany seem now to apprehend the prime necessity of a stricter Sabbath-observance for the interests of piety; and have recently combined to promote it. But it will be vain for them to attempt to engraft such a reform on this doctrinal theory of Lutheranism. No plausible tinkering with a doctrine so fundamentally erroneous will suffice. The connection between a false theory and a vicious practice is too inevitable. If the reform is to be established successfully, its foundation must be laid in the retraction of these opinions, and

the explicit adoption of the Puritan and Presbyterian theory of the Lord's day.

It may here be added, that the Mennonite church, both in Europe and America, holds substantially the Lutheran ideas of the Sabbath, and that their practice is influenced by them in a similar way. When this communion, led by Menno Simonist, set about ridding themselves of the reproach of fanatical Anabaptism, they were careful to assume so much of the prevalent religion as they could, consistently, with their essential peculiarities, in order to substantiate their plea that they were no longer a radical political sect, but a proper, evangelical denomination. The prevalent Protestantism of those countries was Lutheran; and hence the theology of the Mennonites, and their ideas of Sabbath observance are largely Lutheran. The articles of their most current confession, are silent concerning the observance of the Lord's day.

Next in order, should be mentioned the opinions of the Socinian sect. The Racovian Catechism, the recognized Confession of this body, in the 16th century, states their erroneous belief with unmistakable precision and brevity. Under the fourth commandment are the following questions and answers:

“What is the fourth commandment?”

“Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy.”

“What dost thou believe concerning this commandment?”

“I believe that it is removed under the new covenant, in the way in which other ceremonies, as they are called, are taken away.”

“Why, then, was it inserted in the decalogue?”

“Thus, that it might be manifest the most absolute part of the Mosaic law was not perfect, and that some indication might exist of this fact, that a law was to succeed the Mosaic law, by far more perfect, the law, namely, of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

“Did, or did not, Christ ordain that we should observe the day which they call *Lord's day*, in place of the Sabbath?”

“Not at all; since the religion of Christ entirely removes the distinction of days, just as it does the other ceremonies, as they are called; as the Apostle clearly writes in Coloss. 2: 16. But since we see that the Lord's day has been celebrated from of old time by Christians, we permit the same liberty to all Christians.”

A day of religious rest, then, according to Socinians is utterly abolished by Christ, just as the other Levitical ceremonies. There is no obligation whatever. But, in order to avoid the odium of unnecessarily disturbing venerated customs, such Socinians as choose, are *permitted to observe* the Lord's day. It will be a harmless peculiarity! To understand the second and third answers, it should be remembered that the Socinians wholly deny

that Christ did any vicarious or atoning work. Having denied this, they are of course pressed with the question: "How, then, is he more than any other eminent prophet; and why are such peculiar names and honours given him by Scripture? Why is an importance so entirely peculiar attached by it to his mission. To find a plausible answer to this hard query; to invent a *nodus vindice dignus*, they say that one peculiarity of his mission was to reveal a code of morality greatly more pure and complete than that of Moses and the prophets. And thus they have a constant polemical interest in depreciating and misrepresenting the moral code of Moses. So, forsooth, the All-wise placed this supererogatory precept, which was of only temporary authority, in the summary of his eternal, moral law, in order to give people a standing hint of the fact that this code was far from being complete! Since the coming of Christ, men need no such hint, according to the Socinians; for one great part of Christ's mission was to tell us clearly this very thing. And before the coming of Christ, this precept could not serve that purpose; because the Old Testament contained no indication whatever, that this was not as good and *bona fide* a commandment as all the rest. One feels strongly tempted to characterize this nonsensical position, with the unsavoury phrase, which Calvin usually applied to the grosser absurdities of his opponents, as *a putidum commentum*."

As to the ground held by the Anglican church, concerning the authority of the Lord's day, its standards are indecisive. It holds the same opinion with the Augsburg Confession, concerning the power of the church to ordain rites, ceremonies, and holy-days, additional, but not contrary to the Scriptures; but it has not observed the scriptural modesty of the Lutherans, in enforcing the uniform observance of these human appointments. While its theory on this point is not greatly more exaggerated in words than that of the Augsburg Confession, its practice has been unspeakably more tyrannical. The twentieth of the "Thirty-nine Articles," ("Of the authority of the Church,") says: "The church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith; and yet it is not lawful for the church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, &c." The thirty-fourth says: "Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that other may fear to do the like,) as he that offendeth against the common order of the church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren." The articles contain no nearer reference to the Lord's day. Our purpose in quoting these words

will be seen in connexion with the following from the thirteenth of the ecclesiastical canons and constitutions :

“Dus celebration of Sundays and holy-days.”

“All manner of persons within the church of England, shall from henceforth celebrate and keep the Lord’s day, commonly called Sunday, and other holy days, according to God’s holy will and pleasure, and the orders of the church of England prescribed in that behalf,” &c.

The church of England, then, is not, by her standards, definitely committed to that loose theory which we have unfolded; but the association of Sundays and holy-days, as equal in their claims, and the nature of their authority, is significant. The church, according to these articles, has power to ordain days, additional to those appointed in Scripture, provided they are not condemned in Scripture; and to enforce their observance by censures. And it is plainly implied that the obligation to keep a Sunday is only of the same character with the obligation to keep an Epiphany or Good Friday. Both are alike according to God’s holy will; but it is God’s will, not pronounced in Scripture, but through the authoritative decree of the church. It was the primitive church which introduced the festivals of Epiphany and others; and it was the same authority which introduced Sunday. As the thirty-fourth article claims that the same church authority which made, can unmake or alter these appointments, it would seem that even the Lord’s day might be liable to change by human authority. It is not easy to see how a Protestant, who believes that the traditions and ordinances of the church are not divinely infallible, and who yet places the Lord’s day and the church holy-days on the same basis of authority, can consistently esteem the obligations of the Sabbath, as sacredly as, in our judgment, they require. Yet we doubt not that many devout and evangelical Episcopalians, both in this country and in England, do regard them as highly as the best Christians in the world. The opposite practices and feelings of many of the “high church,” are well known. Their worst exemplar is to be seen in Laud and his “Declaration of Sports.” The Episcopalians of his party, in that day, were the most bitter enemies of those holy men, who first restored to the Protestant world the blessed doctrine that the church of God still possessed its Sabbath by Divine authority; branding them with the names of Judaizers and Sabbatarians.

We proceed now to state the opinions of Calvin, and some of the reformed churches. By consulting Calvin’s Institutes, (B. II., chap. 8.,) it will be seen that his views of Sabbath-observance are substantially those of Luther. He states that, among the Israelites, there were three grounds for the observance of the seventh day; first, that it might be a type of that cessation of the works

of self-righteousness which true believers practise; second, that there might be a stated day for public worship; and third, that domestic animals and servants might enjoy a merciful rest from bodily labour. Only the last two of these grounds exist, according to Calvin, under the New Testament. Hence he says: (Ch. 8., Sec. 33.) "We celebrate it not with scrupulous rigour, as a ceremony which we conceive to be a figure of some spiritual mystery, but only use it as a remedy necessary to the preservation of order in the church." In the previous section he says: "*Though the Sabbath is abrogated*, yet it is still customary among us to assemble on stated days, for hearing the Word, for breaking the mystic bread, and for public prayers; and also to allow servants and labourers a remission from their labour." And in section 34: "Thus vanish all the dreams of false prophets, who in past ages have infected the people with a Jewish notion, affirming that nothing but the ceremonial part of this commandment, which, according to them, is the appointment of the seventh day, has been abrogated; but that the moral part of it, that is, the observance of one day in seven, still remains. But this is only changing the day in contempt of the Jews, while they retain the same opinion of the holiness of a day; for, on this principle, the same mysterious signification would be attributed to particular days, which formerly obtained among the Jews." And in the same tenour, he remarks upon Coloss. ii: 16. ("Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days.") "Such a distinction (of days) suited the Jews, to observe sacredly the appointed days, by separating them from other days. *Among Christians, such a distinction hath ceased*. But, somebody will say that we still retain some observance of days. I answer, that we by no means observe them, as if there were any religion in holy-days, or as if it were not right to labour then; but the regard is paid to polity and good order, not to the days." In the Genevan Catechism, written by Calvin for the church of Geneva, and dedicated to the ministers of East Frisia in the Netherlands, the statements already quoted from the Institutes are so exactly reproduced, that they need not be repeated. In the Heidelberg Catechism, the symbol of the German Reformed Church in the Palatinate, the opinions of Calvin are adopted, though stated with such brevity, that we learn them in part by inference. The one hundred and third question and answer are:

"What doth God enjoy in the fourth commandment?"

"First: That the ministry of the Gospel, and the schools be preserved; and that I, with others, diligently frequent the Divine assemblies, industriously hear the Word of God, make use of the sacraments, join my prayers also to the public prayers, and bestow something on the poor according to my ability. Second: That in

all my life I shall abstain from wicked actions, permitting the Lord to do his work in me through his Holy Spirit, and thus shall begin that everlasting Sabbath in this life." The ideas of Calvin are here so evidently involved, and there is so studious an avoidance in the generality of the terms, of all reference to the consecration of a given day, by Divine authority, under the New Testament, that we cannot be mistaken in our surmises.

To those who are aware of the close relationship between Socinianism and Arminianism, it will not be surprising that the latter sect, at its birth, adopted an idea of the Lord's day only less relaxed than that of the former. It is unnecessary to multiply citations; a single passage from Limborch, one of the distinguished heads of their seminary in Amsterdam, in his commentary on Romans xiv: 5, will be both sufficiently distinct and authoritative:

Romans xiv: 5. "Another esteemeth every day alike," viz: (explains Limborch) "The converts to Christ from among the Gentiles, on whom the burden of the ritual law was never imposed, did not recognize this distinction of days, but esteemed all days equal, and one no more noble than another. It is true, indeed, that the apostles and primitive church were already accustomed to assemble in sacred meetings the first day of the week; but not because they believed that day more eminent than any other, nor because they believed the rest of that day to be a part of Divine worship, as the rest of the seventh day had been under the law; nor that it must be observed with rigour, as formerly, under the law. By no means: but because it was convenient to designate some time for sacred exercises; and that a man might the better be at leisure for them, rest also from daily labour was required. The first day of the week, on which the Lord rose from the dead, (which is thus called the Lord's day, Rev. i: 10,) seemed most meet to be destined to these services; but not because it was judged more holy, or because a rigid rest and cessation of all work in observing that day was a part of Divine worship. For thus, *it would have been not a taking off of the yoke, but a shifting of it.*"

On the whole, it may be said that the Protestant churches of continental Europe have all occupied this ground, concerning the sanctification of the Lord's day. These churches, properly speaking, have never had the Sabbath; for it has only been to them a holy-day, ranking no higher than Christmas or Easter, or a season set apart by civil enactment, or a convenient arrangement for concert in public worship; and not a sacred day of Divine appointment. The manner in which it is desecrated, commonly, throughout the Protestant States of the continent is shocking to the feelings and usages of strict, American Protestants; and seems to them to approximate only too much to the license of

Popery. But we have now seen that this desecration is not an accidental irregularity: it is the natural and proper result of the theory in which these churches have been educated since the reformation. That the greatest and best of the reformers should have failed to embrace the truth concerning the Lord's day, is indeed no subject of surprise. That men emerging at a bound from the meridian darkness of Popery into Gospel light should see all things correctly at first, was not to be expected. That they saw so many things "eye to eye," and erred in so few, is a wonder, only to be explained by the presence of the Spirit of all truth. It is wholesome to become acquainted with their few errors, and to explode them; for it will tend to correct that overweening spirit of party which ever prompts Christians to call themselves by the name of men, like those who said: "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas." But it may well be inquired also, whether a part of the spiritual decline which has almost extinguished the true light in the ancient seats of Luther, Calvin, Witsius and De Moor, is not due to this misconception of Sabbath obligation, and its consequent neglect. The sacred observance of one day in seven is God's appointed means for the cultivation of piety: when piety vanishes, orthodoxy necessarily follows it in due time.

As has been already indicated, the first successful attempt to establish the theory of a *Christian Sabbath*, since the reformation, was made among the English Puritans. About the year 1595, a dissenting minister of Suffolk, Dr. Nicholas Bound, published a book entitled "*Sabbatum Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, or, The True Doctrine of the Sabbath," in which he advocated the view afterwards adopted by the Westminster Assembly. This treatise had great currency among the devout dissenters, and evangelical churchmen, and was the beginning of a discussion which continued, under repeated attempts for its suppression by high church authorities, until the doctrines of the Puritans became those of the bulk of sincere Christians throughout Great Britain and the American colonies. Archbishop Whitgift condemned Dr. Bound's book to suppression. James I. published his Declaration of Sports, encouraging the people to dancing, trials of archery, erecting May-poles, and other amusements, at any hours of the Lord's day not occupied by public worship. The flood of immoralities introduced by this measure became so odious, that the secular magistrates, at the urgent instance of the people themselves, suppressed the Sunday sports. Under Charles I., Laud invoked the aid of his clergy to reestablish them; and the strange spectacle was seen, of the laity petitioning against the profane desecration of the sacred day, and their spiritual guides compelling them to perpetrate it! (Neal. Hist. of the Puritans, Vol. I., Ch. 8.; Vol. II., Ch. 2-5.)

The first great Synod which ever propounded, in modern ages, the true doctrine of the Lord's day, was the Westminster Assembly. Their confession of faith, which is now the standard of the Scotch, Irish and American Presbyterian, and of many independent churches, states the truth so luminously, (Ch. xxi., Sec. 7-8,) that we shall repeat their words here, though familiar, as the best statement of the proposition and text of our subsequent discussion.

Sec. 7. "As it is of the law of nature that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God ; so in his word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men, in all ages, He hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto Him ; which from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week ; and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord's day, and is to be continued to the end of the world as the Christian Sabbath."

Sec. 8. "This Sabbath is then kept holy unto the Lord, when men after a due preparing of their hearts, and ordering of their common affairs beforehand, do not only observe an holy rest all the day from their own works, words, and thoughts, about their worldly employments and recreations ; but also are taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy."

As the doctrinal articles of the Westminster Assembly were generally adopted by the Calvinistic dissenters of England and America, they also embraced these views of the Sabbath. The Immersionist denominations of these countries, which arrogate to themselves the title of Baptists, came from a mixed origin. The first idea and nucleus of the sect in England were from the Anabaptism of the Netherlands and lower Germany. That continental sect was at first every where persecuted, and in the long and terrible oppression of Protestantism, in the Netherlands, under Charles V., and his son, Philip of Spain, they in common with Lutherans and Reformed, emigrated in vast numbers to every accessible place of refuge. The commercial and religious affinities of England and the low countries were then very close ; so that thousands of the Protestant middle classes of that wretched land were soon found settled in London, Norwich and other towns. It was thus especially, that Anabaptism took root on English soil. The Baptist churches afterwards formed, received their other element from the churches of the Calvinistic Independents, in which, for a considerable time, immersion and pædobaptism were both practised by compromise. This independent element was Calvinistic and Sabbatarian ; the Anabaptist material was Arminian in doctrine, and practised the loose views of

Luther concerning the Sabbath. Hence, the Baptist churches of England and those of this country, which are their counterparts, differed among themselves, and presented mixture and diversity of usage on both these points. The new American sect, self-styled Reformers, popularly known as Campbellite, has adopted the boldest view propounded by the Socinians; presenting here another evidence of its Socinian tendencies.

Wesleyanism is an offshoot of the Anglican church, with the mystical Arminianism of the Moravians, and of Holland, superinduced upon it. The Lutheranism of this country claims to be a reproduction of that of Germany, only stripped of its Erastianism and doctrine of religious establishments. It takes pride in republishing the symbols of Melancthon and Luther. The Episcopacy of America strives to be a counterpart of that of England. The reader will now easily comprehend, from this historical review, what would naturally be the views of these several denominations concerning Sabbath-observance, and what is the legitimate source of that diversity, vagueness and license, which are exhibited in this country, in our Sabbath usages. To particularize further would be unnecessary, and might be supposed invidious.

II. We proceed now to the attempt to give a full but summary statement of the grounds upon which Presbyterians assert the doctrine of a Christian Sabbath as it is set forth in their confession. And *first*: it is most obvious that if the Sabbath law contained in the decalogue is "a positive, moral and perpetual commandment, binding all men, in all ages," and not ceremonial and positive, like the Jewish laws of meats, new moons and sacrifices, it cannot have passed away along with the other temporary shadows of Judaism. If it was not introduced by the Levitical economy for the first time, but was in force before, and if it was binding not on Jews only, but on all men, then the abrogation of that economy cannot have abrogated that which it did not institute. The apostle Paul justifies us here, by using an argument exactly parallel in a similiar case. "The covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul." Gal. iii: 17. Upon the question whether the fourth commandment was of Mosaic origin, or earlier, the fathers were divided; and this fact is another among the many proofs of their slender acquaintance with the Hebrew literature and antiquities.

That it is a positive, moral, and perpetual command, we argue from the facts that there is a reason in the nature of things, making such an institution necessary to man's religious interests; and that this necessity is substantially the same in all ages and nations. That it is man's duty to worship God, none will dispute. Nor will it be denied that this worship should be in part social; because man is a being of social affections, and subject to social

obligations; and because one of the great ends of worship is the display of the Divine glory before our fellow-creatures. Social worship cannot be conducted without the appointment of a stated day; and what more reasonable than that the Divine authority, who is the object of this worship, should meet this necessity, by himself fixing the day for all mankind? And even for the cultivation of our individual devotion, a periodical season is absolutely necessary to creatures of habit and of finite capacities, like us. What is not regularly done will soon be omitted; for periodical recurrence is the very foundation of habit. Unless these spiritual thoughts and exercises were attached to some certain season, they would inevitably be pushed out of the minds of carnal and sensuous beings like man, by the cares of this world. Now, when it is our duty to perform a certain work, it is also our duty to employ all the necessary means for it. The question, whether the Sabbath command is *moral* or positive, seems, therefore, to admit of a very simple solution. Whether one day in six, or one in eight, might not have seemed to the Divine wisdom admissible for this purpose; or which day of the seven, the first or last, should be consecrated to it, or what should be the particular external ceremonies for its observance; all these things, we freely admit, are of merely positive institution, and may be changed by the Divine Legislator. But that man shall observe some stated, recurring period of religious worship, is as much a dictate of the natural reason and conscience, as immediate a result of the natural relations of man to God, as that man shall worship his God at all. And no reason can be shown why this original moral obligation was more or less stringent upon the Israelites of the Mosaic period, than on men before or since them. If the ground of the Sabbath institution, in the moral relations existing by nature, is universal and perpetual, is it not reasonable to expect the precept to be so also?

We argue further, that the enactment of the Sabbath-law does not date from Moses, but was coeval with the human race. It is one of the two first institutions of paradise. The sanctification of the seventh day took place from the very end of the week of creation. (Gen. ii : 3.) For whose observance was the day, then, consecrated or set apart, if not for man's? Not for God's; because the glorious paradox is forever true of him, that his ineffable quiet is as perpetual as his ever-active providence. Not surely for the angels? but for Adam's. Doubtless, Eden witnessed the sacred rest of him and his consort from

"The toil

Of their sweet gardening labour, which sufficed

To recommend cool zephyr, and made ease

More easy, wholesome thirst and appetite

More grateful."

And from that time downward, we have indications, brief indeed, but as numerous as we should expect in the brief record of Genesis and Exodus, and sufficient to show that the Sabbath continued to be an institution of the patriarchal religion. A slight probable evidence of this may even be found in the fact, that seven has ever been a sacred and symbolical number, among Patriarchs, Israelites, and Pagans. In Genesis we read of the "seven clean beasts," the "seven well-favoured," and "seven lean kine," the "seven ears of corn, rank and good." Now there is no natural phenomenon to suggest the number; for no noted heavenly body, or natural element, revolves precisely in seven hours, days, weeks, or months. Whence the peculiar idea everywhere attached to the number, if not from the institution of a week for our first parents? But to proceed to more solid facts: It is at least probable that the "end of days," (Gen. iv: 3,) rendered in our version, "process of time," at which Cain and Abel offered their sacrifices, was the end of the week, the seventh, or Sabbath-day. In Gen. vii: 10, we find God himself observing the weekly interval in the preparations for the flood. We find another clear hint of the observance of the weekly division of time by Noah and his family in their floating prison. (Gen. viii: 10-12.) The patriarch twice waited a period of seven days to send out his dove. From Gen. xxix: 27, we learn that it was customary among the patriarchs of Mesopotamia, in the days of Laban, to continue a wedding festival a week; and the very term of service rendered by Jacob for his two wives, shows the use made of the number seven as the customary duration of a contract for domestic servitude. Gen. l: 10, shows us that at the time of Jacob's death, a week was also the length of the most honourable funeral exercises. In Exod. xii: 3-20, we find the first institution of the passover, when as yet there was no Mosaic institutions. This feast was also appointed to last a week. In Exod. xvi: 22-30, where we read the first account of the manna, we find the Sabbath institution already in force; and no candid mind will say that this is the history of its first enactment. It is spoken of as a rest with which the people ought to have been familiar. But the people had not yet come to Sinai, and none of its institutions had been given. Here, then, we have the Sabbath's rest enforced on Israel, before the ceremonial law was set up, and two weekly variations wrought in the standing miracle of the manna, in order to facilitate it. And when at length we come to the formal command of the decalogue, it is expressed in terms which clearly indicate that the Sabbath was an institution already known, of which the obligation was now only re-affirmed.

The very fact that this precept found a place in the awful "ten words," is of itself strong evidence that it is not a positive and ceremonial, but a moral and perpetual statute. Confessedly, there

is nothing else ceremonial here. An eminent distinction was given to the subjects of these ten commands, by the mode in which God delivered them. They were given first of all. They were spoken in the hearing of all the people, by God's own voice of thunder, which moulded its tremendous sounds into syllables so loud that the whole multitude around the distant base of the mount heard them break articulate from the cloud upon its peak. "These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice; *and he added no more.*" (Deut. v: 22.) No other words shared the same distinction. And then they were engraven, by God's own agency, on two stone tables, whose durability was to represent the perpetual obligation of all which was written upon it. How can it be believed that this one ceremonial precept has been thrust in here, where all else is of obligation as old, and as universal as the race? This is strengthened also by the reflection that the ground first assigned in Genesis, and here repeated for its enactment, is in no sense Jewish or national. God's work of creation in six days, and his rest the seventh, have just as much relation to one tribe of Adam's descendants as to another. Note the contrast: that, in many cases, when ceremonial and Jewish commands are given, like the passover, a national or Jewish event is assigned as its ground, like the exodus from Egypt.

The assertion that the Sabbath was coeval with the human race, and was intended for the observation of all, receives collateral confirmation also from the early traditions concerning it, which pervade the first Pagan literature. It can hardly be supposed that Homer and Hesiod borrowed from the books of Moses, sabbatical allusions, which would have been to their hearers unintelligible. They must be the remnants of those primeval traditions of patriarchal religion, which had been transferred by the descendants of Japheth, to the isles of Chittim. The early allusions to a sacred seventh day may be sufficiently exhibited by citing a collection of them from Eusebius' *Preparatio Evangelica*, (L. xiii., Sec. 13,) which he quotes from the *Stromata* of Clement of Alexandria. The latter father is represented as saying: "That the seventh day is sacred, not the Hebrews only, but the Gentiles also acknowledge, according to which the whole universe of animals and vegetables revolves." Hesiod, for instance, thus says concerning it:

"The first, the fourth also, and the seventh is a sacred day." (*ἰσρον ἡμῶν.*) *Dierum*, line 6.

And again: "The seventh day once more, the splendid dawn of the sun."

And Homer: "The seventh then arrived, the sacred day."

Again: "The seventh was sacred."

“The seventh dawn was at hand, and with this all the series is completed.”

And once more: “On the seventh day, we left the stream of Acheron.”

And thus also writes Callimachus the poet: “It was now the Sabbath day: and with this all was accomplished.”

Again: “The seventh day is among the fortunate; yea, the seven is the parent-day.”

Again: “The seventh day is first, and the seventh day is the complement.”

And: “All things in the starry sky are found in sevens; and shine in their ordained cycles.”

“And this day, the elegies of Solon also proclaim as more sacred, in a wonderful mode.”

Thus far Clement and Eusebius. Josephus, in his last book against Apion, affirms that “there could be found no city, either of the Grecians or Barbarians, who owned not a seventh day’s rest from labour.” This of course is exaggerated. Philo, cotemporary with Josephus, calls the Sabbath εορτή κανόνημος.

We argue once more, that the Sabbath never was a Levitical institution, because God commanded its observance both by Jews and Gentiles, in the very laws of Moses. “In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, *nor thy stranger that is within thy gates.*” To see the force of the argument from this fact, the reader must contrast the jealous care with which “the stranger,” the pagan foreigner residing in an Israelitish community, was prohibited from all share in their ritual services. No foreigner could partake of the passover—it was sacrilege. He was not even permitted to enter the court of the temple where the sacrifices were offered, at the peril of his life. Now, when the foreigner is commanded to share the Sabbath rest, along with the Israelite, does not this prove that rest to be no ceremonial, no type, like the passover and the altar, but a universal moral institution, designed for Jew and Gentile alike?

We have thus established this assertion on an impregnable basis, because the argument from it is direct and conclusive. If the Sabbath command was in full force before Moses, the passing away of Moses’ law does not remove it. If it always was binding, on grounds as general as the human race, on all tribes of mankind, the dissolution of God’s special covenant with the family of Jacob did not repeal it. If its nature is moral and practical, the substitution of the substance for the types does not supplant it. The reason that the ceremonial laws were temporary was that the necessity for them was temporary. They were abrogated because they were no longer needed. But the practical need for a Sabbath is the same in all ages. When it is made to appear that this day is the bulwark of practical religion in the world, that its proper

observance every where goes hand in hand with piety and the true worship of God ; that where there is no Sabbath there is no Christianity, it becomes an impossible supposition that God would make the institution temporary. The necessity for the Sabbath has not ceased, therefore it is not abrogated. In its nature, as well as its necessity, it is a permanent, moral command. All such laws are as incapable of change as the God in whose character they are founded. Unlike mere positive or ceremonial ordinances, the authority of which ceases as soon as God sees fit to repeal the command for them, moral precepts can never be repealed ; because the purpose to repeal them would imply a change in the unchangeable, and a depravation in the perfect character of God.

2. We will now proceed, in the second place, to consider the passages of the New Testament from which the abrogation of the Sabbath obligations has been argued, together with some considerations growing out of them. In attempting to refute the exposition and arguments of those who advocate the repeal of those obligations, we shall not pause to attribute each gloss which we reject to its especial author, or load our page with citations of learned names. It may be remarked once for all in the outset, that the erroneous expositions of Calvin are far the least objectionable, and, at the same time, the most subtle and acute ; and that those of Neander are in full contrast with his in both these respects.

The first passage is that contained, with some variation, in Matt. xii : 1-8, Mark ii : 23-28, Luke vi : 1-5. The reader, on examining these places in connexion, and supplying from the second or third evangelist what is omitted by the first, will find that our Lord advances five ideas distinguishable from each other. His hungry and wearied disciples, passing with him through the fields of ripe corn, had availed themselves of the permission of Deut. xxiii : 25, to pluck, rub out, and eat some grains of wheat, as a slight refreshment. The pharisees sieze the occasion to cavil that He had thus permitted them to break the Sabbath law, by engaging in the preparation of their food in sacred time ; objecting thus against the trivial task of rubbing out, and winnowing from the chaff a few heads of wheat as they walked along. Our Saviour defends them and himself by saying, in the first place, that the necessity created by their hunger justified the departure from the letter of the law, as did David's necessity, when fleeing for his life he employed the shew-bread (and innocently) to relieve his hunger ; second, that the example of the priests, who performed necessary manual labour without blame about the temple on the Sabbath, justified what his disciples had done ; third, that God preferred the compliance with the spirit of his law, which enjoins humanity and mercy, over a mere compliance with its outward rites ; for, in the fourth place, God's design in instituting the

Sabbath had been purely a humane one, seeing He had intended it, not as a burdensome ceremonial to gall the necks of men to no benevolent purpose, but as a means of promoting the true welfare of the human race; and last, that He himself, as the Messiah, was the Divine and Supreme authority in maintaining the Sabbath law, as well as all others—so that it was enough for Him to pronounce that his disciples had made no infraction of it.

The first general view presented hereupon by the anti-Sabbatarians is, that Christ here, for the first time, introduces the freer, more lenient law of the new dispensation, by his Messianic authority, as a substitute for the stricter Mosaic law. The simple and short answer is, that it is the Sabbath *as it ought to be observed by Jews*, under the Mosaic laws, which our Saviour is here expounding. The new dispensation had not yet come; and was not to begin till Pentecost. After all this discussion, Christ complied with all the requisitions of the Levitical institutions up to his death. If, then, any thing is relaxed, it is the Mosaic Sabbath, as Jews should keep it, which is the subject of the alteration. But we wish the reader to bear in mind, as a point important here and hereafter, that our Saviour does not claim any relaxation at all for his disciples. The whole drift of his argument is to show that when the Mosaic law of the Sabbath is properly understood, (as Jews should practise it,) his disciples have not broken it at all. They have complied with it; and need no lowering of its sense in order to escape its condemnation. Bearing this in mind, we proceed to the second erroneous inference. This is, that our Saviour illustrates and expounds the Sabbath law by two cases of other laws merely ceremonial, the disposition of the old shew-bread and the Sabbath sacrifices. Hence the inference, that the Sabbath also is but a ceremonial law. But to those who will notice how entirely the Jewish Scriptures ignore, in their practical recitals and discussions of religious duties, the distinction which we make between the "moral" and the "positive," this inference will be seen to be utterly worthless. The Jewish mind never paused to express the distinction, in its practical views of duty. See how Moses jumbles together in Exodus, prohibitions against idolatry, or hewing the stones of which the altar was made: against eating flesh torn of beasts in the field, and bearing false witness. See how Ezekial (ch. xviii.) conjoins eating upon the mountains and taking usury on a loan, with idolatry and oppression, in his descriptions of the sins of his cotemporaries. But again: It has been admitted that the external and formal details of Sabbath observance may be of only positive obligation, while the obligation to keep religiously a stated season is moral. It does not, then, at all imply that the substantial observance of such a stated day is not of moral and perpetual obligation, because any of those details concerning the labours of necessity or mercy which are wholly compatible with such observ-

ance, are illustrated by comparison with other ceremonial precepts. It is argued again, that "our Saviour, in his third point, implies that Sabbath observance is but ceremonial, while the duty of mercy is of moral obligation, when he indicates that, if the two clash, the Sabbath observance is to give way. The positive gives way to the moral." The force of this is entirely removed by recalling the fact that it is not a failure of Sabbath observance, which he excuses by the argument that the positive should give place to the moral; but it is an incidental labour of necessity wholly compatible with Sabbath observance. There had been no failure. Nor is it true that when we are commanded to let one given duty give place to the higher demands of another, the former is therefore only positive, while the latter is moral. There is a natural, moral, and perpetual obligation to worship God; and yet it might be our duty to suspend any act of worship, time and again, to almost any number, in order to meet the demands of urgent cases of necessity calling for our compassion. The wise man expresses precisely the sense of our Saviour's argument when he says: "To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice." (Prov. xxi: 3.) And the meaning is, that the formal acts of religious worship, though in general demanded by nature and reason, are less important in God's eyes than the direct acts which express the true spirit of holiness in which religion consists. "Sacrifice," both here, and in our Saviour's citation from Samuel, represents the whole general idea of outward religious worship. It is not because "sacrifice" is merely ceremonial, that it is postponed in importance, to mercy and justice, but because it is external, and may be merely formal. Religious worship, here intended by the more special term "sacrifice," is surely not a duty merely ceremonial and positive in its obligation, though external. Our Saviour, then, does not imply that the Sabbath is an institution merely ceremonial, by comparing it to sacrifice.

The perverted gloss of the fourth idea: "The Sabbath is made for man," is almost too shallow to need exposure. It has been used as though it sanctioned the notion, that man was not intended to be cramped by the Sabbath, but, on the contrary, it was intended to yield to his convenience and gratification. But since the object of the Sabbath is here stated to be a humane one, namely: the promotion of man's true welfare; it must be settled what that true welfare is, and how it may be best promoted, before we are authorized to conclude that we may do what we please with the holy-day. If it should appear that man's true welfare imperatively demands a Sabbath-day, strictly observed and fenced in with Divine authority, the humanity of the Divine motive in giving a Sabbath would argue any thing else than the license inferred from it.

The concluding words of the passage, in Matthew, have suggested an argument which is at least more plausible. Calvin

paraphrases them thus: "The Son of man, agreeably to his authority, is able to relax the Sabbath-day just as the other legal ceremonies." And just before: "Here he saith that power is given to him to release his people from the necessity of observing the Sabbath." The inference is obvious, that if this is His scope in these words, then the Sabbath must be admitted by us to be only a ceremonial institution; for we have ourselves argued that moral laws are founded on the unchangeable nature of God himself, and will never be changed, because God cannot change. But this is clearly a mistaken exposition. It may be noted that the conjunction which is rendered by Calvin and the English version: "The Son of Man is Lord *even* (or also) of the Sabbath-day," is unanimously rejected by modern editors of the text. Calvin, of course, makes this conjunction regard the ceremonials just mentioned: "The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath also," (as well as of matters of shew-bread and sacrifice.) But we should almost certainly read the clause without the conjunction: "If ye had known what this means, 'I prefer mercy rather than sacrifice,' ye would not have condemned the innocent. *For* the Son of Man is *Lord* of the Sabbath." What force shall we assign to the illative 'for,' wholly neglected by Calvin? There is no reasonable explanation of it, but that which makes it introduce the ground on which the innocence of the disciples is asserted. "These men, blamed by you, are innocent; it is enough that I defend them: *for* I am Lord of the Sabbath. This law is my law. Mine is the authority which enacts it, and if I am satisfied, that itself is innocence in my subjects." But this is comparatively unimportant. The evident reason which shows Calvin's paraphrase to be entirely a misconception, is this: As we have said, the whole drift of our Saviour's argument is not to excuse his disciples, but to defend them. He does not claim that the Sabbath law, as enacted for Jews, must needs be relaxed, in order to admit the conduct of the disciples; but that this law justified their conduct. He concludes his defence by telling their accusers: "you have condemned *the innocent*." Now to represent him as shielding them by asserting a right in himself to relax the Sabbath law for them, makes him adopt in the end a ground of defence contradictory to the former. The last argument would stullify all the previous one. The logical absurdity would be exactly of the same kind with that contained in the trite story of the school-boy, who, when charged with striking his school-mate, answered: "I did not strike him at all; but if I did, he struck me first." And, as a question of fact, is it true that Christ did, at this time, exercise his Divine authority to relax any Mosaic institution in favour of his disciples? Is it not notorious, on the contrary, that he taught them to give an exemplary compliance in every respect, until the time was fully come after his resurrection?

But to conclude. It is most obvious that, whatever is our exposition of the particular parts, our Saviour's drift is to unfold the true nature of the *Mosaic Sabbath*, as then obligatory on Jews still obedient to the ceremonial law, as he admitted himself and his disciples to be; and not the nature of the Christian Sabbath. The latter was not to be introduced until many months after, as our opponents themselves admit. And this short view is a sufficient refutation in itself.

It may be as well to notice here a supposed difficulty attending our argument. It is said: "If you deny that Christ promises any relaxation of the stringency of the Levitical Sabbath, as of a ceremonial yoke, then you ought in consistency to exact of Christians now as punctilious an observance as was demanded of the old Jews, in every respect. You should refuse to make a fire in your dwellings on the Sabbath. You should seek to re-enact the terrible law of Numb. xvi, which punished a wretch with death for gathering a few sticks."

This is only skillful sophistry. We have not asserted that all the details of the Sabbath laws, in the books of Moses, were of perpetual moral obligation. We have not denied that some of them were ceremonial. The two instances mentioned, which are the only plausible ones which can be presented against us, are not taken from the decalogue, but from subsequent parts of the ceremonial books. We expressly contrasted the Sabbath precept as it stands in the "ten words" with all the rest, with reference to its perpetual, moral nature. The precept there contains only two points—rest from secular labour, and the sanctification of the day, which means in our view its appropriation to sacred services. The matter which is of perpetual moral obligation in the Sabbath law, is only this, that a finite, sensuous, and social being like man, shall have some periodical season stately consecrated to religious services, (such season as God shall see fit to appoint.) And all matters of detail and form which do not clash with this great end, are matters of mere positive enactment, which may be changed or repealed by Him who enacted them. But we can present several very consistent and sufficient reasons why the ceremonial details added to the great moral law of the decalogue, by the subsequent and ritual part of the Levitical legislation, should be more stringent, and enforced by heavier penalties than among us. First: the Sabbath became to the Israelite not only a religious institution of moral obligation, but a type. It took rank with his new-moon, and his passover. Of this, more hereafter. But the very nature and design of a symbolical ritual demand that it shall be observed with technical accuracy. Next, the government was a theocracy, and no line whatever separated the secular and sacred statutes from each other. Hence it is natural that offences should deserve very different penalties under such a government, and

especially an offence aimed so especially against the Divine Chief Magistrate, as Sabbath labour. Third : The Hebrews' houses had no hearths, nor chimneys, except for cooking ; so that in that warm climate a prohibition to light fire on the Sabbath is exactly equivalent to a prohibition to cook on the holy-day. Even if this prohibition were a part of the decalogue, it would be a ridiculous sacrifice of its spirit to its letter, to compel us in our wintry climate, to forego the fire which is hourly necessary to health and comfort. But as the prohibition signifies in its spirit, we freely admit that with us, as with the Jews, all culinary labours should be intermitted, except such as are demanded by necessity and mercy, or by the different nature of a part of the food on which civilized nations now subsist. For us to allow ourselves further license would be to palter with that which we have so carefully pointed out as the essential and perpetual substance of the Sabbath law ; the cessation of labour, and the appropriation to religious pursuits of one day (not one fragment of a day) in seven. When the confession of faith says that we are commanded to rest "all the day" from our own employments and amusements, and to "take up the whole time" in religious exercises, it only assumes that "a day" means, in the decalogue, a day.

The second group of passages which are used against our theory of Sabbath obligation are : Rom. xiv : 5-6, Gal. iv : 9-11, Col. ii : 16-17. To save the reader trouble, we will copy them :

"One man esteemeth one day above another : another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord : and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks ; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks."

"But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage ? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain."

"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new-moon, or of the Sabbath-days : Which are a shadow of things to come ; but the body is of Christ."

The facts in which all are agreed, which explain the Apostle's meaning in these passages, are these : After the establishment of the new dispensation, the Christians converted from among the Jews had generally combined the practice of Judaism with the forms of Christianity. They observed the Lord's day, baptism, and the Lord's supper ; but they also continued to keep the seventh day, the passover, and circumcision. At first it was proposed by them to enforce this double system on all Gentile Christians ; but this project was rebuked by the meeting of apostles and elders at Jerusalem, recorded in Acts xv. A large part, how-

ever, of the Jewish Christians, out of whom ultimately grew the Ebionite sect, continued to observe the forms of both dispensations; and restless spirits among the mixed churches of Jewish and Gentile converts planted by Paul, continued to attempt their enforcement on Gentiles also; some of them conjoining with this Ebionite theory the graver heresy of a justification by ritual observances. Thus, at this day, this spectacle was exhibited. In the mixed churches of Asia Minor and the West, some brethren went to the synagogue on Saturday, and to the church-meeting on Sunday, keeping both days religiously; while some kept only Sunday. Some felt bound to keep all the Jewish festivals and fasts, while others paid them no regard. And those who had not Christian light to apprehend these Jewish observances as non-essentials, found their consciences grievously burdened or offended by the diversity. It was to quiet this trouble that the apostle wrote these passages. Thus far we agree.

We however further assert, that by the beggarly elements of "days," "months," "times," "years," "holy-days," "new-moons," "Sabbath-days," the apostle means Jewish festivals, and those alone. The Christians' festival, Sunday, is not here in question; because about the observance of this, there was no dispute nor diversity in the Christian churches. Jewish and Gentile Christians alike consented universally in its sanctification. When Paul asserts that the regarding of a day, or the not regarding it, is a non-essential, like the eating or not eating of meats, the natural and fair interpretation is, that he means those days which were in debate, and no others. When he implies that some innocently "regarded every day alike," we should understand: *every one of those days which were subjects of diversity*: not the Christians' Sunday, about which there was no dispute.

But the other party give to Paul's words a far more sweeping sense. They suppose him to assert 'that the new dispensation has detached the service of God from all connexion with stated seasons whatever; so that in its view, all days, Sabbath or Sunday, passover or easter, should be alike to the Christian spirit. He who ceased to observe the Jewish days, in order to transfer his sabbatical observances, his stated devotions and special religious rest to the Christian days, was still in substance a Judaizer. He was retaining the Jewish bondage of spirit under a new form. The true liberty which Paul would teach was this: To regard no day whatever as more related to the Christian consciousness than any other day, and to make every day a rest from sin, pervading all with a sacred spirit by performing all its labours to the glory of God. This is the true, thorough, and high ground, which the apostle called them to occupy with him. But opposition to Judaism, and reverence for Christ in his resurrection had led the Christians to hold their public meetings on Sunday instead of

Saturday ; and some little allowance of set days (including Easter and Whitsuntide) had been granted to the weakness of the Christian life, which, in the common average of Christians, had not yet risen to that level which would enable them, like Paul, to make every day equally a Lord's day. This concession had been possibly established with Paul's connivance, certainly very early in the history of the church ; and, on the whole, was a very convenient and useful human appointment.' See this view in Neander. Hist. Vol. I., Sec. 3. Sec. II. 3, and Planting and Training. Vol. I., B. 3., Ch. v., Sec. 2. The chief argument by which he supports his view, is a perversion of the figurative and glowing language found in the few and not very perspicuous writings of the Christians immediately next to the apostles, where they speak affectionately of the Christian's whole life as belonging to God by the purchase of redemption, and of the duties of every day as an oblation to His honour. The thankful spirit of the new dispensation, urges Neander, unlike the Jewish, felt itself constrained by gratitude for redemption to consecrate its whole life to God. Whatever the Christian's occupation, whether secular or religious, all was alike done to the glory of God. Hence all was consecrated ; every day was a holy-day ; for the whole life was holy ; every Christian was a perpetual priest. Hence there was no room for the idea of a Sabbath at all. Strange that the learned and amiable antiquary should have forgotten that all this was just as true of pious Hebrews before, as of Christians after Christ, of Isaiah as of Paul. Isaiah, if redeemed at all, was redeemed by the same blood with Paul, owed substantially the same debt of gratitude, and would feel, as a true saint, the same self-consecration. The spirit of the precept, "Do all to the glory of God," actuates the pious Israelite exactly as it did the pious Christian. Let the reader compare Deut. vi : 4-5, with Matt. xxii : 37, so that the refined argument of the learned German proves that there ought to be no room for a sabbatical distinction of days under the old dispensation, just as under the new. Unluckily, the explicit language of the books of Moses is rather damaging to the validity of the inference.

Let us also notice, just here, the consequences of the ground on which Neander places those festival observances of the early Christians on stated days, of which he could not dispute the occurrence. He represents that Paul invited and exhorted them to ascend at once to his high, spiritual ground, discarding all reference to stated days whatever, and making the whole life a Sabbath. But the average standard of spirituality was not yet high enough to make this practicable for all ; and so the partial observance of stated days, Sundays, Easter and Whitsuntide, was allowed by a sort of ecclesiastical precedent. Now we remark, first, that this represents the Spirit of Inspiration as setting up an impracticable

standard. If the average of spirituality was not high enough in the days of inspiration to make it practicable actually to discard all relation of the acts of Christian devotion to stated days, may we rationally expect that it will ever be high enough while Christians are in the flesh? In other words: Is there not an implied admission here, that there is an innate necessity in the character of human beings that they should have a sabbatical institution of some sort? The assertion of such an universal necessity is one of the corner-stones of our argument. Second: The idea reveals an unworthy and false conception of Paul's inspiration. Paul, forsooth, proposes a certain mode and standard of Christian devotion, but it is found necessary in practice to correct it by the wiser guidance of church-precedent, almost under Paul's nose! This representation of the whole matter could never have proceeded from any other than the transcendental theory of inspiration; which regards it as merely a higher mode of the natural and normal exercise of the man's own consciousness, at a more exalted level than that attained by other men. Let those American Christians who indulge their prurient literary vanity by bespattering Neander with their unintelligent praise, remember that this is the conception of inspiration to which they commit themselves in commending him.

In our remaining discussion of the passages cited from the epistles, we may confine our remarks to Col. iii: 16-17. For it contains all the apparent difficulties for the sabbatarian, and all the supposed arguments for his opponent, in the strongest form. The point made by Calvin upon the words, "Sabbath-days, . . . are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ," is far the most plausible, and indeed the only one of serious difficulty. It is in substance this: That if it be admitted that the Lord's day was never included by the earlier Christians in the term *σαββατα*—and the apostle is here condemning the Jewish holy-days only—still the fact will remain, that the Jewish Sabbath was a shadow. That is: It was a typical, and not a perpetual moral institution; so that it must go by the board along with all the other types, after the substance comes, unless some positive New Testament precept re-enact it. But there is no such precept. To this we answer, that the Sabbath was to the Jews both a perpetual, moral institution, and a type. That it was the former, we have proved in the first general branch of our discussion. It was as old as the race of man, was given to all the race, was given upon an assigned motive of universal application, and to satisfy a necessity common to the whole race was founded on man's natural relations to his Maker, was observed before the typical dispensation came among all tribes, was re-enacted in the decalogue where all the precepts are perpetual, and was enjoined on foreigners as well as Jews in the Holy Land: while from all types foreigners were expressly

excluded. That it was to the Jews also a type, we admit. Like the new-moons, it was marked by an additional number of sacrifices. It was to the Israelites a memorial of their exodus from Egypt, and their covenant of obedience to God. Deut. v : 15, Exod. xxxi : 13, Ezek. xx : 12. It was for a time, at least, a foreshadowing of the rest of Canaan. Hebr. iv : 4-11. It was to them, as it is to us, a shadow of the rest in heaven. Hebr. iv : 9. Calvin adds (Bk. II. Institutes, Ch. 8., Sec. 29) that its most important typical use was to represent the cessation of the efforts of self-righteousness in us, that we may repose in the justifying and sanctifying grace of Christ. For this his proofs seem to us very slender. When the Epistle to the Colossians says that sabbaths, along with holy-days and new-moons, are a shadow, it seems to us much the most simple explanation to say that it is the sacrificial aspect of those days, or (to employ other words) their use as especial days of sacrifice, in which they together constituted a shadow. They were a shadow in this: that the sacrifices, which constituted so prominent a part of their Levitical observance, pointed to Christ the body. This is exactly accordant with the whole tenour of the Epistles.

The seventh day had been, then, to the Jews, both a moral institution and a ritual type. In its latter use, the coming of Christ had of course abrogated it. In its former use, its whole duties and obligations had lately been transferred to the Lord's day. So that *the seventh day*, as distinguished from *Sunday*, along with the new-moons, was now nothing but a type, and that an effete one. In this aspect, the apostle might well argue that its observance then indicated a Judaizing tendency.

We fortify our position farther by re-asserting that the fair exposition of all these passages should lead us to understand by the phrases, "days," "times," "holy-days," only those days or times which were then subjects of diversity among the Christians to whom the apostle was writing. When he implies that some innocently "regarded every day alike," we ought in fairness to understand by "every day," each of those days which were then in dispute. But we know historically that there was no diversity among these Christians concerning the observance of the Lord's day. All practised it. If we uncritically persist in taking the phrase "every day" in a sense absolutely universal, we shall place the teachings and usages of the apostle in a self-contradictory light. We make him tell his converts that *the Lord's day* may be regarded as just like any other day; when we know that, in fact, neither the apostle nor any of his converts regarded it so. They all observed it as a religious festival, and as we shall show with the clear sanction of inspired example. Again: it must be distinctly remembered that the word Sabbath was never applied, in New Testament language, to the Lord's day, but was always

used for the seventh day, and other Jewish festivals, as distinguished from the Christian's Sunday. We have the authority of Suidas, Theophylact and Cæsarius, and Levit. xxiii: 24, that the "Jews called any of their stated religious festivals, σαββατον." We might then argue, perhaps, that there is no evidence that the seventh day is intended in this place of Colossians at all; but only the Jewish feasts. But we waive this, as too near to special pleading. With far more confidence we argue, that since all parties have claimed the parallelism of three passages in Romans, Galatians and Colossians, as to their occasion and doctrine, we are entitled to assume that the passage in Colossians, the most explicit of the three, is to be taken as explicative of the other two. And we assert that, according to well known usage of the word σαββατα at that time, the Sundays were *definitely excluded* from the apostle's assertion. When he says here, "holy-days, new-moons, and Sabbath-days," he explicitly excludes the Lord's days. We are entitled to assume, therefore, that they are excluded when he says in the parallel passage of Romans, "every day," and in Galatians, "days, and months, and times, and years." That the Lord's days were sacred was not in debate; this is set aside as a matter known to all, consented unto by all. It is the Jewish holy-days, from the observance of which, the Christian conscience is exempted.

Let us recur to that view of the necessity of a sabbatical institution in some form. It is not a temporary or ceremonial need, but one founded on man's very nature, and relations to his God. If there is no stated sacred day, there will be no religion. Now shall we so interpret the apostle's words as to leave the New Testament church no Sabbath at all in any shape? After the experience of all ages had shown that a Sabbath rest was the natural and necessary means essential to religious welfare, was the New Testament church stripped more bare, left more poor than all preceding dispensations? Paradise had enjoyed its Sabbath, though needing it less. The patriarchal saints enjoyed it. Abraham enjoyed it. Israel, under the burdensome tutelage of the law, enjoyed it. But now that the last, the fullest, the most gracious and blessed dispensation of all has come, this one of the two institutions of Eden is taken away! We cannot accept such an exposition of the apostle's meaning. We must conclude that when he seems to release his converts from all obligations of days, the Lord's day is tacitly understood as reserved, as not here in question; because about this all parties had been agreed.

Let us notice here how inconsistent and un-protestant is Neander's position. He asserts that it is inconsistent with the free and spiritual nature of Christianity that God should give any stated day, by his express ordinance, a closer relation to the Christian consciousness than any other day. Is it not equally inconsistent

that He should give any particular place, and forms of worship a peculiar relation to the Christian consciousness? But, under the New Testament, he has done this very thing; commanding us to worship in concert at the place or building appropriated by our brethren for this purpose, and to do so with prayers, hymns, and the sacraments. It is admitted again, that after all the church has found that practically there is a necessity, founded in man's universal nature and relations to God, which compels us to take some stated day into a peculiar relation to the Christian consciousness, to some extent at least. Sunday *is* a Christian festival, and a memorial of the resurrection—says the Lutheran—made so with sufficient validity, by a church precedent. But is it not far more consistent with Protestantism, which teaches that nothing but God's revealed will is its religion, to find this validity, if it finds it at all, in his law, rather than a church tradition? We seek an express precept for the mode of our worship, the number and forms of our sacraments; and teach that any element of service which is not thus enjoined, is will-worship. Should we not find a Divine precept for the season of our worship also? And if we find none, does not Protestant consistency require us to say that Sunday, not being enjoined by express Divine command, is literally no more to Christians than any other day, which they agree, for conscience' sake, to appoint for a week-day, prayer-meeting, or Bible Society address, and may be changed with as little scruple? As to the motive that it is commemorative of Christ's resurrection, why will not one Sunday a year answer just as well for this, as one Good Friday a year does to commemorate the passover of our Lord? The Lutheran or Episcopalian, in enforcing a partial observance of Sunday, is indeed consistent with himself; for he believes that ecclesiastical authority is sufficient to do this, if not contrary to the Scriptures; but he is not consistent with the Word of God, which teaches, as we understand it, that nothing is to be enjoined as a stated part of His worship, except what he has expressly enjoined. "The Bible alone is the religion of Protestants."

3. We shall now, in the third branch of our discussion, attempt to show the ground on which we assert that the Sabbath, "from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord's day, and is to be continued to the end of the world as the Christian Sabbath." This proof is chiefly historical, and divides itself into two branches; first, that drawn from the inspired history of the New Testament; and second, that found in the authentic but uninspired testimony of primitive Christians. The latter, which might have been thought to demand a place in our review of the history of Sabbath opinions has been reserved for this place, because it forms an interesting part of our ground of argument. But let us here say,

once for all, that we invoke this patriotic testimony, in no popish or prelatist spirit of dependence on it. In our view, all the uninspired church testimony in the world, however venerable, would never make it our duty to keep Sunday as a Sabbath. We use these fathers simply as historical witnesses; and their evidence derives its whole value in our eyes from its relevancy to this point; *whether or not the apostles left a custom of observing Sunday, instead of the sabbaths established by their example in the churches.* When the fathers say: "We as fathers, as bishops, as church rulers, tell you to observe Sunday;" we reject the warrant as nothing worth. But if they are able to say: "We, as honest and well informed witnesses, tell you that *the apostolic age left us the example and warrant* for observing Sunday," we accept the testimony as of some value. Prelatists are fond of shutting their eyes to this plain distinction, in order to claim that we must either surrender all the early historic light of uninspired literature, or else adopt their semi-popish theory of tradition. We trust the distinction is so stated here, once for all, that all will see it, (except those who do not wish to see it,) and will bear it in mind.

Our first, or preliminary argument for the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, is that implied in the second Scripture reference subjoined by our Confession to the sentence we have just quoted from it. If we have been successful in proving that the Sabbath is a perpetual institution, the evidence will appear perfect. The perpetual law of the decalogue has commanded all men, in all time, to keep a Sabbath-day; and "till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall not pass from the law of God, till all be fulfilled." The Apostle, in Col. ii: 16-17, clearly tells us that the seventh day is no longer our Sabbath. What day, then, is it? Some day must have been substituted; and what one so likely to be the true substitute as the Lord's day? The law is not repealed—it cannot be. But Paul has shown that it is changed. To what day is the Sabbath changed, if not to the first? No other day in the week has a shadow of claim. It must be this, or none; but it cannot be none; therefore it must be this.

The other main argument consists in the fact that disciples, inspired apostles, and their Christian associates, did observe the Lord's day as a religious festival. And this fact must be viewed, to see its full force, in connexion with the first argument. When we find them at once beginning, and uniformly continuing the observance of the Lord's day, while they avow that they are no longer bound to observe the seventh day, and when we couple with this the knowledge of the truth that they, like all the rest of the world, were still commanded by God to keep his Sabbath, we see that the inference is overwhelming, that the authority by which they observed the Lord's day was from God, although they do not say so. That which is inferred from Scripture, "by good

and necessary consequence," is valid ; as well as that which is set down expressly in it." Examination shows us, then, that the disciples commenced the observance of the Lord's day by social worship the very next week after the resurrection. From John xx: 19, we learn that the very day of the resurrection, at evening, the disciples were assembled with closed doors, with the exception of Thomas Didymus. Can we doubt that they had met for worship? In chap. v: 26, we learn: "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you." None will doubt but that this was also a meeting for worship, and the phraseology implies that it was their second meeting. In Jewish language, and estimates of time, the days at which the counts begin and end are always included in the counts; so that "after eight days," here indisputably means just a full week. Let the reader compare, for instance, Leviticus xiii: 4, with xiv: 10. "The priest shall shut up him that hath the plague seven days." "And on the eighth day he shall take two he lambs without blemish," &c. So the new-born child must be circumcised the eighth; but it is well known that the number eight is made up by counting the day of the birth and the day of the circumcision. A full week from the disciples' first meeting brings us again to the first day of the week. Until Pentecost we are left uninformed whether they continued to observe the first day, but the presumption is wholly that they did.

By consulting Leviticus xxiii: 15-16, Deut. xvi: 9, the reader will see that the day of Pentecost was fixed in this way. On the morrow after that Sabbath (seventh day) which was included within the passover week, a sheaf of the earliest ripe corn was cut, brought fresh into the sanctuary, and presented as a thank-offering to God. The day of this ceremonial was always the first day of the week, or our Sunday, which was, to the Israelites, a working day. From this day they were to count seven weeks complete, and the fiftieth day was Pentecost day, or the feast of ingathering. Let the reader remember that the Israelites always included in their count the day from which, and the day to which they counted; and taking his almanac he will find on actual experiment, that the fiftieth day will bring him to Sunday again, the first day of the week. The gospels tell us most explicitly that the year Christ died and rose again, the passover feast began Thursday evening; the day of unleavened bread (in the afternoon of which the Saviour died) was our Friday, the day his body lay in the grave, was our Saturday, or the Jewish Sabbath, and the day he rose was the first day, our Sunday. This last was also the day when the Jews offered their first sheaf. So that Pentecost day must also fall (as indeed it did every year) on a Sunday. Thus we reach the interesting fact that the day selected by God

for the pentecostal outpouring, and the inauguration of the Gospel dispensation, was the Lord's day—a significant and splendid testimony to the importance and honour it was intended to have in the Christian world. But we read in Acts i: 14, and ii: 1, that this day also was observed by the disciples as a day for social worship. Thus the first day of the week received a second, sacred and august witness, as the weekly solemnity of our religion, not only in its observance by the whole body of the new church, but by the baptism of fire, and the Holy Ghost—a witness only second to that of Christ's victory over death and hell. Then the first public proclamation of the Gospel under the new dispensation began; and surely, when every step, every act of the Divine Providence was formative and fundamental, it was not without meaning that God selected the first day of the week as the chosen day.

It is most evident from the New Testament history, that the Apostles and early church uniformly celebrated their worship on the first day of the week. The hints are not numerous; but they are sufficiently distinct. The next clear instance is in Acts xx: 7. The Apostle was now returning from his famous mission to Macedonia and Achaia, in full prospect of captivity at Jerusalem. He stops at the little church of Troas, to spend a season with his converts there: "And upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, (ready to depart on the morrow,) and continued his speech until midnight." Here we have a double evidence of our point. First, Paul preached unto the disciples on this day, while we see from the sixth verse, that he was a whole week in Troas, including the Jewish Sabbath. Why does he wait nearly a whole week to give these his more solemn and public instructions, unless there had been some usage? Again: the words, "when the disciples came together to break bread," clearly indicate that the first day of the week was their habitual day for celebrating the Lord's supper. So that it is clear, this church of Troas planted and trained by Paul, was in the habit of consecrating the first day of the week to public worship; and the inspired man here concurs in the habit. Neander does, indeed, suggest an evasion, in order to substantiate his assertion that there is no evidence the Lord's day was specially sanctified during the life-time of Paul. He says that it is so, very probable this day was selected by the brethren, because Paul could not wait any longer, ("ready to depart on the morrow,") that no safe inference can be drawn for a habitual observance of the day by them or Paul! But chap. v: 6, tells us that Paul had been already waiting a whole week, and might have had choice of all the days of the week for his meeting! No other word is needed to explode this suggestion.

The next clear instance is in 1 Cor. xvi: 1-2. "Now concern-

ing the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." The points here indicated are two—that the weekly oblation of alms-giving was fixed for the Lord's day—and that this rule was enacted for the church of Corinth, and all those of Galatia. The inference is overwhelming, that the apostle made the usage ultimately uniform in all the churches of his training. Neander again attempts to destroy this evidence for the sanctification of Sunday, by saying that this does not prove there was any church meeting, or public worship on this day. The sum of alms was, most probably, simply laid aside at home, in an individual, private manner; and this is made more probable by the apostle's own words: "let every one of you lay by him in store." But suppose this understanding of the passage is granted, against the uniform custom and tradition of the earliest Christians, which testifies with one voice, that the weekly alms-giving took place in the church meeting; Neander's point is not yet gained. Still *this alms-giving was*, in the New Testament meaning, *an act of worship*. See Phil. iv: 18. And the early tradition unanimously represents the first Christians as so regarding it. Hence, whether this alms-giving were in public or private, we have here an indisputable instance, that an act of worship was appointed, by apostolic authority, to be stately performed on the Lord's day, throughout the churches. This is evidence enough that the first day of the week was the day already known and selected for those forms of worship which were rather weekly than diurnal. The reader will, perhaps, be disposed to exclaim, in view of two successive cases of sophistry so shallow, and admitting of so facile exposure, "Very great men are not always wise." It will be a profitable exclamation for him not only to make, but to ponder; and we confess that one motive with us in giving prominence to the statement and refutation of Neander's views, has been to illustrate the small trust-worthiness of his learning and logic. We should learn from so eminent an instance, two things. One is, that the literary and religious atmosphere of Germany has recently been so unwholesome, that there is *always* danger in accepting the religious opinions of German scholars. The infection of their psychology, and theory of inspiration and interpretation, is universal. The German mind breathes it with its vital breath, from its infant years. None can escape. Even Hengstenberg, with all his hardy, Saxon sense, and his devout reverence for Scripture and the Reformation, has belied the trust encouraged by his earlier works. The second edition of his *Christology* expunges from his first edition many of the things for which we valued it, replacing them with views unsatisfactory to an American, orthodox mind; and he condemns his earlier work, to us so

greatly preferable, as a crude and juvenile effort. Even Neander, with all his industry, knowledge, and Christian devotion, (a devotion which the most of us might profitably imitate,) betrays many of the dearest and most fundamental interests of the Christian cause. We have seen what is his testimony to the Christian's Sabbath. He denies that the apostolic church ever had a true gift of tongues, as all the believing world has understood it; asserting that nothing more is meant than that the disciples were enabled occasionally to speak with an elevation and energy beyond themselves. He indicates, after all his reverence for spiritual religion, a defective theory of inspiration. He attempts to weave all the history of the church, filling his five large volumes, into a generalization to support his pet theory, which is: that there has been a development and increase perpetually progressive, of the power of true Christianity in the human race, ever since the Christian era; that Christianity was developing, namely, and not receding, in the growing corruptions of the Christian Roman empire, in the devastations of the northern barbarians; in the gathering gloom of the dark ages! He gravely argues, from a few hyperboles of Justin and Tertullian, about the universal royalty and priesthood of believers, that the primitive church was a stranger to the idea of *ministry and laity*. He flatly denies that there is any evidence that infant baptism was of apostolic origin or authority! This is the writer so generally bepraised, ever since his ponderous tomes have reached our shores!

The other thing illustrated, is the true ignorance and flunkeyism of our day. When Neander announced these brand-new results of his antiquarian labours, and especially his conclusions concerning the subject and mode of baptism, how they were received? Our immersionist brethren, of course, hailed them with immense satisfaction, as "clinchers;" and were almost ready to cry: "It is the voice of a God, and not of a man." This was not surprising. But exen Pædobaptists in many places seemed to feel that the cause must be given up; now that this high Dutch oracle had come forth from the bowels of his patristic quarries, twirled his broken quill, and pronounced his decision against it. Even the North British Review, professed Coryphæus of the literature of Scotch Presbyterianism, puts on a look of superior wisdom, and says with calm conceit, that since Neander has taught us, nobody must venture to assert that infant baptism is of apostolic origin, under the penalty of being behind the times. No; we must defend our Pædobaptist usages in some other way!

Now, did these people ever hear that there have been other antiquaries before Neander? Did they know enough about literature to be aware that the materials which the great German had to use, were just the same, and neither more nor less than the previous antiquaries had. Were they aware that the field of

early patristic literature is a field of limited and definite extent, fenced in by absolute metes and bounds, outside of which all is utter and absolute darkness; that every thing which possibly can be done for the illustration of this narrow field has been done generations ago, and that more, or more complete editions of the early fathers never have been, or will be published, than were produced by the Benedictines a hundred and fifty years before our day; that this narrow field had been surveyed, *ransacked*, by industrious antiquaries before Neander was born, and every treasure-trove of available information, down to the least broken bits, had been picked up, yea, inventoried and labeled, and put on the shelf for the use of scholars? And now, when an antiquary comes forward at this late day, and claims that he has just begun to find out things in this little, limited field, it is simply preposterous. And as for these gentlemen who bow to Neander's infallibility concerning the primitive view of baptism; have they compared his researches with the previous ones which they reject for him? There, for instance, is old "Wall on Infant Baptism," who professed to have gleaned all the early patristic information on this point, and methodized it. There are Bingham's "Origines Sacrae," which explore the profoundest depths of early Christian lore, and present us with their buried stores ready arranged. There are a score of enlightened, laborious scholars, who have applied to this one subject all the keenness of minds thoroughly educated and sharpened by polemic zeal. Has a comparison been made between them and Neander? Have the overweening admirers of the latter examined whether he gathers any wider induction of facts; or whether he reasons on them better than the others did? Had this comparison been made; it would have been found that Neander's induction was far more narrow and scanty as a mere specimen of learned lore; and that his reasoning on it was of a piece with that which we have seen applied to the Sabbath-question. The only imaginable advantage he possesses over his more learned and able predecessors, who have concluded the opposite to him, is, that he happens to be fashionable just now. And the thing illustrated by these instances of misapplied praise, is this: that our generation has indolently suffered so much of the solid learning accumulated for us by our forefathers to be forgotten, that there is actually not enough left to teach us how ignorant we are, or to prune our conceit.

But we return from this digression to the New Testament allusions to the observance of the Lord's day. Only one other remains to be cited: that in Rev. i: 10. John the apostle introduces the visions of Patmos, by saying, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." This is the only instance of the application of this title to the first day of the week in the sacred writings. But all expositors, ancient and modern, say unhesitatingly that Sunday is designated by it. On this point the church has had but one

understanding, from the first century down. The apostle evidently means to inform us that on Sunday he was engaged in a spiritual frame of mind and feelings. The application of the name, Lord's day, to Sunday, by inspired authority, of itself contains almost enough of significance to establish its claims to sanctification, without another text or example. What fair sense can it bear, except that it is a day consecrated to the Lord? Compare Isaiah lviii: 13, when God calls the Sabbath, "my holy-day." If the Sabbath is *God's day*, the *Lord's day* should mean a Christian Sabbath. And the occupation of the apostle this day, with peculiar spiritual exercises, gives additional probability to the belief that it was observed by the New Testament Christians as a day of devotion.

We come now to the second branch of the historical argument—the testimony of the early, but uninspired Christian writers. The earliest of all cannot be called Christian. In the celebrated letter of inquiry written by Pliny the younger to the Emperor Trajan, for advice on the treatment of persons accused of Christianity, this pagan governor says, that it was the custom of these Christians, "to meet, *stato die*, before light, to sing a hymn to Christ as God, and bind each other in an oath (not to some crime) but to refrain from theft, robbery and adultery, not to break faith, and not to betray trusts." This letter was written a few years after the death of the apostle John. We cannot doubt that this *stated day*, discovered by Pliny, was the Lord's day. Ignatius, the celebrated martyr-bishop of Antioch, says, in his epistle to the Magnesians, written about A. D. 107 or 116, that this is "the Lord's day, the day consecrated to the resurrection, the queen and chief of all the days."

Justin Martyr, who died about A. D. 160, says that the Christians "neither celebrated the Jewish festivals, nor observed their sabbaths, nor practised circumcision. (Dialogue with Trypho, p. 34.) In another place, he says that "they, both those who lived in the city and those who lived in the country, were all accustomed to meet on the day which is denominated Sunday, for the reading of the Scriptures, prayer, exhortation and communion. The assembly met on Sunday, because this is the first day on which God having changed the darkness and the elements, created the world; and because Jesus our Lord on this day rose from the dead."

The Epistle attributed to Barnabas, though not written by this apostolic man, is undoubtedly of early origin. This unknown writer introduces the Lord, as saying: "The sabbaths which you now keep are not acceptable to me: but those which I have made when resting from all things, I shall begin the eighth day, that is the beginning of the other world." "For which cause, we (Christians) observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus rose from the dead," &c. Eph. ch. xv.

Tertullian, at the close of the second century, says: "We celebrate Sunday as a joyful day. On the Lord's day we think it wrong to *fast*, or to *kneel* in prayer."

Clement of Alexandria, cotemporary with Tertullian, says: "A true Christian, according to the commands of the Gospel, observes the Lord's day by casting out all bad thoughts, and cherishing all goodness, honouring the resurrection of the Lord, which took place on that day."

But, perhaps, the most important, because the most learned, and, at the same time, the most explicit witness, is Eusebius, the celebrated bishop of Caesarea, who was in his literary prime about the era of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325. In his Commentary on the xcii Psalm, which the reader will remember, is entitled "a psalm or song for the Sabbath-day," he says: "The Word, (Christ,) by the new covenant, translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light, and gave us the symbol of true rest, the saving Lord's day, the first (day) of light, in which the Saviour gained the victory over death, &c. On this day, which is the first of the Light, and the true Sun, we assemble after the interval of six days, and celebrate holy and spiritual Sabbath; even all nations redeemed by Him throughout the world assemble, and do those things according to the spiritual law, which were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath. All things which it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's day as more appropriately belonging to it, because it has the precedence, and is first in rank, and more honourable than the Jewish Sabbath. It is delivered to us (*παράδοται*) that we should meet together on this day, and it is evidence that we should do these things announced in this psalm."

The first church council which formally enjoined cessation of labour upon the Lord's day, was the provincial synod of Laodicea, held a little after the middle of the fourth century. The twenty-ninth canon of this body commanded that none but necessary secular labours should be carried on upon Sunday. But Constantine the Great, when he adopted the Christian as the religion of the State, had already enacted that all the labours of courts of justice, civil and military functionaries, and handicraft trades should be suspended on the Lord's day, and that it should be devoted to prayer and public worship. This suspension of labour was not however extended to agriculturists, because it was supposed that they must needs avail themselves of the propitious season to gather their harvests, or sow their seed without regard to sacred days. But the Emperor Leo (who came to the throne, A. D. 457,) ultimately extended the law to all classes of persons.

The Christians did not for several hundred years, apply the word *Sabbath* to the first day of the week, but always used it distinctly to indicate the Jewish seventh day. Their own sacred day, the first day, was called by them the Lord's day, (*ἡμέρα κυριακή*)

as they said, because it was dedicated to the honour of Christ, and because it was the head, crown, and chief of all the days. They also called it *Sunday*, (*Dies solis*, a phrase frequently found among the Latin Christians,) because, according to their interpretation of Genesis i: 3, the sun was created on the first day of the week, but still more, because on that day the brighter *Sun of Righteousness* arose from the dead, with healing in his beams. The objection often made by persons over puritanical, that it smacks of Pagan or Scandinavian profanity to say *Sunday*, because the word indicates a heathenish consecration of the day to the sun, is therefore more Quakerish than sensible. We are willing to confess that we always loved the good old name Sunday—name worthy of that day which should ever seem the brightest in the Christian's conceptions, of all the week, when the glorious works of the natural creation first began to display the honours of the great Creator, and when that new and more divine creation of redeeming grace was perfected by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. But, in the application of the phrase "Christian Sabbath," to the first day, the Westminster Assembly had a definite and truthful design, although the early church had not given it this name. It was their intention to express thus that vital head of their theory; that the Old Testament institute called Sabbath, which was coeval with man, and was destined to co-exist with all dispensations, was not abrogated; that it still existed substantially, and that Christians were now to find it in the Lord's day. *To the Christian the Lord's day is the Sabbath.* (Such is the significance of the name) possessing the Divine authority, and demanding in the main the sanctification which were formerly attached to the seventh day.

4. Another most interesting and practical head of the Sabbath argument remains; from its practical necessity, as a means of securing man's corporeal and mental health, his morality, his temporal success in life, and his religious interests. This is the department of the discussion which has been more particularly unfolded in the "Permanent Sabbath Documents," published under the auspices of Dr. Justin Edwards, and more recently in the remarkable essays on the Sabbath, produced by workmen in Great Britain. It is now by so much the best understood part of the Sabbath-discussion, that we should not have introduced it at all, except that it was one of the stones in the arch of our attempted demonstration, that there is a natural necessity in man for a Sabbath rest. The Creator, who appointed the Sabbath, formed man's frame; and all intelligent observers are now agreed that the latter was adapted to the former. Either body or mind can do more work by resting one day in seven, than by labouring all the seven days. And neither mind nor body can enjoy health and continued activity, without its appointed rest. Even the structure of the brutes exhibits the same law. Again: as a

moral and social institution, a weekly rest is invaluable. It is a quiet domestic reunion for the bustling sons of toil. It ensures the necessary vacation in those earthly and turbulent anxieties and affections, which would otherwise become inordinate and morbid. It brings around a season of periodical neatness and decency, when the soil of weekly labour is laid aside, and men meet each other amidst the decencies of the sanctuary, and renew their social affections. But above all, a Sabbath is necessary for man's moral and religious interests. Even in paradise, and in man's state of innocence, it was true that a stated season, resolutely appropriated to religious exercises, was necessary to his welfare as a religious being. A creature subject to the law of habit, of finite faculties, and required by the conditions of his existence to distribute his attention and labours between things secular and things sacred, cannot successfully accomplish this destiny, without a regular distribution of his time between the two great departments. This is literally a physical necessity. And when we add the consideration that man is now a being of depraved, earthly affections, prone to avert his eyes from heaven to the earth, the necessity is still more obvious. Man does nothing regularly, for which he has not a regular time. The absolute necessity of the Sabbath, as a season for the public preaching of religion and morality, as a leisure time for the domestic religious instruction of the young, as a time for private self-examination and devotion, is most clear to all who admit the importance of these duties. And now, it is most obvious to practical good sense, that if such a stated season is necessary, then it is proper that it should be ordained and marked off by Divine authority, and not by a sort of convention on man's part. To neglect the stated observance of a religious rest, is to neglect religion. And when there is so much of mundane and carnal affection, so much of craving, eager worldly bustle, to entice us to an infringement of this sacred rest, it is certain that it will be neglected, unless it be defended by the highest sanction of God's own authority. Nay, do we not see that this sanction is insufficient, even among some who admit its validity? Again, if such a stated rest is necessary, then it is also necessary that its metes and bounds be defined by the same authority which enjoins the rest itself. Otherwise, the license which men will allow themselves in interpreting the duration of the season, and in deciding how much constitutes the observance of it, or how little, will effectually abrogate the rest itself. If, then, the necessities of human nature require a Sabbath, it does not appear how God could ordain less than we suppose he has done, in requiring the whole of a definite length of time to be faithfully devoted to religious exercises, and in making this command explicit and absolute.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 232, No.-2, OF THIS VOLUME.

Strange to say, though the Jewish controversialists assert that this verse does not refer to the Messiah,* they are still obliged to confess once in the year at least, even on the Day of Atonement, that it does refer, and is applicable only to him. There is a very remarkable passage in the prayers for that solemn day, which proves, beyond all contradiction, that the ancient Israelites who compiled the following prayer, understood the son of Amoz to speak in this verse of the despised Nazarene. It is used in the form of a melancholly Hymn:—

פְּנָה מִנּוּ מְשִׁיחַ צְדָקָנוּ.
 פֶּלֶצְנוּ וְאֵין מִי לְצַדִּיקָנוּ :
 עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ וְעוֹל פִּשְׁעֵינוּ.
 עֲרַמְס וְחַוָּא מְחוֹלָל מִפִּשְׁעֵינוּ :
 סוֹבֵל עַל שְׁכָם חַטָּאוֹתֵינוּ :
 סְלִיחָה מִצְוֹא לְעֹנוֹתֵינוּ.
 נִרְפָּא לָנוּ בְּחַבְרֹתָיו :

Messiah, our Righteousness has departed from us,
 Horror has seized us, and we have none to justify us.
 With our wickedness and misdeeds He was burdened,
 And He was wounded for our transgressions ;
 Bearing on the shoulder our sins ;
 In order to find an atonement for our iniquities.
 By His stripes we were healed.†

With what consistency, then, can any Israelite assert that this prophecy refers to any one else? It is certainly very dishonest, in prayer to God to apply this passage to the Messiah, and in controversy with men to deny and dispute this application. Here we have more than enough to sustain the position which we have laid down, viz.: that in their non-controversial writings, and their solemn and public prayers to a heart-searching God, the Israelites apply this important prophecy to the Messiah only.

In the following verse, we have a full description of our state of helplessness and our relation to the Messiah;—a description of the miserable condition of mankind, which induced the Glorious

*Many Jewish commentators follow Aben Ezra, and apply this verse to the sufferings of the Israelites in their present exile and dispersion.

†Vide book of common prayers used on the feast of atonement.

Messiah to travel in the greatness of His strength, in order to effect a reconciliation between rebellious man and his offended Maker :

All we, like sheep, have gone astray ;
Each of us turned to his own way ;
But the Lord caused to meet in Him
The iniquity of us all. *

בַּצֹּאֵן This is a common, but very graphic and significant metaphor, teaching the folly, diversity and universality of sin. This figure presents two considerations ; 1st. The general disposition of the species to wander from the fold, as also its defencelessness and entire dependence upon its keeper for protection as well as support ; and 2d. its meek and harmless disposition. The 1st represents the sinful creature ; the 2d a type of the Righteous Creator. With reference to the 1st, we have several very beautiful allusions in the Sacred Scriptures. Thus, Michaiah describes the destitute condition of Israel as a flock scattered upon the hills,

* **כָּלֵכְנָר** n. mas. sing. with suff. 1st. pers. pl. pron. ab **כָּל** the whole or all, taken collectively ; ab **כָּלֵל** to complete, to perfect.

בַּצֹּאֵן n. collect. com. with pref. **בְּ** for **כֹּה** like the ; ab **צֹאֵן** for **צֹאֵן** flocks, small cattle, i. e. sheep and goats ; ab **צֹאֵן** to abound with sheep and goats. When unity is intended, **צֹאֵן** is used, e. g. **וְאַרְבַּע צֹאֵן תִּחַת הַשֶּׁה** and 'four' sheep for the 'one' sheep, Exod. xxi. 37. (Eng. verse. xxii. 1.) Metaph. a people, as the objects of God's sovereign care. (see 2 Sam. xxiv. 17. Psal. lxxx. 2. (Eng. verse. lxxx. 1.), c. 3. Ezek. xxxiv. 2, 3, &c. **תִּעְרֹב** kal pret. 1st pers. pl. ab **תָּעַר** to wander, to go astray, to err, moraliy.

פָּנִיחָה kal pret. 1st pers. pl. ab **פָּנַח** to turn, turn oneself ; to turn oneself away from God, and follow his own heart's devices.

הַפְּרִיעַ Hiph. pret. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab **פָּרַע** to strike upon, or against, whether violently or lightly ; hence to rush on any one with hostile violence ; to fall, or let fall upon any one, 'in a hostile sense.' 'In a good sense,' it means to assail with petitions, i. e. to urge, entreat, &c.

עֲוֹן n. mas. sing. const. of **עָוָר** sin ; (in this instance it is to be understood only in reference to its effects ;) iniquity, guilt ; punishment, as the penalty of sin : ab **עָרַה** to bend, twist, distort ; to act perversely, to sin.

as sheep (רֶעִים) that have no shepherd; 1 Kings, xxii.17. Zachariah prophesied, that when the Good Shepherd should be smitten and removed from His flock, the sheep (רֶעִים) should be scattered; Zach. xiii. 7. David acknowledges that he did go astray, like a lost sheep, (רֶעִים) and earnestly prays that God may seek His servant; Psal. cxix. 176. And here Isaiah, using a similar language, depicts fully the dangerous and awful condition of the entire species:

“All we, like sheep, have gone astray;”

“Each of us turned to his own way;”

including the whole family of man without any exception. Both Jews and Gentiles have wandered like a wandering flock, a flock which had no shepherd; “for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” Rom. iii. 23. But the Lord, rather than suffer His people to be crushed under the weight of this accumulated transgressions, and thus perish forever, hath caused to meet in Him, i. e. Messiah, “the iniquity of us all;” i. e. the Messiah became the subject on which all the rays, collected on the focal point, fell. These fiery rays, says Dr. A. Clarke, which would have fallen on all mankind, diverged from divine justice to the east, west, north, and south, were deflected from them, and converged in Him. So the Lord hath caused to meet in Him the “punishment” due to the iniquity of all.

This is a repetition of the all important general Scriptural Truth; viz, that we cannot possibly be reconciled to Jehovah, unless we are very deeply interested in the efficient expiatory atonement, wrought out by the Messiah’s sufferings and death: for, unless He had taken the heavy burden of our sins upon Himself, we should have been lost to all eternity.

In the following verse, we have a beautiful and graphic description of the covenant between the Eternal Father and His Eternal Son, for the redemption of mankind. The whole verse seems as the master key to the ark which contains the title deeds of our Christian redemption:

He was rigorously demanded to pay the debt,
And He submitted Himself,
And did not open His mouth.
Like the Lamb was he led to the slaughter,
But as a sheep before her shearers is dumb,
And did not open His mouth.*

* נִפְּשׁ Niph. pret. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab נִפְּשׁ to impel, urge, exact; used particularly with regard to a rigorous exactions of debts; to

What a beautiful and graphic description! The very single word **נָשָׂא**—literally rendered,—

“He was rigorously demanded to pay the debt,” fully pictures to our minds the inconceivableness of the malignity

urge a debtor, to demand a debt. Deut. xv. 2, 3. The following is Kimchi's interpretation of the word **נָשָׂא**:—

נָשָׂא בְּמִמּוֹן: כְּמוֹ נָשָׂא אֶת הַכֶּסֶף: לֹא יִגְדֹשׁ אֶת רַעְיוֹהוּ:

He was demanded to pay the debt; as (in the following passages) ‘he exacted the silver,’ &c. 2 Kings, xxiii. 35; he shall not exact it (the debt) of his neighbour. Deut. xv. 2. vide Rabbi David Kimchi, in loco.

וְהוּא Personal pron. 3d pers. sing. mas. used here emphatically, with the **וְ** copulative.

נִעְנָה Niph. part. sing. mas. ab **עָנָה** for **עָנָה** to bestow labor upon; to exercise oneself; to be afflicted, oppressed. Reflect. (as used in this verse) to submit oneself to any one, particularly to God. (see Exod. x. 3, Dan. x. 12.

יִפְתָּח Kal fut. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab **פָּתַח** to open the mouth, hand, &c.; to open any one's mouth, i. e. to cause one to speak; to open any one's ear, i. e. to reveal to him; (used of God;) to open one's hand to any one, i. e. to be liberal towards him.

The future here is to be rendered as ‘past,’ in accordance with the following grammatical rule:

Futures are sometimes placed after a preterite, to denote an action which, although subsequent to that expressed by the preterite, is ‘past,’ with regard to the time of narration, e. g.

הִלְבִּישְׁנִי בְּגָדֵי יֵשַׁע מֵעֵיל צִדְקָה יַעֲטֵנִי

He has clothed me with the garments of salvation, with the robe of righteousness ‘he has covered me.’ Is. lxi. 10. See also Is. xiv. 8, Job iii. 25, Psal. lxvi. 6.

Such futures are more frequently connected to the preterite by **וְ** conjunctive, e. g. **וּמִבֶּטֶן יִצְאָתִי וְאָגִדָּע** Oh, that when I came from the womb ‘I had perished.’ Job iii. 11. See also Is. x. 23, liii. 2, lxiii. 3, 5, 6.

In negative propositions, the conjunction is prefixed to the negative particle preceding the verb, e. g. **וְלֹא יִתְבַּשְׂשׂוּ** and they ‘were not ashamed.’ Gen. ii. 25. **וְלֹא תֹאכַל** and ‘she did not eat.’ 1 Sam. i. 7. and, in our text, **וְלֹא יִפְתָּח פִּי** and he ‘did not open, his mouth, vide Nordheimer's Heb. Gram.)

בְּשֵׂה n. com. (here mas.) sing. with pref. **בְּ** for **בָּהּ** as the Lamb.

This n. has no pl. the corresponding n. of multitude being **צֵאֵן**

of sin, when the blood of God's own Son was the only channel through which pardon could flow to the sinner; and, the impossibility of escaping eternal death and destruction, unless in Milton's language :

“Some other, able, and as willing, pay
The rigid satisfaction, death for death.”*

We are here reminded of the full force of Isaiah's glowing description of the Father's unwillingness that the sinner should die

It means a sheep or a goat. But where the particular species are to be distinguished more accurately, it is said Deut. xiv. 4, **יְהִי כְשֵׂבִים וְיִשָּׂה עֲזִים** one of the flock of sheep and one of the flock of goats, i. e. a sheep, a goat.

לְטַבַּח n. mas. sing. with pref. לְ for לָהֶּ to the slaughter, ab טַבַּח to kill, slay, spoken of animals for eating. See Exod xxi. 37, 2 Sam. xxi. 11, Proverbs ix. 2. Metaph. of men, see Psal. xxxvii. 14. Lam. ii. 21. Ezek xxi. 15, &c.

יִרְבֵּל Hoph. fut. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab רָבַל to flow; to run as a sore; to go, to walk; hiph. to lead, bring forth, Hoph. to be brought, led, carried.

This fut. is to be rendered as 'past,' in accordance with the following grammatical rule :

A future preceded by a preterite, denotes an action which, although subsequent to that expressed by the preterite is 'past' with regard to the time of narration, e. g.

הִפֵּן יָם לִירֵבֶשֶׁה בְּנִהַר יַעֲבֵרוּ בְּרִגְלֵי שָׁם נִשְׁמָחָה בּוֹ :

He turned the sea into a dry land, they went through the flood on foot; there 'did we rejoice' in him. Psal. lxvi. 6. see also Is. xiv. 8. lxi. 10. Job iii. 25. (vide Nordheimer's Heb. Gram.)

וְכִרְחַל n. fem. sing. with pref. כִּי prep. and ו conjunctive. and as a sheep.

A ewe; hence any sheep.

גִּזְזִיהָ Kal part. act. pl. const. with suff. 3d pers. sing. fem. her shearers. ab גָּזַז to shear, to cut off, hair, wool, &c.

נִאֲלָמָה Niph. pret. 3d pers. sing. fem. for נִאֲלָמָה ab אָלַם to bind, specially the tongue, i. e. to be dumb, silent. Niph. to be dumb, mute, silent.

וְלֹא יִפְתָּח פִּי 'And He did not open His mouth.' As **יִפְתָּח** and **פִּי** are of the mas. gender, they must be referred to the subject **יְהוָה** used here for the mas. gender.

This clause is a repetition of the first clause. This kind of repetition which is of frequent occurrence, has a peculiar charm; for it adds a peculiar emphasis to the discourse.

*Paradise Lost, Book III. lines 211, 212.

in his sins ; Is. lix. 16 ; and the voluntary most gracious offer of the Son to pay the rigid satisfaction ; Ps. xl. 6-10 ; beautifully and graphically paraphrased in the following lines of Milton :

Say, heavenly powers, where shall we find such love ?
Which of you will be mortal to redeem
Man's mortal crime, and just th' unjust to save ?
Dwells in all heaven charity so dear ?
He ask'd ; but all the heav'nly choir stood mute,
And silence was in heav'n : on man's behalf
Patron or intercessor none appear'd,
Much less that durst upon his own head draw
The deadly forfeiture, and ransom set.

* * * * *

Behold me then ; me for him, life for life
I offer ; on me let thine anger fall ;
Account me man ; I for his sake will leave
Thy bosom, and this glory next to thee,
Freely put off ; and for him lastly die,
Well pleased. On me let death wreak all his rage !*

We can almost see the meek and patient Redeemer led along by an infuriated multitude, and knowing that the Father's demand was just, He therefore, "when reviled, reviled not again, when He suffered, He threatened not ; but committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously ! (1 Pet. ii. 23.) This description of the Saviour's meek endurance, is made more highly graphic and impressive, by the repetition of the words פִּירַי יִפְתָּח "And did not open his mouth. Our glorious Mediator did indeed open his mouth ; but it was only to glorify the Father, to attest His love, and to pray for His enemies.

The absurd supposition of the modern Jewish expositors, that this passage refers to their nation suffering in their present exile ; and the supposition of the German critics, that it refers to Israel in their Babylonish exile, are utterly precluded by the peculiar characteristic ascribed to the person here described. The description here is of one who has the meekness and gentleness of a lamb, and the inoffensiveness of a sheep. Surely this does not apply to the Israelites !† But behold Jesus of Nazareth ! His love was as

* Paradise Lost. Book III. Lines 212-221, 236-241.

† A very hasty glance at the history of the Jews is sufficient to strip them of all pretensions to the character of an unoffending lamb. As long as ever they had the power, they did resist bitterly and bloodily. The history of the Jewish captivity for the first seven centuries, is a history of a series of insurrection, fierce and violent against the nations. How desperate was the resistance to the Roman powers, which brought on the destruc-

high as that glory which, for a time, He resigned—and as deep as that abasement to which for a time, He submitted. He came to die for us even while we were yet enemies. And, by His most precious blood, He purchased our dead souls which were exposed in the valley of spiritual slaughter, to the storms of wrath, and the winter of ruin.

In the following verse, we have an unparalleled description of the violent death which terminated the sufferings which the Messiah took upon Himself for the sins of the people:

Without restraint, and without sentence was He taken away,
 And who can speak of His habitation?
 But He was cut off from the land of the living,
 Because of the transgressions of my people,—
 Because of the stroke that should have been to them.*

tion of the Temple by Titus! But when that was destroyed, the spirit of resistance still remained. A. D. 115, the Jews of Cyrene rebelled, and murdered 220,000 Lybians; and it was not until after several bloody battles, that they submitted. A. D. 116, the Jews in Mesopotamia rebelled, and it was necessary to send the greatest general of the Empire to meet them. Soon after the Jews of Cypruss rebelled and massacred 240,000 of the inhabitants; a powerful army was necessary to bring them to obedience. A. D. 132, Ben Chozba appeared in the character of Messiah, at the head of an army, ready to shake off the Roman Yoke. Rabbi Ackiva, one of those looked upon by the Rabbins as most righteous, supported his resistance to the Roman authority; a bloody war was the consequence, and it was only by force that this insurrection was put down. A. D. 415, the Jews of Alexandria revolted. A. D. 522, the Jews of Persia revolted, under the conduct of Rabbi Mid, or Mir, at their head, and declared war against the king of Persia. A. D. 535, the Jews in Caesarea rebelled. A. D. 602, the Jews at Antioch rebelled. A. D. 624, the Jews in Arabia took up arms against Mohammed. A. D. 613, they joined the arms of Chosroes, when he made himself master of Jerusalem, and put thousands to death. All these historical facts are copied from Dr. Jost's history of the Jews, as may be seen by the reference below.† Dr. J. is a Jew himself. Hence his testimony is of paramount importance. It is not our purpose, however, to create ill-feeling against the Israelites, who have every where been badly used; but these traits of their history show that they have resisted evil—that as long as they had the power, they chose to resist evil—that their character in captivity has not been that of a Lamb; that, therefore, this passage, yea the whole of this chapter, cannot be applied to the Israelitish nation.

† See Dr. Jost's *Geshichte der Israeliten*, iii. 22, 179, 235, 244, iv. 202, 230. v. 228, 298.

* **מֵעֵצָר** *n. mas. sing.* with pref. **מִן** for **בְּ** prep. without restraint, ab **עֵצָר** to close up: to hold back, to restrain. The prep. **מִן** or its abbreviation **מִן** often has a negative signification, e. g. **לֹא מִן**.

Long ere this most awful scene happened, the sweet psalmist of Israel, instructed by the Holy Ghost, uttered the following most affecting and pathetic representation of the Messiah's keenest distress :

פָּרַיְךָ מִמּוֹת Then indeed thou shouldst lift up thy face without spot. Job xi. 15. This example, out of many others, justifies us in giving a privative sense of 'without,' to the prep. **מִ** in this and the following word.

רָמַמְשָׁפֵט n. mas. sing. with pref. **מִ** prep. and **ו** conjunctive, and without a judicial sentence, pl. **מִשְׁפָּטִים** a judgment, judicial sentence, used especially of a sentence by which penalty is inflicted; ab **שָׁפֵט** to judge, administer justice; decide a course; to pass a sentence, condemn, punish; to defend a cause; to rule, govern. **לָקַח** Pual pret. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab **לָקַח** to take; take away,

Gen. xiv. 12; take away life, Jerem. xv. 15; to take violently, Ezek. xxii, 25; to take possession of anything, Numb. xxi, 25.

דִּירוֹ n. mas. sing. with suff. 3d pers. sing. pron. mas., his habitation., pl. **דִּוְרִים** and **דִּוְרוֹת** age, generation; dwelling, habitation.

For a like sense of the n. **דִּוְרִי** see Is. xxxviii. 12, **דִּוְרִי נָסַע**

וְנִגְלָה מִנִּי פֶּאֱהָל רְעִי my 'habitation' is taken away, and is removed from me like a shepherd's tent. This rendering is adopted by Kimchi, Aben Ezra, Bp. Lowth, Gesenius, Rosenmüller, Barnes, Henderson, &c. So in Psal. xlix. 20, **הַבּוֹא**

דֹּר אֲבוֹתָיו (His soul) shall come to the 'house of his fathers, (i. e. the grave.) This rendering is adopted by Gesenius, Mendelshon, and many Jewish commentators. So the Inf. or verbal n. in Psal. lxxxiv. 11, **בְּאֵהָלֵי-רָשָׁע**

Than the 'dwelling' in the tents of wickedness; from **דָּוַר** to go around, to go in a circle; to remain, to delay, to inhabit.

יִשְׁוֹחַח Pilal fut. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab **שִׁוַּחַח** to speak, tell, declare; to meditate.

נִבְזַר Niph. pret. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab. **בָּזַר** to cut off or down; to cut in two; to decide, decree; Niph. to be cut off, torn away, denoting a violent, premature death; to perish.

מִפְּשַׁע n. mas. sing. with pref. **מִ** causative pref. because of the transgression, ab **פָּשַׁע** to revolt, rebel; to sin, transgress, especially against God.

נָבַע n. mas. sing. ab. **נָבַע** to touch, touch with force and violence, to smite, strike, especially to strike with a plague, used of

My friends, my neighbours view my care ;
 My kindred gaze, but gaze from far.
 Lo ! they that hunt my life to kill,
 And they that thirst my blood to spill,
 Point the keen gibe, the ambush lay,
 And mischief breed the livelong day.

God.

In Hebrew Poetry, whose beauty is much enhanced by the parallelisms, where the same preposition should be employed in both members, it is generally omitted in the second. Hence according to grammatical rule, we have to prefix the causative preposition **מ** to the noun **נָרַע** and read **מִנְרַע** because of the stroke.

The following is the rule :

Im poëtischen Parallelismus wird nicht selten eine Praeposition, die im ersten Gliede ausgedrückt worden, im Zweyten dann ausgelassen und hinzugedacht. Gesenius' Lehrgebäude, p. 838. To illustrate this rule, I will content myself with the following few examples :—

בִּישׁוּשִׁים חֲכָמָה

ו (ב) אַרְוֵה יָמִים תְּבוּנָה

Is not wisdom 'with' the ancient ?

And 'with' length of days understanding ? Job. xii. 12.

שָׁגוּ בְּרֵאָה

פָּקוּ (ב) פְּלִילִיָּה

They have erred 'in' vision.

They have stumbled 'in' judgment. Isaiah xxviii. 7.

וְלֵאמֹר לִירוּשָׁלַיִם תִּבְנֶה

ו (ל) הֵיכַל תִּבְנֶה

Who sayeth 'to' Jerusalem, thou shalt be built ;

And 'to' the temple, thy foundations shall be laid. Is. xli. 28.

יָרִיעוּ עֲלֵימוֹ

(כָּעַל ה) גִּבּוֹב

(Men) shouted 'after' them

As 'after' the thief. Job xxx. 5.

לְמַעַן שְׁמִי אֶאֱרִיךְ אַפִּי

ו (לְמַעַן) תִּהְלָתִי אֶחְשֶׁם - לָךְ

'For the sake' of my name, I will defer mine anger ;

And 'for the sake' of my praise, I will restrain it from thee. Is. xlvi. 9.

But, as the deaf, mine ears I shut :
 My mouth I ope not, as the mute :
 Deaf to reproach am I become,
 And of contentious language dumb.*

תַּחַת בְּשִׁתְּכֶם מִשְׁנָה
 וְ (תַּחַת) כְּלִמָּה יִרְנֶה יְהִלְקֶם

‘For’ your shame, ye shall receive a double inheritance ;
 And ‘for’ your ignominy, ye shall rejoice† in their portion,
 Is. lxi. 7.

†I have adopted Bp. Lowth’s version, because he has followed
 the Syriac version, which is the truest. Both the Syriac and
 other manuscripts read תִּרְנֶה 2d pers. mas. pl. fut. kal., instead
 of יִרְנֶה 3d. pers. mas. pl. ab רָנַן to shout for joy, rejoice.

מֵאל אֲבִיךָ וְיִעֲזָרְךָ
 וְ(מֵ) אֵת שְׁדֵי וְיְבָרְכֶךָ

‘By’ the God of thy father, who shall help thee ;
 And ‘by’ the Almighty, who shall bless thee. Gen. xlix, 25.

לַעֲשׂוֹת עֲצָה וְלֹא מִנִּי
 וְלִכְסֹף מִסִּכָּה וְלֹא (מִ) רִדְחִי

Who form counsels, but not ‘of’ me ;
 Who ratify covenants,† but not ‘of’ my spirit. Is. xxx. 1.

† Literally “who pour out a libation.” But מִסִּכָּה is here used (accord-
 ing to ancient custom) as the Greek word *σπονδή* which is used both for a
 libation and covenant. Hence the lxx. *σπονησας σπονθησας*.

לְמַן. A poetic form for לְהֵם, composed of the pref. לְ prep. and מֵן suff.
 3d pers. pl. mas. pronoun.

Many eminent scholars think that the suff. מֵן, in several
 passages in the Hebrew Scriptures, stands also for the sing. לְךָ.
 But in all those passages, Psal. xi 7. excepted, it so stands only
 with reference to collectives. The lxx read לְמַן *εις Θανασον*
 and Dr. Kennicott, thinks that the Hebrew text, at least up to
 Origen’s time, actually had לְמַן, agreeably to the version of
 the lxx. This, says Dr. Alexander, is wholly without critical
 authority.

That the form here is a plural, is very evident from the
 parallel phrase עַמִּי my ‘people,’ and especially from the sense
 of the whole chapter ; viz. that the Messiah did indeed suffer
 the ‘punishment due to the iniquity of all ;’ and that He made
 a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice ‘for the sins of all.’

*Psalms xxxviii, 11. 14.

Instead of preventing or restraining the Jewish Council from carrying into effect their murderous purposes against our blessed Saviour, Pilate "delivered Him to their will." Instead of pronouncing a formal sentence upon Him, the Governor, occupying the judgment seat, declares Him a "just man," and yet, "delivered Him to be crucified." "Then all the disciples forsook Him, and fled:" Matth. xxvi. 56; "and all His acquaintance, and the women that followed Him from Galilee, stood afar off, beholding these things." Luke xxiii. 49. He was thus harmless, guiltless, and helpless, there being no one to remonstrate or prevent the Lamb's being slaughtered. God had ordained thus, and thus it was accomplished.

In vain do we search for a parallel in historical annals—whoever died as a malefactor, before or since, with the judge's verdict in his favour of his being a "just person?" That Jesus of Nazareth did so die, is not denied even by the Jews themselves.* Hence,

*The opinion of learned Jewish Rabbins, upon this most important subject may be gathered from the two following very important Jewish documents, bearing witness to the great and unparalleled fact, that Jesus of Nazareth was indeed taken away without restraint and without sentence. The one is a part of an address of the late Judge Noah of New York—a Jew of no mean talents and qualities; and the other a part of an address of Dr. M. J. Raphall of England, but now of New York—a Jew well known for his clear, striking, and original writings; and is an author of no little standing. Hear the Judge:—

He (i. e. Jesus of Nazareth) preached at all times, and at all places, in and out of the Temple, with an eloquence such as no mortal has since possessed, and, to give the most powerful and absorbing interest to his mission, he proclaimed himself son of God, and declared himself ordained by the Most High to save a benighted and suffering people, as their Saviour and Redeemer.

The Jews were amazed, perplexed and bewildered at all they saw and heard. They knew Jesus from his birth. He was in constant intercourse with his brethren in their domestic relations, and surrounded by their household Gods; they remembered him a boy, disputing, as was the custom, most learnedly with the doctors in the Temple; and yet he proclaimed himself the son of God, and performed, as it is said, most wonderful miracles, was surrounded by a number of disciples of poor, but extraordinary gifted men, who sustained his doctrines, and had an abiding faith in his mission.

He gathered strength and followers as he progressed; he denounced the whole nation and prophesied its destruction, with their altars and temples. He preached against cities, and proscribed their leaders with a force which, even at this day, would shake our social systems.

The Jews became alarmed at his increasing power and influence, and the Sanhedrin resolved to become his accusers, and bring him to trial under the law, as laid down in Deut. xiii.

"In reflecting deeply on all the circumstances of this, the most remarka-

in addition to the Scriptures' infallible testimony, the testimony of the Jews (see note * on page 387) does not only warrant our very just application of this prediction to Jesus of Nazareth, but also

ble trial and judgment in history, I am convinced, from the whole tenor of the proceedings, that the arrest, trial, and condemnation of Jesus of Nazareth, was conceived and executed under a decided panic."

Thus far Judge Noah.

Hear the learned Jewish Rabbi, Dr. Raphall :—

I have spoken at some length of Pontius Pilate, not because his administration was important in itself, but chiefly because you may deem it interesting to know what I think of the character and sway of the man before whose tribunal "the great teacher of Nazareth," was arraigned.

I feel that I am treading on slippery ground, for on this, and beyond all other subjects, your opinions and mine must be expected to differ. But I stand before you this evening as an historian, not as a polemic ; and as an historian I have only to remark, that in its first origin Christianity does not appear to have exercised any direct or immediate influence on the polity and public affairs of the Jews.

Their tradition preserve but few memorials of the founder of Christianity ; indeed, it is more than doubtful whether he be the Jesus spoken of in the Talmud, and who is stated to have been the cotemporary of Joshua ben Perachia, more than one hundred years before the period at which the Gospels place the birth of the son of Mary. Thus the Jews, like yourselves, have no other authentic account of his life and teachings than the Gospels, and with these you are doubtless better acquainted than I can pretend to be. I am, therefore, not called upon to speak of his life and actions.

"But if you are desirous of knowing the opinion of a Jew, 'aye of a teacher in Israel,' respecting the proceedings against and the condemnation of the Master from Nazareth, I do not hesitate to tell you, that I do not by any means feel bound to identify myself, or my brethren in faith, with those proceedings, or to uphold that condemnation."

"The Sanhedrin of those days, composed both of Sadducees and party-coloured Pharisees, of timid, time-serving, and therefore 'unprincipled men,' does not sufficiently command our confidence. What we know of the motives of some of their acts is not of such a nature as to inspire us with that firm reliance in their integrity and piety, that we should at all feel bound to identify ourselves with them, or to maintain the justice of a sentence, solely because they pronounced it."

"On the contrary ; in the absence of any Jewish account of these proceedings, and taking the account of the trial in the Gospels as entitled to that credence which contemporary history generally claims, I, as a Jew, do say that it appears to me Jesus became the victim of fanaticism, combined with jealousy and lust of power in Jewish hierarchs ; even, as in latter ages, Huss and Jerome of Prague, Latimer and Ridley, became the victims of fanaticism, combined with jealousy and lust of power in Christian hierarchs."

"And while I and the Jews of the present day protest against being identified with the Zealots who were concerned in the proceedings against

makes their and the Rationalists' application of it to either Israel, the prophets, or any body else, altogether enigmatical.

The Israelites, the Socinians, and the Rationalists have worked themselves into the belief that the plural form of the pronoun לָמֹךְ fully warrants their application of the prediction to a collective body. That the form of the pronoun is plural, I fully admit, but the admission does not afford the least shadow of evidence in their favour. They seem to be ignorant of the peculiarity of Hebrew poetry, of which this verse is one of the most sublime specimens. According to the rules of grammar,* in order to make the parallel complete, it is necessary to supply the causative preposition לְ to the first member כָּרַע of the second parallel; thus :

מִפְּשַׁע עַמִּי
(לְ) כָּרַע לְמֹךְ

Because of the transgression of my people,—

Because of the stroke that should have been to them.

This strictly grammatical rendering, does not only at once put an end to all the difficulties which critics fancied, and to all the objections unbelievers urged; but also convinces us more than ever of the Saviour's redeeming love, and of the grand absorbing Scriptural fact that, all the Saviour did and endured, from the hour of His birth, to that very momentous hour when He exclaimed on Calvary, "It is finished," was done and endured, that salvation might be wrought out for guilty men.

In the following verse, the Prophet proceeds to speak of the ignominious and obscure burial that was assigned to the Messiah,

Jesus of Nazareth, we are far from reviling his character or deriding his precepts, which are indeed, for the most part, the precepts of Moses and the Prophets."

"You have heard me style him 'the great teacher of Nazareth,' for that designation I and the Jews take to be his due. 'No enlightened Jew can or will deny' that the doctrines taught in his name have been the means of reclaiming the most important portion of the civilized world from gross idolatry, and of making the revealed word of God known to nations of whose very existence the men who sentenced him were probably ignorant. Nor do I and the Jews of the present day stand alone in this view, since it was held by the great Maimonides six hundred years ago."

The above extracts are a verbatim copy of the original, as copied by the Rev. W. R. Fremantle, M. A., Rector of Claydon, (a parish of England, county of Bucks,) and incorporated in a sermon which he preached on Sunday, March 7, 1852, before the University of Oxford, in St. Mary's Church.

*See the analysis of the words כָּרַע and לְמֹךְ

and God's overruling matters by His providence, in accordance with His pre-determined counsel :

And His grave was assigned with the wicked,
But He was with a rich man after His death,
Because He had done no violence,
Neither was any deceit in His mouth.*

*וַתֵּן Kal. fut. 3d. pers. sing. mas. with ך conv. used here impersonally 'he gave,' for 'some one gave, assigned,' ab כָּתַן to give ; design to give ; grant ; render ; appoint, assign, make, constitute.

אֶת Prep. 'with' ; as וַיִּתְּחֵלֶךְ חֲנוּךְ אֶת-הָאֱלֹהִים And Enoch walked 'with' God. Gen. v. 22. וְנָתַן לַכֹּהֵן אֶת-הַקֹּדֶשׁ And he shall give it unto the priest 'with' the holy thing. Levit. xxii. 14.

רָשָׁעִים Adj. mas. pl. of רָשָׁע 'wicked,' ab רָשָׁע to be wicked ; to act wickedly, impiously ; to be guilty.

קָבְרוּ n. mas. sing. with suff. 3d pers. sing. mas. 'his grave,' ab קָבַר to bury.

וְאֵת Prep. 'with,' and ך adversative 'but' ; as וְאֵת-בְּרִיתִי אֲקִים 'But' my covenant will I establish with Isaac. Gen. xvii. 21. וְאֵת-בֵּית יְהוּדָה אֲרַחֵם 'But' I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, Hos. I. 7.

עָשִׂיר n. mas. sing. 'a rich man', pl. עֲשִׂירִים ab עָשָׂר to be or become rich ; make rich, enrich. The n. here is decidedly used in a good sense, rich, honourable, noble. lxx. τους πλουσίους ; and is so used throughout the hebrew scriptures. The exact fulfillment of this remarkable prediction is fully described in the following passage : 'Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης ἦλθεν ἀνθρώπος πλούσιος ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, τοῦνομα Ἰωσήφ, ὃς καὶ αὐτός ἐμαθήτευσε τῷ Ἰησοῦ &c., Matth. xxvii. 57-60.

בְּמָתוֹר n. mas. pl. with pref. בְּ prep. and suff. 3d. pers. sing. mas. from מָתָה 'death,' ab מָתָה to die, both naturally and by violence.

The prep. בְּ here signifies 'after' ; as בְּשַׁבְּעֵתְיָכֶם. 'After'

your weeks be out. Num. xxviii. 26. וּבְמֹת אֲבִיהָ וְאִמָּהּ

And 'after' the death of her father and mother. Esther. ii. 7.

כֹּל-הַנֹּגֵעַ בָּהֶם בְּמָתָם כָּל-הַנֹּגֵעַ בָּהֶם בְּמָתָם Whosoever doth touch them 'after' they are dead. Levit. xi. 31. בְּמֹתַי וּבְקִבְרָתִם אֲתִי

'After' I be dead then ye shall bury me. 1 Kings. xiii. 31. By this strictly grammatical rendering of the prep. here employed, the objection that Jesus in His death was with transgressors, is

Because the Messiah was pleased to take upon Himself the sins of a wicked world, to bear them in His own body on the tree, and to endure all the penalty merited by the sins of a world lying in wickedness; the unjust Israelites, ignorant of God's pre-determined counsels, argued that He suffered because of blasphemy; and, adhering to it to the last, they accordingly destined Him to have the ignoble interment of blasphemers, according to their law.* But Jehovah, according to whose gracious purpose, the Messiah suffered, overruled their wicked design, declaring that He (the Messiah) Himself had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.

How strikingly was this fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth, the

altogether removed. The pl. is here used intensively, to express the awful nature of that death, to which the Lord Messiah submitted. So in Ezek. xxviii. 10 מוֹתֵי עֲרֵלִים הָמוֹת 'The deaths of all the uncircumcised thou shall die;' expressing a violent death. Jarchi renders בְּכָל מִינֵי מוֹת by בְּמָתִיר, 'after all kinds of death.'

עַל A causative particle, 'because or for that'; as in Gen. xx. 3.

הִנֵּה חַנָּה מֵת עַל-הָאִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר-לָקַחְתָּ Behold thou art but a dead man, 'because' of the woman whom thou hast taken.

חָמַס n. mas. sing. 'violence,' ab חָמַס to do violence to any one; to injure, oppress.

עָשָׂה Kal. pret. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab עָשָׂה to work; to make, do, act.

מְרַמֶּה n. fem. sing. 'deceit,' ab Pi. רָמָה to deceive (prop. to make fall,) from רָמָה to cast, throw.

בְּפִי n. mas. sing. with. בְּ prep. and suff. 3d pers. sing. mas. const. of פִּי for פָּאָה ab פָּאָה to breath, blow.

*Ο δὲ βλασφημηῆσαι τολμήσας Θεόν καταλευσθεῖς κρεμάσθω δι' ἡμέρας ἡμέρας, καὶ ἀτιμῶς καὶ ἀφανῶς θαπτόσθω. Flav. Joseph. Antiq. Jud. Lib. iv. cap. viii. 6. 'Let him who dares to blaspheme God, be stoned and hanged for a whole day, and have an ignominious and obscure burial.'

כל הרוגי ב"ד אין קוברין אותן בקברי אבותיהם בכלל ישראל :
אלא שתי קברות מתקנין להן ב"ד אחד לנסקלין ולנשרפין
ואחד לנהרגין ולנחנקין :

'Those who are condemned to death by a judicial tribunal, are not to be interred in the sepulchres of their ancestors, but in one of the two places of burial which are assigned for them by the court; viz. the one for those stoned and burned, and the other for those beheaded and strangled.' Maimonides, Tract Sanhedrin, cap. xiv. 9.

reader need only peruse the Evangelists' account of Christ's death and burial*. He was indeed executed as a malefactor, and with malefactors; but His burial was a most honorable one. His body was embalmed with a large quantity of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pounds weight, wrapt in a clean linen cloth with the spices, and laid in a new tomb hewn in a rock. This was done because He was neither a malefactor, nor a blasphemer; or, in the language of the text—foretold about seven centuries before.

Because He had done no violence,
Neither was any deceit in His mouth.

Christ's burial must be considered as a most powerful proof both to the inspiration of the sacred scriptures, and to the correctness of the Apostles, and the Church in all ages, in referring this whole important prediction, to Christ, and to Christ only. Truly! Jesus of Nazareth was the very person of whom Daniel spake. "And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself." Dan. ix. 26.

In the following verse the Prophet predicts the Messiah's ultimate glory and triumph; teaches us the doctrine of the Messiah's "voluntary" substitution of Himself as a victim to expiate human guilt; and that whatever hand man might have in the Messiah's death, it was, nevertheless, the result of Jehovah's most gracious purpose:—

But Jehovah was pleased to bruise Him; He put Him to grief:
Verily, if He make Himself a sacrifice for sin,
He shall see a seed, He shall prolong days,
And the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in His hand.†

*See Matth : xxvii. Mark. xv. Luke. xxii. 66–71. xxiii. Joh. xviii. 28–40. xix.

יהוה Pr. n. (The most sacred name of God, expressive of His Eternal Self-existence.) with ך conj. This conjunctive is resumptive and confirmatory, connecting what follows with יהוה in the sixth verse.

חפץ Kal. pret. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab חפץ to be well disposed, favourably disposed, well pleased to take pleasure in, delight in. This verb is in several passages rendered by the lxx. by εἶδο αἴω, ᾧ. e. g. בְּיָהוָה בָּהָרַי, lxx. "Ὅτι εὐδαιμόνησεν ἄγκυρος ἐν σοί, Is. lxii. 4.; בְּ-חַפְצֵי בֵרִי, lxx. "Ὅτι εὐδαιμόνησεν ἐν ἐμοί. 2 Sam. xxii. 20.; אֵץ תִּחְפֹּץ, lxx. τὸ εὐδαιμόνησεν, Psal li. 21.

דָּבַא Piel inf. with suff. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab דָּבַא to break in pieces, to bruise; to trample upon.

In view of the great object to be gained, namely, the eternal redemption of His chosen, the Messiah voluntarily submitted Himself to those sorrows which were necessary to show the malig-

החלי Syriac form for **החלח** Hiph. pret. 3d pers. sing. mas. (to which we must supply a suff. 3d pers. sing. mas.) ab **חלח** to be weak, feeble; sick; pained; grieved, to suffer grief; &c. This use of Aramaism is not unfrequent in verbs **חלח** and **חלח**, in consequence of their intimate relation, being quite identical in Aramaean. (see Gesen. Gramm.)

אם This particle here forms the point of transition from the use of the pret. to that of the fut. tense; expresses the certainty of what is affirmed; and possesses all the native force of its derivation from **אמן** which means to be firm; faithful; trustworthy; sure, certain. It is used here as an Adv. of certainty meaning verily, surely, truly, certainly, from the verbal Adj. **אמן** or the noun **אמן**, both from **אמן**. This particle generally denotes the supposition on which the truth of a proposition is sustained, or the truth and firmness of the proposition itself. Here it is certainly used in the latter sense. Examples where **אם** is so used, are many. Of these we will cite but few: **אם** **יִלְרֵץ** 'Surely' He scorneth the scorers: Prov. iii. 34.; **אם-תִּפְיֵן בְּנֵי יְהוָה** 'Surely' Jehovah delights in us: Numb. xiv. 8.; **אם-גִּלְעָד אָרֶן** 'Truly' Gilead is wicked: Hos. xii. 12.; **אם-תִּקְשֵׁל אֱלֹהֵי רָשָׁע** 'Surely' thou wilt slay the wicked, O God: Psal. cxxxix. 19.; **אם-יִהְיֶה אִלֹּהִים עִמָּדִי** 'Verily' God will be with me: Gen. xxviii. 20. The force of this particle is indeed identical with that of the Arab. 'Enna', or 'Anna' which, Grammarians affirm is equivalent to 'Hackckan,' truly; it is used 'Tawkidan,' i. e. for the purpose of confirmation. (For a fuller explanation of this particle, see Dr. S. Lee's Heb. Lex.)

תִּשְׂרֶם Kal. fut. 3d pers. sing. fem. ab **שָׂרַם** and **שָׂרַם** to set, place; constitute; make, do. The fem. form here agrees with **נַפְשִׁי**, and the literal rendering is as follows: 'Verily, if **נַפְשִׁי** His soul makes **אִשָּׁם** a sacrifice for guilt; i. e. if He lay down His life as a propitiatory sacrifice. The following out of many passages in the New Testament, are very illustrative of this:—*Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθε διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι, καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντι πολλῶν.* Matth. xx. 28.; *παρῆδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῶ Θεῷ εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας.*

nity of sin. He made Himself of no reputation, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. (Philip. ii. 7. 8.) We cannot gaze on the illustrious and

Eph. v. 2.; "Ὁς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον, ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων. Tit. ii. 14.

חַטָּאת n. mas. sing. ab **חָטָא** and **חָטְאָ** to be or become guilty; to bear one's guilt; to suffer punishment for guilt. The n. **חַטָּאת** means guilt, and by a meton. an offering or sacrifice for guilt. The lxx. render it, *περι ἁμαρτίας* 'a sin offering.' So Christ, in 2 Cor. v. 21, is said to have been made *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν*, 'a sin offering for us.' (This rendering is advocated by Hammond, Le Clerc, Whitby, Newcome, Vitringa, Parkhurst, Schleusner, Billroth, and many other respectable critics.) Both **חַטָּאת** and **חַטְאָת** are sacrificial terms, and are very frequently so used in the Levitical law; but whilst **חַטְאָת** signifies 'any act of sin,' considered simply in itself, **חַטָּאת** relates only to the 'guilt of sin,' as affecting the sinner, in the way of exposing him to punishment. That our Lord did indeed assume this liability and actually endured the punishment due to sinners, is very evident from the following out of many passages:—*Καὶ οἶδατε ὅτι ἐκείνος ἐφανερῶθη, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἄρῃ καὶ ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔσται.* 1. Joh. iii 5.; *νῦν δὲ ἄπαξ ἐπὶ συνσελεῖα τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας, διὰ τῆς Θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται.* Heb. ix. 26.

נָפַח n. com. sing. with suff. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab **נָפַח** to respire, take breath, refresh oneself. The derivative **נְפִישׁ** is used for 'soul,' as the principle of life; 'life,' as **נְפִישׁ הַחַיָּת** 'life for life,' Exod. xxi. 23.; 'Self,' as **וַאֲסָרָה אֶשֶׁר אֶסָרָה עַל-נַפְשָׁהּ** 'or of her bond wherewith she has bound herself.' Numb. xxx. 5.; 'person,' as **שִׁבְעִים נַפְשִׁים** 'Seventy souls,' i. e. persons. Exod. i. 5.

רָאָה Kal. fut. 3d. pers. sing. mas. ab **רָאָה** to see; to see the sun, i. e. to live; &c.

זָרַע n. mas. sing. ab. **זָרַע** to sow, plant, &c., **זָרַע** signifies prop. the act of sowing seed; hence 'seed' of corn, plants, trees, &c.; and by Meton. issue, progeny. Hence the figurative phraseology **זָרַע הַמַּמְלָכָה** 'the 'seed' royal,' 2 Kin. xi. 1.; **כִּי זָרַע בְּרוּכִי**, 'for they are the 'seed' of the blessed of Jehovah,' Is. lxxv. 23.; **מִבְּקֵשׁ זָרַע אֱלֹהִים** 'that he might seek the 'seed'

mysterious victim, stooping beneath the amazing burden of human transgression, without feeling convinced that whilst the righteous Jehovah is disposed to save, yet He is fully resolved that no sinner should be saved without an efficient expiation for the evil done by sin. In the Messiah's sufferings and death, the holiness

of God,' i. e. His adopted children. Mal. ii. 15. This figurative use of the noun, utterly precludes the Jewish objection, viz., that זָרַע is only applicable to the natural offspring. To the above quoted passages, we will add the following, namely, זָרַע לְאָחִיךָ 'and raise up 'seed' to thy brother.' Gen. xxxviii. 8.; וְהָיָה הַבְּכוֹר אֲשֶׁר יִלְדֵךְ יִקְוֶה עַל-שֵׁם אָחִירֵךְ הַמֵּת 'and it shall be, that the first-born which she beareth, shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead.' Deut. xxv. 6. Here it cannot be contended that the child is the natural offspring of the deceased. The same word זָרַע in Psal. xxii.

31., is rendered figuratively even by Aben Ezra who also adds כְּאִלּוּ הוּא זֶרַע אֲשֶׁר יַעֲבֹדֶנּוּ 'as if that was a 'seed,' which serveth Him.' (vide Aben Ezra in loco.) Again in Gen. iii. 15. the great Maimonides in his Moreh Nevuchim Part. ii. cap. xxx. tells us that, we are not to understand the natural offspring of the 'tempter,' but those who do his works, and are actuated by his spirit. That Jesus did see a seed, begotten unto life, by His word and spirit, is very evident from the fact that, millions of sinful men have believed and were saved—millions are now prostrating themselves at the foot of the cross, looking to Jesus as their Saviour and their God, the Alpha and the Omega—and millions will yet come out from the dark corners of the earth and be enlightened by the instrumentality of a preached Gospel. Hiph. fut. 3d. pers. sing. mas. ab אָרַךְ to make long; to prolong, prolong one's life; to delay, defer.

יִאָרְךָ

יָמֵיהֶם

n. mas. pl. of יוֹם a day, so called from the diurnal heat, ab יוֹם to be warm, hot. The noun is not only used to denote 'day,' as distinguished from 'night,' but also 'any period' of time, as made up of days; hence 'age,' 'life-time.' The inappropriate rendering, 'He shall see a seed which shall prolong their days,' i. e. life, occasioned by the connection of this member יִאָרְךָ with the preceding, וְרָאָה זָרַע adopted by the lxx., vulg., and some modern writers, is somewhat anticipated by the Targum and Aben Ezra. Their language is as follows: יִרְאוּ בְּמַלְכוּת מְשִׁיחָהוֹן יִסְגְּדוּן בְּנֵיהֶן וּבְנֵי יוֹרְכוֹן יוֹמֵיהֶן 'they shall see the kingdom of their Messiah; they shall multiply sons and daughters; they shall prolong their days.' (vide

of Jehovah's nature and law, is fully seen ; therefore, Jehovah was pleased to bruise Him, because all his holy attributes are fully vindicated by the dying love of His well beloved son—pleased, because these sufferings and death would result in the pardon and recovery of an innumerable multitude of lost sinners, and in their eternal happiness and salvation.

Targ. in loco.)

והנה ידבר על הדור שישוּבוּ לַשֵּׁם : לְדַת הַשֵּׁם : בְּגֵעַת'קָץ
 בִּיאַת הַמְּשִׁיחַ 'And behold he speaks of the generation that

shall return to God, and the true religion, at the coming of the Messiah.' (vide Aben Ezra in loco.) Jewish controversialists assert that, 'the expression יָמֵיךָ אֶרְךָ is only applicable to temporal life ; Jesus, say they, was put to death at the age of about 33 ; 'Ergo' this prediction cannot be applied to Him. This objection would never have been urged, if the case were not desperate. The passage here is parallel to the following :

חַיִּים שְׂאֵל מִמֶּךָ כְּתָבָה לּוֹ אֶרְךָ יָמִים עוֹלָם וְעַד

'For life He ask'd ; thou Him didst give,
 Perpetual length of days to live.'

Psal. xxi. 5. Here the passage not being controversial, Kimchi himself acknowledges that אֶרְךָ יָמִים 'length of days' means 'eternal life.' The following is his language :

שִׂאתֵיךָ לּוֹ יָמִים לְעוֹלָם־הַזֶּה : אֶרְךָ יָמִים עוֹלָם וְעַד חַיִּי
 הַבָּא 'He asked life of thee,' means that thou wouldst

lengthen his days in this world ; 'length of days,' means the life of the world to come. (vide Kimchi in loco.) Thus on the Jewish showing, this objection is of no weight. En passant, we may remark that, Kimchi along with many eminent Jewish critics apply the whole of the xxist psalm to the Messiah ; but Jarchi according to his usual mode of treating Messianic predictions, remarks :

Our rabbins לפִּתְרוֹתָי עוֹד עַל דָּוִד עֲצֵמוֹ לְתַשׁוּבַת הַמִּינִים :
 apply it to the King Messiah ; "but on account of the Christians," it is better to expound it with respect to David himself.' (vide Jarchi in loco.)

וְחִפֵּץ n. mas. sing. with ׀ copulative, ab חִפֵּץ to delight in, &c. We have already shown in the beginning of this verse that the lxx. have often rendered this verb by *εὐδοξέω*, *εὖ*. Hence we find no reason why the 'derivative' in this place may not be rendered by *εὐδοξία*, implying the special good-well or favour of Jehovah.

בְּיָדְךָ n. com. sing. with pref. בְּ prep. and suff. 3d. pers. sing. mas.
 ab יָד dual יָדִים pl. יְדוֹת the human hand. As the hand is

“But Jehovah was pleased to bruise Him; He put Him to grief:”

Yes, Jehovah Himself put Him to grief, that the vials of wrath, which our sins had incurred, should not be spoiled of any of their scalding drops, ere emptied on the surity of our alienated tribes. Well might the angels—who veil their faces in His presence—draw back confounded, and the heavens which were created by Him, be darkened, and the earth, which was consecrated by His hallowed footsteps, reel at that awful mysterious spectacle. But it was on the cross that all was finished,—that all that was written concerning Him was fulfilled. This was indeed a mighty work—a work of amazing love, therefore, Jehovah who is the fountain of mercy and love, was pleased to look with complacency and delight on such an act of immeasurable loving kindness,—an act by which a door of restoration to God’s favour was very effectually opened for Adam’s children; and, by which alone, all the scattered sheep might return to his fold again.

Having thus very vividly described the boundless benevolence evinced in the Messiah’s sufferings and death; the prophet with singular harmony directs our attention to the consequences of His perfect obedience:—

Verily, if He make Himself a sacrifice for sin,
He shall see a seed, He shall prolong days,
And the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in His hand.

Here the Messiah is represented as making Himself a sin offering, that sinful man may be pardoned. That the person here

the instrument by which men effect most of their purposes, the noun is variously applied, e. g. power, ability, authority, help, aid, &c. ; when used with prepositions (as is the case here) very often loses its force as a noun, e. g. בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה by the ‘hand’ i. e. through the instrumentality of Moses.’ Numb. xv. 23.; בְּיַד אֲחִיָּהָה הַשִּׁלֹּנִי by the ‘hand’ i. e. through the instrumentality of Ahijah, the Shilonite.’ 1. Kings. xii. 15.; בְּיַד יְרֵמְיָהוּ הַנְּבִיא by the ‘hand’ i. e. through the instrumentality of Jeremiah the prophet.’ Jerem. xxxvii. 2. Hence בְּיַד here should be rendered in His hand, i. e. through His instrumentality.

יִצְלַח. Kal. fut. 3d. pers. sing. mas. ab יִצְלַח to go over or through; to

go on well, to prosper, succeed, accomplish prosperously, successfully. That Jehovah’s special good-will was and is prosperously and successfully accomplished through the Ministry and Mediation of our blessed Saviour, is fully evident from the fact that, from the beginning of Christ’s first advent, every succeeding century has witnessed more Christianity in the world than the preceding, or any former one.

spoken of is Jesus of Nazareth, is very evident from the fact that throughout the New Testament the Salvation of men is uniformly attributed to Christ's death. That our blessed Saviour did willingly make Himself a sin offering, is very evident from His own gracious words, "Even the son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." (Matth. xx. 28.) "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." (Joh. x. 17. 18. Christ was Himself the Altar, the Sacrifice, and the Priest. Hence He could offer Himself, freely and voluntarily, a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling Saviour. (See Eph. v. 2.)

In consequence of this, it is here foretold that the Messiah's death shall be glorious to Himself, and most beneficial to others; for He shall see a seed of true and genuine converts, both reconciled to God, and eternally saved by His death. All believers in Christ are said to be born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. (1 Peter 1. 22., 23.) As many as received Him, says the beloved disciple, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. (Joh. i. 12., 13.)

By the mysterious coalition of the Godhead and Manhood, the Messiah has imparted immortality to His humanity. This is evident from our Saviour's words, Fear not, I am the first and the last: I am He that liveth, and was dead; and behold I am alive for evermore. Amen. (Revel. i. 18.) The same strain is heard from the chords swept by the sweet psalmist of Israel: His name shall endure for ever: His name shall be continued as long as the sun and men shall be blessed in Him: All nations shall call Him blessed. (Psal. lxxii. 17.) Nor is Daniel's language less explicit I saw in the night-visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man, came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His Kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. (Dan. vii. 13., 14.) These few passages, out of many, show to a demonstrative evidence that the expression, He shall prolong days, refers and was fulfilled in the person of our Saviour. For He did indeed die about the thirty-third or fourth year of His age; but He could not be holden of the bonds of death. The third day His humanity arose from the dead, has lived ever since, and will live for evermore.

The last clause of this verse is a brief but emphatic reference to

Jehovah's eternal purpose, which the Messiah, the eternal Son of God, would effect :

And the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in His hand. The pleasure of Jehovah, is His gracious decree for the redemption and salvation of mankind. This decree which proceeded purely from His good pleasure and free grace, was put in the Saviour's hands. How marvellously has this gracious and Godly pleasure of saving fallen man prospered in Christ's hands, is fully seen in the great prosperity of His eternal Gospel. It proved, in a very short time after its promulgation, both to Jews and to Gentiles, the power of God unto salvation. Ever since, notwithstanding the oppositions of the evil one, this Gospel continues to make great progress in every part of the world. The dark corners of the earth are enlightened, the weak established, the mourners comforted, and all the host of the redeemed prepared for Glory. In short, there is not a day, an hour, a moment, wherein He is not beholding with delight the prosperity of His divine pleasure.

But while we rejoice in the great progress which Christianity is now making, we still look forward to the time when the whole material system shall be splendidly renovated—when the creature itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption—when animate and inanimate nature shall reach one general Jubilee—when the whole of the habitable globe shall be inhabited by a holy priesthood, a peculiar people. In short, we look for the new heavens and the new earth, which Isaiah described in his most fervid strains, (Is. lxxv. 17,) and upon which St. Peter gazed with delight, (2d Peter iii. 13,) and which the beloved disciple beheld in mystic vision on the Isle of Patmos, (Revel. xxi. 1-27); when the mysterious tree of life—which was denied to fallen man [Gen. iii. 22]—shall re-appear and be enjoyed by those who shall be clothed with the garments of salvation, [Revel. ii. 7. xxii. 2, 14.], even the salvation of our God, in Christ Jesus our Lord.

The following verse is resumptive and confirmatory of the preceding. Jehovah here declares the abundant and most glorious effects of the Messiah's most excruciating agonies and death :

After the trouble of His soul,
He shall see [the seed] and be satisfied ;
By the knowledge of Himself He shall justify ;
The Righteous One is my servant for the many ;
For He shall bear their iniquities.*

* **בְּעֵבֶל** n. mas. sing. (const. of **עָבַל**) with pref. **בְּ** prep. ab **עָבַל** to toil, labour, travail. 'This last meaning of the verb has no reference whatever to the sorrows of childbirth.' The prep. **בְּ** is used here in the sense of 'after' ; as **בְּשָׁלֹשׁ יְדֵי שָׁמַיִם** 'after three

How accurately and how minutely was this very remarkable

- months,' Gen. xxxviii. 24.; מִיָּמִים 'after some time,' Jud. xi. 4.; כְּחֶלֶם מֵחֶקְרִין 'as a dream after one awakes,' Psal. lxxiii. 20.; מֵרַב יָמִים 'after many days,' Is. xxiv. 22.; מִיָּמִים 'after two days,' Hos. vi. 2. Throughout the holy Scriptures, the Messiah's sufferings are uniformly represented as introducing His glory and the glory of His kingdom. This is in the strictest accordance with our Saviours language, οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; Luke xxiv. 26. See also 1 Peter i. 11., ἐρρουνῶστας εἰς τίνα, ἣ ποῖον καιρὸν, ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, προμαρτυρούμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα, καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας.
- נָפַשׁ n. com. sing. with suff. 3d. pers. sing. mas. ab נָפַשׁ to respire, take breath, refresh oneself. The derivative נִפְּשׁ is used for 'soul,' as the principle of life; 'life,' as נִפְּשׁ תְּחַתְּ נִפְּשׁ 'life for life,' Exod. xxi. 23.; 'self,' as וְאִסְרָה אֶתְּךָ עַל-נִפְּשָׁהּ 'or of her bond wherewith she hath bound herself,' Numbers xxx. 5.; 'person,' as שִׁבְעִים נִפְּשׁ 'seventy souls,' i. e. persons. Exod. i. 5.
- יִרְאֶה Kal. fut. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab יִרְאֶה to see; to see the sun, i. e. to live; &c. The object to יִרְאֶה is זֶרַע This is supplied in the text, q. v.
- יִשְׂבַּע Kal. fut. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab יִשְׂבַּע and יִשְׂבַּע to be or become satisfied or satiated, to be filled; to have enough, abundance, to be supplied to the full. Metaph. this verb is very expressive of St. Paul's vivid description of Christs exaltation, ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἑπουρανίων καὶ ἐργείων καὶ καταχθονίων, Philip. ii. 10. That this verb is used in a spiritual sense is evident from the following out of many other passages: וְיָדַעְתָּ אֲתָּה-טוֹב בְּיִשְׂבַּע נְאֻם-יְהוָה 'and my people shall be satisfied (or filled) with my goodness, saith Jehovah. (Jerem. xxxi. 14.)
- בְּיָדְעָתָּה n. fem. sing. with pref. בְּ prep. and suff. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab יָדַע to know, perceive, discern; to understand; to know by experience, experimentally, as יָדַעְתָּהּ so shalt thou know, i. e. thou shalt have the assurance that &c. Job v. 24. So here, by the term יָדַעְתָּהּ we are to understand 'the experimental and vital knowledge of the Messiah's propitiatory sufferings, involving faith and a self-appropriation of the Messiah's Righteousness, the effect of which is expressed by יִצְדִיק That this vital knowl

prediction fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth! No sooner did he utter the sentence 'It is finished,' than He began to see the seed and be

edge is absolutely necessary to life eternal, is very evident from our Saviours teaching, *αὕτη δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ, ἵνα γινώσκωσι σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.* Job. xvii. 3. That this knowledge is no mere speculative knowledge, is evident from St. Paul's and St. Peter's teaching. Philip. iii. 8-11. 2 Peter i. 2. 3. So also in Jeremiah's teaching. Jerem. ix. 23, 24. comp. 1 Cor. i. 29-31.

יְצַדִּיק Hiph. fut. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab **יְצַדִּיק** to be just, upright, righteous. Hiph. to make just, upright, pious,' by one's example, or doctrine, as **וַיַּצְדִּיקוּ הָרַבִּים** 'and they that turn many to righteousness.' Dan. xii. 3. In a forensic-theological sense,' to justify, to esteem, pronounce, or declare just, or righteous, i. e. to acquit or absolve from past offenses, and accept as just to the reward of righteousness, as **כִּי לֹא-אֶצְדִּיק רָשָׁע** 'for I (God) will not justify the wicked.' Exod. xxiii. 7.; **וַיִּצְדִּיק יְהוָה צְדִיקִים** 'and (God) justifying the righteous, 1 Kings viii. 32. That **יְצַדִּיק** must be rendered in the highest and most perfect theological sense, is very apparent from the last parallel in this verse, **וְעֹנֵתָם הוּא יִסְבֵּל** 'for he shall bear their iniquities,' and especially from the grand fact that, the person spoken of throughout this chapter is represented as a priest and sacrifice for sin. According to the accentuation, this verb stands very closely connected with the following noun **יְצַדִּיק** to indicate the very close connection in which the perfect Righteousness of the **יְהוָה עֲבַד יְהוָה** stands with the justification to be imparted to the sinner through faith in Him.

יְצַדִּיק Adj. sing. mas. from the foregoing verb **יְצַדִּיק** This adjective is here used as a noun, without the article **הַ** This omission of the article is not unfrequent in hebrew poetry, of which, the whole of this chapter is a sublime specimen. This is done (see rule in Nord. Heb. Gram. Sect. 718.) for the sake of elevating and condensing poetical expressions, e. g. **אָמַר שֹׁמֵר אֶתָּה בֹּקֵר** '(the) watchman says, (the) morning comes,' Is. xxi. 12.; **לְפָנַי-שָׂמֵשׁ** '(the) king will rejoice,' Psal. xxi. 2.; **וְכֹךְ-שָׁמַח** 'as long as (the) sun endures, His name shall be magnified,' Psal. lxxii. 17. Throughout the Old Testament Scriptures, wherever **יְצַדִּיק** is used of Jehovah or the Messiah, it is rendered as the *Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν δίκαιον* or *δίκαιος Κύριος* in the New Testament, in the highest and most perfect theological sense. The Messiah is emphatically called **יְצַדִּיק** 'The Right-

satisfied. Joseph and Nicodemus, who, in His lifetime were afraid

teous one,'—the Fountain of perfect Righteousness, and רִנְיָשׁוּעַ rendered σωζων by the lxx. and פְּרִיק by Junathan, 'a Saviour or Redeemer,' Zech. ix. 9. This prediction is applied to the Messiah, by our Lord Himself, Matth. xxi. 4–11. Joh. xii. 14, 15. The writings of the Jews, also furnish an unbroken chain of testimony to prove that this prediction was always referred to the King Messiah. (see Zohar part iii fol. 110. col. 3. and fol. 133. col. 4. Edit. Lublin.; Beresheth Rabba fol. 66. col. 2.; Bab. Talm. Tract Sanhedrin fol. 98. col. 1.; Saadia Gaon on Dan. vii. 13.; M. Alsbech com. in loc.; and Jarchi com. in loco.

עֲבָדָי n. mas. sing. with suff. 1st. pers. sing. mas. ab עָבַד to work, labour, till the ground; to serve, serve God, i. e. to worship God, serve Him with offering a sacrifice, &c.; to compel to work, bring into bondage, &c. The n. עֲבָדָי is used as a low epithet and is applied to common servants and slaves; and as a very honourable epithet and is applied to the pious worshippers of Jehovah; e. g. Abraham, Psal. cv. 6, 42; to the prophets; e. g. Moses, Deut. xxxiv. 5. Isaiah, Is. xx. 3.; and, pre-eminently to the Messiah, as the most distinguished Divine Ambassador, Is. xlii. 1. xlix. 6. lii. 13. Philip. ii. 7. The great mass of Jewish commentators apply the epithet עֲבָדֵי יְהוָה to the King Messiah.

לְרַבִּים Adj. pl. with pref. לְ for לָהֶם ab רָבַב to become much or many, to be increased; to be much or many. The רַבִּים here is to be rendered in the sense of the οἱ πολλοί in Rom. v.; and as the οἱ πολλοί of the Apostle means those that have sinned, so the רַבִּים of the Prophet means those for whom Christ died, who are no other than those who have sinned. (See Matth. xx. 28. xxvi. 28. Rom. v. 19. Heb. ix. 28.)

וְעֲוֹנֹתָם n. fem. pl. with pref. וְ causal prep. and suff. 3d. pers. pl. mas. ab עָוָן sin, (in this instance it is to be understood only in reference to its effects;) iniquity, guilt; punishment, as the penalty of sin; ab עָרַח to bend, twist, distort; to act perversely, to sin.

הוּא Pers. pron. 3d. pers. sing. mas. This separable form of the pers. pron. is used here for the sake of emphasis as the subject of the following verb. (see Nord. Heb. Gram. sect. 852.)

וְסָבַל Kal. fut. 3d. pers. sing. mas. ab סָבַל to bear; to bear griefs, sins, i. e. to receive the penalties which another has deserved; as וְאֵנְחָנוּ עֲוֹנֹתֵיהֶם סָבַלְנוּ 'and we have borne their iniquities,' Sam. v. 7.

to be recognised as His disciples, boldly came forward to pay their homage to His dead body. Three thousand souls on one day, [Acts ii. 41,] and five thousand souls on another occasion, [Acts iv, 4,] were converted to Jesus, by the solemn and earnest preaching of that disciple, who, in his Master's lifetime shamefully denied Him. Jerusalem—the very place where the Saviour of men was crucified and put to shame, soon numbered many myriads of believing Jews and Gentiles among its ungrateful inhabitants. And Judea itself was very soon overspread with Christian communities.

To have a due appreciation of the fulfillment of this most glorious prediction, we have to look back on the impure Romans, [Rom. i. 21—32.]; the licentious Corinthians, [1 Cor. v. 1.]; the sensual Ephesians, [Eph. v. 3—18.]; the ignorant Philipians, [Acts xvi. 19—24. Philip. iii.] the idolatrous Thessalonians, [Thess. i. 9.] who, by the Grace of God, were enabled to embrace the truth as it is in Jesus. Look on the multitudes of different nations, kindreds, tongues and people, who, through the operating influences of the Holy Spirit, have heard the word of life and glory, believed, were saved, and are now peopling the Glorious Mansions of Paradise.—Look on the civilized world and see its millions of inhabitants, with their kings and their nobles prostrating themselves at the foot of the cross. And, finally, with the eye of faith look forward to that happy period, when true Christianity, in its unsullied purity, shall be established on this earth, when sin and Satan shall be forever banished from every corner of the globe, when at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in Heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and when every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. [Philip ii. 10, 11.]

Such a glorious result cannot fail to afford inexpressible pleasure and give an infinite satisfaction to Him who, for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame. (Heb. xii. 2.) He did indeed despise the shame, because it was not worthy to be compared with the glorious event, which He had in full view, namely, the salvation of countless millions of lost sinners from eternal destruction; and He did feel, feels, and will ever feel perfectly satisfied when beholding the glory brought, and shall be brought to the Father in consequence of that new covenant established between heaven and earth, in the eternal salvation of untold myriads of immortal souls, and in the spread of His kingdom far and wide as creation's utmost bounds.

In the following member, the prophet predicts the mode of fallen man's justification before Jehovah, namely, that we are to be accounted righteous in God's sight, only by a vital knowledge of the Messiah :—

‘By the knowledge of Himself He shall justify ;
Throughout the Holy Scriptures we are taught that the Father

cannot be savingly known, but in and by the Son. Hence, in order to possess Eternal Life, we must become fully acquainted with Christ, His plan of salvation, His obedience, and the terms of His most Holy Religion. It is by this vital knowledge that faith, love, and obedience are wrought in every believer's heart. For the excellency of this vital knowledge, St. Paul could, doubtless, count all things but loss. (Philip iii. 8.) Through this vital knowledge, says St. Peter, 'all things that pertain unto life and Godliness, are given unto us.' (2 Peter i. 3.) בְּיָדוֹ says Isaiah, 'shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory.' (Is. xlv. 25.) And, to this effect, our blessed Saviour saith, 'And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.' (Joh. xvii. 3.)

The closing members of this verse express a cause and an effect:

'The Righteous One is my servant for the many ;
For He shall bear their iniquities.'

Until the Messiah took upon Himself the form of a servant, all men, along with their federal head were driven from Jehovah's holy presence, in consequence of the old serpent's foul stratagem. He took this form because of the Joy that was set before Him ; namely, the sinners' eternal salvation through the vital knowledge of Himself. But for our blessed Saviour's mysterious condescension to become a servant for the many who partake of His life-giving Spirit, and endured their penalty, by which He re-instated us in our original position, and made us his friends (Joh. xv, 15.), believers would indeed be 'of all men most miserable.' But thanks be to Jehovah who, most freely, and with most condescending compassion, forgiveness, and liberality, 'loved us, and sent His only begotten Son to be the propitiation for our sins.' [1 Joh., iv, 10.] 'Not as the offence,' says St. Paul, 'so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.' - - - 'For as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' [Rom. v, 15, 19.] 'The Son of Man,' says our blessed Saviour, 'came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.' [Matth. xx, 28.]

In the following verse, Jehovah announces, as it were, the exact reward of the Messiah, in consequence of the very mighty spiritual victory which He attained :

Therefore will I apportion Him with the many ;
And he shall divide the spoil among the strong ones ;

Because He poured out His soul unto death,
 And was numbered with transgressors,
 And bare the sin of many,*
 And made intercession for the transgressors.

* לְכֵן causal particle, comp. of לְ prep. 'for,' and כֵּן 'that.' It is chiefly used to point out an event as the consequence of one stated before.

אֶחָדָם Piel. fut. 1st. pers. sing. mas. ab חָלַק to be smooth ; to divide, distribute, apportion ; to spoil.

לְ Particle, comp. of prep. לְ used as the mark of the 'dative,' and suff. 3d. pers. sing. mas.

רַב־רַבִּים Adj. pl. with pref. רַב for רַב־בָּ ab רַב־בָּ to become much or many to be increased ; to be much or many. The prep. רַב should be rendered, 'with,' as in the following out of many examples : אֶכְפֹּרָה פָּנָיו בְּמִנְחָה 'I will appease him 'with' the present.' Gen. xxxii. 21. ; בְּצַבְאוֹתֵינוּ 'with' our armies,' Psal. xliv. 10. בְּעַם כָּבֵד וּבְיָד חֲזָקָה 'with' much people, and 'with' a strong hand,' Numb. xx. 21. These רַב־רַבִּים constitute the

Messiah's חֶלֶק They are peculiarly called חֶלֶק יְהוָה 'Jehovah's portion,' Deut. xxxii. 9. Our blessed Redeemer emphatically calls them τὰ πρόβατά μου 'my sheep,' Joh. xxi. 15. Of these, our Lord assures us that, it is the Father's will that, 'none should be lost' ; Joh. vi. 39. ; and, to them, He graciously promised to give ζωὴν αἰώνιον 'eternal life,' Joh. x. 27-30. Oh how infinitely happy is the prospect of the true Israel ! They joyfully take Christ for their everlasting portion, and reciprocally the Redeemer, in His infinite love, takes them for His portion.

אֵת Illustrative particle (used here as the sign of the accusative) with וְ copulative.

עֲצוּמִים Adj. mas. pl. of עֲצוּם ab עֲצֵם to be or become strong, mighty, powerful, great ; to become strong in number, numerous. This same epithet עֲצוּמִים is used in Dan. viii. 24., synonymously with עַם-קִדְשִׁים 'holy people,' or literally 'a people of saints.' Hence the עֲצוּמִים here are no other than the οἱ πολλοί 'the many' who were, are, and shall be reconciled to Jehovah by a living faith in the Eternal Messiah.

יִחְלַק Piel. fut. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab חָלַק to divide, &c. (see above.)

שָׁלַל n. mas. sing. ab שָׁלַל to draw out ; to strip off, to spoil ; to carry off the spoil. Mankind, through sin, are become the slaves—the

In this brief verse, the reader cannot fail to find the announcement of those very conflicts and conquest of the Messiah which formed the theme of the prophets' noblest verse, and St. John's sublimest delineations. In the two first members, the church is represented, 1st, as a 'portion,' i. e. the Father's Gift to the Messiah; 2dly, as a 'spoil,' i. e., the fruit of the Messiah's own spiritual con-

prey of the terrible one—Satan. But Jesus, and Jesus alone, who is stronger than he, having paid their ransom, is able and willing to deliver them from his power.

תַּחַת Prep. of place indicating motion or rest 'under, beneath;' and from this is derived its chief secondary acceptation 'instead of, in exchange for, on account of, because.'

אֲשֶׁר Rel. pron. of both gen. and numb. used here as a rel. conj. 'that.' This rel. is very frequently preceded (as in this instance) by **תַּחַת** or another connective particle whenever it is used (as in this instance) with reference to the entire contents of the preceding sentence or clause. The use of **אֲשֶׁר תַּחַת** in this place is emphatic, expressing more distinctly the idea of reward, 'pro eo quod.'

הִעָרָה Hiph. pret. 3d. pers. sing. mas. ab **עָרָה** to be naked, to make naked or bare; empty, pour out, i. e. to give up one's life; to expose. (see Psal. cxli. 8., and Philip ii. 7.)

לְמָוֶת n. mas. sing. with pref. **לְ** for **לָהּ** ab **מָוֶת** to die, both naturally, and by violence; to put to death, kill, slay.

נִפְשׁוֹ n. com. sing. with suff. 3d. pers. sing. mas. ab **נָפַשׁ** to respire, take breath, refresh oneself. **נִפְשׁוֹ** is here used for 'life or soul,' as the principle of life. The whole phrase **הִעָרָה לְמָוֶת נִפְשׁוֹ** 'He poured out, made bare or exposed His life, or soul unto the death,' is very expressive of the Messiah's voluntary and unreserved exposure 'even to the death of the cross.'

וְאִתּוֹ Prep. 'with,' and **וְ** copulative.

פְּשָׁעִים Participial n. mas. pl. of **פָּשַׁע** ab **פָּשַׁע** to revolt, rebel; to sin, transgress, especially against God.

כְּמִנְהָ Niph. pret. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab **מָנָה** to divide, separate; to assign, appoint; to number; Niph. pass. to be numbered; reflex. to suffer oneself to be numbered. This is expressive of the Messiah's voluntary sufferings. St. Mark's application of the phrase **כְּמִנְהָ פְשָׁעִים וְאִתּוֹ** says Dr. Alex., points out but one of the many remarkable coincidences which were brought about by Providence between the prophecies and the circumstances of our Saviour's passion.

quests. The world's conversion to Christ must be regarded in both these views. The power of Godliness, we are told, shall one day pervade all ranks of people; but this saving power must be

וְהָיָה Pers. pron. 3d. pers. sing. mas. with pref. וְ copulative. This separable form of the pers. pron. is used here for the sake of emphasis as the subject of the following verb.

חַטָּא n. mas. sing. ab חָטָא to miss, make a false step; to sin; to offer as a sin-offering, and hence, to expiate, cleanse, or free from sin.

רַבִּים Adj. pl. of רַב ab רַבֵּב to be or become many, numerous, &c.

נָשָׂא Kal. pret. 3d. pers. sing. mas. ab נָשָׂא to lift or take up; as וַיִּשְׂאֵהוּ אֶת-הַתְּבִיחַ 'and bare up the ark,' Gen. vii. 17.; to bear with any one, as וַיִּשְׂאֵנִי 'bear with me,' Job xxi. 3.; to bear any one's sin, i. e. to receive the punishment of sin upon oneself, as בְּדַע לֹא-נִשְׂא הַבֵּן בְּעֹן הָאָב 'why doth not the

son bear the iniquity of the father'!

בֶּן לֹא יִשְׂא בְעֹן הָאָב 'the son shall not bear the iniquity of

the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son,' Ezek. xviii. 19, 20.; to bear the punishment of one's own sin, as וְנִשְׂא חַטָּאוֹ 'and he shall bear his sin,' Lev. xxiv. 15.; to

take away one's sin, i. e. to expiate, make atonement for sin, as

לְשַׂאת אֶת-עֹן הָעֵדָה 'to atone for the sin of the congregation,' Lev. x. 17.; to pardon sin as וַיִּשְׂאֵהוּ עֹן חַטָּאתִי 'and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin,' Psal. xxxii. 5.; &c.

לְפָשְׁעֵיהֶם Participial n. mas. pl. of פָּשַׁע with pref. וְ copul. and pref. לְ for לָהּ ab פָּשַׁע to revolt, &c., see above.

יִפְגְּדֶנּוּ Hiph. fut. 3d pers. sing. mas. ab פָּגַע used here in its good sense,

i. e. to assail with petitions, i. e. to urge, entreat, &c. The act of intercession spoken of here, is very appropriately expressed by the indefinite future, to show that it is to be continuously carried on. This is in the strictest accordance with the following grammatical rule:—'When in speaking of a present state or action the writer's attention dwells rather on its future continuance than on its commencement, he employs the future tense. This takes place when a general proposition is made which will always hold good, e. g. יִשְׁמַע הָרֶבֶם וַיִּדְבַּק לִקְרוֹ 'a wise man hears, and increases his knowledge,' Prov. i. 5. Nord. Heb. Gram. sect. 964. 2. c.' According to the whole context, the act of intercession here is to be taken in the wider and New Testament sense.

imparted to the sinner, for we cannot make ourselves to differ. Hence, none, whether high or low, learned or unlearned, ever can unfeignedly yield themselves up to Christ, without being given to Him by the Father. Of this gift, Christ thus speaks, οὐδὲς δύναται εἰσεῖν πρὸς ἐμὲ, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ πατήρ ὁ πέμψας με ἐλάβῃ αὐτόν, καὶ γὰρ ἀναστήσω αὐτόν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. [Joh. vi, 44.] This Father's gift, Christ, we are told, divides unto Himself as a spoil. Satan, the prince of this world, had usurped a power over mankind, but Christ τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας who is stronger than he, both overcame and took from him the armour wherein he trusted; [see Luke, xi, 22,] divided, is now dividing, and will still divide the spoil, till the whole world shall savingly know Him. Accordingly, He 'the נָגִיד לְאֲמִים רִמְצָנָהּ leader and commander of the people,' [Is. lv, 4,]

engaged with all the powers of darkness, and, 'by death, destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the devil.' [Heb. ii, 14.] On the cross, we are assured that, He 'spoiled principalities and powers, and made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it.' [Col. ii, 15.] And, in His ascension, He 'led captivity captive, received gifts for men: Yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them.' [Psal. lxxviii, 18.] Thus did Jesus wrest the 'many,' i. e. the church reconciled to Jehovah by faith in himself, from the firm grasp of the Apostate Angel; and, thus must we Christians, like faithful warriors, strive to fight a good warfare—'the good fight of faith,' having truth for the girdle of our loins—righteousness for our breastplate—the Gospel of peace for our greaves—faith for our shield—God's word for our helmet and our sword, praying always with all prayer and supplication in the spirit. [see Eph. vi, 10-18.]

In the following clause, the prophet, being full of the Messiah's most amazing love, in voluntarily offering Himself as an efficient sacrifice to expiate human guilt, once more recapitulates the ground of the Messiah's most glorious reward:

Because He poured out His soul unto death.

How beautifully harmonious with these gracious words is the language of our blessed Master! 'Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.' [Joh. x, 17, 18.] Yes, Jesus of Nazareth, did indeed come for the express purpose of laying down His life a ransom for lifeless sinners; and He, in His infinite mercy and love, voluntarily and unreservedly exposed Himself to death in our stead, as the original words of our text forcibly express. This was fulfilled in the shedding or pouring fourth of His most precious blood, when his hands, feet, and side were pierced with the nails and the soldier's spear, when suspended upon the cross. This same reason of Christ's exaltation

is also assigned by St. Paul. [Philip. ii, 9.]

“And He was numbered with transgressors.”

The minute fulfillment of this prophetic record did not fail to strike the Evangelist St. Mark, in a very forcible manner; [Mark xv, 28,] but his specific application does by no means exhaust the whole sense of the prediction. To mark the ignominy that He was to endure for us, Jesus was indeed numbered with transgressors of the most atrocious character, bearing in His own person the load of our iniquities, and enduring the curse and condemnation due to the sinner.

“And bare the sin of many.”

This is a brief but most comprehensive reason, why the Holy and Just One had thus to travail in the greatness of His strength, in submitting to such an ignominious death upon the cross. To this effect the Holy Spirit infallibly testifies that, the immaculate Jesus was indeed ‘Such an High Priest as became us, holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners;’ [Heb. vii, 26,] ‘The Lamb without blemish, and without spot;’ [1 Peter, i, 19,]; ‘that He was manifested to take away our sins; and in Him is no sin;’ [1 John, iii, 5,]; and that He ‘was once offered to bear the sins of many. [Heb. ix, 28.] Hence, the right and Just Gospel demand for faith in, and obedience to him as the Almighty Saviour; for, ‘there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved,’ but the ever blessed name of the Holy Jesus, who, in order to effect a full expiation for sin, and the entire pardon and complete salvation of the sinner, ‘humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.’ [Philip. ii, 8.]

‘And made intercession for the transgressors.’

This was fulfilled even when suspended upon the cross. ‘Father forgive them; for they know not what they do.’ [Luke, xxiii, 24.] The Messiah’s intercession is here introduced as another ground, on which the increase and aggrandizement of His Kingdom may be expected. The Messiah was not only to offer Himself as a sacrifice for sin, and to enter into Heaven with His own blood, but He was to make intercession for us at the right hand of God. In His mediatorial office; Christ, very effectually pleads the merit of His death to procure the salvation of all who come unto God through Him. Christ being our everlasting High Priest, Sacrifice, Intercessor, and Mediator, we are fully assured, ‘is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them.’ [Heb. vii, 25.]

Since the establishment of Christianity, there was not a day which did not witness the efficacy of the Saviour’s intercession. We behold it in the conversion of the thousands on the day of

Pentecost, [Acts, ii, 41,] and of the thousands who heard and believed the word preached by Peter and John in Solomon's Temple, [Acts, iv, 4,]; in the opening of the doors of faith unto the Gentiles, [Acts, xiv, 27,]; in the conversion of the mightiest, noblest, and most civilized nations, who, with their kings and rulers did, worship, are worshipping, and ever will worship and exalt the name of Jesus as their Saviour and their God; and, in the invincible faith of the Church, who rejoicing in what God had done for the Salvation of thousands of millions of immortal souls, is still knocking at the door of mercy, looking for that blessed period when 'at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.' [Phil. ii, 10, 11.]

Thus, by the Almighty's help, we have gone minutely into every verse, showing from the Sacred Scriptures and from ancient Jewish tradition, that this most important portion of Holy Writ had none for its most Glorious theme but the person of the Messiah—Jesus of Nazareth whose humiliation was and is unequalled and whose glory was, is, and ever will be altogether unparalleled. Let us then earnestly pray, that the condition of the unbelieving Jews who filled up the measure of their sins by crucifying the Lord of Glory, may be a warning to us not to 'crucify to ourselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame.' Let us, 'watch, and pray' that the Holy Spirit may enable us to stand fast in our high and glorious calling. 'Let us not be high minded, but fear.' 'For if God spared not the natural branches, we must 'take heed lest He spare not us,' and cause the repentant Israelite to turn upon us, and address us in the following beautiful, but searching lines of Bishop Heber :

And who art thou that mournest me, replied the ruined grey,
And fear'st not rather that thyself may prove a cast—away?
I am a dried and abject branch, my place is given to thee;
But woe to every barren graft of that wild olive tree.

Our day of Grace is sunk in night, our time of mercy spent,
For heavy was my children's crime, and strong their punishment.
Yet gaze not idly on our fall,—but, sinners, warned be,
Who spared not His chosen seed, may send His wrath on thee.

Our day of Grace is sunk in night, thy noon is in its prime,
Oh! turn and seek thy Saviours face in this accepted time!
So, Gentile, may Jerusalem a lesson prove to thee,
And in the new Jerusalem thy home forever be.

THE ALPHABET OF NATURAL THEOLOGY.

It has often seemed to us, that in deriving proofs of the existence, character, and attributes of God from the works of nature, many writers on the subject, had at least neglected one important field of argument, where advantages to the cause of Natural Theology might be reaped.

We have many able treatises to prove the existence, and to illustrate the perfections of Deity, by the ordinary cumulative arguments of contrivance and design everywhere apparent, from the pens of such men as Ray, Derham, Butler, Paley, Chalmers, Brougham, and the authors of the splendid Bridgewater Treatises; but to a great degree, they have confined themselves to the organic kingdoms of nature, or to the relations of these to the inorganic; or have ranged through the skies, and discovered wisdom in the arrangement of planets, suns and adamantine spheres.

But we inquire why not begin at the beginning? with that which must be fundamental to all other arguments, and must antedate them all? Why not dig deep and found the argument upon which so much depends, upon the very crystalline rocks that lie at the foundation of the globe? And rise from these to the ordinances of Heaven?

There are, it seems to us, many facts, laws, relations, evidences of design, or of rational intuition, scarcely, if at all, less striking, developed by the researches of modern science in the mineral kingdom, and among the ultimate particles of matter, than those which are adduced from higher departments of nature. And chance, or the fortuitous concourse of atoms has little to do in the one case as in the other.

But the acute Paley, at the opening of his lucid argument disparages all wisdom in *stones*, and of course in all minerals, for every thing not animal and vegetable is mineral. So also in the latter part of his work on Natural Theology, he proceeds on the same assumption: "*now inert matter is out of the question*; and organized substance includes marks of contrivance."* Chalmers also in the introductory chapter of his Bridgewater Treatise speaks in a similar strain. It is not to the creation of the world, and the endowment of matter with certain properties and laws

* These facts are noticed in Buckland's Bridgewater Treatise, vol. 1, ch. xxiii. Also by Mantell, Wonders of Geology, vol. II. page 898. "The pebble rejected by the divine, as affording no evidence of design, becomes, in the hands of the geologist a striking proof of infinite wisdom."

as materials to employ in making organic being, and antecedent in idea to their construction, that we are to look for a revelation of the Divine attributes. But for the most part the skill displayed in the "dispositions of matter," in certain figures; just as if some Demiurgus had happened to pass this way, and finding the earth made, with all its chemical and mechanical laws, having had no hand in ordaining them, should proceed to turn them to account, in fashioning animals and plants where none had ever been before, and should add the vital force to the laws he found existing.

It is true (he says page 20) that we accredit the author of those [specimens of natural mechanism] with the creation and laws of matter, as well as its dispositions; but this does not hinder its being in *the latter and not in the former*, where the manifestations of skill are not apparent, or where the chief argument for a divinity lies." And so he continues, as if, because the endowing of matter previous to its organization, with certain properties and law, was not *all*, or the chief thing, it was not worth noticing; seeming to forget that those properties were involved in the organization, given in reference to it, so constituted as to be employed for this purpose, when the Divine Architect proceeded to arrange the shapes of things, and communicate life. We see not how the two things between which he makes so great a distinction can well be separated from one another, and shall speak further on this point hereafter.

It is true that some writers on these subjects *touch occasionally* on the points which we now propose briefly to discuss—as Hitchcock in his *Religion of Geology*,* Buckland and Prout, in their *Bridgewater Treatises*, some of the writers of which series of works do not seem to have had an understanding with one another, so as to keep their departments distinct; and they are too diffuse on some points, and too concise on others. And it strikes us that Prout's chemistry hardly answers the purpose intended in the series, so well as many other works on the subject, prepared without that object in view.

We propose to pass by the ordinary argument from adaptation and design, or what Chalmers calls the "dispositions of matter," in the organic kingdom; that derived from astronomy and from geology, for which its advocates set up so high claims;† and descend to the proofs of design in the structure and composition of unorganized mineral bodies; to place ourselves almost as

* Particularly Lecture V. So Harris in *Pre Adamite Earth*. And the author of "Plurality of Worlds," pages 243 and 264.

† Prof. Hitchcock claims, "that the illustrations of natural religion from Geology, are more numerous and important than from any other and perhaps all other sciences." *Elementary Geol.* ed. 25, page 356. *Religion and Geology passim.*

if we had come here and studied all these sciences that bear upon this subject, before Divine power had gone another step, and had introduced vegetables and animals—to stand at the vanishing point of organisms in the crystalline rocks, at the dividing line between the reign of mere mechanical and chemical laws, and the commencement of that peculiar force called vital, organic. And while some would banish final causes from the domain of physical science, we think that an abundance of facts may be brought forward, from the laws of mere *brute* matter, evidencing design, and constituting a teleological argument for the existence and attributes of an intelligent Creator. But in the first place, we may suggest some reasons why this field of argument has been less explored than most others. It may be mentioned,

1. That the facts that bear upon this form of argumentation, are not so obvious as in some other departments of knowledge; they are not so much open to inspection in every day life, as those presented in some other walks of science.

2. The peculiar pursuits of many writers have led them altogether in other directions.

3. Other sources of argument, by which the footsteps of the Creator are traced, are so abundant, and the evidences of wisdom so marked, that it is difficult to exhaust the subject, and therefore other points have claimed the preference.

4. It is only within a comparatively recent period that the deeper secrets of nature have been revealed, to the patient research of modern science. And more especially since the discovery of electro galvanism, has put into the hands of the high priests of nature, a powerful instrument of analysis, so that a powerful argument could be constructed here. But now the most acute and active minds in Christendom, are pushing their investigations to the utmost limits of human powers, and lifting the veil from the most intricate processes of nature.

5. That rigid immutable order which is found to prevail; that eternal sameness fixed as the ordinances of heaven and earth, which really contributes to the strength of the argument, *seems* in the view of some to detract from it, and to give some advantage to the infidel, as if there was some necessity in the nature of things for “fixing nature fast in fate,” without any controlling, intelligent free agent.

This everlasting unchangeableness seems to deny will and purpose in any contriver, as if every event here must be so, of course; as the scoffer says, “all things continue as they were from the creation of the world;” “where is the promise of his coming then? We see no evidence of a God, but of blind unconscious law.” Says Trench, “if in one sense, the orderly workings of nature *reveal* the glory of God, in another they *hide* that glory

from our eyes ; if they ought to make us continually remember Him, yet there is danger that they lead us to forget Him, until this world around us shall prove, not a translucent medium through which we look to Him, but a thick impenetrable veil, concealing Him wholly from our sight. Were there no other purpose in the miracles than this, namely, to testify the *liberty of God*, and to affirm the will of God, which however it habitually shows itself *in* nature, is yet more than and above nature, were it only to break the link in that chain of cause and effect, which else we should come to regard as itself God, as the iron chain of an inexorable necessity, binding heaven no less than earth, they would serve a great purpose.”*

6. Some entertain apprehensions in reference especially to arguments drawn from physical science, as if they detracted so much from other and higher sources, and interfered with the Christian evidences ; as if the spiritual was not based upon the natural—and the earth on which we tread was not the footstool of Him whose throne is in the heavens.†

We begin then, where most naturally all evidence of contrivance and design should commence, with the atomic constitution of matter. Just as letters are the first elements of all speech, and they combined, make words, and words put together according to the rules of grammar and the laws of the human mind, constitute sentences, and discourse ; so here is the a. b. c. of Natural Theology ; here are the first rudiments of that language of sensible signs, *things*, by which He who moves the mighty machine of the universe, and in every part of which He is present, communicates His thoughts to men.

A certain writer remarks that “the fact of *design* may be inferred from any degree of regularity however imperfect, which cannot reasonably be ascribed to chance.”‡

There are at present about 60 elementary substances, or different kinds of matter recognized among chemists, by the union of which in a great variety of ways, and in many proportions, all the bodies with which we are conversant are composed ; nor have we any reason to believe that the heavenly bodies are much different in their composition from our earth.¶ And this fact of itself is matter of astonishment, that in the infinite variety of substances, which are objects of our senses, and which affect our

*Notes on Miracles, page 24.

†Pre Adamite Earth, p. 119.

‡ See Chalmers on man, chap. iv. and McCosh on Divine Gov. 127.

¶ Though the combinations of matter in meteoric stones are different from those of cosmical origin, yet the elements are the same ; “they are the only means by which we can be brought in possible contact with that which is foreign to our planet.” Humboldt's Cosmos. vol.1, p. 186.

bodies and minds so variously, and of which our bodies and all other organic bodies are composed, there are only 60 kinds of matter.!

But still more worthy of our admiration is it, that it is now demonstrated by the persevering efforts of Wollaston, Dalton, Gay Lussac, Thenard, Thomson, Berzelius, and others, that there are, in each of these elementary kinds of substances, certain ultimate particles, or atoms, beyond which chemical analysis cannot carry us. Thus the question so long agitated concerning the infinite divisibility of matter is at length settled. These are not the "monads" of Democritus, nor the animated particles of Buffon, nor the "numbers" of Plato and Pythagoras; nor the small portions of space made impenetrable by some; nor the mathematical points of Boscovich, but indestructible, intransmutable, and infinitely small solid particles of matter, the direct objects of creative power. As Newton, long ago expressed it, "the author of nature in the beginning formed matter in solid, massy, hard, impenetrable particles, of such sizes and figures as most conduced to the end for which He created them." This is the inference, and the argument of Sir John Herschell, so often quoted, that where so many separate things are exactly alike, this is inconsistent with chance, and implies some cause in operation independent of themselves, and antecedent to their existence. As they are found in combination in certain definite and unalterable proportions, essential to the nature of such substance thus compounded, this shows that this has been arranged by some mind; they could not have given themselves this quality, both of existing and combining in exactly always the same proportion; each kind of matter having its own shape and size and weight of particles.* Our minds of necessity infer here intention, purpose, from the facts in the case. And that the qualities of these particles are not necessary, but are subject to the will and direction of their creator, will appear further, when we come to speak of their combining in multiple proportions.

We have spoken of the size and weight of these atoms; and though we cannot inspect them individually, yet according to Prout's law, we know their relative weight as compared with hydrogen, which, entering into combination in smaller proportion than any other known substance, is taken for unity, though we know not its weight. And the farther analysis has proceeded, the more this law has been verified, decimal fractions dropped, and the combining numbers of the elements stated in whole numbers. Just as in arithmetic, it is common to say, "three barley corns

* Religion of Geology, page 153. Sir J. Herschell on the study of Nat. Philosophy, sec. 27.

make one inch; twelve inches make one foot," &c., while the length of the barley corn itself at the base is undetermined; so we say of these elements, they enter into union with one another, carbon, in the proportion of 6; sulphur of 16; oxygen, 8; iron, 28, &c., meaning in each case so many *times the weight of the number that stands for* hydrogen. It is well known, too, that those substances which are capable of existing in the form of vapor, unite also in regular proportions by *volume*, at the same time that they do by weight, but the numbers that express their *volumes*, are different from the weights.*

Whether the atomic theory as held by the ancients be true or not; or whatever assumptions may be necessary to make these facts coincide with that, these are not only observed facts, but demonstrated laws; and though they relate to matters so small, they are among the most astonishing discoveries of modern times, lying at the foundation of all chemical science, giving it a mathematical basis, and rendering it an exact science.

That these atoms are minute beyond all our comprehension, will appear in various ways. It has been estimated that a grain of gold can be divided *mechanically* so that 80,000,000,000,000 of parts can be seen by the eye, and the presumption is that *chemical* division would carry it still farther. Ehrenburg, the Prussian naturalist, discovered the fossil shells of animalcules so minute that 41,000,000,000 only filled the space of a cubic inch; how many particles then in each separate shell? He also speaks of infusoria so small that 500,000,000 of them exist in a drop of water, and find ample sea-room. And these, too, not mere inorganic particles, endowed with vitality; but furnished with digestive and respiratory organs; with circulating juices, and contrivances just as elaborate as those of the higher orders of animals. What then must we think of the ultimate particles that compose each organ, of each animal?† It is probable that each one contains millions.

Above, how high, progressive life may go:
Around, how wide, how deep extend below!

As in the heavens that roll over our heads there are objects so vast, motions so swift, distances so immense, that astonished thought recoils upon itself at their contemplation; so when the mind is directed to that no less wonderful world under our feet; to the infinite descent of animated existence; and to these as only the starting points of another infinitesimal series of magnitudes,

*We have omitted to speak of the sesqui series, and of isomorphs.

†"The milky way and the fixed stars of animal life which the microscope reveals to us.

Natura in minimis maxima est. See Lyell's Elements Vol. I, page 53. Mantell's Wonders, Vol. II, p. 900.

so far down as almost to realise the idea of mathematical points that have position but not magnitude; we are here no less than in the other case, filled with wonder and amazement, at the wisdom and power of that God, who shows his signs in the minute, as well as in the vast.

And those who have led us into these secret and minute operations of nature, deserve to have their names recorded with those, who have made such revelations in the oceans of space; "detected stars in their deep recess, widened creation," written their names in heaven, and bounded their fame by the limits of the universe.

The law of multiple proportions is still more astonishing; that when elements unite in more proportions than one, they always bear some simple relation to one another. And the same substance whether made in the beginning by the direct action of the Creator; composed by the regular operation of His natural laws at any time since; or by the chemist in his laboratory to day; or by ten thousand men in different parts of the earth at the same time, is always found to contain the same elements *combined in the same way*. This law men cannot alter any more than they can move the sun from his course. If we vary the proportion and the arrangement of the particles, we change the nature of the product.

For instance, if we take the most common substance, water; we find both by analysis, and by synthesis.

1. One atom of hydrogen, weight 1, and one atom oxygen, 8 times as heavy.

2. One atom of hydrogen, weight 1, and two of oxygen, 16.

3. Ozone, one atom of hydrogen, weight 1, and three of oxygen, 24.

This fact itself, that bodies combine in regular proportion by weight, shows contrivance, and forethought; but much more striking is it, when we consider that with each molecule of one ingredient added, the other remaining the same, we have a different substance. The properties of each successive product, have been determined upon separately: and so different are they, that it is the same in the end as if the number of elements had been indefinitely increased. And here is to our view a strong argument against the necessary existence and properties of matter. For if so, then the more of any kind in a combination, the more the product, at every step, must partake of the qualities and properties of that one; just as when we dissolve common salt in water, the more we advance towards saturation, the stronger is the taste of the salt. The increase of the particles of any one kind, could not change the nature of the new substance. But how is it here? We all know the nature of water—when pure, it is colorless, inodorous, tasteless; freezing at 32 deg. &c. But when we add to it another portion of oxygen, and instead of the pro-

portions 1 to 8, we have 1 to 16, we then produce one of the most singular liquids known. It is not like hydrogen, oxygen, water, or anything else. It is about once and a half as heavy as water, nauseous and disgusting to the taste; and no degree of cold has ever reduced it to a solid form. It whitens the skin, and is very easily decomposed; and while water enters into a great variety of compounds, this has no tendency to unite with other bodies. The change in this case is just as great, and the properties are as much contrasted with water, simply by adding one proportion of one ingredient, as would be in the solution of salt, if after proceeding to a certain point, upon adding more saline particles, it became sweet! And singular as these facts are, the addition of a third portion of oxygen is no less so, if the composition of oxone be what is now supposed, for it is not easy to obtain it pure, and to analyse it quantitatively.*

It has the smell of chlorine; is in a gaseous form; has powerful oxydising agencies; rapidly destroys organic substances, and is supposed to exist abundantly in the atmosphere. Why should two portions of oxygen make a heavy liquid but *three*, a light gas?

The union of nitrogen and oxygen, illustrates these laws more perfectly perhaps than any other case furnished by chemistry. We have,

1. Protoxide of nitrogen,	1. atom nit. weight 14,	and 1. oxygen,	8.
2. Deutoxide	1. " " "	14, "	2. " 16.
3. Hyponitrous acid,	1. " " "	14, "	3. " 24.
4. Nitrous acid,	1. " " "	14, "	4. " 32.
5. Nitric acid,	1. " " "	14, "	5. " 40.

Now let us briefly examine each of these compounds. The first is the well known laughing gas, which, when inhaled in small quantities, produces pleasing sensations, and insensibility to pain; these effects soon pass off without injury; it is also colorless.

But what a contrast in the second, which differs only by one atom of oxygen. It is *poisonous*, cannot be tasted, inhaled, or even smelled; and the *attempt* to inhale it is most dangerous. It is colorless, but when mixed with the air forms red fumes.

The third at ordinary temperatures is a *blue liquid*, but very volatile, and in the form of vapor is *red*.

The fourth is a liquid, colorless when cold, straw yellow when warm, orange yellow when warmer; deep red in vapor and very corrosive.

The fifth is the well known aqua-fortis, once and a half as

*" Shown by Bunsen to be a combination of one atom of hydrogen with three of oxygen," Reguault's Ch. Vol. II. p. 38.

heavy as water, stains the skin yellow, and is one of the most powerful agents known. And yet the proportion of the ingredients is not so very different from the composition of the atmosphere. Oxygen itself is not poisonous, with one portion of nitrogen it is most pleasant to breathe; why then such a change of properties by adding 2, 3 or 4 more atoms to it? Certainly here is proof that the qualities of matter are not necessary, but contingent, and that the relations established among the atoms, is the result of a preconceived idea—a purpose of an intelligent agent. Let any intelligent being inspect the numbers that express the constitution of these substances, and he would say at once, before he knew how different they were in nature, that according to the doctrine of probabilities, there are all odds against any chance in the case. There are many other cases where a very small variation in the ingredients of a compounds, produce a great difference in its nature.

Calomel is a very insoluble tasteless powder, safe and mild. Corrosive sublimate is very soluble, distressingly nauseous to the taste, and a deadly poison. One is contrasted with the other in many points, and yet the difference is only in one atom of chlorine. If we take two atoms of carbon, and one of nitrogen, and unite them, we have a colorless gas with a peculiar smell, which can be reduced to a volatile liquid, and burns with a blue flame. Now if we add to this one atom of hydrogen, which is the smallest atom known, and which equals only the one twenty-sixth part of the previous compound, we shall have that fearful poison, prussic acid.

A little charcoal, a little nitrogen which we inhale with every breath, and which enters into all vegetables and animals, with the smallest conceivable portion of hydrogen, all of them the simplest substances imaginable, united chemically, make one of the most violent poisons known; one drop on the tongue of a dog kills him instantly.* No one could have produced the nature of this compound, from a knowledge of each element in it. And the same is true in ten thousand combinations known to chemists. There are most astonishing changes in density, color, state; solid, liquid, and gaseous; in properties, from mild and safe to the most virulent poisons. Some uniting with others readily, and others not at all; as if, as Kepler supposed, they had the power of choice. These laws, however, give stability to the constitution of things around us; and what we have found to be true in one case, we can calculate upon again. Without this we should have no science; we could have no forethought, or plan for the future; all

* It is employed in medicine, but diluted with 97 parts in 100 pure water, and then a safe dose is 2 to 3 drops in a glass of water. Turner's Chem. pp. 556-558.

would be doubt, uncertainty, stagnation. A hand guided by infinite wisdom has adjusted the number of elementary substances, their relative amounts in the earth; the size and weight of the molecules of each, and the different effect of combining them in fewer or in larger numbers, so as to *fill different offices* according to their relations—just as if they changed their nature with such changes—as a writer in the apocrypha remarks, “thou hast formed all things in number, weight and measure.”* Every particle of matter, whether elementary or a compound molecule, proclaims, “the hand that made us is Divine.” Not *words* alone are signs of his ideas, of things existing in his mind before creation, but *works*, things, tangible objects, by means of which he converses with those who are capable of hearing his voice, where there is no sound audible to the ear. “Every rock in the desert, every boulder on the plain, every pebble by the brook side, every grain of sand on the sea shore, is replete with lessons of wisdom to the mind that is fitted to receive and comprehend their sublime import.” And, as Dr. Channing remarks, “science undoubtedly brings vast aids, but it is to *prepared* minds”—“nature explored by science is a witness of the infinite.”

But there is one other point to be noticed before we leave this part of our subject. There are numerical relations between the atomic weights of certain classes of substances which cannot be accidental.

cThus Sulphur is 16; Selenium, 40; and Tellurium 64; here the middle number is half the sum of the extremes, and the properties of the substance are intermediate between the others. So with Chlorine, 35, Bromine 80; Iodine 127, very nearly. So with the Alkalies, Potassium, 39; Sodium, 23; Lithium, 65. So with the Earths, Barium, 68.5; Strontium, 43.8; Calcium, 20.† These numerical relations are more fully carried out, in reference to other properties of the elements in Silliman’s Journal;‡ where it is said by the writer, “These various facts force upon me the conviction that this relation between the atomic weights is not a matter of chance, but that it was a part of the grand plan of the Framer of the universe, and that in the very deviations from the law, there will hereafter be found fresh evidence of the *wisdom and forethought of its Divine Author.*”

These added to the multiple proportions, and the constancy of the atomic numbers, show *constituted*, not *accidental* relations; and the argument is cumulative, for there are affiliations of density, solubility, &c., at the same time.

Here are combinations of laws, or modes in which the forces of

* Wisdom, 11; 20.

† Mantell’s Wonders of theology. Title-page Vol. II.

‡ Annual Scientific Discovery, 1852, p. 167.

§ May, 1854, page 397.

matter act, which cannot originate with matter. There is too much symmetry, order, method. The end of wisdom is design, and that implies a designer.*

The "mind of man is in some measure of the same nature as the Divine mind of the Creator. The laws that man discovers in the creation must be laws known to God. The truths—for instance, the truths of geometry, which man sees to be true, God must also see to be true." *Plurality of Worlds*, page 276.

But it is among the products of organized beings that the most astonishing changes and the most singular numerical relations are found: There are groups, families, homologous series of substances which required great art to discover, much more to form and endow with such properties.

And though by the course of argument that we have marked out to ourselves, we are excluded from the domain of organisms; yet not from the products, or educts, derived naturally, or formed artificially from them; and which are not themselves organized—for we are arguing from law, order, method, evidencing rational intuition, as distinct from organization, on which ordinarily the great strength is laid. When such substances as gums, resins, oils, &c., are separated from the influence of the vital force; or new combinations of elements are formed chemically from those that were first united by that influence, then they may be regarded as under the same laws as unorganized bodies. Organic beings are characterized by the small number of their constituent elements and the high proportion in which they combine; as well as by the mode of their combination, and the peculiarity of that mysterious force called vital, by which they are held together; but when it ends, chemical forces remove their sway, having been all the time before, pressing upon the former so as to make life a war with death.

The common opinion is, that organic beings are composed of a different kind of matter from the various portions of it in the universal kingdom. But the great mass of such beings consists of only four of the most common elements. Carbon, Hydrogen, Oxygen and Nitrogen†; and only about 14 can enter into them, about the same in number as those that make up a large part of the world; though not identically the same. And these, when disengaged return to the great reservoir of matter in the earth, to repeat the same course in some new organism, from which perhaps arose originally, the idea of the transmigration of souls.

And here at the outset a most remarkable fact meets us—that by the employment of the chemical and mechanical forces at our command, we can decompose organisms, and produce artificially

* This argument is forcibly stated in *Preadamite Earth*, page 72.

† In addition to the 4 mentioned above we may have, Potash, Soda, Lime, Silica, Oxide of Iron, Magnesia, Sulphur, Phosphorus, Chlorine and Fluorine.

some of the excretions of living beings, but here we are stopped by a higher law; we put the right elements together, in right proportions, we make a regular chemical compound, and perhaps a crystal—but with all our art, and the powers of mere nature to aid us, we cannot *organise* a particle of woody fibre (the same as gum and starch) or of animal muscle. It might seem at first view as though we could approach very near the result, but we find a wide distance between what we can effect, and a seed even, that will vegetate: what this vitality consists in, or how it is acquired is the great mystery.

Nature is nothing but a collection of laws, and modes of operation. The greatest human geniuses possess themselves of these. They apply them: they operate in accordance with her teaching, for they can do nothing otherwise.

Now then, if there were any inherent powers in mere brute matter; any forces or laws by which nature, unaided by human skill and science, ever did, or ever could originate an organism, she could do it now; for she is not effete in these last days.

No *mere* chemical or mechanical movements of matter can educe vital action; but when life is given, it may employ those agencies; this is well expressed by Liebig:* “The best definition of life involves something more than mere reproduction, namely, the idea of an active power, exercised by virtue of a definite form, and production, and generation in a definite form. By chemical agency, we shall some day be able to produce the *constituents* of muscular fibre, skin and hair: but we cannot form by their means an organized tissue, or an organic cell. The production of organs, the co-operation of a system of organs, and their power not only to produce their component parts from the food presented to them, but to generate themselves in their original form, and with all their properties, are characters, belonging exclusively to organic life, and constitute a form of reproduction independent of chemical powers. The chemical forces are subject to the invisible cause by which this form is produced. Of the existence of this cause itself, we are made aware by the phenomena which it produces. * * * *

The chemical forces are subordinate to this cause of life, just as they are to electricity, heat, mechanical motion, and friction. By the influence of the latter forces, they suffer changes in their direction, an increase or diminution of their intensity, or a complete cessation or reversal of their action. The vital principle is only known to us through the peculiar form of its instruments, that is, through the organs in which it resides. Hence, whatever kind of energy a substance may possess, if it is amorphous and

* *Ag. Chem.* Ed. N. York, 1849, pp. 37, &c., 104.

destitute of organs, from which the impulse of motion or change proceeds, it does not live. Its energy in this case depends on a chemical action. Light, heat, and electricity, or other influences, may increase, diminish, or arrest this action, but they are not its efficient cause.

In this way the vital principle *governs* the chemical powers, in the living body, and this is particularly apparent in regard to vegetable life." Again, speaking of the power that plants have of assimilation, to produce certain parts of themselves, he says it exceeds the most powerful chemical action." The best idea of it may be found, by considering that it surpasses in power the strongest galvanic batteries, with which we are not able to separate the oxygen from carbonic acid." Howmuchsoever then, any may be disposed to disparage "brute unconscious materialism," and to lay the whole stress upon the "dispositions of matter," we see that chemical laws underlie all organization, and are the instruments employed by the vital force, while no operation of theirs will produce the latter.

Organic chemistry, instead of being as formerly a mere mass of unconnected facts—a perfect wilderness—is now gradually assuming a regular shape—in which, if anywhere, beauty and lucid order prevails.

And it is wonderful how great a variety of compounds can be formed from a few elements, by varying the arrangement of the atoms. And, as in the common form of the argument, much detail must be allowed for its full exhibition, we hope that we shall not be considered tedious, if we bring forward some of those singular groups—homologous series of compounds, so intimately related to one another. Let us commence with the methylic.

Series.	Ethers.	Alcohols.	Sulphurets.	Mercaptaus
Hydrogen—H.	Water—HO.			
Methyle—C ₂ H ₃ .	Ox. Meth.—C ₂ H ₃ O	C ₂ H ₃ O, Ho.	C ₂ H ₃ S.	C ₂ H ₃ S, HS.
Ethyle—C ₄ H ₅ .	Ox. Eth.—C ₄ H ₅ O	C ₄ H ₅ O, Ho.	C ₄ H ₅ S.	C ₄ H ₅ S, HS.
Propyle—C ₆ H ₇ .	Ox. Pro.—C ₆ H ₇ O	C ₆ H ₇ O, Ho.	C ₆ H ₇ S.	C ₆ H ₇ S, HS.
Butyle—C ₈ H ₉ .	Ox. But.—C ₈ H ₉ O	C ₈ H ₉ O, Ho.	C ₈ H ₉ S.	C ₈ H ₉ S, HS.
Amyle—C ₁₀ H ₁₁ .	Ox. Am.—C ₁₀ H ₁₁ O	C ₁₀ H ₁₁ O, Ho.	C ₁₀ H ₁₁ S.	H ₁₁ , C ₁₀ S, HS.

Now if even a person knew nothing about chemistry, and would inspect the mere formulas that represent so many different substances; not only in each column vertically, but also across the page, he must see that here is evidence of mind—that all this symmetry could not arise from chance. Paley begins his argument with the construction of a watch. Suppose we had never seen a watch made, or the maker, but different men at different times, and in various parts of the world had discovered the parts of a watch and had brought them together and found them to be related to one another, and fitted to one end—and as part after part was added, it would appear what parts were yet deficient to

fill out here and there, and the discovery of these would be predicted, because the mind of the inspector could see that there was a complete plan in the mind of the maker; all this would scarcely be a stronger case than this series of homologous bodies; and there are many more of the same kind.* It is thought that the first, or left hand column, can be extended to 60 Carbon, and 61 Hydrogen, in the same way; and as we rise in the scale the density, and the boiling point rise also. Many are known higher in the scale, in the column of Ethers. The Alcohols are all formed from sugar, which is $C_{12} H_{12} O_{12}$, while vinegar is $C_4 H_4 O_4$. Their boiling point, rises 34 deg. at every step—and some have been discovered in the series as high as 60 Carbon, 61 Hydrogen.

Another most remarkable series is formed by prefixing $N H_2$ to each member of the first column, $N H_2 H$, &c.

“No series more striking than this. Its discovery was predicted by Liebig just ten years before it was made, and the properties of the compounds belonging to it plainly indicated.”†

The series of Aldehydes is also an interesting one, commencing with $C_2 H_2 O_2$, and at each step adding $C_2 H_2$; and from that, we have a most remarkable series of acids formed by adding to each of the last, 2 portions of oxygen, and extending it on to Mellissic Acid, $C_{60} H_{60} O_4$. As Whewell remarks, “such properties of numbers, thus connected in an incomprehensible manner with fundamental and extensive laws of nature give to number an appearance of mysterious importance and efficiency.”‡ Why is not this symmetry of numerical relations just as striking, as symmetry of parts in an organism? If in some of our Western territories, we found the trees of any kind arranged in regular rows, over thousands of acres, or even in a small space; and especially if they were fruit trees, should we not infer that they had been arranged by some one on purpose? Here is care, forethought—it is not such as is found to be the spontaneous growth of nature anywhere in the world—it could not have happened by chance. The inference is not from the *trees* as such, but from their arrangement. In precise accordance with what we are contending for—it was long since proposed to make signals to the inhabitants of the Moon, and to correspond with them, “by erecting on the plains of Liberia a geometrical figure, because, (it is said) a correspondence with them could only be begun by means of such mathematical contemplations and ideas which we and they must have in common; they might recognise it and erect

* Eneyc. Britt. 8th Ed. Vol. VI. p. 507.

† This argument is stronger than that from the watch, for in that case we may call for a designer for the watch-maker.

‡ Phil. Ind. Sc. Vol. I. p. 24.

one in reply.”*

The next great fact that we adduce in the course of our argument is Crystallization. The force that produces this is the same as solidification in all other cases. It is only one degree below the vital force where evidences of contrivance and design are ordinarily looked for. But just as, in Geology we descend till we reach the vanishing point of life and organization in the crystalline rocks ; and, as in rank we descend from the most perfect and complex, to the most simple forms of organised beings, till we come to the Zoophyte Sponge, the lowest in the scale ; † so on the other side, we ascend with a *kind* of organization, less complete indeed, but scarcely less wonderful, the arrangement of molecules of brute matter, in regular mathematical shapes, mostly with plane surfaces, often of great beauty, and sometimes of vast size. There is a great variety of symmetrical forms, but they can be reduced to a few primitive ones, ‡ as in the case of Calc Spar, of which there are several hundred secondary shapes, but all are found to be modifications of one primitive nucleus, a rhombohedron. This is the law that Bergman first discovered, and Hany demonstrated and made the base of his system.

That in every crystallized substance, though different figures may arise from modifying circumstances, there is, in all its crystals, a primitive form, the nucleus, invariably the same in each substance, originating, by the addition of successive laminae, all the forms we meet with. § This primitive form can be detected by mechanical means, and as in the case of Calc Spar, just referred to, the angle of inclination of whose sides is $105^{\circ}5'$, the angles of all these primitive forms, are invariable in the same substance ; and often very nearly alike in the same family ; thus the Carbonate of Lime, of Magnesia, of Iron, of Manganese, of Zinc, of Lime and Magnesia combined, vary in their angles only from $105^{\circ}05'$, to $107^{\circ}40'$, and between these two limits, so small, Breithaupt makes 24 sub-divisions. Just as every animal and plant has its own peculiar configuration, which it does not lose or change in any great degree, in any age, or in any part of the world, but nature is fast bound, so it is in the mineral kingdom. As every seed has its own body, so does every elementary kind of matter have its own type. And it is singular and worthy of remark, that there is so wide a distinction between the substances

*Dick Celles, scenery, Harper's Fam. Lib. p. 273.

†Koget, Bridgewater, Treatise, Vol. 1. page 119. speaks of "infusory animalcules arranging themselves as if by a kind of organic crystallization." Mantell, Wonders of Geology Vol. I. page 195. speaks of nearly five hundred varieties of crystallized Carbonate of lime. Hany assumed six primary forms as the base of his system—some reckon fifteen.

‡Generally 18 or 14.

§We purposely omit Isomorphs here. See Eucy. Brit. 8th. Ed. Chemistry.

organized by the vital force, and those which owe their structure to molecular forces ; that while the former are invariably bounded by curve hues,* the latter are enclosed by plane surfaces. And yet they both nearly meet at their lowest point, and diverge. And it is only here that we have bodies of a rectilinear figure ; the earth, and all the heavenly bodies with which we are acquainted are spherical, and move in curves. And the agency, residing in matter with which we are daily conversant, which is capable of arranging molecules, into perfect mathematical figures, without the aid or control of man, is indeed wonderful. The fact that this force is untrollable by man is seen in the freezing of water ; which congeals in filaments crossing one another at angles of 60 and 120 degrees ; “they are aciculae dovetailed into each other, and producing a continuous transparent mass.” *Regn. Chem. Vol. 1. p. 97.* Water adheres to this law with an irresistible force ; and it is said that a globe of it, one inch in diameter, expands with a force equal to 13½ tons. 96 different forms of snow-flakes have been observed in the Arctic regions.

In the appropriate circumstances, when we give it an opportunity, and it is free to move, each particle seeks its like ; unites, arranges itself in its proper place and order, wherever it is needed around the central nucleus to fill out the solid angles, and complete the terminations, just as if it had voluntary motion and choice ; as if it had discretion, where to attach itself. So much is this the case that a crystal which is deficient or broken may be placed in the proper solution, and the parts wanting may be filled out.† This certainly looks like design, and is very much like the various matters in solution in the blood of animals, depositing themselves only where they are needed, as when a bone is broken phosphate of lime is brought and left there ; and what is needful to form the nails, is deposited at the ends of the fingers, and not in the teeth.

We call that force which accomplishes such wonderful results, attraction, but mere attraction is a blind power ; here is selection, order, method, working by the principles of mathematics ; not a mere solidification in a confused manner. The particles of different kinds of matter are just like so many soldiers with different kinds of uniform—all alike in one respect as *men*, but with specific differences by which they are distinguished, and all marshalled into distinct bodies, and performing, each kind, its own distinct evolutions under the command of one great officer.

And we are to remember that though a variety of substances may be in solution together, even salts of different colors, as nitre

*We are aware that the stem of the *Pentecrinus* is pentagonal ; and that the stems of some plants are angular.

† *Mrs. Somerville Con. Phys. Sciences, p. 105*

and sulphate of copper, white and blue, yet each kind will marshal itself under its own leader, without regard to the others that may be present, just as a swarm of bees, though mixed at first with a great variety of other insects, will at length separate themselves, and settle down in one mass.

This fact is often improved in the arts, in the separation and purification of many salts; and it is well known that when salt water freezes, the salt and impurities present are excluded from the crystal.

Professor Whewell remarks that "bodies never crystallize but when their elements combine chemically; and solid bodies which combine, when they do it most completely and exactly, also crystallize."*

This is the highest point that nature can attain to, by chemical and mechanical laws, without something else superadded from abroad. It approaches the lowest degree of organization, but stops at its own fixed limit. It cannot energize a seed. The elder Silliman calls it "the most exalted agency of the mineral kingdom."†

Dana says, "the student of mineralogy who is interested in observing the impress of Infinite Wisdom in nature around him, finds abundant pleasure in examining the forms and varieties of structure which minerals assume, and in tracing out the principles and laws which creative power has established even throughout lifeless matter, giving it an organization, though simple, *no less perfect than that characterizing animate beings.*"‡

And again, he speaks of "the organizing force of the so called inorganic kingdom," of which all the grandeur of physical nature is the result. And we may say that forms produced by it are just as constant, as the distinct and unchanging individuality of animal and vegetable types. As Prof. Lewis remarks, "God makes types and nature prints them." As in anatomy there is, as Cuvier has shown, a fixed relation between all parts of the animal frame, so that if you have one, you can calculate the rest; so here there are laws of numerical relations, in the position of the bounding planes, and the axes of crystals, so that they can be made the subject of calculation.§

Harris remarks that "affinity finds its perfection in crystallization. This appears to be the highest state of mere inorganic nature. It involves the idea of numerical and developed sym-

* Philosophy of Inductive Science, vol. 1, p. 353, and his definition of a crystal is, "that portion of any mineral substance which is determined by crystalline forces acting to the same axes."

† Bakewell's Geology, Ed. 1832. p. 413.

‡ Mineralogy, small ed. p. 14. Large ed. 1850, p. 125. Do. p. 41.

§Six days of Creation, Ref. 5.

metry. A body perfectly crystallized, and exhibiting not merely geometrical symmetry of outward shape, but showing by its cleavage, its transparency, its uniform and determinate optical properties, that the same regularity pervades every portion of the mass, is an object for the production of which every great physical law and element of nature appears to have combined—suggesting to the imagination a beautiful pre-intimation of the coming flower.*

As the world now is, where there are so many obstacles to the full operation of the molecular force by which crystals are formed, and the particles are not in solution, or otherwise conditioned, to allow of freedom of motion; yet, this force has operated to a greater degree than most persons are apt to consider. And some of the same classes of crystals which are cut and set as gems, are formed of a large size. Among the most abundant materials of inorganic nature is silica, or quartz; and of this crystals occur sometimes of an enormous size. “A group in the museum of the university of Naples weighs nearly half a ton. A crystal at Milan weighs 870 pounds; another at Paris, 800 pounds; † one crystal at Tinken was of the same size; a group at Dartmouth College weighs 147 pounds.

A spinel is mentioned of 49 pounds weight.

A topaz at Stockholm weighs 80 pounds. Beryls are found in New Hampshire weighing 240 pounds.

It is well known that many crystals can be formed artificially.

We see something of the same nature in the famous columns of basalt in the Giant's Causeway in Ireland, which are regular prisms, from 20 to 200 feet in height. Similar phenomena are seen at Fingal's Cave in Staffa; and in this country; particularly in the region of lake Superior, as exhibited in Owen's report on the geology of Wisconsin, &c. ‡ And if all the cavities in the earth, filled with the products of her great glass house, could be laid open to view, we should see objects of beauty and grandeur, surpassing doubtless all that has ever been imagined; beyond the wildest conceptions of the Arabian Nights. It need not be mentioned that all the older rocks are crystalline.

Now this rigid immutable order—this adherence of every substance to its own form—this regularity in the angles of crystals with mathematical exactness, with other accompanying circumstances peculiar to the many different species, cannot arise from chance—from the fortuitous concurrence of atoms.

* Pre Adamite Earth, page 90.

† Presented by Napoleon in 1795 to the Cabinet of the Garden of Plants. Silliman's Travels, vol. 1, p. 128. Garnets three or four inches in diameter are found at Fahlun in Sweden.

‡ Pp. 384, 392, 401.

Here is rational intuition—an expression in a solid form of a preconceived idea; the revelation of mind and will; having acted and going on to act; with a constant tendency and effort to produce forms beautiful both by their regularity, their transparency, and their color. Here is something addressed to our minds, courting our investigation, and admiration, full as much as the flowers of the vegetable kingdom.

Here is the language of hieroglyphics, employed by a mind, behind the scene. Just as the skill of the bee in making her cell with mathematical precision, having the angles, and sides invariably the same; and so constructed as to afford the most capacity, and strength, with the least material; and yet she works all unconscious of the principles involved, and discovered by accurate calculation, being guided by her Maker, and expressing his knowledge through her; so just as much, is it the case, when the molecular force arranges particles, so as to form a hexagonal prism of quartz with its hexagonal pyramid, and the surfaces polished equal to the skill of any lapidary. The works in both cases are perfect—principles are followed with unerring certainty, always and everywhere. In both, there is an agency, the ultimate effects of which we must admire, though inexplicable by our boasted reason; for “swift instinct leaps, while slow reason feebly climbs.” “In that, ’tis God directs, in this ’tis man.” “The same *mind*, that bids the spider parallels design, sure as DeMoivre, without lead and line.” The same here as in inorganic nature, which is to Him, a body; He the soul, but not in the sense, of either the ancient or modern infidel poets.

Humboldt says,* “those forces to which we apply the term chemical affinity, act upon molecules in contact, or at infinitely minute distances from one another, and *animate* equally the inorganic world, and animal, and vegetable tissues.”

“If we were interrogating any class of the phenomena of the physical world, in astronomy, suppose, or chemistry or the morphology of vegetation or crystallization, and in the course of our enquiries were to detect some numerical law, or series of numerical relations, we should generally speaking acknowledge the law or the relations to be real and the effect of design, even in cases where they do not admit of being exactly verified as matter of fact.” †

In the earth beneath, we see a great variety of these, as well as Kepler’s, Pode’s, and Newton’s laws in relation to the magnitudes, times and distances of the heavenly bodies; and all making one grand, uniform system, and having one object. And this is

*Cosmos. vol. 1, p. 63.

† Browne, *Ordo Saeclorum*; Int. page 14.

abundantly set forth by McCosh, on Divine Government, particularly when speaking of the prevalence of general laws. They are adapted to lead our minds up to their Great Author, to educate and train them to the love of order and harmony; both in intellectual and moral things. We learn to reason by studying geometry; why not then, by contemplating the geometry which God works, by resolving in our minds the thoughts that originated in His mind, learn to think in the same channel?

Sir Joshua Reynolds in giving advice to a young painter, says: "With regard to the pictures that you are to choose for your models, I would have you take those of established reputation. The habit of contemplating and brooding over the *ideas of great geniuses* till you find yourself warmed by the contact, is the true method of forming an artist-like mind."* How much more then, the ideas of the Great Master Genius, in whose mind dwelt all ideas of beauty, order and harmony, before they received expression in a visible form? Who works all things by number, measure, weight, and time? Who weighs the mountains in scales, the hills in a balance, and measures the waters of the ocean in the hollow of his hand?

" He tells the heart,
He meant, He made us to behold and love
What He beholds and loves, the general orb
Of life and being; to be great like Him,
Beneficent and active. Thus the men
Whom nature's works can charm, with God himself
Hold converse; grow familiar, day by day,
With His conceptions, act upon His plan;
And form to His, the relish of their souls."

And may we not say that these laws, particularly those that relate to crystallization, have a bearing on the future?

It is generally admitted, at least by geologists, that the interior of the earth is in a state of fusion; we need not now go fully into the proof of this—as the increase of heat as we descend, about 1 deg. for every 45 or 50 feet—the 300 active volcanoes throwing out enormous quantities of liquid lava, &c. And that the various and powerful agencies constantly at work, tending to dissolve the solid crust of the earth, and to destroy all organisms on its surface, should some day act with greater intensity than now, and accomplish all that the Bible predicts, is highly probable from the deductions of science. Almost every one has heard of the remark of Pliny, that "it is the greatest of all miracles that a single day should pass without a universal conflagration."†

* This would be looking at the copy, instead of the original, for we cannot create, even in idea.

† Hist Mundi. Lib. cap. 107.

We have already remarked that crystallization is the same as solidification, and that the reason why we do not see it in operation in a greater degree, is that it is held in check. The molecular forces cannot come into play. Mobility may be given to the particles, 1, by fusion; 2, by solution; 3, by vaporizing them; or 4, by an elevation of temperature while in a solid state. But all these depend upon the operation of heat, and the powers of galvanism and electricity. What a splendid field for crystallization then, when, as the apostle Peter tells us, "the elements shall melt with fervent heat," and "*all these things shall be dissolved*?"*

This will include every circumstance necessary for any kind of matter, to assume its own symmetrical form. Whether a state of vapor is needed, or fusion, or solution in some liquid; every particle will have an opportunity to seek its like; when all traces of organization shall have been obliterated, and there will be nothing left but a mass of mineral matter, and that "*dissolved*." The whole world will be under the control of chemical affinity, molecular forces, galvanism, electricity, &c., until it may please the Great Creator, by direct interference, to restore organized beings. What then must result, according to what we see now, or can foresee by the light of science, but the production of crystals on a scale of massive grandeur, never yet witnessed, unless among the icebergs of the Arctic circle, or among the Alps.

The same circumstances will recur, as when most of the most valuable crystals we now have were formed, except that it is hardly probable that the state of fusion in former times, was as general and complete as it will then be. By the operation of these laws *then*, we have the most splendid crystallizations which nature furnishes. The emerald, the topaz, the sapphire, and other kindred gems, were elaborated during the supposed chaotic state of the globe; for no earlier products have yet been discovered than those most perfect illustrations of crystallographical, chemical, and electrical laws."† "Crystallization is indeed not exclusively the attribute of primitive regions; but in such regions it is eminently conspicuous; and if we find crystals in the productions of every geological age, we are thus furnished with proof that those agencies continued to operate, although with less frequency and energy, through all succeeding periods, and that they have not ceased *even in our own times*, for mineral crystals are every moment forming around us." "I have seen even quartz crystals form rapidly under my eye, and others have cited them as slowly produced with regularity

*2, Pet. 3. 10-12. The Apostle uses the verb λυώ three times, "to loosen to separate." This will not be a mere alteration of the surface, as in some of the past geological periods.

† Religion of Geology, p. 281.

and beauty from the fluoric solution of siliceous earth. Crystals of pyroxene, specular iron, titanium and other minerals have been produced by volcanic and furnace heat; more than 40 species of minerals have been observed in the slags of furnaces.* And again, "the only powers with which we are acquainted, that are at all equal to the effect, are water and fire, aided by various acid, alkaline, saline, and other energetic chemical agents." Unless interfered with then, these powers, which have always acted more or less, will, in the universal dissolution, operate to the highest degree.

And let us remember that even the gems that we value so much for their rarity, beauty, and durability, are of the same substances that we daily tread under foot, only in a finer, purer form. The diamond, the most precious of all, is carbon—charcoal—and what will prevent all the carbon in organic nature, in the beds of coal, and in the atmosphere, from taking the form of the diamond? The agate, amethysts, chalcedony, and a great variety of others, are the same for the most part, as the sands of the sea shore, and that enters so largely into all our rocks and soil. Why not form immense six sided prisms? The sapphire and topaz contain alumina that is found in all clays, and the most common rocks; † why may not these, as well as beryls and emeralds, be found in size like the prisms of Giant's Causeway?

For the Great Artist has only to call into action His own laws, not of affinity alone, but of corpuscular attraction, and the whole surface of the globe (especially if there is no more sea) will shoot up, as if by magic, a boundless profusion of the richest gems, and of the largest size, rising as Milton's Pandemonium did, "like an exhalation." This is the certain and natural consequence of that state of the earth, that science leads us to expect, and the bible warns us to look for. Just as He who calleth things that be not as though they were, spake the word at creation, and organized out of the most common mineral materials, all the organic kingdom, from the most minute infusory atoms, to man, the head of this world—and by a cyclical law they all return to the same condition again, as that in which they were at first.

Just as Adam and Eve, the highest product of divine art—or as the highest developed beauty of form, in a Helen, ‡ modeled after the picture of Zeuxis, and combining in one all the graces of the very chefs-d'oeuvre of Grecian art; as they are only the most common dust, and must return to that again; so, on the other

† Prof. Silliman, Bakewell's Geology, ed. New Haven, 1833, p. 430.

‡ The oriental ruby also.

‡ *ἡ δία γυναικῶν*, Ill. III. 171. See what enthusiasm a sight of her called forth, even from old men, in vs. 155—160. Eucy. Met. Vol. IX. pp. 405 406. These lines were added to the picture by the painter.

hand, when all this is completely dissolved, why may not he who makes all things beautiful in their season, cover the surface of the earth with the flowers of the mineral kingdom? With a *kind* of organization, if less complex, yet no less wonderful than what now occupies that surface?

As there have been five geological periods before us, the present must be the sixth—and that which succeeds the final conflagration will be the seventh and last; the final configuration that it is to have, the last change that it is to undergo. All things then would strictly be “made new;” this falls in too with what we might justly suppose, if as probably the great majority think this earth is to be the future residence of the saints. Our argument here from the past and present operation of these laws, and their tendency to effect vastly more, when obstacles are removed, is precisely like Butler’s, regarding the tendency of virtue and vice. “For their tendencies are essential, and founded in the nature of things; whereas the hindrances, to their becoming efforts are, in numberless cases, not necessary, but artificial only.” “And indeed, every natural tendency which is to continue, but which is hindered from becoming effort by only accidental causes, affords a presumption, that such tendency will, some time or other become effort.” Analogy, Part I. Ch. III.

And it is possible that some of the language of the Bible that has been considered figurative, may be the statement of a literal fact. As in Isa. 54: 11, 12, “I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires. And I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones.”* This is emblematical of Heaven, if not a real description of its beauty, purity, and glory. Ezekiel (38: 13) seems to imply that Eden, the garden of God, abounds in all kinds of precious stones. Tyre is represented as having been there and brought away “every precious stone;” “the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold;” “thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire.”

The city of New Jerusalem, Rev. XXI. is inconceivably splendid, from the abundance of such precious stones used in its construction. Its walls of jasper, its gates of pearls, its foundations garnished (where there is an allusion to the bride “*adorned*” with jewels, in verse 2, and expressed by the same word) with all manner of precious stones. Its pavement of rock crystal set in gold, is exceedingly rich, surpassing the mosaic floors of ancient or modern times. This vast structure is “the tabernacle of God with men;” “The throne of God and the Lamb;” “The true (real) tabernacle,

* Kimchi supposes that this may be taken literally. See also, Book of Tobit, 18: 16, 17.

which the Lord pitched, and not man." Heb. 8 : 5, "the greater and more perfect tabernacle," than that in the temple on earth, the one, into which Christ entered when he ascended on high, Heb. 9 : 12.

And as the holy of holies in the tabernacle of Moses, and in the temple of Solomon, both built after a divine model, exhibited to the eye, Ex. 25 : 9, 40, 26 ; 30, 1. Ch. 28 : 11, 12. Heb. 8 : 5, *was an exact cube*; so is this city that descends from God out of Heaven, Rev. 21 : 16. But this is the fundamental form, of all systems of crystals, and is not susceptible of variation. It is perfect; all the sides, the axes, the lateral edges, and solid angles, are equal. It is emblematical of that "righteousness," that is to dwell in the new earth, 2 Pet. 3 : 13. that is, of those righteous men who are to reside there permanently.*

And there is a wonderful fitness between *souls* renewed in the Divine image, with all their powers perfectly harmonized : and bodies, fashioned anew after the model of Christ's glorious body, Rev. 1 : 12—16. Danl. 7 : 9. Math. 17 : 2. Spiritual, pure, immortal, and perhaps in structure more resembling crystals than the present organizations; not adapted to sinful but to sinless beings, and constructed, as well as other objects around by the operation of laws that acted alone here, no one knows how long before there was any organization, and then having been held in check for so long a time, will resume their sway under the direction of him who established them.†

There is evidently some important reason why the Creator in every case has chosen this shape, the cubical, for his own peculiar dwelling, when all the heavenly bodies with which we are conversant, are spherical.

It is possible to conceive of the New Jerusalem, instead of having 12 separate layers in the sides each made of one kind of precious stone, as homogeneous in its structure, and the mention of so great a variety of gems may only be intended to indicate their prevailing colors, as in chap. 9 : 17, "breastplates of fire, jacinth, and brimstone," are of these several colors, see, chap. 1, 14—16.

And notwithstanding the criticism of Trench on the word

*It is a striking fact that Aristotle uses the figure of a cube as a symbol of perfection, Ethics Bk. I. Cap. X. Sec. 7. *Αμφω γαρ τετρασια*, Rhet. III. 11. There are at least seven important substances that crystalize in cubes; and many others in some modification of it, at the head of which is gold.

†The Seasons spiritualized by same author, pp. 14—35. Also, *Physical Theory of Another's Life*. "True Spiritual body shall [perhaps] be absolutely homogeneous in its elements, perfectly simple in its construction, and uniform in its structure :—a pure undiversified, uncompounded corporeity" p. 134.

φωστῆρ in Rev. 21, 11, making it equal to λυχνοσ in verse 23,* the circumstances would not indicate that, and there must be some reason for varying so important a word so soon. In the former passage, the apostle is describing the appearance of the city to the eye as it descended before him; this description continues to verse 22, when he tells us what was within it. And he informs us that it needs no external source of light, "to shine in it,"† for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof," 22, 5. "For the Lord God giveth them light." The light *outside* φωστῆρ is "like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal;" and the *light giver on the inside* is compared to the sun, the moon, and a candle, λυχνοσ. So that there is a difference between them. Now if we examine the precious stones that entered into the foundations, and perhaps constituted the sides of this glorious building, we shall find all the colors of the spectrum; those into which white light can be analysed by refraction, and almost in their proper order, beginning with the base. And it is a fact worthy of notice, the light from whatever source, from the sun, or from a candle, or from the most distant star, can be resolved into the same seven colors, by refraction. The city of the great King, then, is filled with perpetual radiance from His throne, who is Light, while that light passes through the walls, "clear as crystal," and on the outside, presents to the beholders all the colors of the rainbow. See chap. 4:3; 10:1; 1:28.

They upon whom is written the new name of the Saviour, within behold His face without a cloud, shining as the sun; they see Him as He is, with His perfections all blended, just as the seven colors of the rainbow are united in white light. And we know that in the bible, and especially in this book, seven is the number of perfection. But an observer on the outside, as in this world, only see glimpses of Deity, we see Him through some medium, so that each attribute and perfection is seen separately—nature reveals the infinite in the finite. Flesh and blood cannot endure the dazzling light of His throne. As the apostle says, 1 Cor. 13:12, "now we see, (not through a glass, i. e. a window but) by means of a mirror obscurely, but *then*, face to face," i. e. clearly, without any medium. Compare 2 Cor. 3:18; Rom. 1:20.‡

There are some most admirable remarks in Howe's Blessedness of the Righteous, ch. v., that fall in here; we extract the following: "We have something of the Divine glory shining now upon us; but the many interpositions cause a various refraction of its light. We have but its dispersed rays, its scattered, dishevelled beams;

* Synonyms of New Test., pp. 221, 222,

† ἵνα φαίνωσιν ἐν αὐτῇ, not εἰς.

‡ "God (says Aristotle) who is invisible to every mortal, is seen by his works."

we shall *then* have it perfect and full." "We shall better be able to discern the divine excellencies together, have much more adequate conceptions; a fuller and more complete notion of God; we shall see Him as is."

These laws and relations of matter all existed before any organization in this world—they have operated more or less in organic beings, and parallel with them; they are to come into fuller play than ever before, after the end of this world—in "that world which is to come," and to have their end there, so that it is fair to infer that they were at first given in reference to that; and whether the language of the bible, alone speaking on this subject, and describing certain phenomena connected with that new earth, be figurative, or literal, it is as if the latter; and if figurative, that is, if what John saw was a mere vision, it may preintimate some real structure hereafter to be erected in accordance with it, just as Moses and David saw in vision, the models of the tabernacle and temple. Embodied spirits must have a local habitation, and it is intimated, especially by Paul in Rom. 8 : 19–23, that the physical creation is to share in the glory of the saints.

THE INFLUENCE OF STIMULANTS ON THE MANIFESTATION OF MIND.

The contact of material substances is attended uniformly by certain phenomena which result from the action of one upon the other. This may depend upon the chemical affinities or the electrical relations of the bodies; or there may be a simple mechanical adaptation of one to another. These relations are appreciable by our senses and therefore may be reduced to demonstration. But when we come to treat of the essence of things, and going beyond the region of the tangible attempt to comprehend the subtle ether of intellect, and descant on the impressions made upon it by other things, we encounter a difficulty which is not found in the scope of physical science. Our own consciousness must necessarily supply the counterpart to information from any and all other sources; but there is a vast field exterior to ourselves which must be explored to supply data for the exercise of our reason and judgment. To comprehend fully the workings of the human mind, would require a minute and thorough investigation of the laws of thought, and we can only approximate a true mental philosophy in any of the researches which may be undertaken in reference to intellect. We

have various treatises by erudite scholars and yet but little of the intellectual operations of man receives the common sanction of writers; and Aristotle, Plato, Bacon, Locke, Reid, Stuart, &c., disagree in reference to many points. But enough is known and recognized by literary men, to enable us to reason upon the manifestations of intellect, and I propose to delineate some of the processes by which they are effected, when stimulants are introduced into the system. The "*quo modo*" is beyond our apprehension, and we must be content to point out the results, and from thence draw our inferences as to the operation of this class of articles on the mind. The nature of the action is extremely obscure, and we must attain to a much nicer understanding of the relations of body and mind before we are prepared fully to elucidate this point. I would not confound the intellectual principle with the soul, in the views I have to present. The soul is that imperishable element which appertains to another sphere of existence, and the moral nature of man grows out of the relations of this spirit to God. It is the link which binds us to eternity, and has an importance transcending the ordinary phenomena of mind, so far as heavenly things are superior to those of earth. I do not therefore undertake to treat of the conditions of the soul, but simply of the frames of the mind, induced by the use of stimulants.

In using the term stimulants, I have no reference to irritants of the animal tissues, as contradistinguished from soothing agents, or to any of the local effects of different agents, but will consider this class of articles in connection with their operation on the general organization of man.

The brain is conceded to be the instrument of the mind, and this organ with the nervous system setting out from its base and extending to every part of the physical organization, forms a medium of communication by which the mind and body exert reciprocal influence upon each other. The afferent nerves convey impressions from without to the cerebral centre and the efferent nerves transmit the impulses from this centre to the most distant, as well as the adjacent parts. There are certain reflex functions attributed to the spinal axis which seem to be independent of volition, and indeed this portion of the nervous system is little more than a chain of connection through which impressions are conveyed to and from the brain. It is to the medical philosopher and the physiologist a most important feature in man's organization, but we are at present only concerned with it as an electro-telegraphic line of communication with the brain; and much depends upon the normal and healthy condition of this part, for the proper exhibition of the effects of stimulants upon the mind. The agent which may be taken into the stomach is not conveyed directly to the brain to produce its effects; but it acts upon the nervous branches which are distributed to the stomach and adjacent parts;

and thence, the influence is conveyed by the nerves through the spinal column to the brain. It is a reflected, and not a direct influence. We have it on good authority that alcohol is present in the cerebral structure of those who have been long habituated to the free use of this article, and there may be reason to believe that this or any other stimulant is conveyed to the brain under the occasional use of such agents, but their effects on the mind must be attributed to the sympathetic relation which exists through the nerves. We know that sensation is instantaneously manifested by the brain when a remote part is brought in contact with an object, and this can easily be explained by the agency of the nerves transmitting with lightning speed the impressions made upon their remote branches. So it is with the impressions of stimulants when taken into the stomach, and we can readily conceive that all the effects which are manifested may ensue without absorption of any portion of the agent, as they certainly are in some instances previous to any process of digestion.

The question as to the assimilation of such articles does not come within the scope of this paper, except as we are concerned with the sustaining of mental efforts by recourse to stimulants; and I would only remark that stimulants are often combined with nutriment in their natural state, and thus may be partially carried into the circulation; but it is held by most writers that alcohol in its purity is not changed by the organs of digestion, and that it passes as alcohol into the blood, and is thrown off as alcohol by the exhalents.

We have not been able to separate, so completely, the active principle of other stimulants, and hence the decision of the question must be deferred for further investigation.

There are two classes of stimulants—the one exciting and exalting the vital energies in a direct proportion to the quantity taken into the stomach—the other exciting at the outset, and when taken in moderate quantities, but having a secondary effect as a sedative or narcotic, and the stimulant influence bearing an inverse ratio to the quantity taken. The former may be called purestimulants, and the latter false; or the one persistent, and the other transitory. The pure or persistent stimulants are such as ammonia, Cayenne pepper, mustard, &c., and the false or transitory are alcohol, ether, opium, assœfætida, tobacco, &c. The first named are opposed to a sedate influence in all their operation on the physical and mental constitution; but the latter will induce such an effect if taken in large quantity at one time, and hence they are resorted to for their tranquillising influence, by a large proportion of our race. We have then to treat of this class of stimulants, principally, in the present essay; and I would remark, that they are justly regarded as stimulants, in view of the influence which is secured by small quantities often repeated, or the influence upon

those who have become habituated to their use. A sustained stimulant effect may be attained, in this way of employing this class of articles ; but if alcohol is taken too largely, intoxication and stupor ensue ; if opium is used beyond a certain dose, sleep is the result ; and it is only by long habit that persons come to use these articles in considerable quantities, and keep up the stimulant action. A portion of any article of this class which is taken with a salutary and benign influence by one accustomed to it, would produce the most overpowering effect upon those who have not used it previously. This is an effect totally different from that depression which is consecutive to the excitement of a stimulant. The one is a part of the action and influence of the agent, the other is an effect, or sequence of the influence which is exhausted previously. The law of habit, by which passive impressions are lessened, while active tendencies are increased, is strikingly illustrated in the use of stimulants ; and the only rational manner of accounting for this condition of things, is that the sensibility of the nervous system is exhausted, by the frequent repetition of the excitement, and that a demand is thus created for a larger amount, and the tolerance of the agent results from the diminished sensibility. This effect is entirely different from what is observed in the case of local irritants, the influence of which is manifested in a progressive ratio with the frequency or continuance of their application ; and thus we may draw a distinction between the mere irritant, and the stimulant. But a stimulant may, at the same time, prove an irritant, and it is under such circumstances that we observe the influence enhanced by continuance, in any particular instance, of a very irritable constitution. It has been observed that some who have long used alcoholic liquors, get into a state that very little is required to induce intoxication ; and it is from the stimulant becoming an irritant, and thus adding to the excitement, by repetition or continuance of a quantity which had previously been well received by the system of the person. But this is an abnormal state, and must be considered an exception to the general rule, as to the effect of stimulants, which is as laid down in my original proposition ; to excite primarily, but leave a state of depression, which requires a repetition of the agent to bring the tone of feeling and action, up to the ordinary standard. This is the hinging point in giving an explanation of the influence of stimulants upon intellectual manifestations ; and the strong proclivity which is exhibited by mankind to have recourse to such articles as brandy, wine, opium, tobacco, tea, coffee, &c., results from the fact that the subsidence of the excitement of one portion, leaves the system in a condition below the natural healthy standard, and another portion is demanded to bring it up again ; and thus from one step of indiscreet trial of such agents, others are induced, and eventually a habit is formed, which

seems almost like a second nature. Indeed we find that persons addicted to the use of such articles, feel more inconvenience in being deprived of them temporarily, than they do in having their food abstracted for a proportionate time. A restless discontent is observed under such circumstances, accompanied by an incompetency for any concentration of the mental powers; and the speaker whose words flowed freely, is now silent, and the temper which was gleesome, is now morose. It would not appear that there was any positive improvement upon the natural state of the mind by resorting to stimulants, but that the exaltation was a forced state which makes the fall come with the more weight upon their removal. The glow of feeling, and the generous impulse, and the intellectual vigor, which seem to be connected with the occasional use of stimulants, do not compensate for the lowering of all the mental energies which succeeds this condition, and although it may serve a temporary purpose, it must in the end fail to secure a mean or average amount of salutary influence. Here then, I would lay down my position, that stimulants may elate the feelings, swell the impulses, invigorate the conceptions, and improve the utterance for a time, but that all this soon vanishes and leaves the subject more flat and dull, than before they were taken; and that the continued use of such artificial supports, weakens the natural powers, and impairs the capacity, for any arduous mental effort, even under the influence of the most stimulating agents.

Stimulants primarily excite the physical powers, and elate the mental faculties; but secondarily depress the same in a direct proportion to the previous exaltation; and to secure their salutary influence upon the operations of the mind involves a paradox; that they should not be taken frequently, and yet the influence must be sustained. With these general propositions, I will proceed to treat of the special stimulants, and as alcohol is the article which holds pre-eminence by the quality of its action, and the extent of its use in this country, I will advert to it in the outset. This term is applied in strictness, according to Ure's Chem. Dictionary, to the pure spirit obtained by distillation and subsequent rectification from all liquids that have undergone vinous fermentation and from none but such as are susceptible of it.

But it is commonly used to signify the spirit, more or less freed from water in the state in which it is usually met with in the shops, and in which as it was first obtained from the juice of the grape, it was long distinguished as spirit of wine, at present it is chiefly extracted from grain or molasses in Europe, and from the juice of the sugar cane in the west Indies, while in this country it is procured from apples and peaches as well as grain, and in the diluted state in which it is used in trade, constitutes the basis of the several spirituous liquors called brandy, rum, gin, whiskey, and cordials, however variously denominated or disguised.

The question in reference to alcohol being contained in wine, is set at rest by the experiments of Gay Lussac, and Mr. Brande, which were instituted upon the pure juice of the grape, and alcohol was evolved. Little observation is required to ascertain the existence of alcohol in the article which is frequently vended as wine at the present day. It has been demonstrated, says Paris in his *Pharmacologia*, that Port, Madeira, Sherry, &c., contain one fourth to one-fifth of their bulk of alcohol, so that a person who takes a bottle of either of them, will thus take nearly half a pint of alcohol, or almost a pint of brandy. But owing to the peculiarity of the combination of alcohol in pure wine, it does not affect the system so promptly or so powerfully as when it is present in a mere state of dilution, or as in our fabricated wines. It has been suggested that the genuine article of wines has to be digested before its full specific effects can be manifested, and this accounts for the different effects which the same wine may have in different states of the digestive organs.

The influence of alcohol upon the organization of man, varies according to the constitution of the individual, and Macnish makes a division of effects founded upon the temperaments.

According to the greater or less development of the nervous system, the primary influence of alcohol is modified, and an individual of phlegmatic temperament is not so readily affected as one in whom the nervous element predominates.

Frequent repetition of this powerful stimulant impairs the nervous energy, and the quantity must be increased to have the same notable effect. This results from that law which is illustrated by Darwin in his *Zoonomia*, that a quantity of stimulus greater than natural, producing an increased exertion of sensorial power in any particular part, diminishes the quantity of it in that part. And it is thus that habit renders the influence of alcohol less manifest. The diminished susceptibility depends upon the impairment of the nervous energy, and we should not infer that the quantity is increased with impunity.

Some constitutions will bear the continued moderate use for a length of time, but this is by no means conclusive that it has no injurious tendency. One individual may drink a quantity daily without any deleterious effect being manifested, which would produce serious consequences in a more susceptible subject. It takes more heat to boil quicksilver than it does to boil water, and so it takes more stimulus to effect a dull lethargic person, than it does to influence an energetic and sprightly individual. The quality of the influence is to be considered more than the degree, and all are acquainted with the primary excitement, as shown in the increased loquacity and activity of thought after the first few drams. The primary operation of spirituous liquors being upon the nerves of the stomach and being thence transmitted to the great nervous

center, it is to the brain we must look for its effects on the intellectual faculties. I once saw a striking exemplification of the different effects on the brain, in the persons of two sailors. In the one, the general system was affected and he was scarcely able to stand, while the mental faculties were unaffected, and he seemed entirely rational. In the other, who was a red haired vivacious fellow, of the sanguine temperament, locomotion was attended with no difficulty, and yet he was ranting brawling like and a madman. The brain was in this case more susceptible to the impression of the stimulus from the greater development of the nervous system; and it will be found that temperament generally modifies the influence of alcohol. In the anatomy of drunkenness we have the following graphic delineation of the phases of alcohol.

The first influence upon the mind is pleasant, all the faculties are aroused for a time to increased and lively exercise. A gaiety and warmth are felt at the same time about the heart. The imagination is filled and expanded with a thousand delightful images. Every thing now gives perfect satisfaction to the individual. He is a more devoted friend—more fond as a lover, more benevolent—more patriotic, and all-in-all, human nature would seem on the highway to improvement. Generous and frank, he discards the stiff formalities of society, and acts out his true character without reserve. It is now that the workings of the heart may be observed, and many a tale, else untold, has wine brought forth.—Perhaps some treasured flattery, or just as apt some sad rehearsal of neglect, or revelation of some dark and wicked deed unknown but by the tell-tale mouth of the inebriate.

The most delightful time, says Macnish, seems to be that immediately before becoming very talkative. Prior to this, a kind of serenity pervades all the thoughts and feelings; but the manner becomes more impetuous, and folly marks the conduct of the individual. The power of volition, that faculty which keeps the will subordinate to the judgment, seems totally weakened, and nonsense is the order of the day. Instead of that noble air of independence which characterised his being under the slightest influence of drink, we now observe a littleness and simplicity in his actions, and his face wears an idiotish expression. He talks incessantly, and his head grows giddy with the excitement of liquor. While he thinks himself entitled to respect, he is looked upon as unworthy of consideration by those around him. Who has not remarked the ceremonious and punctilious air of the drunken man who fancies himself sober. A more ludicrous, or more humiliating scene cannot be presented than that of a man whose capacity of mind, and endowment of learning ought to give him a high position in the world of literature, and yet by beastly appetite, are made the instruments of buffoonry, and every species of niggard littleness. To see the mind of man blasted by the withering in-

fluence of drink, to see reason subject to grovelling, base propensities, and at last to be obliterated, as the blank nothingness of idiotism, shrouds the intellectual being, may well make us weep over frail humanity.

If it were only the mean and vulgar of the human race, who are affected by the use of ardent spirits it would be a matter of less moment, but those of the most commanding genius, those of the most sprightly and generous disposition, those qualified to instruct and to please the circle around them; in a word, the princes of earth, are liable to be engulfed in the maelstrom of intemperance and sink to the level of the brute.

Reason is the crowning glory of man, and he may have enjoyments far superior to the groveling propensities of beastly appetites; but this rich legacy of nature should be protected from the rude and sacriligious touch of intoxicating drinks, if the possessor would improve his capacity by the most exalted attainments.

Next to alcohol in importance must be ranked opium and its preparations. It differs essentially in its influence on the intellectual faculties and the emotions, from the article of which we have treated.

De Quincy considers that alcohol deranges, while opium harmonises the mental powers, and says that the brutal part is affected by the former, while the moral part is affected by the latter. But we should be slow to receive the authority of any individual in reference to the effects of opium who has made a boast of his excessive use of it as this writer has done, and I have no confidence in the reformation which he professes, although he evidently intends to convey the idea that he had most heroically abandoned this drug.

But there is certainly a fascination in the spell which opium throws around its subject, arousing the imagination and refining the fancy to a remarkable degree, and I am willing to receive Mr. De Quincy's authority as to its effects upon him in this respect.

No individual has ever lived to rehearse such experience as he narrates; and when we consider the great powers of intellect which he undoubtedly possessed by nature, and compare the wild vagaries of the Opium Eater, with the sterling worth of some of his other productions, we may well doubt the conclusion that the mental faculties are harmonised by the use of opium.

We know how Coleridge in the honesty of his heart, bewailed the sad enchantment which opium threw around him, and had not his intellect soared far above that of ordinary mortals, he could not have sustained the benumbing influence of this drug. It is the mind of giant powers that feels the elevating and spiritual effects of opium, while lesser intellects succumb under its influence, and sink into utter insignificance. A certain amount of native energy of thought is requisite as a pabulum for the operation of this article, and then we observe a resiliency under its use which gives a

charm to every conception and places the individual for the time on enchanted ground. I have not found this view alluded to by any writer on the effects of opium, but from observation of its influence, I am convinced that a difference of intellectual faculties makes a great modification on its operation. A dull man will be put to sleep, or any ideas he may have will be obscured, while the man of high tone of mind will experience a charming, enlivening influence; and he will be more capable of undertaking and sustaining protracted literary tasks when using it. I do not allude here to that peculiarity in this article, by which it composes one person, and disturbs another, for I regard that as strictly a physical feature, and not within the scope of this paper, but the point to which I wish to draw attention has reference to its psychological influence, and seems to me of much practical consequence in deciding upon the quality of the influence of opium on the human understanding. If it be only those who have great powers of mind that can experience the expanding and elevating effects of its use, may we not suppose that there are particular elements of the mind to which it addresses itself, and that an intellect which is deficient in these faculties, is not affected in this salutary manner. We all know that the most common result of the administration of opium is to induce sleep, which is an obliteration of all rational faculties of the mind, and only leaving in operation those elements which are concerned in dreaming, which are very nearly allied, if not identical with the imagination. As opium is known to excite the imagination under ordinary circumstances, we should look for it to show its influence in the nocturnal hallucinations of those who are given to dreams, and it is even so to a remarkable extent. The practical inference I desire to make, is, that while opium excites the imagination, it clouds the reasoning powers in our waking moments, as it gives an impulse to dreams, while the other mental faculties are overpowered by its soporific influence.

This difference of effect in putting one to sleep while it enables another to accomplish more than under other circumstances, admits of no better explanation than that the feeble powers of thought in the former are readily overcome and subdued by it, while the mental energy of the latter affords a resistance, and the excited imagination comes to the rescue and not only sustains the reasoning power, but by reflecting its own excitement, renders it capable of accomplishing a greater amount of labor, or at least of protracting its effects for a greater length of time. This is further illustrated by the difference of effect on the same person in different moods of mind. If an individual of considerable mental capacity has nothing to occupy the mind, and takes a full portion of opium, or its active ingredients, he will be brought under its soporific influence. But if the same person has something upon which the mind is engaged when it is taken, it will not induce the above effect, but

will be found to co-operate with the imagination in carrying out the intellectual effort. This does not argue that it should be continued, but that it is an artificial and extraneous power which leaves the native faculties in an unfavorable condition. Any person who takes a large portion of opium at once may experience the elation of spirits and the activity of mind which results from this article, and if the influence is permitted to subside without a repetition of the portion, the enervation and dullness which succeeds its stimulant influence will be felt to a most uncomfortable extent. If those who undertake to experiment with this truly fascinating drug, will determine to test its effects by a single large portion, say from five to ten grains of the crude opium, or from a half grain to one grain of morphine, the sweets and bitters of its influence may be learned within twenty-four hours, and I think the subject will be content to stop at this point, without further trial of it. But it too often occurs that a small quantity is taken at first, and repeated within two or three hours, and thus continued from day to day until its stimulant action is so pervading, and is attended with such pleasurable sensations, emotions, and conceptions, that the individual is indisposed to interrupt the influence, and soon becomes so enchanted with it as to crave its continuance at the risk of sacrificing every other comfort which earth can bestow. I have but little knowledge of this article from personal experience, but enough to satisfy me that it is not safe to engage in these experiments for testing the influence of it, and I would warn all who may be tempted by the charm of its enlivening action, to reflect that this is succeeded by a stupifying effect, and if this is dispelled by repeating the dose, a habit will ensue, which is the most irresistible and hopeless that can befall any human being. It is like all gratifications of sensual appetite, the more it is indulged, the less power of control has the individual over it, and he comes eventually to feel that, what I do, I would not, and yet a constant struggle is kept up between the desire and the will until at length every obligation to self and society, is absorbed in the oblivious effects of opium. In the course of my observations I have had my sympathies most painfully enlisted for the victim of this spell, and it is a great mistake to suppose that those who use opium habitually in large quantities are satisfied with their indulgence. So far from it, that I am of the opinion that no one of them would resume the use of it, if they could be restored to freedom from its powerful bondage, and their are few but make efforts, however abortive they may be, to lessen the quantity and abandon the habit. I need not detail the enormous quantities of this drug which the devotee may consume without a fatal result. Certainly enough to destroy ten men who are not accastomed to the article. This is an article which of all others depends for its effect upon the state of the nervous system, and when the sensibility has been be-

numbered by the long continued use of it, a large portion is requisite to have any perceptible influence on the physical or mental organization, and in the extreme case of opium eating, it is scarcely possible to administer a quantity which will prove poisonous to such an extent as to put an end to existence. The deplorable condition of such subjects is shown when the article is abstracted for any length of time, and the greatest disorder of body, and distress of mind, is the result. Convulsions and delirium are not unfrequent from the sudden interruption of its use by those who have been long addicted to it.

But it may be said that I am portraying the gloomy side of a picture, which when reversed will reveal brightness to counterbalance this aspect, and why should one leave the sunshine to go into darkness. All this will do to repel an argument from the abuse of an article, against the use of it; but it is then incumbent to show that the use does not naturally, and as a matter of course, lead to such a result, and this is a task which cannot be accomplished. But independent of the tendency of this habit to run into such an extreme, there are sufficient reasons for shunning the use of opium as a stimulus to the mind. Even an occasional resort to it is found to impair the ordinary and healthful tone of the mental faculties, and the mind is not so competent to its undertakings, as when it is not used.

The influence of this article upon the human mind tends to interfere with its normal condition, and thus to derange its faculties; and although it may give a bracing influence for a time, it leaves all the powers of the mind more feeble and less capable of concentration upon any subject. It must be allowed that there is a certain standard of health for the faculties of the intellect, as there is for the performance of the functions of the body, and any thing which disturbs that just equilibrium must be considered injurious to either the physical or mental part.

As opium has an effect on the mind different from that impulse which is imparted naturally to the intellectual faculties, we must infer that it interferes in so far with this standard of health, and hence it cannot be looked upon as free from evil in its operation. A stream which is swollen by an undue current of water, has more force than in its natural state, but it at the same time fails to subserve the same useful ends, and is by its very turbulence and violence liable to cause much harm in its course. And so the train of thought may become tumultuous under the influence of this drug, but it is not likely to be conducted properly, or to attain to proper conclusions, and hence it should not be used with this view.

An article is yet to be mentioned which is more generally employed in this country for its effects upon the mind, than either of those which have been spoken of in this paper. It will not perhaps

be considered as properly a stimulant, but we may add to this list without impropriety, the tobacco.

If used in any considerable quantity it will prove decidedly sedative in its effects, and yet like the other articles it may be used in minute portions so as to secure a stimulant influence. Indeed its primary action is to excite, and the depressing effect succeeds to this so rapidly as to prevent it from being detected when the portion is sufficient to have a controlling influence on the person. In the case of one totally unaccustomed to it, very little is requisite to induce nausea and great prostration, but when the person has become habituated to its use, these effects are not readily produced and we find a genial glow imparted to the whole being by its influence either when chewed or smoked. I take it then to have a stimulant action, and indeed every one who uses it, feels that an animating effect results from it when gloom or mental disquiet has been present. The laborer works more cheerfully with his quid of tobacco, the engineer plans more satisfactorily with it, the mechanic and tradesman each finds his task lighter under its influence, and we are warranted by the extent of its use amongst literary men and students, to conclude that it affords a stimulus to the mental efforts, and arouses the dormant energies of the mind. Thus it would seem entitled to a place among stimulants, and although it cannot be so ranked in the *materia medica*, yet as used amongst our people it has this effect, and may be so regarded in this essay. Much of the confusion as to the medical properties of different articles results from overlooking the fact, that in small portions they are stimulant, and in large, prove sedative in their action on both body and mind. This is the effect in reference to alcohol and opium without doubt, and I think it must appear from what has been stated that it will hold also in reference to tobacco. This then accounts for the eagerness with which all classes of people seize upon this weed, which is invariably offensive to the taste, and repugnant to the delicacy of mankind, at the outset of its use. There seems to be a deep rooted craving for stimulants in man's constitution, and however nauseous and revolting the ordeal of acquiring the habit, such articles will be resorted to by our people. How many a boy has been sickened time after time in learning to chew or smoke, and yet felt that it was not manly to give up the attempt to use what so many gentlemen regarded as a great luxury, and eventually when time and frequent trial has reconciled his stomach to the article, with what a show of self complacency is he seen with one cheek distended, and the saliva squirting from his mouth, or with the smoke of a segar curling upward at each puff of his breath. Oh! ye men who have grown up with tobacco in your mouths; say, what motive prompted you to first use of this abominable stuff? It occurs to me that I hear you say, "whatever man has done, boy may do," and although it will cost me some

self sacrifice I am resolved to triumph over nature and enjoy the associations of a blissful habit which is recommended by so many prominent examples. There can be no natural fondness for tobacco, and the taste is acquired, in compliance with some preconceived notion of the dignity or manliness or desirableness of the practice. With this kind of feeling perhaps, in nine cases out of ten, if not ninety-nine out of a hundred, the habit is formed, and like all acquired tastes, a keener relish is soon generated for the tobacco, than is felt in the gratification of any natural appetite. But apart from this, the influence upon the brain and nervous system is such as to induce its continuance, and to reproducing its effects as often as practicable. We find three different processes resorted to for securing its influence; chewing, smoking, and snuffing; the last of which should be regarded the most dignified, in consideration of its being confined, so far as my knowledge extends, to those of adult age.

Either of these practices imparts the influence of tobacco; and as such an effect is sought for by those who use them, a distinction is not requisite in treating of its influence on the mind.

Reluctant as I am, to show any quarter to so filthy a habit as the use of tobacco, I must think it is more likely to serve the purpose of literary men, as a gentle stimulant to thought, than either of the other articles of which we have spoken. There is a soothing effect connected with its action on the intellectual faculties, which seems especially favorable to contemplation; and it strikes me that the reasoning powers are more likely to be efficiently exercised under its influence, than with either of its other agents. It differs from them by not inducing intoxication, and thus would seem to act in some manner entirely different on the brain and the mental faculties. The tranquilising influence of tobacco is doubtless the commingling of the sedative with the stimulant effect on the brain, and it seems in this respect especially fitted for a placebo to the nerves, since it cannot be used beyond a certain extent without effecting the system unpleasantly, and thus placing a check to the use of it. For instance, if ever the habitual snuffer, undertakes to smoke, he is sickened; and if the excessive smoker takes a chew, his stomach revolts; and finally, if the chewer should swallow even a small portion, he finds nausea to ensue from it. Thus, a barrier is presented to the influence being carried beyond the primary stimulant action, and the slight shading-off with the sedative, only tends to compose the faculties of the mind. My object is to treat this subject philosophically, and although my prejudices against the use of tobacco, are of the strongest kind, I would be reconciled to a systematic moderate employment of this article as an adjuvant to the operations of the mind. The great danger here, as with other things of this class, is that no limit is fixed to the indulgence by those who use it, and the consequence is, that it be-

comes liable to obscure and derange faculties it might otherwise act upon in a salutary manner. But even when the indulgence in tobacco is carried to an extreme, it is not attended with such disastrous effects upon the mind as the extravagant use of alcohol or opium entails upon their consumers. The absence of an intoxicating principle in tobacco lessens its destructive power over the mental faculties, but we should not thence conclude that no injury results.

It is an insidious, and gradual impairment of the energy and tone of the intellect which results from the long continued and lavish indulgence in the use of this article. If any one would know whether the mind has been affected by this practice, let the use of the article be suspended, and observe whether the mind acts as it did previous to its commencement or during its use. It will be found that all energy has departed with the accustomed stimulus, and that the reasoning process cannot be sustained for any length of time, or for any definite end; and that the temper has become morose or peevish. A return to the tobacco will perhaps set all right again, or if the individual has the moral heroism to abstain for a great length of time, the mental tone may be restored. So the splints may be placed upon a fractured limb and enable it to be used, or if it is not subjected to any violence for a length of time, it may get strong again without them; but this does not argue that the limb is not weakened, and no more does the above resource prove that the mind is not impaired. If the muscles of any part of the body are relieved of their accustomed functions by artificial means for any considerable time, their power is impaired; and the continuance of the assistance becomes necessary; and so with the faculties of the mind; if they are stimulated for any length of time, the excitement must be kept up, to sustain even the ordinary vigor of the intellect, and when it is abstracted, the mind is shown to be impaired, and it requires time to restore it to its primitive state, if indeed it ever does recover the power which belonged to it before resorting to the artificial stimulus.

There are various other stimulants which are resorted to with a view to support the jaded intellect, and among them tea and coffee may be reckoned the most common and the most innocent. But my limits will not permit me to go into any special notice of other stimulants, and I would only remark that if there is a use for these agents, it is when "exhausted nature" needs a restorer. Then they may be used safely, and perhaps in some instances with advantage to the action of the mind; and with a view to secure their best effect when most needed, they should not be resorted to habitually, or even occasionally, unless the prostration from extraordinary intellectual labors should require a temporary stimulus.

The human mind is capable of development by certain pro-

cesses of culture independent altogether of physical influences, and it behoves every one to use those means of an exalting and ennobling character, in preference to those which appeal to our base material part. If there is one element which should be enthroned in Majesty over our nature it is intellect, and that man who profanes its sanctity by the unnecessary use of stimulants is doing violence to the highest and noblest behest of humanity.

There is a dignity and grandeur in the clear day light effulgence of native intellect which as far transcends the luminous glare of the mind excited by stimulants, as the brightness of the sun exceeds the red glare of the meteor. The maturity of thought is the perfection of nature.

Beauty unadorned, is most adorned, in the case of intellect, as in that of person; and plain common sense is more becoming for rational men and women, than the gewgaws and tinsel of the imagination. Native simplicity of thought and expression should always be appreciated more than extravagance in ideas and language. A relish for the latter shows the fondness of our people for excitement; and hence the incentive to use artificial stimulants for the mind in pandering to a vitiated taste. The one acts upon the other, and they are mutually productive of unfavorable results. Those who stimulate have no greater power of thought or facility in communicating their ideas than those who rely entirely upon the resources of nature and abstain from all artificial helps to the mind. Indeed we find that the general tone of feeling and the vigor of intellect manifested by the latter class, transcend the developements of the former, even when under the influence of the exciting agent.

The ordinary routine of intellectual labor cannot be entered upon by the one without the accustomed stimulant, whereas the emergency of the occasion supplies to the other a sufficient incentive to mental activity, and the effort itself gives an impulse to the operations of the mind. If one desires to impart strength and elasticity to his limbs, he should not practice bounding on a spring-board, and still less should he who would bestow energy upon his mental faculties, seek the impulse of a stimulant.

The mind may be developed by a proper culture so as to give permanency and stability to the intellect, and a pure native energy of reason should be cherished and exercised as the most ennobling attribute of man. It is not the display of imagination that gives a claim to consideration, but it is a capacity for thought, and a comprehensiveness of ideas connected with knowledge, which makes the man of mind. The health and strength of the understanding is impaired by the use of stimulants, and no temporary advantage results from them, which can compensate for their injurious effects.

OUR PROBLEM.

The greatest problem of duty, laid upon the Church of the South to solve, during this current age, unquestionably respects the negro race as found on our territory under our control; greatest, alike in importance and in difficulty. No generation has risen and passed away, since the denominations that obtain here began in any general or systematic way to deal with it. Individual efforts have been made and blessed, ever since we began to be a people. Indeed, it is doubtful whether as much is done to-day, by the mode of family instruction, as was done thirty years ago.

In nothing does the difficulty of the question appear more signally, than in the variety of attempts which Christians of every name are making to do this great thing. Our Methodist brethren send out white Missionaries to preach and catechise, committing a secondary supervision and the intermediate religious services to colored "leaders;" and it would be ungracious not to acknowledge the enthusiasm, perseverance, and Christian self-devotion, with which they have toiled. The democratic element among the Baptists has operated to prevent any *special* treatment of this special case; the negroes gather into churches and have pastors of their own race, or remain a kind of irregular branch church, connected with some other body in the same place—very much as a mission among the poor whites in our suburbs might be conducted by them. So far as we are aware, labor in this cause among Episcopal ministers is mostly confined to catechetical instruction, and informal religious exercises. This work they are pursuing in many parts of our State with an industry and faithfulness worthy of all praise.

But when we look at our own church, it is no longer possible to generalize. The good work is spreading, and has spread, far and wide; but not upon any uniform plan. As regards Charleston Presbytery, it is believed that not a single church entirely neglects its duty—yet hardly any two of them agree in their way of discharging it. One has a service for them during the week; another a meeting conducted by the pastor Sunday morning; yet another devotes the afternoon of Sunday to them, and commits the labor to the elders. Some prefer to reach them by Sunday Schools, and some by preaching. Some employ watchmen, or leaders; others dispense with them in name, but look to the patriarchs of the coloured membership to keep watch over their

younger brethren ; still others oppose the whole system of leaders.

Nor is there any humiliation or weakness in this, at the outset of an undertaking so vast, so difficult, interladed with so many moral, social and political interests, and affected so variously by influences beyond the control of the Church. On the contrary, it shows the independent life and zeal of the churches ; how, without following the print of any human foot, they have looked up to their Lord and striven to do His will among the darkened and the poor. God bless them in this chief and Christ-like labor ! Make them more abundant, both in toils and in fruits !

But it is time, surely, for something more than isolated experiments. Through the years of more than a generation of men, we have been seeking out the true principles and method of the undertaking—touching here and there upon the shores of this “undiscovered country.” Would that some Maury might arise in the Church, to gather up the entries in our journals, net for us the results of this multifarious experience, and furnish us with the charts for a voyage so arduous, and of such inestimable returns !

Meanwhile, it becomes us, as promptly and clearly as we may, to state the conclusions for which our experience already furnishes the materials, and narrow thus the matters yet to be explored and discussed. And the most comprehensive, and perhaps the only radical question, now upon the minds of our brethren, relates to the organization of our churches in respect to this element.

We need hardly remind our readers that two theories obtain among us in this matter, which give rise to two systems, known respectively as the “mixed” and “separate” systems ; homely terms, but expressive and convenient enough, and we shall use them without farther apology. The necessity for mentioning theories as well as systems, arises from the fact that neither theory is perfectly brought out in practice. No church which proceeds upon the idea of blending the two races in religious culture, blend them in all its services ; neither do churches specially devoted to the negroes, exclude, but welcome, white hearers and worshippers. We shall find points calling for remark both in the theories and the systems—alike in the principles and practice—on either hand.

Let us consider, first, the “separate” system, which proposes the establishment of churches of colored people exclusively, (though with provision for white hearers in the congregation,) under the care of pastors who are white men. And we take this plan first, because it is of later introduction than the other, and avows itself an improvement upon it. Justly alledging (as we shall see under another head) certain great difficulties and defects in the ministration of religion to the negroes in the old way, it offers to obviate them in the manner we have mentioned. This it has in a degree accomplished ; but it remains a fair question

whether on the whole the method proposed is the best method. Let us see.*

A very weighty objection to this system is found in the fact that it fails to sanctify the relation of master and servant. Not—we hasten to add—altogether to take cognizance of the relation; for the faithful preacher in either congregation, black or white, will dwell upon the duties of his people; and duties grow out of all relations. But there is a difference palpable to us all, between such precepts delivered to one party only, and the same given to the two parties together; in the first case, it is counsel or precept *only*, in the other, it is of the nature of a covenant.

This difference becomes almost oppressive to one's mind, when we descend from the pulpit to the table of our Lord. Which of us does not feel the lack, if God's children of both races are not found together there? Who does not feel that the bond between master and servant is both strengthened and softened, when the same emblems pass from hand to hand, and from lip to lip, through the whole round of the family? Would it not seem a sad and strange thing to have one church for parents and another for children? And is there not a measure of the same objection to having one church for masters and another for servants?

The objection, as thus stated, applies to the principle of separation, and it appeals to the most affecting and unanswerable illustration of the principle involved—as it is natural and right that an argument should appeal. But the principle is manifestly the same, where the separation is of classes, as where it is of persons. Nay, is it not a *more* objectionable feature when generalized than when individualized? In the one instance, a difference of tastes, a lingering of former affections or ties, a special religious history, might account for the divided worship of the family. But in this case, it is the *organic law of the Church* that divides them; we have, inwoven in our very institutions, a permanent divorce of the two classes as regards worship. This, it seems to us, is a very serious matter—one for which only the greatest spiritual advantages can compensate; and then, only when those advantages are obtainable in no other way.

There is a tendency in the spirit of the age to introduce *caste* into religious as well as social matters—a tendency that shows itself not only, nor perhaps most seriously, in this particular case. It was not, we know, and rejoice to say, in this spirit that the advocates of the "separate" system undertook their work; but we fear it is this spirit which gives much of its popularity to the movement. This is an age of analysis; and the American peo-

* It may be as well to say that some of the following remarks have already appeared in the Southern Presbyterian.

ple—next perhaps to the French—are most deeply bitten of that passion. It comes easily to us to classify men in order to deal with them, from the pulpit or otherwise. But does not the Gospel counterwork this spirit? Does it not continually group men crosswise to the lines of human discrimination? And shall we not, on the whole, be more in consonance with its manner and spirit, when we gather all classes and conditions of men to the same table, and feed them with the same bread? Is not Protestant Christianity pre-eminently the religion of families, honoring and strengthening the bonds which Popery stigmatizes and which communism destroys?

The only reply to this objection of which we are aware, points to the provision made for white hearers, and to the fact that such hearers always are present, and can be addressed at the discretion of the minister; that the two races partake together of the sacred elements at the communion and with an association much more intimate than in fact obtains under the other system. This may all be admitted in palliation; we are dealing now with the evils not of the mixed, but of the separate system. In palliation, we say, it may be admitted; to admit it in refutation would be to commit an error fatal to our Presbyterian principles. It would be to confound the *audience* with the *church*. Upon the importance of distinguishing them, it surely cannot be necessary to dilate even a moment. The one is a heterogeneous and in part transient accumulation; the other is an organic body. Many of the former may be strangers; the latter are the minister's flock. To these, he is the Lord's under shepherd; to these, he speaks not as one having authority, but as the Scribes. These are there because it is their home; the others are drawn by their tastes, or their friendships, or best of all, by their love to the cause, and their desire to sustain a good man in an arduous and noble work. But even this gives him no right to deal with them. Indeed, speaking strictly, it does not appear by what right he notices them at all, or knows that they are present. The evil we speak of, therefore, is not removed, but somewhat narrowed, by the fact here alleged.

Just at this point, and closely connected with the remark just made, arises our *second* great objection to the separate system; it makes discipline the action solely of one class upon the other. These white hearers who are present in the congregation are not amenable to the same *authorities* as are the persons who compose the church. There is but one kind of officer, the white man; there is but one kind of subject under his administration, the negroes. And we earnestly press the question upon the consideration of our readers, whether this is not in some measure a departure from the Scriptural idea of the Church. We turn to the 12th chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, and in the 13th verse we find him saying: "For in one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,

whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free." These words make it plain that in the argument which follows his reference is not merely to diversities of spiritual gift, but to all kinds of gradation in the church; whether of intellect, or social position, or wealth, or race, they all reappear in the church and are provided for there as members of one body. Nor is he speaking here of the invisible church universal, but of the things healthful and right in the church of Corinth; and he argues: "If the whole body were eye, where were the hearing? if the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased Him." His thought evidently is that particles thus taken from all the divisions of human life are incorporated into one mass by a mighty and vital principle—subjected to the same influence, brought under the same law, wielded as one living frame, though they be different members. There is here, therefore, an absolute and irremovable intolerance of class distinctions in the framing and administration of his church. In social and domestic life they have their place—are sanctioned and blessed of God; but "lords over God's heritage"—rulers, standing on social rank or distinctions of race, and not on the consent and appointment of the church, are not known to the New Testament theory on this point, has thus been stated very broadly so as to leave a margin for whatever parings or limitations may in practice be found necessary. We admit, at once, that the officers of a church must often be chosen from one part of the body only; for there only will be found the convergence of the necessary qualities; but then, it is *because of the presence of these qualities* these men are chosen, and not because they come of a certain stock, or have reached a particular social position.

Now in the separate system, this particular class distinction is taken up, and made the basis of the whole organization. The whole function of government is discharged by the pastor, who is of one race, and the whole duty of obedience is assigned to the church, which is of the other race. Under the conditions of society here, there are, plainly, two ameliorations of this evil possible. The colored members might be fully organized into a church, having elders of their own color, and white pastors; or the church might be composed of the two races, and the whole body might be subjected to a session of white men. But the separate system steers carefully between these two expedients, and gives us, in the church as in the world, the naked rule of the black man by the white. Indeed, it is as an improvement upon the *second* of these forms of organization, as already existing in our churches, that it was called into existence.

It appears to us, then, that the churches of mixed membership had taken one step nearer the Scriptural model, in that they or-

tain elders *in every church*, instead of appointing officers over the flock.* In them, though the officers are white men only, and in this respect a distinction is maintained, (whether the case admits of farther approximation to the primitive pattern, is a question reserved for another place,) yet these officers administer the same law to both white and colored members, and in this respect the distinction is done away.

The objection here advanced is certainly weighty; and to reply that the position of our colored members is anomalous, and the result of the impact of civil society upon the constitution of the church, is not to settle the question, until we have reduced the anomaly to the lowest point possible, and that on Scriptural principles.

We are constrained to offer a *third* remark upon this matter, so much involved in what has been said as to seem a repetition of it, yet important enough to claim a brief but distinct consideration. It is, that the preaching of the gospel to the poor is a vital point with every Christian church, and that to cut off the poor from it is to wound and impoverish the whole body. It cannot be too often repeated and enforced, especially in these unspiritual and worldly days, that each church is a missionary committee—exists not for itself, but for the spreading of the Gospel and the evangelization of the world. It is of exceeding importance, therefore, to incorporate the missionary element in every church by blending the destitute with the enlightened. It is one of the moral diseases of the day to make all this evangelistic labour *foreign* to the churches. They like such buildings, arrangement, worship, preaching, as does not pre-suppose the presence among them of the ignorant, the lowly, the poor. And it is our duty, and our vital interest, not to cultivate, but to extirpate this feeling.

So far as the reply to this is based on the fact that some negroes will worship in the white churches, and some white people in the churches devoted to the negroes, we have considered it already, and have seen that while, practically, it palliates the evil, it does not alter the organic law of the separate churches. But there is another, and very important reply. It denies that the negroes are our poor—point, with great truth, to the comfort and plenty in which they live—and bid us reserve our pity for our white brethren who have not where to lay their head, or a morsel of bread wherewith to feed their children.

All this we freely and gladly admit, with daily thanks to Him who has enabled us to fence out hunger and the extreme of destitution from our dependant population. Nevertheless, *as regards the supply of the gospel*, the negroes are our poor. If we have not

*Smyth's Ecc. Repub'n, p. 78. Form of Gov't, chap. XII, sec. I.

compassion on them, they must die without the bread of life; and this is just the point which our argument respects—the missionary element, as necessary to the completeness of our churches.

A word will suffice for the irregularity in the constitution of these churches, as respect, our form of government. It would be unfair to press this, inasmuch as we are meeting a case not imagined when that admirable constitution was prepared. Dear as it is to us, it is not so dear as the souls of men, or the coming of the kingdom of Christ, and if it should prove necessary to adjust it to this great enterprise, we thank God for the hope we have that the whole church with one voice would call for amendment just as large and free as the exigency demanded. The question at present, however, is whether any alteration in practice or theory is needed; and if it is, whether the necessary alteration is of this kind. Whether the present provision for evangelist and missionary fields does not cover the inception of every such work, and whether the mixed churches are not upon the very basis whereon we ought to build? Whether the wide-spread establishment of these separate churches would not be a silent revolution in our system? That changes in our organization of some kind are necessary, we are not prepared to deny; but we have been endeavoring thus far to show that this is not the change we need.

We have thus endeavored to state clearly some of the chief objections to the separate system; it remains, now, to glance at those which attach to the other. And they have been so well and fairly stated in the Appendix to the Minutes of Charleston Presbytery, in session at Barnwell, April, 1837, that we shall do little more than quote substantially or literally, from that most interesting document.

We urge as a first defect, following the order of the Appendix, that “on the ordinary plan of our churches, especially in cities, the Gospel cannot, from the nature of the case, be fully and effectually imparted” to the negroes. “There may be some instances, in which, by extraordinary exertion and by means of extra services, Pastors succeed in imparting the Gospel in such a manner as to be understood by them. These cases, however, are rare. The *amount* of labor is too much for most men, and for the *sort* of labor demanded, many are unsuited. To meet the necessities of both whites and blacks in the *same* service is ordinarily impossible. If he gratifies the taste of the whites, the blacks do not understand him, and if he preaches so as to be comprehended by the blacks, the expectations of the whites are disappointed.”

We should like to strike out the word “especially” so as to read “our churches in cities.” For the country churches have nobly made the necessary sacrifice, and given half their Pastors’ time exclusively to the negroes, and, in the villages, by one expedient or another the difficulty is virtually obviated. But the

demand upon their Pastors by city-congregations do nearly or quite disable them from labor properly adapted to the ignorant and poor. The strong tendency is to grow respectable, prosperous and refined, *in such a way* (for that is all we object to) as to cut them off entirely from the lower strata of society. We shall say nothing yet of the remedy ; it is our present duty to state the fact.

A second point of prime importance is that, as things now stand, the blacks cannot experience the full benefit of *pastoral labor*." "Besides preaching the Gospel, the other functions of a Pastor are catechizing, visiting, administering rule and discipline, and performing marriage and funeral ceremonies." Now, on the ordinary plan, how much of this labor is overtaken? Facts answer, "but little. The system is more to blame than the Pastor. Can a man discharge his duties to a large white congregation, and at the same time perform the labor required in catechizing colored candidates for church membership as they should be, visiting the colored sick and poor, performing funeral and marriage ceremonies, and above all, investigating and deciding the numerous and tangled cases of discipline which are ever arising? He cannot, simply because he is human."

"A *large white congregation*"—perhaps there is a ray of light there. We will look at it again.

A third argument against things as they are is found in the lack of sufficient and good accommodation for the colored people. These large white congregations need and occupy too much of the space—too much, that is, for the accommodation at the same time of their proportion of the negroes. There is truth and force in this also.

Very weighty is the fourth allegation of the Appendix, that colored churches under white Pastors are needed as a "bar to the collection of such congregations under the supervision and control of ignorant colored men." In such congregations "good may be done, but mingled with evil. They are served * * * by uneducated men, and where the blind lead the blind, both fall into the ditch." This allegation is evidently intended to derive its force from the beforenamed defect in the present mixed system. But in truth, there is a much deeper and more powerful cause at work—the *instinctive, inextinguishable desire for congeniality and close drawn ties between the leader of worship and the congregation*: a passion strong enough to override the petulance, vanity and misrule of ignorant men—to outlive the opposition of masters—to counterbalance the attractions of our best churches. This element in the calculation must be fully acknowledged, and wisely and efficiently provided for, or, in our humble opinion, our hold upon the negroes will be weakened more and more, and in the end cease altogether.

Looking back, now upon the ground we have traversed, rather than surveyed, one comprehensive remark suggests itself. The objections to the separate system, are objections to the principle, and are modified and weakened by the present practice, while the objections to the mixed system, are altogether practical, and their principle stands unassailable. And the question arises—though it can scarcely need to be discussed. To which, as intelligent and farseeing men, shall we give our adhesion; to the system which springs out of the principles of the Gospel and the Constitution of our Church, and admits of indefinite development toward our own ideal; or to that which, though well-worked by wise men, departs from our principles in the outset?

We have no patience with that intolerance of anomalies which would consent to the failure of any good work rather than depart from recognised forms; but we submit the question, whether, first, that is not something more than anomalous to which our arguments under the first head fairly apply; and secondly, whether, considering the separate system as an anomaly, its advocates have not yet to complete the proof of its necessity.

Leaving that with them, let us now attempt to show how the "mixed system" may be so developed as to meet the exigencies, and begin to perform the work, which has here pressed itself upon our attention. But it will be necessary, first, to bar the inference that, because we fail in presenting a perfectly satisfactory scheme, the Church must necessarily fall back upon the separate system. The true inference would be—and we hasten to write it—that wiser heads, more mighty in the Scriptures, more thoroughly informed with the spirit of our polity, and better able to vindicate the truth, should lend their utmost energies to the help of the Church, now entangled among her foes in the meshes of this great problem, and sorely bested by it—trying often times in vain to feed and protect her own—stumbling upon those she meant to help—bewildered, but not desponding; weakened, but not discomfited; foiled thus far, but rising again to the work with a purer heart and a better, because a more spiritual, hope in her Great Captain. Let it not, therefore, be counted presumption to us that we have coveted the blessing of them that are ready to perish, even though we fail.

To set forth our thought upon this matter, it will only be necessary that three grand axioms concerning the Churches of our Lord Jesus Christ be stated and applied. Perhaps another opportunity may arise for a full elaboration of them.

The first axiom is, that every church is set as truly for the "gathering" as for "the perfecting of the saints in this life." It will instantly follow, that no church is in a scriptural position—that is to say, in a place of health or spiritual honor—that regards only the conservation of what has already been attained; or which maintains itself in a condition which virtually excludes aggression

and missionary life. The application we make is that large churches should *colonize*, and reduce their swollen bulk—not to the lowest point at which life can be sustained, but to *the point of highest individual efficiency*. We proceed briefly to justify this application.

An overgrown church falls below the highest point of efficiency, because it outruns the pastor's ability to watch over the flock. There are no more hours in his day than in another man's; his locomotion is by the same means; his appliances for reaching and moving his people are the same. Beyond a certain limit, therefore, the effect of the growth of the church is just a more minute subdivision of his efforts if he is sanguine and energetic, a slacking of them if he is despondent, a partial distribution of them if he is weak. And though it may be said that the elders are his assistants and must supply what is lacking in him, it leaves the fact unaltered as regards the Pastor; and the notorious, the unquestionable tendency of this state of things, is that a certain portion of the congregation monopolize more or less completely the cares of the Pastor. This brings us back to the argument quoted from the Appendix—that "a large white congregation" absorbs the energies of the Pastor and compels him to neglect the colored people. Now, if the Pastor's influence is necessary to the highest individual efficiency of the members, and a large church outruns his ability to supply that influence, then our syllogism is complete, and very large churches fall below the highest point of efficiency possible to them.

The same thing appears in the necessity impressed on large bodies to move in masses and not by individuals. Such churches must abound in meetings, speeches and resolutions—in committees, boards and delegations; they learn to do that *immediately*, which the highest welfare of the particular members requires should be done *immediately*. Now it is clear that much of the life and individuality of each man must be held in obedience, in order that they may move in mass; and the highest point of individual efficiency is again seen to be sacrificed to the numbers and external prosperity of the church.

Now this absorption of the individual is itself a very serious loss, and not remedied if we suppose such a systematic sub-division of labour as appoints a definite duty to every man. He is overshadowed by the machinery from the outset, and his sense of responsibility weakened by it. Besides, this devotion to the one duty assigned him by the supposition has itself a tendency to cramp the mind. If we take the supposition of the previous paragraph, then, the tendency of the large church is and make soldiers of the line instead of riflemen—parts of a mass instead of independent actors; if we take the second supposition, then the tendency is to make grinders of pin's points instead of thinkers, inventors, living men.

Once more—there is great danger with such churches of withdrawing men's eyes from spiritual to carnal indications and sources of strength. Numbers, wealth, and splendidly appointed services grow but too easily in importance to our gross minds; and the faith thus wrongly bestowed reduces greatly the efficiency of the people.

It will doubtless be replied that these evils are foreseen and fought against; we hasten to admit it. There are no evils against which prayer and pains will not largely avail. Yet the only relevant question is not, whether these evils are palliated, but whether they are *inevitable*; or, if inevitable, whether there is not another system which reduces them to a minimum, while this system (as we have seen) cherishes them. We maintain that there is, and we urge its consideration upon our readers. Give us churches, every member of which can claim and receive a fair share of his Pastor's time and care—where the aroma of his goodness and wisdom can be infused into their lives—where their individuality can be preserved and the utmost amount of good be accomplished by each, and the largest net result be attained by the whole body.

Just here we approach the second axiom we wish to apply. The "*perfecting* of the saint in this life" involves the drawing out into action of all his powers and graces. And though this point was touched upon, in a preceding paragraph, it was with a different argumentative aspect from that now before us. The question there was of the efficient aggressiveness of the church; here, it is of the spiritual perfecting of the members. Such is the unalterable oneness of a man—his *atomism*, if we may coin a word—that no one of his powers can be neglected, whether passive or active, without damage to the whole of him. Symmetrical development is the condition of healthy life; and this can only be secured by the exercise of all his faculties. Providential environments, without our will, accomplish a part of this work; the remainder is devolved upon man. It is manifest, therefore, that the providing a place and duties for every member in, its body should enter into the very structure and the daily working of every church, though not always, perhaps, into its written constitution. It is not enough that as head or member of a family, as citizen or stranger, as master, or servant, he has work to do; his power as a christian, the resources of his spiritual citizenship, his zeal as a believer and lover of his God, must have all possible play, and must learn to bear the strain of arduous exertion.

The application to be made of this principle is, that no church is soundly constituted, a certain class of whose members are mere dependents and hangers-on. That there will be neutrals, *faineants*, in every church, is only too true; but they must be seen and felt to be a foreign element; the attitude of affairs should be a standing protest against their sloth and barrenness. And here will be seen, we think, the bearing of the remark to which we were

brought a few pages back, concerning the inextinguishable desire of congeniality and close drawn ties in worship. The negroes must to some extent participate in the social service of God; and the talents that are always to be found in the possession of some of them for counselling, guiding, and leading in worship, must be drawn out and employed, *under the careful supervision of the established officers of the church*. "If all things done in the church should be done decently and in order," so especially should the gifts of the "gifted" be exercised under and within the limits of well defined and *absolute* regulations. The *truly* gifted and the right minded, the zealous and the modest, will rejoice to submit themselves to such restraints which will at once sustain them against their own timidity and misgivings, and defend them against the jostlings of independent competitors."*

The third axiom to which we appeal is, that in order to the healthy condition of the church, there must be constant interaction of all the parts. This has been so abundantly illustrated by Paul that we shall not venture an argument upon it. It is not without significance that more than one Apostle has confounded our logical deductions from the temple-like character of the Christian Church, by calling it a "*living*" temple. Returning thus to its best analogon, the human frame, we see that it is not permitted the blood to curdle in slow assimilation within this or the other member; it must fly from the heart with a swift largess to every limb, and back to the deep and central shrine, there to be inter-fused, and poured out in the endless commerce of life upon the whole body.

Our application here is not far to seek; every church must jealously guard against the resolution of its mass into different congregations worshipping within the same walls. One of the sorest evils under the sun is doubtless the inevitable gravitation of custom into routine and thence to formalism. Another is, the tendency of churches formed out of originally various elements to *dissimilate* them, and settle back into those elements. And one indispensable mode of warding off these dangers is found in the suggestion just made—to take up into the body materials from every side, and hold them in unity by the might of Christian life; that is, by the inworking grace of God.

But we are most unwillingly driven to the conclusion that this subject cannot be justly dealt with in the closing paragraphs of an article. Yet we linger, with a feeling near of kin to tenderness, upon the beautiful hope that has risen upon our thoughts—the hope of a Church of the Future that shall be indeed the Garden of God; where the lofty and lowly, the fruit and blossom of many

*Isaac Taylor.

climes, the wild vines and olive trees reclaimed and grafted, shall blend their several gifts in perfect tribute to the Heavenly Husbandman—where those whom He hath “joined together” in faith and holiness, and in daily life, shall not be “put asunder” in worship—where the “rich and the poor” shall yet more happily “meet together,” before the Lord who is “the Father of them all.” This is Utopian, no doubt, there is Utopia in all things good—that sweet faint perfume from the Paradise so far away! But what then?

THE TESTIMONY OF THE ROCKS.

BY HUGH MILLER.

The world has scarcely yet recovered from the shock experienced by the news of Hugh Miller's decease. For the Stone Mason of Crodmarty had hewn out for himself by the diligent culture of magnificent endowments a fame wide as the world. Rude and ignorant laborers had ceased to be his companions and the wise and learned had welcomed him as a peer to their brotherhood; the bleak hill-side and quarry had been exchanged for the study—the mason's hammer for the pen—poverty for comparative affluence and obscurity for a renown honorably won and undimmed by a stain. Master of a style which for pictorial vigor and accuracy, is under the circumstances of his early life absolutely marvellous; endowed with a native sense which preserved him even in his loftiest flights from extravagance and exaggeration; vigorous and powerful in argument; subtle in analysis; keen in observation; of a lively and graceful fancy, he added yet one crowning charm to manifold accomplishments, by which to endear himself to the wise and good, namely, the consecration of his powers to the noblest work for which an immortal being can live—the glory of the Almighty Maker. It must be long ere the thoughtful student of God's providence, can recover from the sorrow and alarm with which he sees such a man cut down in the strength of his years and the maturity of his powers, “when his eye was not dim” nor his natural strength abated and by means so inscrutable and sorrowful. But whilst we render most heartily this tribute—whilst we admit the genius and power of the writer—whilst we readily confess that in this last work of his hands which comes to us sanctified by death and can be read only with tears of sorrowing love

and reverence there are passages altogether equal to any which he has ever written, we are yet constrained to say that in its exposition and application of geological facts it is marred by the most extraordinary inaccuracies, in its exegesis of the Sacred Text blurred by the most fanciful, forced and unnatural devices, that it is wanting in logical unity and coherence and that viewed in relation to its main topic, namely, the reconciliation of so-called geological science with the Mosaic Record, it is a total and most lamentable failure. That portion of the book which specially deals with the topic under discussion, is comprised in the Third and Fourth Lectures, entitled "The Two Records, Mosaic and Geological"—in the Fifth and Sixth, entitled "Geology in its Bearings on the Two Theologies," and in the Seventh and Eighth, entitled "The Noachian Deluge." It is scarcely necessary to premise that Mr. Miller takes for granted the certainty of that hypothesis adopted almost universally by Geologists, by which the formation of the earth's crust and the entombment in its strata of organic remains whether vegetable or animal, are referred to the operation of causes now in existence, essentially the same in energy, number and extent of area ever which their force is felt and consequently involving the lapse of an almost immeasurable period of time for the accomplishment of the result in question—and his controversy is with those Biblical critics and interpreters of the sacred text who hold that the Mosaic Record fixes the creation of the "earth and all things therein" at near six thousand years ago, and within the space of six ordinary days of twenty-four hours. Now in this state of the case Mr. Miller affirms,

1. That the only part of the Mosaic Record with which Geology has to do is the work of the Third, Fifth and Sixth days—which we grant.

2. That the days of the Mosaic Record are to be regarded as indefinitely prolonged periods, which let us for the present also grant.

3. That the Mosaic Record is not a history of literal events as they occurred but *a vision which appeared*—as a moving panorama—a great spectacle exhibited to the tranced and illuminated seer, the salient points of which alone he seized and described, which for the present also let us grant.

4. That admitting these propositions the Geological Record is precisely one with the Mosaic Record, which we emphatically deny—here and now let us introduce Mr. Miller's own representation of this coincidence.

"The Geologist," he says, "in his attempts to collate the Divine with the geological record I repeat has only three of the six periods of creation to account for—the period of plants—the period of great sea monsters and creeping things and the period of cattle and the beasts of the earth. He is called on to question his sys-

tems and formations regarding the remains of these three great periods and of these only. And the question once fairly stated, what, I ask, is the reply? All geologists agree in holding that the vast geological scale naturally divides into *three* great parts.

There are many lesser divisions—divisions into systems, formations, deposits, beds, strata; but the master division in each of which we find a type of life so unlike that of the others, that even the unpractised eye can detect the difference are simply three—the Palæozoic or oldest fossiliferous division; the Secondary or middle fossiliferous division; and the Tertiary or latest fossiliferous division. In the first or Palæozoic division we find corals—crustaceous molluscs, fishes, and in the later formations a few reptiles. But none of these classes of organisms give the leading character to the Palæozoic; they do not constitute the prominent feature or render it more remarkable as a scene of life than any of the divisions which followed. That which chiefly distinguished the Palæozoic from the Secondary and Tertiary periods was its gorgeous flora. It was emphatically the period of plants, of herbs yielding seed after their kind. * * * * * In no other age did the world ever witness such a flora, and once more. The geologic evidence is so complete as to be patent to all that the first great period of organized being was, as described in the Mosaic Record peculiarly a period of herbs and trees yielding seed after their kind.”

It may seem a harsh averment, but truth requires us to say that these are here almost as many inaccuracies as statements. It is far from being correct to say that all Geologists are agreed as to this trinal division of fossiliferous strata, as can readily be seen by inspection of their tables of classification prefixed to the last edition of Hitchcock's Geology and given though not so fully in *all* the manuals, and exhibiting such a diversity as must make the reader, especially if he remembers the object and abstract worth of these classifications, pause in astonishment at such an assertion.

These tables are from the highest authorities, and it is very certain that if Geologists were called upon in the present state of Palæontological knowledge to make a classification of the fossiliferous strata, based upon peculiar forms of animal and vegetable life they would all agree with Sir Chas. Lyell in his affirmation that “if we were disposed on palæontological grounds, to divide the entire fossiliferous series into a few groups less numerous than those in the above table (corresponding to Mr. Miller's) and *more nearly co-ordinate in value than the sections called primary, secondary, and tertiary*, we might perhaps adopt the six groups given in the next table” which are.

1. Post Pleiocene & Tertiary.
2. Cretaceous.
3. Oolitic.
4. Triassic.

5. Permian, Carboniferous, & Devonian.

6. Silurian & Cambrian.

And he adds that even this would be liable to change and could only be provisional, so little have the fossils been studied and so constant is the accessions of palæontological facts by virtue of which all our division as yet, are premature and unreliable.

So baseless is the dream of Mr. Miller, that there is any such palæontological day as his "Palæozoic"—so unfounded and contradictory of geological fact is the notion that we have in this group from the Cambrian to the Permian a great palæontological unity, and yet let the reader notice that, for the argument of Mr. Miller, this is an indispensable requirement. Nor is there the smallest ground for asserting even if we were to grant the existence of this day, that it was pre-eminently "a day of plants of herb yielding seed after its kind." The boldest theorizer would not dare to affirm this of any part of this Palæozoic day—nor does Mr. Miller, when he comes to apply it in so many words, except the Carboniferous, and now what is the proportion which this bears to that whole palæozoic day which Mr. Miller speaks? Let the reader cast his eye upon the following latest estimate of the thicknesses of the respective members of this group.

Permian,	1,000 ft.
Carboniferous,	10,000 "
Old Redsandstone,	10,000 "
Silurian,	7,500 "
Cambrian,	20,000 "
Cumbrian,	10,000 "

Here we have, for it is confessedly true only of the Carboniferous rocks, if of them, a statement which it applicable only to about one-fifth of this palæozoic day. So far as mere negative evidence is concerned, in the Cumbrian, Cambrian and Silurian strata, we have only a few furoid impressions—in the Old Red in addition to these, a specimen of coniferous wood extremely important as we shall presently see, and in the Permian, a flora diminished in quantity but allied in character to the carboniferous rocks, and we ask now if it be fair or just in this state of the facts to use as an argument in relation to this whole palæozoic day what is true only of a very small fraction of it? But it may be objected, that as we have accepted the hypothesis that this creative day was presented to Moses in the form of vision, we may reasonably infer that the seer would be arrested by and describe this sudden outburst of floral life which characterized the carboniferous era to the exclusion of all else—all else being so insignificant as not to awaken an emotion and therefore passed by. Now there is not on record a more singular evidence of the obliquity of vision that a foregone conclusion can effect, than this objection manifests in the case of Mr. Miller, and he shall himself give us a picture of the ages pre-

ceding the coal—Mr. Miller of the “Old Red sandstone” shall assist us in rectifying Mr. Miller of “The testimony of the Rocks.” Of the Silurian Epoch—“*Life abounded* on all these platforms and in shapes the most wonderful. The peculiar encrinites of the group rose in miniature forests and spread forth their sentient petals by millions and tens of millions amid the waters; vast ridges of corals peopled by their innumerable builders—numbers without number—rose high amid the shallows; the chambered shells had become abundant—the simpler testacea still more so; extinct forms of the graptolite, or sea pen existed by myriads, and the formation had a class of creatures in advance of the many legged annelids of the other.”

Of the upper silurian, after a vivid description of the forms of its fish—he adds “Judging, too, from this ancient deposit, they seem to have been introduced not by individuals and pairs but by whole myriads.

“Forthwith the sands and seas, each creek and bay
With fry innumerable swarmed; and shoals
Of fish, that with their fins and shining scales
Glide under the green wave in plumps and sculls.”

The fish-bed of the Upper Ludlow Rock abounds more in osseous remains than an ancient burying-ground. And of this Silurian period and before the old Red Sandstone's first layer had been cast down as sediment from its waters, he says “The earth had already become a vast sepulchre, to a depth beneath the bed of the sea equal to at least twice the height of Ben Nevis over its surface.”

And finally of the Old Red Sandstone, “Generations lived, died, and were entombed in the ever growing depositions. Succeeding generations pursued their instincts by myriads, happy in existence, over the surface which covered the broken and perishing remains of their predecessors and then died and were entombed in turn, leaving a higher platform and a similar destiny to the generations that succeeded. *Whole races became extinct* through what process of destruction who can tell? *Other races sprang* into existence through that adorable power which One only can conceive and One only can exert.”

And this is the “dish of herbs” “yielding seed after its kind” to which the “Testimony of the Rocks” invites us; this is the period of which we are seriously told that “the geologic evidence is patent to all,” that it was preeminently a period of plants, when through four-fifths of it at least the seas swarmed with multitudinous and wondrous forms of animal life, of which there is no more graphic, vivid and truthful delineation than that which Mr. Miller himself furnishes. Truly this Seer must have been profoundly tranced who could see nothing to call pen or pencil into exercise—

to excite his wonder and reverence, until the carboniferous flora burst upon his vision, and who could forget, even amid its tropical beauty and luxuriance, the miracles of God's creative power and wisdom, teeming in the Silurian and Old Red Sandstone Seas.

But grant all that could be asked, and let us consider a little more closely the declaration "that in no other age did the world ever witness such a flora; the youth of the earth was peculiarly a green and umbrageous youth." Now we hesitate and the most cautious reasoners on geological facts, do unanimously hesitate to make any such affirmation. The only conclusion which legitimately follows from the enormous coal deposits, is *not that there was a greater quantity of vegetable life upon the globe than at previous or subsequent epochs, but that there were more favorable circumstances for its preservation,*" and there are good reasons for agreeing with Sir Charles Lyell, that "until we better understand the conditions necessary for the preservation of animals and plants, all such generalizations from purely negative evidence are premature and unreliable," and as corrective of any extreme confidence in Mr. Miller's hasty assertion, we may do well to remember that the whole number of fossil vegetables hitherto discovered and described does not exceed *two thousand*, whilst of existing species, the product of creative power, during Mr. Miller's *third day* there are at least *one hundred thousand*; the flora of his palæozoic day is constituted chiefly of orders of plants, which bear now a most insignificant proportion to the higher, and though they attained a gigantic size and were of singular form yet how this justifies the assertion that the world had never seen such a flora before or since, it is difficult to conceive; but as we intend to employ this fact forthwith, we waive all further question now as to the Geology of this Palæozoic day, and granting that there is such a thing palæontologically, and that it is characterized by a peculiar type of life, and that this type of life, is its peculiar and abundant vegetation, then we affirm that it is not described in the Mosaic Record, and that no just interpretation of that record can make it by any possibility descriptive of the vegetation of the rocks from the Cambrian to the Permian formations, inclusive; that is to say Mr. Miller's exegesis of the Mosaic Record is as vicious and defective as his interpretation of the Geological Record. Let the reader turn to the following passages in the first and second chapters of Genesis:

"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 it was so.'"

"And God said, 'Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed which is upon the face of all the earth and every tree, *in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed!* TO YOU IT SHALL BE FOR MEAT.'"

“And out of the ground, made the Lord God to grow, *every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food.*”

If any thing be clear from these passages (and the more closely they are examined in the original the clearer does this become) it is that here is the record of God's creative power exercised in the production of those plants which are chiefly necessary to the support of man's life—of the whole animal life on the globe—there is in the Bible no record of the creation of all the higher orders of plants unless it be in these passages and yet of the existence of these there is not a trace in the long period of Mr. Miller's palæozoic day—and once more we call attention to the statement of this fatal fact, made by Mr. Miller himself, in terms the most exclusive and absolute, and what is more singular in this very “Testimony of the Rocks,” page 78, “I have already referred to the sombre, unproductive character of the earliest, terrestrial flora with which we are acquainted. It was a flora unfitted apparently, for the support of either graminiverous bird or herbivorous quadruped. The singularly profuse vegetation of the coal measures, was with all its wild luxuriance, of a resembling cast. So far as appears neither flock nor herd could have lived on its greenest and richest plains; nor does even the flora of the olite seem to have been in the least suited for the purposes of the shepherd or herdsman. Not until we enter on the Tertiary periods, do we find floras amid which man might have profitably labored as a dresser of gardens, a tiller of fields or a keeper of flocks and herds. Nay, there are whole orders and families of plants of the very first importance to man which do not appear until late in even the Tertiary Ages. Some degree of doubt must always attach to merely negative evidenc; but Agassiz, a geologist whose statements must be received with respect by every student of the science, finds reason to conclude that the order of the Rosaceæ—an order more important to the gardener than almost any other, and to which the apple, the pear, the plum, the cherry, the quince, the peach, the apricot, the nectarine, the almond, the raspberry, the strawberry and the various bramble-berries belong, together with all the roses and the potentillas, was introduced only a short time previous to the appearance of man. And the true grasses—a still more important order, which, as the corn-bearing plants of the Agriculturist, feed at the present time, at least two-thirds of the human species, and in their humbler varieties form the staple food of the *grazing* animals, scarce appear in the fossil state at all.” This is plain and true, indisputable by any man at this hour and in the present state of our geological knowledge, but notice what ruin it works to Mr. Miller's theory or what folly and inanity it puts into the Mosaic Record, for, it is affirmed that the 11th and 12th verses of the first chapter of Genesis, describe the flora of the Palæozoic day—and this flora excludes all the higher orders of

plants—but there is no record of any other creation of plants and consequently in a professed record of the creation, for man's benefit, all the vegetable world most necessary to him and in which he must perforce feel the deepest interest is passed by in utter silence. Once more the only account of a creation of plants is in the 11th and 12th verses of the 1st chapter of Genesis—but Mr. Miller declares this to be exactly descriptive of the Palæozoic day—he must therefore apply the language used subsequently in the record, in relation to this creation, to the flora of the Palæozoic day and say it was “pleasant to the sight and *good for food*” and “*it shall be for meat to you.*” Courteous reader, we invite you to a Palæozoic “dinner of herbs”—we will search its morasses—explore its dusky thickets and thread its tangled forests to be your purveyor or caterer; the courses may be few and the entertainment lenten but the best the garden yields shall be yours; if that dish of club-mosses and that salad of ferns be not very satisfying—experiment upon that stack of scouring rushes (*Equiectacæ*) and if they serve only the double purpose of whetting teeth and appetite, you may perhaps pick from that pyramid of cones, the central ornament of our board, something more palatable, and if we cannot offer you “the juice crushed from the purple cluster,” we can present for your epicurean criticism, the nuts which should be accompanied by it and we promise you if you crack the *Trigonocarpum* and pick out its mysterious kernel you shall do more than the Geologists have yet done. Is it credible that any Seer however tranced by this floral vision, would not under the clarifying influence of a relentless appetite fully awake, catch some faint glimpses of the multitudinous fish “that with their fins and shining scales” were gliding “under the green wave,” and realize at least momentarily the existence of the “huge crustaceans” and the inviting mollusks, that swarmed in the waters around him?

It is scarcely necessary to add a single word, respecting the device resorted to by Dr. Kurtz and adopted by Mr. Miller to evade the seeming difficulties of the ordinary exegesis, namely that the narrative in Genesis is a *vision*. The device though specifically new is generically old. It has been a myth, an allegory, a series of symbols, and old and loose tradition, or two narratives, the patched and pieced mosaic of two or more writers working on old records or ancient traditions, and now fitly enough for the use to which it is to be put, it is a vision, which may be classed with the other surprising discoveries of that imaginative nation whose acknowledged kingdom is the air.

It is a device not authorized by the writers—not justified by the style—not at all congruous with the subject—contradicted by the express statement, similar to that which introduces the history of Christ's ancestors, “These are the *generations* of the heavens and the earth” and in flat opposition to the uniform reference to

it in the word of God, as a literal and exact record of God's creative acts, trusted in and relied upon as such. Nothing, we are persuaded, but the exigencies of a favorite theory could have induced a man of Mr. Miller acknowledged judgment and good sense, to adopt it.

With regard to the notion that the "days" are indefinitely prolonged periods, we have only to say, that we do not think Mr. Miller, is obnoxious to criticism for holding it—and equally certain is it, that it is not a device of Geologists but a dream of Theologians. True or false—good or bad, it is to us astonishing at least. The word of God if such interpretations be allowed, will come to be regarded as a series of traps and pit falls for unwary travellers; for surely if language had been sought by which to convey the notion of what we commonly understand by a day—the "evening and morning" the week ending with the "seventh day" "the rest of the Sabbath" and the reason given for observing it, are all the very words and phrases by which we should have hoped to make our meaning clear, to the feeblest understanding; but there are men to whom simplicity is a pain and vicious subtlety a delight, who would rather err alone than be right with the multitude—self elected to the ungracious task of finding difficulties or the malignant one of making them. At the same time we are bound to admit that the work of the fourth day being the creation of the sun and moon, &c., and the existence of quite varying notions of the term day in different portions of the earth, may make us hesitate before repudiating all other interpretations of the word than the one which seems to us so natural. If we examine Mr. Miller's second and third periods, we shall find just as little correspondence between the Geological and Mosaic Periods, the second and third of Mr. Miller's series. The second extends from the Permian to the Chalk and it affirmed by Mr. Miller to be pre-eminently the period of whale like reptiles of the sea—of enormous reptiles of the land and of numerous birds, some of them of gigantic size. To say nothing of the introduction of Mammals at latest in the Oolite—not to repeat that Mr. Miller's statement is true geologically of only a small part of that great series of formations extending from the Permian to the Chalk, we once more affirm that the Mosaic Record does not describe it. It must be plain to the most careless reader that *land reptiles* are not described in the history of the fifth day and that *sea mammalia* are, under the name of great whales. So that the class which Mr. Miller affirms, characterize his third period, are really described in the Mosaic Record as having appeared in the second. In like manner the Reptiles of Mr. Miller's second period, are, in the Mosaic Record described as having been created in his Third Period, for it is impossible to interpret in any other way, the "*creeping thing*" of the

24th verse. There is therefore, in none of these periods any such correspondence as Mr. Miller claims.

We have not thought it necessary to attend at the same length to Mr. Miller's representation of any other than one portion of this geological history—"ex uno disce omnes;" and indeed one of them being shown utterly to fail of the required conditions, it is of little consequence what judgment a close examination would compel us to pronounce concerning the remainder. But before we close it may be well to inquire into the origin of so singular and anomalous a failure on the part of a man so able in every respect for the successful accomplishment of the task which he had assigned to himself. We should be sorry indeed to charge him as some critics have done with ignorance either of Geology or Theology and still less should we with another set of critics, assign these strange lapses to an incipient insanity (for such inhuman and shocking criticisms have been uttered) inasmuch as the most important part of the book was written and published years since, but rather to the obliquity of vision and the perversity of judgment, which a dominant idea, will, indulged and cherished till it becomes an idol, produce, in the purest nature: and in Mr. Miller's case, this sinister influence has been aggravated by the false position in which he has been placed partly by his own acts, partly by those of others, as the Christian Apologist "par excellence" in the conflicts of the church with Geologists and we think this a fit occasion on which to declare our earnest conviction, that the cause of Christ has no more foolish friends in these days than those who with insufficient knowledge of Geology, and the subsidiary sciences, spurn it and its advocates from court as though it had no cause worth a hearing, unless it be those who weak in faith and knowledge, are ready to admit any gloss and submit to any perversion of the word of God, to silence the pretentious bluster and bribe away malignant and puerile assaults of its enemies. On some future occasion we propose to shew what is in our judgment the strength and the weakness of Geological speculation, and the inexpugnable position which the church may take and ought to take in relation to it. This much only, we add now, that Mr. Miller's attempt and all similar attempts, are simply efforts to accomplish, what in the present state of our knowledge is an impossibility. If any man was fitted by knowledge, by genius, by piety for this attempt, then Hugh Miller was that man—"Could Tory have been defended by any right hand, then this one had done it." Meanwhile we shall see scheme after scheme of reconciliation involving more or less perversion of God's word and ignorance of his works, spring into rank luxuriance, wither and die in a day, until the handwriting of the Lord in his living word and in the tablets of the everlasting rocks, better deciphered and more truly expanded. in the light of a larger knowl-

edge and in the glory of a clearer vision, shall reveal the eternal unity of him by whom are all things, and for whose glory they are and were created.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Reviewer Reviewed, or a Reply to a Critique in the Southern Presbyterian Review for April, 1857. By THEODORE S. GOURDIN, Past Master of Landmark Lodge, No. 76, A. F. M. Charleston: Harper & Calvo Printers, No. 125 East Bay, up stairs. 1857. pp 24.

We need say but a few words in answer to Mr. Gourdin. He represents us as making an attack on Free Masonry, whereas we only attacked his address on that subject. It is not modest in this writer to insist that Free Masonry and his exhibition of it are identical. Nor is it the part of a good and valiant Knight Templar, as he claims to be, thus to thrust in his brethren between his adversary and himself. The Free Masons, we had always understood, are an Association of men of various religions for purposes of charity and benevolence. Mr. Gourdin perverts the society into a teacher of religion, and that religion, in our judgment, Infidelity. Free Masons themselves condemn his address. They have to us personally and directly repudiated him as any representative of their association. We think they owe it to themselves to do this publicly and officially. Such advocates as Mr. G. do them no credit.

Addresses Delivered at the Inauguration of REV. LEWIS W. GREEN, DD, as President of Transylvania University and State Normal School. Nov. 18, 1856. Published by order of the Board. Frankfort, Kentucky: A. S. Hodges, Printer. 1856. pp 40.

Morrison College was formerly the name of the Literary Department of an Institution to which were attached two professional schools, Law and Medicine—all included under the general charter and title of Transylvania University. The buildings, grounds, endowments and other proper-

ties of the College have been transferred to a Board of Trustees appointed by the Legislature, and the Institution has been re-organized so as to include five distinct schools; *viz*: I. A School of Moral Science, including all the branches usually embraced in that department, intellectual, moral and social; II. A School of Physical Science with a like extent of meaning attached to the term; III. A School of Mathematics; IV. A School of Ancient Languages and Literature; and V. A SCHOOL FOR TEACHERS, including the theory and practice, the science and art of TEACHING. This last named School has two Professors exclusively devoted to this department, and in addition to these the President of the University (who is also Professor of Moral Science) together with the Professor of Physical Science give special instructions to the Normal students.

The address by Dr. Green is a vigorous and eloquent production, from which we should like to make several extracts did space permit.

The idea of a State School for Teachers is indeed a noble one. The plan of organization, according to which it is not merely attached to a college but is incorporated with it as one of its component and essential parts, yet retaining its own distinctive character, strikes us as very judicious. The advantages are not all on the side of the Normal School. We can well conceive that, as Dr. Green states, the College itself enjoys advantages from its connection with that School. The infusion of so large an element favorable to *study, to morality and to order*; the presence of *so many full grown men*, sober, discreet, studious and decorous in all their demeanor, must tend to render Transylvania University, a place peculiarly well adapted to the education of youth.

The Constitution of the Society for the Relief of Indigent and Superannuated Ministers of the Presbyterian Church and their Families. Charleston: Steam Power Press of Walker, Evans & Co., No. 3 Broad Street. 1857. pp 12.

This Society was incorporated by the Legislature of S. C. in December 1854. Its officers are THOMAS C. PERRIN of Abbeville, President; JAMES GILLAM of Greenwood, Vice President; JOHN P. WATTS of Laurens, Secretary; and JOHN F. LIVINGSTON of Abbeville, Treasurer.

The Certainty of the Final Triumph of the Gospel. A Sermon preached by appointment before the Synod of Mississippi, by the REV. J. A. LYON, D. D., of Columbus, Mississippi. Published by request. Natchez: Printed at the Daily Courier Office. 1857. pp 21.

This discourse exhibits considerable ingenuity and skill in argument.

The design of it is to show that Reason and Providence accord with Scripture in testifying that the world shall eventually be evangelized. But we question the value of any proof from Reason upon a question which depends as this does, absolutely upon the will of God. The Providence of God and yet more the Word of Promise of God are the only grounds of any confident reliance, where every human probability seems adverse to our desires.

Three Changes in Theological Institutions. An Inaugural Address delivered before the Board of Trustees of the Furman University, the night before the Annual Commencement, July 31, 1857, by JAMES P. BOYCE, Professor of Systematic and Polemic Theology. Greenville, S. C. : C. J. Elford's Book and Job Press. 1856. pp 48.

This is the production of a gentleman (originally of Presbyterian stock) who with unsparing liberality and zeal, is devoting his large property and the powers of his strong, original and independent mind, (both inheritances from his father, the late Hon Ker Boyce of Charleston), to the interests of our Baptist brethren. It is a production full of evangelical sentiment earnest feeling and manly thought, expressed in clear, strong, simple language. Mr. Boyce advocates three changes in the Baptist Theological Institution with which he is connected, viz :

I. To dispense with College education as the prerequisite of Theological education.

II. To extend the course of Theological training.

III. To require a certain declaration of doctrine from all who become Theological Professors.

It is not for us to express our opinion upon the merits of these recommendations. We have a great respect for any thing uttered by such a man as Mr. Boyce. We earnestly desire also the success of the Baptists in their scheme for building up at Greenville a first class Theological Seminary for their whole denomination of the South. We wish this for their sakes

and also for our own. Every thing done for Theological education by any church must help the cause of Theological training in every other church.

A Sermon on the Equality of Ministers of the Gospel, preached December 14, 1856, by REV. H. MANDEVILLE, D. D., Pastor of the Government Street Church, Mobile. Mobile: W. W. McGuire & Son, Book and Job Printers. 1857. pp 42.

A well-reasoned, and well written sermon on the Presbyterian Doctrine of Ministerial Parity, in opposition to the Prelatical theory of three orders in the Ministry. The Government Street Church, Mobile, has done a good service to the cause of Scriptural truth and Christian freedom by publishing this able discourse. Dr. Mandeville has enriched his sermon, as published, with many valuable quotations from the Fathers, in the form of Notes. We hope he may give us yet other products from the pen of which this is, so far as we know, the first fruits since his settlement at Mobile. Let him go on and discuss, for his people and the church at large, some of the other points of Church Government. "The influence of a form of Church Government, though less direct on those who adopt it than that of the doctrines of grace, is yet powerful, (as Dr. Mandeville says,) and the grounds on which we adopt any such form as Divine, should be occasionally at least, dispassionately stated."

An Exposition of the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Phillipians. By the Rev. JEANE DAILLE, Minister of the French Reformed Church at Charenton, A. D. 1639. Translated from the French by the Rev. JAMES SHERMAN, Minister of Surry Chapel, London. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 479. 8 vo.

Daillé will be recognised by our readers as one of the most honored names in the French Huguenot Church. His most celebrated work "De l'Usages des Peres," has already been issued in an English version by the Presbyterian Board. This exposition of the Epistle to the Phillipians was delivered from the pulpit of Charenton, and is marked with those qualities of clearness, candour, boldness, masculine vigour, eloquence, and piety which gave him so much influence among Protestants, and won the reluct-

ant admiration of many in the Popish communion of whose errors he was always a vigorous but courteous assailant. He presided over the last Synod of the French Huguenot Church, which was held at Loudon (not London as the Preface says p. 5.) from Nov. 10th, 1659 to Jan. 10th, 1660, previous to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantz. The French Protestants were accustomed to say that "since the days of Calvin they had possessed no better writer than M. Daille."

Daughter at School instructed in a series of Letters: By the Rev. RUFUS W. BAILEY. Philadelphia: Board of Publication. pp. 252. 12mo

A republication of a book dictated by parental affection, and replete with wise and pious counsels.

"*The Elect Lady.*" *A memoir of Mrs. Susan Catharine Bott, of Petersburg, Va.* By A. B. VAN ZANDT, D.D., New-York. Philadelphia: Board of Publication. pp. 196.

An interesting memoir of one largely adorned with the graces of the Spirit, and of eminent usefulness in the Church of God. "Favour is deceitful and beauty is vain, but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised. Give her of the fruit of her hands, and let her own works praise her in the gates."

Thoughts on Prayer: Its Duty: Its Form: Its Subjects: Its Encouragements: Its Blessings: By JONATHAN GREENLEAF, Pastor of the Wallabout Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, N. Y. pp. 156.

A plain and useful treatise on a most important duty.

The Refuge, by the Author of The Guide to Domestic Happiness. p. 227.

Lucy Dunlevy. A Sketch from Life. By S. S. EGLISEAU, Author of "Lizzie Ferguson" and "Gleanings from Real Life."

Our Friends in Heaven, or the Mutual Recognition of the Redeemed in Glory Demonstrated, by the REV. M. KILLEN, M. D. Comber. pp 22.

The Holy Life and Triumphant Death of Mr. JOHN JANEWAY, Fellow of Key's College, Cambridge, by REV. JAMES JANEWAY.

The Life of MRS. SHERWOOD, author of *Henry and his Bearer, &c.*, &c. pp 152.

What is Faith? by REV. R. H. BEATTIE. pp 102.

Gems of Thought, being Moral and Religious Reflections from MATTHEW HENRY and others, selected by HARRISON HALL. pp 128.

Little Talks for Little Folks. pp 72.

The Last Hours of MR. EZRA C. ROWE of *Fair Haven, Conn.* By his Pastor. pp 12.

Jonah or the Sleeper Awakened, by REV. J. A. WALLACE of *Kingstree, S. C.* pp 16.

A Wife's Influence—a True Narrative. pp 4.

How much Shall I Give? A Series of Tracts on the subject of Systematic Benevolence.

The Joy of Morning. Written for the Board of Publication. pp 55.

Little Kadore and Maurice Sullivan. pp 36.

The Stray Lamb. pp 72.

Faith, The Principle of Missions: By THOMAS SMYTH, D.D. pp 70.

The Evening Visit. pp 84.

Meditations in Sickness and Old Age. By BAPTIST W. NOEL, M. A. pp 114.

The Little Girl's Treasury of Precious Things. Compiled by ANNIE BROOKS. pp 168.

The Little Boy's Treasury of Precious Things. Compiled by ADDIE. pp 238.

Aunt Ruth, or Persecuted not Forsaken. By the Author of ELLA CLINTON. Written for the Board of Publication. pp 237.

The Presbyterian Pastor's Catechism. By the Member of the Presbytery of Baltimore. pp 35. A brief defence of the Presbyterian Church.

Marion Hawie. A Tale of Persecution in the Seventeenth Century. By the Author of "Ella Clinton" and "Aunt Ruth." "And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death." Rev. xii. 11. pp 279.

These are all issued recently by the Presbyterian Board of Publication.

They are fast supplying our children and youth with religious literature adapted to their years, and the churches with useful little manuals and tracts on practical religion, as well as occasionally more weighty, though perhaps not more important issues. We would suggest to the Board to add to the last named collection of tracts the Report on Systematic Benevolence, from the Committee appointed by the Assembly at Nashville.

Christian Missions in their principles. A Sermon for their Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church preached before the General Assembly at Lexington, Kentucky, May 25th, 1857. By EDWARD P. HUMPHREY, Professor in the Danville Theological Seminary. Published by order of the General Assembly. New York: Printed by Edward O. Jenkins, 26 Frankfort Street. 1857.

In this elegant, eloquent, forcible and instructive discourse, Dr. Humphrey answers the question *What is the Scriptural Theory of Missions, and to what extent does our church act on this theory?*

The first principle set forth in answering this question is *That the necessity for Missions springs out of the lost estate of the Heathen.*

The second principle is *That our warrant for the enterprise is the commission of Christ.*

The third principle is *That the instrument of Missions is the Gospel of Jesus Christ.*

The fourth principle is *That the Society for Missions is the Church of God, distinctively as such.*

The fifth principle is *That Funds for Christian Missions should be contributed by the people of God as an act of worship.*

The sixth principle is *That the saving power of Christian Missions is with the Holy Ghost.*

The seventh principle is *That the chief end of these labours is the glory of Christ.*

We copy two pages of this discourse as a specimen of the manner in which Dr. H. handles his subject:

“After what method should we give? The first answer is, give according as you have received, and as God hath prospered you. To offer a pittance out of abounding wealth, and then call that an act of generosity, is to mock; but to call it an act of holy worship, is to scoff. The next answer is, make these offerings stately and frequently. They who complain—and

many such there be—that collections for pious uses in their number exceed the incessant demands of the street beggars, and in their urgency the inevitable visits of the tax-gatherer, would do well to remember that contributions, being worship, must follow the general law of worship, and recur at brief intervals and regular periods, to prove and bless the people. The third answer is, give before you die; for, to neglect this institute of worship while you are living, under the idea of making it all right by your will, is not very unlike proposing to pray, sing praises, and come to the Lord's table by your executor.

What are the duties of our office-bearers in the administration of this ordinance? To this inquiry the first reply is, that the office of the deacon having been magnified, step by step, as this blessed way has been made known to us, should be restored in all our congregations. The next reply is, that the office-bearers, their divinely-appointed orders being filled, should themselves take the oversight of this business as one of their proper official functions in the matter of instituted ordinances. The employment of agents, under regular pay, to go from congregation to congregation administering the worship of God in alms-giving, is an anomaly hardly less admissible than the appointment of brethren paid to go from church to church administering the sacraments; the lawful pastors meanwhile standing aside, as if imbecile in the very matter unto which the pastor, and he alone, in the particular flock over which the Holy Ghost has made him the overseer, holds, in its highest form, the divine vocation. Not that we would cast reproach on what is past in the career of this church, not that we would depreciate the labors of its faithful servants, some of them the noblest of their generations, who have acted as the agents of our Boards and other institutions. Not at all, not at all. We would the rather do honor to the memory of these men; for have they not borne and had patience, and for Christ's name's sake have labored and have not fainted? Did they not build up and sustain all the great institutions of the church long before our pastors were made alive to these high principles? Have they not been foremost, also, in leading the church into a sounder doctrine and a more excellent way? Standing in the light, we would count them worthy of double honor through whose weary labors the church itself has come at last to consider almsgiving as an act of worship, and our office-bearers the lawful ministers of the ordinance. And we honor all the more the labors of these men, when we call upon our congregations to receive this holy ordinance of the primitive church, even the fellowship of the saints; and when we exhort our teaching and ruling elders to take care that every communicant shall have opportunity to enjoy the communion of God's people in alms-giving as now they enjoy that communion in the sacrament of the supper.

By what persuasives shall we encourage the people to exercise the grace of liberality? To this question our doctrine replies, first, that we should discard all mere human expedients, all appeals to vanity, love of display, and self-righteousness. For, if we accept as true the testimony to-day delivered by this venerable Assembly, "that offerings of money for the service of the Lord are acts of worship," then how incongruous do such devices appear. When shall we begin to publish in the newspapers the names of our church-members, with an estimate of the holy and penitential joy with which, man by man, they partake in the communion of the saints through the or-

dinance of the supper? Or, if we are not quite ready to adopt that measure, when shall we cease to state in the newspapers the degree in which, man by man, they participate in that communion through the ordinance of almsgiving? When shall we adorn our parlors with certificates, engraved, signed, sealed, and set in gilded frames, showing the number and fervor of our prayers? Or, if we will not do that, when shall we cease to hang up, where they may be seen of men, certificates showing how abundantly the grace of liberality is shed abroad in our hearts? Wherefore, if we be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, are we subject to such ordinances? The further reply to the question is, having led our people to lay aside these carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation, we would cultivate the grace of liberality in their hearts as we cultivate the other fruits of the Spirit, even by the preaching of the Gospel, by appeals drawn from the love of Him who gave himself for us, who though he was rich yet for our sakes became poor, who came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and give his life a ransom for many. Do we doubt the influence of the Gospel over the hearts of believers? We are sure that the Word and Spirit of God are clothed with a divine power unto the regeneration of them that are far off, barbarians and Scythians; do we doubt the power of that Word and Spirit over them that are made nigh by the blood of Christ, called also to be saints, who have received likewise the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry Abba, Father? Do we at once avow as to the pagans and disown as to the saints our faith in the mighty power of God through the Gospel of his Son?"

The Knowledge of God Objectively Considered—being the First Part of Theology considered as a Science of Positive Truth, both Inductive and Deductive. By ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D. LL. D., Professor of Theology in the Seminary at Danville, Kentucky, *non sine luce*. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1858. 8 vo. pp 530.

It is generally regarded as an evil incidental to Theological Seminaries that they withdraw a large amount of talent, piety and learning from the service of the pulpit, and to that extent, have a tendency to weaken the energies of the Church. This book is a triumphant refutation of all charges of the sort. Our Theological Professors are Preachers upon a large scale, Preachers not only to preachers, but to all the congregations of the land. In their studies they are putting forth an influence which, like the atmosphere, penetrates to every part of the country. The energies of the Church can only be competently developed when there is a due mixture of action and speculation, of private study and public labour—and although the two things are not in themselves incompatible and must be found in every minister of the Gospel, yet they are not likely to be wisely blended, unless there are

men whose business it is to give themselves ; some to one, some to the other ; predominantly, if not exclusively. We must have representatives of each, and the character formed from their combined agency is the character needed in the service of the pulpit. We congratulate the young Seminary at Danville on the omen which it gives of extensive and profound usefulness. Dr. Breckinridge's book will take its place by the side of the works of the greatest masters, and none will feel that they are dishonoured by the company of the new comer. It has peculiar merits. It is strictly an original work—the product of the author's own thoughts—the offspring of his own mind. He has studied and digested much from the labours of others, but has borrowed nothing. No matter from what quarter the materials have been gathered, they are worked up by him into the frame and texture of his own soul, before they are sent forth ; and in this respect, he has produced a book widely different from the miserable compilations with which, on almost every subject, the country is flooded. The plan, too, adapts it to general use. The humblest Christian can read it with almost as much profit as the minister. It is pure, unmixed Gospel—presented in a form at once suited to edify and instruct. It is not a dry, didactic treatise—but a warm, living, glowing representation of the truths of religion in their beauty, their power, and their glory. The author's soul is always on fire. He knows God only to love him, and he seems to feel that he has taught nothing until he has kindled the same flame in the minds of his pupils.

Thus much, in general, we have thought proper to say in relation to this remarkable work. But we cannot, in justice to our readers nor in justice to one who has been so eminently blessed in his labors for Christ and His Church, pass it over with this vague commendation. We propose in our next number to make it the subject of a full and articulate notice—and in the mean time we trust that all our readers will put themselves in a condition to appreciate our criticisms by studying the work for themselves.

Analytical Exposition of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans—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. New York : Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1857. 8 vo. pp 639.

In relation to the origin and design of this work, we shall permit the author to speak for himself :

“Under the impression that I might be able to shed some new light on the general design of the Epistle, and on some of the more important and obscure passages in it, I, at one time, entertained the design of either publishing, or leaving for publication, an Exposition which might have some claim to the threefold appellation of a Grammatical, Historical, and Logical Commentary. The work is still, however, so far from being what I think it ought to be, that, at my advanced period of life, I cannot reasonably expect to be able to complete it, in the way that could be desired, and I have, therefore, given up, not without a struggle, this long and fondly cherished expectation.

Yet I am unwilling to go hence without leaving some traces of the labour I have bestowed on this master-work of the apostle—without contributing some assistance, however limited, toward the production of what, whenever produced, will mark an era in the history of Scriptural Exegesis—a Complete Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans. Forbidden to build the temple, I would yet do what I can to furnish materials to him who shall be honoured to raise it.

For the last twelve months, my principal occupation has been, so to condense and remodel my work, as to present, in the fewest and plainest words, what appears to me the true meaning and force of the statements, contained in this Epistle, of the doctrine and law of Christ, and of the arguments in support of the one, and the motives to comply with the other; and to do this, in such a form as to convey, so far as possible, to the mind of the general reader, unacquainted with any but the vernacular language, the evidence on which I rest my conviction, that such is the import of the apostle’s words.

In carrying out this plan, I have, as a matter of course, confined myself chiefly to what may be termed Logical or Analytical Exposition. To the unlearned, grammatical interpretation can only, within narrow limits be made intelligible, and within still narrower bounds, interesting; and the force of evidence by which a particular conclusion is come to, on grammatical principles, they can scarcely at all appreciate. From similar causes, they can derive but little advantage, even from what is termed Historical interpretation.

But, among this class, there are to be found not a few who, in the exercise of a sound mind, are equally good judges as the learned, as to the clearness of a statement, the appositeness of an illustration, the point of an antithesis, the weight of an argument, and the force of a motive; and when they are made to see that, without using undue freedom with the words of the inspired author, in a translation which they have reason to think upon the whole faithful, the book is made to appear to have one grand object successfully prosecuted by a set of appropriate means; that, while a considerably complicated, it is a singularly harmonious, piece of thought; they not only obtain a clearer view of the meaning, but a deeper conviction that this must be the meaning of the inspired writer, than could be produced on such minds in any other way. And this is a result earnestly to be desired—carefully sought for—for it is of infinite importance, not only that such minds should be brought in contact with what is the mind of God in His word, but into conscious contract with it, so as that they may know and be sure that this is the meaning of the revelation made to them.

This logical or analytical exposition has, in the present instance, been erected on the basis of a carefully conducted grammatical and historical interpretation. Without this it would be a mere castle in the air. The analysis was not first made from a superficial view of the text, or borrowed from some previous exposition, and then the Epistle made to suit the analysis; but, after ascertaining, as far as possible, the meaning of the separate words and phrases, by grammar and history, there has been an honest attempt to bring out, by analysis, satisfactory proof that these words and phrases embody a closely connected discussion of one great subject, that there runs through the Epistle a deep, strong, clear, stream of connected thought—that the statements are perspicuous—the illustrations apposite—the argument sound—and the motives appropriate and cogent.

I am not unaware that, from the fact that the human mind is itself logical, there is a hazard of an analytical expositor creating, instead of discovering, order. But I trust there will not be found much of this kind of paralogism in the following work; for I am sure I have guarded against such a tendency; and I have a deep and solemn conviction that there is no worse or more dangerous way of "adding to the words of this Book," than by first putting into the text, and then bringing out of it, our own preconceived notions, and that he who consciously does so, does it at a tremendous risk.

While the leading character of the exposition is intentionally analytical, I have by no means scrupulously avoided either grammatical or historical remark, where it seemed requisite to subserve my main purpose; and I shall be seriously disappointed if those who study the Epistle, that they may become "wise unto salvation," have reason to complain of the work as but little fitted to guide them in the exercises of the inner life, or to minister motives to the duties, and support and consolation amid the trials and sorrows of the outward life."

That the book is, in many respects, a valuable accession to our Theological literature can hardly be called in question. It is evangelical, clear and often impressive—and though it deals very sparingly in verbal criticism, its precise statements of the logical coherence of thought are often better than the most minute dissection of words and phrases. His explanation, for example, of Rom. 4, 3, *Abraham believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness*, is none the less satisfactory than if it had been elaborately vindicated by subtle and ingenious exegesis. The order of thought requires the meaning he has given and we feel that it must be the true one. We cannot agree with the author in making the righteousness of God equivalent to His method of Justification. We think that it obviously means the matter of our justification. That Divine righteousness which Immanuel has achieved, and which, imputed to us, is the sole ground of our acceptance. We regret also that the author seems so frequently to restrict the vicarious obedience of Christ to His suffering and death. Not that he denies what is commonly called the active obedience.

He evidently admits it—and recognizes its importance—the whole tenour of his argument demands it—but his phraseology is not sufficiently definite and precise. He may plead the example of Calvin—but we regret the inadvertence. We must further say that justifying faith is not in this book discriminated by a reference to its object. The author studiously makes *all true* faith justifying. This seems to us a great error. Though true faith cannot exist without the reception of Christ, no more than it can exist without charity, yet it no more justifies *as faith* than it justifies as accompanied with love. It is its relation to Christ which gives it its efficacy. With these drawbacks we commend the book to the attention of our readers.

A Translation and Commentary of the Book of Psalms for the use of the Ministry and Laity of the Christian Church—By AUGUSTUS THLUCK, D. D., Ph. D. Translated from the German, with a careful comparison of the Psalm-text with the Original Tongues, by Rev. J. Isidor Mombert Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien, 608 Chesnut Street. 1858 12 mo. pp 497.

The writings of Tholluck, though far from coming up to the standard of American Orthodoxy, are pervaded by a spiritual unction which commends them to every pious heart. He is one whom the disciples of Jesus cannot but love. The attractive graces of his character appear in all their lustre in this admirable treatise upon the Psalms. His notes are brief but suggestive—the historical illustrations happily selected and introduced—and the whole spirit of the book is that of humble and intense devotion. Next to the commentary of Calvin, we regard this of Tholuck as the best adapted to popular use of any that we know.

We have received from the Messrs. Carters, to whom we hereby acknowledge our obligations, the following books whose titles and authors are a better commendation than any we can give :

Memories of Bethany—By the author of Morning and Night Watches, &c. 16 mo. pp 268. Beautifully printed.

The City ; its Sins and Sorrows—being a series of Sermons from Luke XIX, 41. *He beheld the city and wept over it*—by THOMAS GRUBBIE,

D. D., author of the Gospel in Ezekiel, &c. 16 mo. pp 215. Printed in much the same style with the preceding.

The Faithful Promises and Altar Stones—By the author of Morning and Night Watches. 18 mo. pp 66.

Flavel's Exposition of the Shorter Catechism. 16 mo. pp 246.

Elements of Algebra—By Major D. H. HILL, Professor of Mathematics and Civil Engineering in Davidson College, N. C., late Professor of Mathematics in Washington College, Va. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1857. 8 vo. pp 507.

This book comes to us very highly recommended by teachers of Mathematics, who are far more competent to pronounce a trust-worthy judgment upon its merits than we are. From what we know of the author's zeal in his profession and of his intense devotion to this class of studies, we have no doubt that it is entitled to all the commendations bestowed upon it. But we suspect, from the size of the volume, and the multitude of long, bristling formulas with which it is speckled, that it was designed rather as a text book for scientific and military schools, than for our colleges. It seems to us simply preposterous to require such an amount of algebra as a condition for admission into any institution aiming only at a liberal education, or to inflict it upon the pupils after they have entered. Some knowledge of the Mathematics is indispensable to a gentleman—but surely not that which we expect in a soldier or a civil engineer. How far they should be prosecuted it is hard to determine, but there is no doubt that the tendency in this country is to push them beyond all reasonable bounds. Their utility, in many and palpable relations, is so great, that they have been permitted to usurp the place of studies far more conducive to intellectual discipline. In this respect we regard them as comparatively worthless—their natural tendency, when exclusively pursued, is rather to dwarf and to stunt the mind. We are disposed, therefore, in a college perscription, to give them in very broken doses. Their introduction, to some extent, is necessary, but it is a necessary evil, and as such, should be counteracted by more liberal and manly studies, which develope and cultivate in full and harmonious proportion, all the powers of the mind. If the time now absurdly devoted in some of our colleges to the Calculus and higher Mathematics were spent upon Philosophy and the Classics—if men were taught to *calculate* less and to *think* more, the result would soon show the superiority of the ancient discipline to that which is superseding it. The Classics and Philosophy make *men*, the Mathematics *soldiers* and *engineers*.

History of Williamsburg Church. A discourse delivered on occasion of 120th Anniversary of the organization of the Williamsburg Church, July 4, 1856, Kingstree, S. C., with notes and an Appendix, by Rev. JAMES A. WALLACE, Pastor of the Church. "There is a voice of years that are gone. They roll before me with all their deeds."—Ossian. Salisbury, N. C.: 1856. pp 122.

This little book relates the history of one of our oldest and most prolific churches. We regret that we could not give it an earlier and more extended notice. The church of Williamsburg was founded by emigrants from the North of Ireland, who reached the country between the years 1730 and 1755. One of their earliest cares was to establish the worship of God in their new home. Their first call was to the Rev. JOHN WILLISON, of Scotland. In this they were unsuccessful. The church was formally organized in August, 1736, by Rev. ROBERT HERON, a Minister from Ireland. It had its full share in the sufferings and exploits of the Revolutionary period. The names of JAMES, MOUZON, and BRADLEY, are enrolled among the patriots of that season of trial. The churches of Indian Town, of Mount Zion, of Brewington, and Zion Church in Maury Co., Tennessee, were formed by emigration from the church of Williamsburg. Mr. WALLACE has performed an acceptable service in rescuing the history of this church and colony, from oblivion, and in perpetuating the memory of those who have performed such a memorable part in securing our religious and civil privileges.

ERRATA.

The reader is requested to correct the following errors of the Press in the article on *Dr. Breckinridge's Theology*. Many others might be noted, but these obscure the sense.

Page 595, line four from top, for "depth," read "strength."

P. 596, line three of second paragraph, for "enriches," read "underlies."

P. 597, line twelve, of note, for "therein," read "believer;" on same page, next to last line of note, after the word "objective," read "better for Dr. B.'s purpose."

P. 598, line eighteen from bottom, for "truth," read "birth."

THE

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. X.] JANUARY, MDCCCLVIII. [NO. 4.

ART. I.—REVISION MOVEMENT.

IN entering upon a brief discussion of the revision movement, it is due to ourselves and to those who entertain the same opinions, to say that we hail with pleasure all efforts to disseminate the Holy Scriptures, and all commentaries, translations, paraphrases, notes, and auxiliaries of whatever kind, conducive to a proper understanding of the Scriptures. To spread a knowledge of the truth abroad, is the great duty of all Christians—of all good men. And regarding the Bible as the great chart of all human rights, its moral code as the only perfect summary of all duties, as a guide to all wise legislation, and the principles taught and illustrated in its sacred pages, as the only hope of the peace, perpetuity and prosperity of our nation; we regard it the sacred duty of every patriot to aid in propagating it through the length and breadth of our land. It is worth more than all human constitutions, all political mass meetings, philosophic theories of government, or learned and eloquent political discussions. The fact that every good man loves the Bible and every bad man hates it, speaks volumes. The noble origin and the high destiny it claims for man, is the source of his highest aspirations and of his holiest inspirations. Here is the great secret of his wonderful progress in civilization, in literature, art and science. Substitute for the light of the Bible the dark dreams of Atheism, Pantheism or Infidelity, and man in his own estimation placed on a level with the brute will soon assimilate to the brute. History and philosophy alike verify this fact.

As christians and patriots, then, we stand forth the humble but uncompromising advocates of the Bible. We regard all efforts of

infidels to bring it into disrepute, as treason both to God and man; and all movements calculated to throw suspicion upon its teachings as highly pernicious to man's best interests. We believe that much has been said and written calculated not only to throw suspicion upon the received translation of the Bible, but upon the Bible itself, by the advocates of the "Revision Movement," as it is called. But for this belief, we should let it pass unnoticed.

At the outset a most remarkable phenomenon presents itself for explanation. One of the greatest movements of protestantism in the present century has been to scatter the Bible without note or comment, that it might be untrammelled by sectarianism and that all christians might co-operate in this great undertaking, over the whole world. To accomplish this, the noblest enterprise of any age, thousands are annually contributed, and the Bible is published in all the principal languages of the world. In addition to this, missionaries are sent into every country, and every effort is made to disseminate Christian knowledge, by publishing, teaching and explaining the Scriptures. And yet while doing this, a set of men calling themselves the "Bible Union," charge them with imposing upon "the masses," by circulating a Bible which contains nearly "*twenty-four thousand errors*," and with making a "declaration of war upon the Bible Union," when it "undertakes with the aid of the best scholars that can be found, to correct the numerous errors, in King James' version." These Revisionists represent themselves as being the light of the world, and the salt of the earth. Speaking of the Bible Union, they say: "It has over five hundred thousand persons engaged in its support. The great mass of these persons are among the most pious, the most holy and righteous people on earth, if obedience to Jesus Christ in every thing is a criterion of holiness and righteousness." "*Obedience to Jesus Christ in every thing!*" what perfect saints! Why does Elijah's chariot of fire delay? Again; "There is not one in the whole body that would buy a false translation of a word if it were as cheap as a penny; there is not one who does not regard each word of the inspired text as a priceless gem, with which no man can trifle." "All parties engaged in the enterprise of the Bible Union are recognized as persons of unblemished integrity, of pure morals, of thorough truthfulness in matters of veracity." "A more just, fair and truthful organization for carrying forward a holy work never was made upon this earth."—(Diss. on Rev. of Hol. Scrip.) Solomon says, Prov. XXXII, 2, "Let another man praise thee, and not thine own lips." We presume that the Revisionists have not yet reached this passage. They have then a large number of "the most pious, most holy and righteous people on earth" engaged in this enterprise which "is one of the noblest elements in the progress of the age." They have "an organization for carrying on this holy work never surpassed on earth." "It is

a regularly organized body of christian people, who stand perfectly fair in society as honest, upright people before God and man. There is not a Bible society in the world that has stronger claims upon the confidence of every pious man and woman on earth."—(p 71.) They have a board of Revisers the most learned ever known in the world. "The Bible Union, therefore, constitutes a Board of Revisers, consisting generally of the most learned scholars that could be found in Europe or America, and many of the highest dignitaries in the different denominations assisted the Bible Union in finding the *best scholars in their ranks*." "The Board consists of upwards of forty men of unsullied character as men, and they are recognized as the most learned men of this or any other age." The Bible Union says, "*There is not, and there never has been, an English version of the Holy Scriptures faithful, in all respects, to the inspired original.*" The "Bible Union" propose to give us one that shall be "faithful in all respects, to the inspired original." We are told that, "in order to give the people of the English race the benefit of these principles in a practical way, the Bible Union made a constitution, founded upon this living truth: "The word of God shall be translated into all languages, so as most clearly to express to the people the exact sense of the original or inspired text, without reference to the tenets or practices of any sect or party in Christendom." p. 69.

To prove the necessity of this great work which they have undertaken, they bring the following charges against the present translation :

1. To the title of some of the Books, employing the word Saint, as Saint John, &c.
2. That some of the renderings are sectarian, teaching Episcopacy and Calvinism.
3. That some words are not translated.
4. That learned words are sometimes unnecessarily used.
5. That it contains obsolete words.
6. That the phraseology is sometimes indelicate.
7. That uniformity is not observed in proper names.
8. A want of uniformity in translating words.
9. A want of discrimination on points of ellipsis.
10. The truth of the original not brought out in some places ; in others additions are made.

Thus the translation in use is represented as a most miserable affair, made by order of a most wicked man for his own purposes and by a batch of unprincipled and incompetent hirelings and sycophants.

Those who do not give in to this revision movement are represented as hiding the word of God from the people and endangering the souls of men ; and are compared to those who in the dark

ages and in a corrupt church opposed the translation of the Bible into the vernacular language of the people;* and war is waged upon the Revisionists, and they are persecuted simply for wanting to exercise a right, that of making a revision or translation, which has been done by Wesley, by the Bible Society and by others without a word being said against them. This is certainly a sad picture of the present condition of the Christian world. Think of this; a body of christians, "the most pious, the most holy and righteous on earth," "obedient to Jesus Christ in every thing," have selected from Europe and America, the "*most learned men of this or any other age,*" to give the people the pure word of God in a translation of the Bible, "faithful in all respects to the inspired original, instead of the present defective, corrupt and sectarian one; and strange to say, instead of being aided by every christian, they are actually discountenanced, and according to their own account, war is waged upon them by the greater portion of all christian denominations! These Revisionists ask, "What can be more heinous, a more flagrant and unpardonable fraud than to palm off on men as the word of God, that which the Holy Spirit never uttered, and translations of even what the Comforter did utter that are universally admitted to be perversions? All the forgeries of earth are venial in comparison with these deeds." Is such the wicked conduct of by far the greater portion of all christians—of all but a handful of Revisionists? Is the christian world made up of knaves and fools, and has it been left for the Revisionists to make this grand discovery? Or is it a false alarm attempted to be gotten up by a few sectarians "most pious, most holy and righteous," and infallible in their own estimation, but not so regarded by the rest of the world?

Are all christians except these few Revisionists, guilty of "the heinous, flagrant and unpardonable fraud" of "palming off upon the people" a 'corrupt, perverted and sectarian translation of the Scriptures; and are they "waging war" upon a most pious, most holy and righteous" organization for the purpose of giving "to the people the pure word of God in a translation of the Bible, faithful in all respects to the inspired original!" **WE SHALL FIRST EXAMINE THE MERITS OF THE TRANSLATION NOW IN USE.**

1. We admit that the present version is susceptible of a few amendments; that in a few instances the translation might be improved; that a few obsolete words might be exchanged for others better understood; and that in the orthography of proper names there should be more uniformity. And if a Board of Revisors were ecclesiastically appointed by different denomi-

*p. 163, Discussion. See, also, p. 152, Fraud.

nations and such corrections made as were unanimously agreed upon, we should give it our entire approbation.

2. There are scarcely any corrections to be made, that have not been already made in the marginal readings or in the commentaries in use.

3. There are no alterations or corrections to be made that would in the least affect any important doctrine or precept in the Bible. And we challenge the Board of Revisors said to be "the most learned men of this or any other age" to prove the contrary.

4. The Revisionists in their attempts to discredit the common version have collected and criticised what they deemed the most faulty specimens of this translation. Let us take some of their examples and see how far they have made out their case. 1. It is objected that the title Saint is prefixed to some of the books of the New Testament. This is said to be of Popish origin. Be it so. It affects neither doctrine nor precept. It deserves no notice further than to show what an effort is made to create prejudice against the received version. We presume the writers were Saints; and that in the titles of their books, they should be called so, is neither a heinous, nor flagrant fraud. The Revisionists call themselves "the most pious, most holy and righteous people on earth." They should not deem it a very great crime to call the inspired writers "*Saints*." 2. It is objected that some of the renderings are sectarian. It is alleged that the word ἐπισκοπή is translated *bishoprick* when it should be translated "*office*" or "*charge*;" (Acts I, 20,) and "*office of Bishop*" when it should be "*office*" or "*charge*," I Tim. III, 1. The translation of I Tim. III 1 would then read thus: "If any one desire office; he desireth a good work." According to Mr. "D. R. Campbell, L. L. D., President of Georgetown College, Ky.," *office hunters* are engaged in a good work. Such a translation is an utter perversion of the original. The only sensible rendering of the word ἐπισκοπή is *bishoprick*, or *office of bishop*.

Dr. Campbell tells us that ἐπισκοπος should be "*overseer*" in every case. Now it so happens that the word *bishop* is just the transfer into English of the Greek word ἐπισκοπος derived from ἐπί, upon or over, and σκοπέω to see, look, &c., being made up of the preposition and verb in Greek corresponding to over and see in English; the word *bishop* is the very same as ἐπισκοπος. While the two words *bishop* and *overseer* have the same meaning so far as derivation is concerned, the former is appropriated to one who has the oversight of a church in religious matters, while the latter, with us, is appropriated to one who has charge of a plantation and hands. By appropriation then, the two words differ very widely in sense. The common sense of every one will reject the translation of the learned L. L. D. The word *bishop* did not make bishops, as known

in the Episcopal form of church government, but the creation of this office only added another meaning to the word.

It is objected that the word *ἐκκλησία* is translated *church*, when it should be *congregation*. In direct opposition to this, we maintain that to substitute *congregation* for *church* would be as great a perversion of the meaning of Scripture as is found in any of the instances, specified by these critics of the common version. This we will make plain to the common sense of the unlearned as well as the learned. In the New Testament, it signifies,

1. The followers of Christ in a particular city or province, as the church at Ephesus, Corinth, Antioch, &c.

2. The disciples of Christ assembled for worship in a particular place, as a private house. Col. IV, 15, Rom. XVI, 5.

3. All the followers of Christ considered as a body. Acts II, 47, "added to the church daily such as should be saved." Eph. I. 22, "and gave him (Christ) to be the head over all things to the church," which is his body." Eph. III, 10, "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the *church* the manifold wisdom of God." Eph. V, "As Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it; That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

To substitute the word *congregation* for *church* not only perverts the word of God, but teaches palpable falsehood. The word *congregation* denotes simply an assemblage of persons, however promiscuous in character, believers and unbelievers, Jews and Gentiles. And many of the declarations made in Scripture concerning the church, cannot be made concerning a congregation. The word *church* on the other hand is appropriated to such as are really or professedly the followers of Christ. It implies assimilation and organization. The derivation of the words *church* and *congregation* prove the first to be the most suitable word. *Church* is derived from *κυριος* and *οικος* and denotes the house of the Lord *primarily*, and *secondarily* those who are attached to the house of the Lord.

The word *congregation* is derived from *con* and *grego*, which is from *grew-gis*, a flock or herd brought together. The word *ἐκκλησία* is derived from *εκ* and *καλεω* called out, as the followers of Christ are called upon to come out from, and be separate from the world.

If the advocates for translating it *congregation*, reply that they intend to adapt its meaning to that of *ἐκκλησία* in Scripture, they might as well select the word "*mass-meeting*" and define it to express the idea, conveyed by the original. They have selected the translation of this word as an evidence to prove that the common version is sectarian. A charge that has no better proof than

this to sustain it, (and this is as good as any they have), deserves to be noticed only as an evidence of the ignorance and weakness of those who use it. It serves further to prove that they themselves are guilty of that sectarianism which they charge upon others. The word *ἐπίσκοπος* translated bishop is another proof of sectarianism. And what is the amount of the proof? An argument drawn from this in favor of Episcopacy, is about equal to one we have heard in favor of Baptists, viz: that we read of John the Baptist, not of John the Presbyterian or Methodist. As to the charge that it teaches Calvinism, we doubt whether the Revisionists will be able to correct this evil. After all the charges they can make, it is likely that the respective advocates of Calvinism and Arminianism will resort as they always have done to the original; and the English reader will make up his opinions from the analogy of faith, and from the general scope of Scripture.

3. Their third charge is that some words are not translated, and the words *raca*, *mammon*, *anathema*, *maranatha*, are given as instances. Now it so happens that there are some words in every language, that cannot be directly translated into another. Hence the number of words introduced into English from other languages. Sometimes they are Anglicised, and sometimes introduced without any change. The words *mammon* and *anathema* have become English words, and could not be exchanged for others without injury to the translation. The word *raca* could not be translated so as to convey the meaning of the original. *Maran-atha* might have been translated "our Lord is coming;" but the whole passage needs the aid of the commentator to enable the common reader to understand it. And if the translation should serve to keep the reader from consulting a commentator, it would be an injury rather than an advantage. The Revisionists then have *one* word that might have been translated.

4. The fourth charge is that learned words are sometimes unnecessarily used. The specifications are synagogue, proselyte, tetrarch, quaternion, centurion, matrix, delectable, terrestrial, celestial, progenitor, prognosticator, &c. When these learned critics shall have found words more simple and equally expressive of the ideas conveyed in the original, we shall admit their charge to have some weight, until then we must regard it as a specimen of captious pedantry.

Says Campbell, "The same objection lies against the following learned forms of proper names: Thomas, Didymus, Marcus, Lucas, Timotheus, and Sylvanus. How much simpler, and more intelligible would be, Thomas the Twin, Mark, Luke, Timothy, and Silas." We have no objection to the change and would like uniformity, but we do not see how a proper name is made more *intelligible*, by changing it from its Greek or Latin form into an English form. Nor do we see how it is made more simple, except

that it is shortened. As to the translation of Didymus, it is of very doubtful propriety. He may have been a twin, and he may not. The fact, that Didymus, in Greek, means a twin, is not positive proof. Do the Revisionists propose to translate all names that are significant? Shall we have Aaron, *lofty*; Abel, *vanity*; Abiram, *high father*; Abner, *father of light*; Adam, *earthy*; Eve, *living*; Daniel, *judgment of God*; Edom, *red*; Moses, *taken out of the water*; Agag, *roof*; and Agagite, *the race of roofs or floors*. Let us take an example in proper names, as Gen. XI and 18, "And Peleg lived thirty years and begat Reu." According to the new version this should read, And *division* lived thirty years and begat his friend or shepherd. And friend lived thirty and two years and begat branch. And branch lived thirty years and begat hoarse or angry. And then in the course of time we should have a new set of revisionists; and their travelling critics, laboring under the weight of their philological and grammatical knowledge gathered up as they travelled, would denounce the absurd translation, and give us *become* hoarse instead of begat hoarse. Let it be remembered that every word is to be translated so as to convey to the English reader the same idea first conveyed by the original to those who received it.

5. *The fifth objection is to obsolete phrases and words.* We admit that there are some obsolete words and phrases, and it may be necessary for readers to consult notes, or dictionaries, or commentaries. But we never expect the time to come, when this will not be necessary. Shakespeare, and Johnson, and Addison, and Milton, and Burns, and Dryden, and Pope, cannot be read and understood by any except good scholars without reference to dictionaries, notes, and even commentaries. Are we to be continually altering these works? The following are some of the examples given by D. R. Campbell, L. L. D.: *cracknels*, for cakes. "We know nothing about cracknels, but just put the word cakes and all is plain." Now, strange as it may seem at first, we object to the alteration. The word *cake* would convey a wrong idea. To us it would suggest the idea of a biscuit. In Europe biscuits like ours are not in use. To them it would convey a different but still a wrong idea. The נְקֻדִים *nekudim*, is trans-

lated κολλυσις in the Sept; *crustula* in the vulgate; and cracknels in English, and were thin cakes pierced through with many holes, the same as is called *Jews' bread* to the present day, and is used by them at the passover. To translate it cakes would mislead the reader; let it remain cracknels, and let those who wish to know its meaning go to a Bible dictionary or commentary.* The next word is *purtenance*. Dr. Campbell should have given us a

*III. Gun substituted for bow would be false.

substitute for this. We doubt whether he could give us a better. The word *bruit* is another. It is not obsolete and I doubt whether one can be substituted that will better express the idea intended.

The word *carriage* is another. From its derivation it signifies something carried. Mr. Campbell would substitute *baggage*. This is of French origin. Why not put luggage, which the English use and is of Saxon origin. Perhaps some would prefer trunkage as more genteel. A word, if it is somewhat obsolete, is better than one of local or temporary use.

The word *fray* is another. The meaning of it is not likely to be mistaken. A marginal correction would answer every purpose.

There are several other examples given, some of which might be altered.

So far then as obsolete or unusual words are concerned, the sum of the matter is this:

1. If they were all corrected, it would add no great deal to the understanding of even the common reader.

2. Some of them cannot be altered and the original idea so well expressed as it already is.

3. The idea of making a translation that will render dictionaries, notes and commentaries unnecessary, is a delusion of ignorant quacks and miserable sciolists.

4. The idea of perpetually modernizing the language of the Bible is one of the follies of shallow thinkers. Progress does not consist in obliterating the past, but in adding to it. Words are signs of ideas, and ideas are the images or impressions of things. The things past cannot be altered, and the words representing the ideas of things past, should be altered as little as possible. To make words which are the signs of ideas derived from things present, represent ideas derived from things past, from the mere fact of some similarity or correspondence between the things present and those past, is to obliterate the knowledge of the past. Thus to substitute cakes for cracknels, is to present to the mind the idea of a thing not only modern, but local, in place of the real thing referred to among the Jews. The revisionists seem to think, that all is made perfectly plain, if they can apply some word, applicable to something now known and in use, to a corresponding thing in time past, however little may be the points of correspondence; while, in many cases, this is so slight, and the things so unlike, that the word applied conveys a very erroneous idea.

6. The sixth charge is "that the phraseology is in several instances offensive to true delicacy." Now these revisionists propose to give a "translation of the Bible faithful in all respects to the inspired original." Every word is to be translated, and by a word that will convey to the English reader the same idea that the original conveyed to those using it. The objection here is not

that the common version is *incorrect*, but *indelicate*. How are they to escape this indelicacy, if the common version is proven to be a faithful translation? This is an old infidel objection upon which we will remark, First, that a book like the Bible, which relates to every part of man, soul and body, must necessarily use terms with which corrupt minds will associate evil. Secondly, that terms in one age and country are vulgar, that are not so in another. Thirdly, that the more corrupt the minds of the people are, the more numerous are the terms with which they associate evil thoughts. Lastly, as cowards brag most, and smatterers in knowledge make the greatest efforts at display, so the less moral and pure the minds of persons are, they exhibit the greatest amount of false delicacy. Externally we live in an age of wonderful refinement, and to sustain it we must coin words. We must say man-cow or male-cow, or male horse; the bosom of a chicken and not the breast; the upper and lower limbs, and not wings and legs. And we have read of a Miss who corrected her father for saying legacy. She said it was vulgar; he should say *limbacy*.

There is nothing in Scripture that should not be there, but it is not necessary that every thing there should be read in public. Medical books contain a great deal not suitable to be read at all times and in all places, or by all persons, but yet necessary in a system of Medicine. He who would undertake to translate a medical book from the French, and mistranslate portions of it, on the ground, that the true and correct translation was indelicate, would be severely criticised.

7. The seventh charge is, that there is a want of uniformity in the orthography of proper names. This has arisen in part, from the fact that the Hebrew alphabet is made up of consonants and vowel points. These vowel points are of comparatively modern origin. In the use of these points there was not uniformity. Secondly, different persons have used different Roman letters to represent some of the Hebrew consonants. And thus different translators have represented Hebrew proper names differently, both in the vowels and consonants. Lastly, the names are sometimes translated and sometimes not. The cause of this discrepancy is obvious to every scholar; and unavoidable except by comparing and correcting different translators.

8. The eighth charge is the want of uniformity in the rendering of words. It is alleged that one word is translated by a great many different words. We shall not follow Mr. Campbell through his long string of words. His objection is not to the translation in any case, specified, but to the principle, that one word should be translated by different words. Our critics seem to have taken up the idea that every word in one language, has a word exactly corresponding to it in every other language; and that in making a faithful translation, all that is necessary, is to

put the one in place of the other. To make those who do not understand the languages, comprehend the weakness of the above objection, a few statements are necessary. It must be borne in mind, that words are the signs of our ideas—that ideas are the impressions made upon our minds by things.

1. Then, there are things in one country and age not found in another. Consequently there are ideas and words in one that are not in another. Such ideas cannot be translated, from the one to the other, without making a new word or giving to some existing word a new meaning, or transferring the word from one to the other along with the idea.

2. As words are very few compared with ideas, one word is often the sign of many ideas. And every word has as many different meanings, as it has applications to different things; each thing being known to be different from every other thing by the different impression which it makes. Thus, the word *sweet*, has as many meanings as there are different things to which it is applied. The same is true of every noun, adjective and verb. A word may have a great many more meanings in one language, than its corresponding word in another has, and these meanings must in translating, be expressed by different words.

3. Some words are very indefinite, are generic, and their meaning must be known from their connection; as the word *tool*; a tool to bore with is an *awl* or *augur*; to saw with is a *saw*; to grub with is a *mattock*; to hoe with is a *hoe*; to plough with is *plough*; to chop with an *axe* or *hatchet*; to cut with is a *knife*; to shave with is a *razor*; to sew with is a *needle*, &c. Now the very first word selected by Mr. Campbell is רמח *romah* from the verb רמח *ramah*, to cast. What the thing cast, is, then, must be learned from the connection. Let Mr. Campbell show from the connection that it has not the different meanings assigned to it in the translation. Words do not make things, but things originate words, and the application of the same word to different things, makes different meanings. Primary, secondary and figurative are as distinct as if the ideas were represented by different words; and in translating from one language to another the different ideas represented by a word in one language must be expressed by different words in that other language. These principles have been sadly overlooked in criticisms and discussions on New Testament subjects. A new system of ideas was to be taught to mankind in a language in which they had never before been expressed. Words in this language became the signs of new ideas to be known only from the context. And strange to say, theologians have ransacked the pages of heathen writers to extract from them christian ideas, and have made a parade about primitive meanings, as if these were to settle questions of christianity. And in

opposition to all common sense and the practice of all translators, it has been asserted that words have but one meaning, however many different applications they may have; that is, apply the word to as many different things as you may, let it represent as many ideas as it may, it still has but one meaning—one idea. What a transformation of things these word-jugglers can make. With them *things* are the *signs of words*, and any number of different things may be changed into one and the same thing, by applying one word to all. The magicians of old were nothing compared with our word-jugglers. By the magic of words, all sectarianism is to be banished; all diversity of thought and opinions is to cease. The great platform of universal catholicity is “*the belief of one fact*,” and “*submission to one institution*.” This is “all that is required of Heaven for admission into the church.” The one fact is that Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah. “The one institution is baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” “Christianity Restored,” pp 118 and 119. Here all may meet, Unitarians, Trinitarians, Arians, Socinians and Universalists, with Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, &c. And how is this to be done? Why, by the magic of words. All must adopt the same form of words and discard all opinions. For this thing of opinion is the source of all sectarianism. We are, then, to use a form of words, but to attach no meaning—no ideas—no opinions to them. What a platform for christian union! How strangely extremes will meet. In principle this is the very platform of Popery. She has her creed or dogmas, and her rites or institutions; repeat the former and submit to the latter, and this is all she requires. Be Unitarian, Infidel, Universalist, any thing you choose privately, but when you would appear in a religious garb, you must put on her livery, repeat her dogmas, and submit to her rites. Be Unitarian, Infidel, Universalist, any thing you choose privately, (*i. e.*) as to your opinions, but when you appear in a religious garb, you must put on the livery of Catholicity—repeat the words, “*Jesus is the Messiah*,” and submit to baptism. In regard to baptism, however, Mr. Campbell is not so liberal as in regard to the Saviour. You may entertain whatever opinions you choose as to the Saviour, provided you call him the Messiah; but baptism is too important a matter to be thus treated; it consists in a specific act *immerse*, and to set the world right on this and some other kindred subjects the Bible requires to be revised. For this was the starting point of revision, as we shall see. Now had Mr. Campbell said that faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as he is revealed to us in the Bible, and baptism with water, irrespective of mode, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as a sign of the Holy Spirit’s regenerating influence, were all that the Scriptures required for admission into the church, we should have sustained the position. But when he lets go the substance

for the shadow, when he would make *faith* a mockery and *form* an idol—when he would attempt to unite all christians and heretics too, by a mere juggle of words, and banish thoughts and opinions, we must say that this is not the age for such measures. We are too familiar with catholicons in medicine, to trust them in religion. And the idea of getting up a Bible by revision, that is to do away with sectarianism, is a quackery at which the ignorant may stare, but the wise will laugh.

We return to Mr. D. R. Campbell's objections. His ninth is, that our version is wanting in discriminating accuracy on points of ellipsis. His ten this, that it fails in numerous instances to give the distinctive truth of the originals, while in others it makes unwarrantable additions. The improvements that Mr. Campbell would make under these heads are neither many nor great. Time will not permit us to notice them further.

We have now noticed the principal objections, and have found that by far the larger portion of them amount to nothing. Some are the mere conceits of individuals; others mere exaggerations; only a few of the phrases objected to are capable of being improved; and not a single doctrine or precept would in the least be altered or changed by any improvement that can be made in the translation.

And here we will repeat that we have no objection to any translations or revisions that men may choose to make; but we do object.

1. To any set of men undertaking to carry through a work of their own by traducing the present version and its translators; aiming to bring it into disrepute and to unsettle the faith of the unlearned for selfish purposes.

2. We do object to their charging the piety and learning of the present age with knowingly imposing upon the unlearned a corrupt and sectarian version; and attempting to cast upon others the odium of keeping the masses in ignorance for their own selfish ends. The accusation of infidelity against the clergy is old and stale, and as contemptible as it is wicked.

3. We do object to the assaults made upon others for the purpose of publishing a sectarian Bible, while attempting to conceal the fact.

4. And in conclusion, we say that they are not entitled to the support and confidence of the public; that their translation is not only sectarian but inferior to the present version.

We have met with a travelling agent of the Revisionists who undertook to enlighten our benighted people, and seemed well satisfied with the marvellous things he had to tell them. He was a clear proof of what we assert, that these Revisionists first wage war upon the world and then cry persecution when their reckless assertions are denied. He claimed to have made the wonderful discovery that priests, not ravens, fed Elijah. No one who ever

saw the Hebrew and Greek will envy him his honor. And as to his sage criticism about Sampson and the foxes, he should have quoted Tom Paine for his authority. If he wished for light on the subject, Bishop Watson would give him more than his new version. *Quiescat in pace.*

We will now notice some things in the "Discussions on Revisions of the Holy Oracles." Did this production not appear as the representative and advocate of the "American Bible Union," we should think that it was doing injustice to the Revisionists to notice it at all. It appears, however, avowedly as their representative; "*ab uno discite omnes.*"

The authors are *James Edwards* and *T. S. Bell*. On page 129, after puffing Bishop Kendrick for revising the Rhemish version, they say, "And the world has seen neither Pope nor council nor conclave of clergymen hurling anathemas* upon the head of Bishop Kendrick for thus endeavoring faithfully to make the word of God plain and complete to the most ordinary reader. Bishop Kendrick did not hesitate to enrich the Vulgate version with the copious treasures of the Greek text; but protestant sectarianism rouses its forces against the enriching of King James' version from the ample resources of the inspired text, as though it feared that what was the word of God in the hands of the Apostles and early saints in Christ Jesus, and what is now the word of God in the hands of scholars, might poison the common version in the hands of the masses of the people, who have been imperfectly taught in the ways of God by the sectarian teaching of the age. Nothing can show more perfectly the innate sense of weakness on the part of sectarianism than its dread of the faithful rendering of the Word of God." This passage convicts the writers of three things. First, of deliberately slandering all protestant denominations. Let them prove that there is a single evangelical denomination of christians, or prove that in any of them there are ministers of the gospel who are not anxious that "*the masses of the people*" should have the word of God as clearly and as faithfully as it can be presented in the English language. They will not however recommend a perverted sectarian version, one that for aught they know may be tinctured with heresy and infidelity, if they are to judge from such advocates as these writers.

Secondly, they talk of "copious treasures in the Greek text" with which the present version should be enriched, a representation which they know to be palpably false. They would make the impression that copious treasures of knowledge are designedly kept back in the present version. They convict themselves of ignorance or infidelity. Either they have no religion, are infidels

*Anathema, untranslated word in the Testament.

discarding all religion, or they belong to some sect. If they are Infidels, then they are hypocrites. If they have any religion, then their denunciation of sects is the result of ignorance; for they belong to a sect. And all they can mean by a Bible version opposed to sects, is one translated to suit themselves. The translation must be made to express what they mean, or it will not be a faithful rendering of the word of God.

These profound scholars give us some specimens of their criticism. I Cor. XII, 31, "orders christians to covet earnestly the best gifts." "But Exodus XX makes it sinful to covet." Had they turned to Webster, they might have learned that covet means to desire earnestly. It is wrong improperly to desire what belongs to another. It is right to desire earnestly what is good and proper to possess.

Again, Gen. XXII, 1, "God did tempt Abraham." James I, 13, "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God," &c. This is put down as another contradiction. A reference to Webster would have cleared this difficulty. Exodus XXIV, "And they saw the God of Isaac." John I, 18, "No man hath seen God at any time." This is put down as a contradiction.

They correct this by translating it, "They saw the appearance of the God of Israel." Query—Was it the Saviour, the God of Israel they saw? or did they see the appearance of the "*invisible God?*" We are at a loss to know whether such miserable criticisms as these implicate the head or the heart most. They are more like the ridiculous quibbles of Infidelity than the criticisms of good sense. We can only notice one or two more. "In Acts V, 3. Peter is made to say, "Whom ye slew and hanged on a tree," meaning that the Jews first killed the Saviour, and then hung him on a tree. The fault here is not in the order of the words but in translating the participle as a verb. It should be, whom ye killed, hanging him on a tree. The same error is found in Acts XXII, 16, Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins. This should be translated, "standing up, be baptized and wash away thy sins." We hope our critics will not over look this, and that they will not immerse Paul standing up. We admit the incorrectness of the translation, but doubt if any person, ever supposed that our Saviour was first killed and then hung upon a tree after reading the account of his crucifixion and death.

On page 134 is the following: In Eph. III, 14, we have, "For this cause I bend my knees before the Father *of our Lord Jesus Christ*." The italicised words are in our version but not in the Greek." This declaration is false, it is in at least three copies which we have examined. It is in the text of Griesbach, accompanied with a mark which indicates a probable omission, "but not so certain," he says, "that we dare expel them as doubtful words from the text." The writers evidently intended to impose on the

unlearned and make the impression that the translators wickedly inserted words for which they had no authority in the Greek. It will not do to say that their meaning is, that the clause is not in the correct original. They say nothing about different manuscripts in the original. They simply and unqualifiedly assert that they are not in the Greek. And the assertion is simply and unqualifiedly false. How are we to trust the Bible in the hands of such Revisionists, when they are not trust-worthy in a plain matter of fact? On the same pages in the very next paragraph is a similar statement. This may be explained by Dr. Maclay's letter, "in one book which came under my observation, after it had been stereotyped, a cursory examination showed that the reviser had deviated from the received Greek text in two places by adding something to it; in twelve places by substituting something for it; in twenty-two places by rejecting something from it. And one of the portions rejected as *spurious* embraced twelve consecutive verses. In another place the following passage is cast out of the Bible :

"For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water; whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in, was made whole of whatsoever disease he had."

Where the common version reads, "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life," the received Greek text has been so critically edited that, in the revised English version, the same passage reads thus: That every one that believes on him may have eternal life. And the rejection of 'Jesus,' 'John,' 'Christ,' and 'Amen,' are specimens of the smaller changes which have resulted from this revision of the Greek text."

This Greek text made by expunging from, by adding to and by altering "*the received Greek text*," is that, we suppose, in which the above passages are not found. These are the men who are to give the people, the masses, the pure word of God.

We charge the Revisionists in the next place with slandering the translators of the common version, for the purpose of traducing the version. They virtually charge them with dishonesty and incompetency. On page 112 of the "Discussion" they say, "But we turn to a consideration of King James' packed jury of revision. It is a great stretch of the truth to call them substantially by the name of translators. The real translator of a large portion of the English Bible was William Tyndale, who gave ample evidence of the possession of more learning than we have any evidence was in the possession of the entire forty gentlemen called King James' translators." "To return "King James' revisers had before them the labors of Tyndale, Coverdale, with improvements of his own, Cranmer's great Bible; the Geneva Bible; the Bishop's Bible; and the Latin Vulgate. All testimony of any weight concurs in supporting the facts." And do these facts prove their incompetency?

According to this logic the present Revisers are ten times less competent; for they have these and all the translations, annotations and commentaries made since, *or ought to have*. Again they say, "A great deal of labor is spent by persons, who scarcely know what they are talking about, in glorifying the learning of King James' translators. If these parties were called upon for proof of their statements, they would necessarily be dumb, for the record is vacant in all the matter of proof. Those translators have not left a single monument of their learning by which its character can be ascertained. Men of science, of arts, and of philosophy, are known by the works they produce, and can be known in no other way. Where is the grammar, the lexicon, any edition of the classics, any treatise in any one department of learning, prepared by any one of King James' board of forty revisers, to which men may look in order to learn something of their acquisitions. All history stands dumb to these questions." These men, like Haman, have prepared their own gallows. They tell us their Board of Revisers are "*recognized as the most learned men of this or any other age.*" They must be "known by the works they produce, and can be known in no other way." We ask "where is the lexicon, the grammar, any edition of the classics, any treatise in any one department of learning, prepared by any one" of the American Union's Board of upwards "of forty revisers, to which men may look to learn something of their acquisitions." Again, page 113, they say, "In order to assist the tyrant James in riveting a yoke upon the necks of the people, these corrupt revisers, holding appointments under James and seeking church benefices at his hands, did not hesitate to make holy writ utter repeatedly God save the king." The words $\text{יְהוֹשִׁיעַ הַמֶּלֶךְ}$ in Hebrew (*yehe hamelek*) is translated in the Septuagint Ζητω βασιλευς , in French *vive le roi*, and in English, God save the King, preserve him alive. The translators who regarded God as the preserver of men, could not have so fully expressed the meaning of the Hebrew by any other phrase. And it is not only wrong, but it is malicious to make so base a charge against the translators without some better evidence to sustain it. If they have better, we have not seen it. The force of the argument, if there is any, is in the translation of the word הַמֶּלֶךְ (*hammelek*) king. Our Revisionists, we suppose, will translate it, "*let the President live.*" We have noticed this only to show how unfounded is a charge that depends upon such miserable sophism.

COMPETENCY OF THE TRANSLATORS.

Let us now inquire into the character of these dishonest and incompetent translators. With King James we are not at all con-

cerned. The attempt to traduce the character of the translators and their version, by depicting that of King James in the blackest colors possible, is a species of sophistry unworthy of men claiming to be "the most pious, most holy and righteous people on earth." The charge, however, is not original with them. The Rev. Dr. Jonathan Homer, of Newton, Massachusetts, made the same charges, but the complete refutation of them ought forever to have put them to rest. The character of the age in which the translators lived, the manner in which they were selected and their private history must forever refute the above charges. We shall notice these briefly.

1. *The character of the age in which they lived.*—"The age in which our translation was made was pre-eminently a learned age. In science and the arts, that in which we live is, we admit, greatly beyond its predecessors. But so far as learning and scholarship is concerned, we do affirm there never has been an age equal to it. There never was an age so distinguished by so many illustrious scholars in every department of classical and biblical learning. Where do we go for profound original information on Latin, Greek or Oriental Literature? Where are the great storehouses from which our bookmakers draw their Lexicons, their Grammars, their Commentaries? Was Melancthon a mere Latin scholar? Did Roger Ascham know nothing of Greek? Were Erpenius, and Golius, and Poccocke, unacquainted with Arabic? Was Hebrew a dead letter to such men as Buxtorf, Morinus, Pagninus, Arias Montanus, Tremellius, Junius, Beza, Castell, Walton and Pool? Where is the Public Library, three-fourths of whose volumes on sacred philology are not dated in the 16th and 17th centuries? We find in this period among the magnates of Oriental and Classical learning besides those already mentioned, such names as Budaeus, Erasmus, Turnebus, the Scaligers, P. Manutius, Aldus Manutius the younger, Casaubon, Fagius, the Morels, Gesner, Fabricus, Morus, Glass, Capellus, Grotius, Usher, Lightfoot, Montfaucon, Vossius, Heinsius, (father and son), Bochart, Meursius, Robert and Henry Stephens, all of them scholars of the very highest order; to say nothing of the incomparable divines, and illustrious authors of every sort and in every nation, who flourished during the same period. Now, though all these were not living at the time our translation was made, yet a majority of them were cotemporary with the translators; and they show the general character of the age, that it was the age of great men, especially of great scholars. The eighteenth century excelled it in science and works of taste. But for men of profound erudition, beyond all contradiction there never was such a period since the foundation of the world. The turn which the Reformation took, and the great controversies, between the Papacy and its opposers, appealing at every step to the original languages of the Scriptures, made Greek and Hebrew

what politics is now, the great absorbing topic of the world. Critical editions of the Bible and of Classical authors were published on a scale and in a style utterly unparalleled. The immense Thesaurus of the Greek language, by Henry Stephens; the Rabbinical Lexicon, of Buxtorf; the Arabic Lexicon, of Golius; the Hierozoicon, of Bochart, the twelve folio volumes of Meursius on Grecian Antiquities, are but specimens of the thorough-going manner in which the scholars of that day handled every subject which they attempted. It is impossible even to glance at their productions without a profound veneration of their scholarship, only equalled by our amazement at the effrontery which would call it in question. Their very printers were learned men. Even their books of devotion are so crowded with Greek and Hebrew that many a sciolist of these days could not read a page in them without his Lexicon and Grammar, who yet would not blush to call himself a scholar, or to attempt with some "consulted aids" to make "a new translation of the Bible."

"Dr. George Hakewell, a cotemporary, in a work first published in 1627, says, 'This latter age hath herein so far excelled, that all the great learned scholars, who have of late risen, especially if they adhered to the Reformed Churches, have been by friars and such like people, in a kind of scorn, termed *grammarians*. But these grammarians are they who presented us with so many *exact translations out of Hebrew and Greek into Latin*, and again out of Latin into other languages. To which may be added the exquisite help of dictionaries, lexicons and grammars, in this latter age, beyond the precedent, not only for the easier learning of the western languages, Latin, Italian, Spanish, and French, but especially the eastern, the Hebrew, the Chaldaic, the Syriac, the Arabic. Of all the ancient fathers, but only two (among the Latins, St. Jerome, and Origen among the Grecians), are found to have excelled in the Oriental languages; this last century having afforded more skillful men in that way than the other fifteen since Christ.' Now is it probable that, only twenty years before this testimony was written, the monarch of an enlightened nation, himself proud of being thought a learned man, and ambitious to effect a version of the Scriptures that might be quoted as the great glory of his reign, should not be able, out of fifty-four of the principal scholars in the Kingdom, including the Hebrew and Greek professors of the Universities, and the most distinguished heads and fellows of the several Colleges, to obtain any learned and honest enough to "translate directly from the original." But laying aside all probabilities, what are the known facts of the case as recorded by unquestioned contemporary historians? Who were the venerable men called by King James to this celebrated undertaking? Many of them, it is true, with the unobtrusiveness of genuine scholars, never pushed themselves much into public notice; and the most we

know of their individual history is a mere catalogue of their works and their preferments, gathered from public records, and from the incidental notices scattered through the authors of that period. But of others we have full and detailed information. And of all we know enough to be fully borne out in the assertion before made, that a more learned and pious assembly the world never saw united in any one literary undertaking."—Princeton Theological Essays, pp 509-11.

In proof of the above, we will now refer to some of these as examples. "*William Bedwell* was one of the most eminent orientalist of his time. His fame for Arabic learning was so great that he was resorted to by Erpenius, during his residence in England in 1606, for directions in his oriental studies. He was Arabic tutor also to the great Dr. Pococke. He commenced the preparation of a general Arabic Lexicon in three volumes folio, and having proceeded in the work for several years, he went to Holland for the greater perfection of it by a collation of the papers of Joseph Scaliger, who had made a collection of twenty thousand words in that language. In consequence of the vastness of the design, and the slowness with which he proceeded in it, he was anticipated by the Lexicon of Golius, the completeness of which made his labors abortive. Eight or nine volumes of the manuscripts of this great work were employed by Castell in the compilation of his unrivalled Polyglot Lexicon. Bedwell also commenced a Persian Dictionary, which he did not live to complete. He published an edition of all the Epistles of John in Arabic with a Latin translation, which was printed in quarto, 1612, at the press of Raphelenigus. In 1615 he published another work entitled "A Discovery of the Importance of Mahomet and the Koran," to which is appended a very curious illustration of oriental etymology and history called "The Arabian Trudgman." He left at his death many Arabic manuscripts to the University of Cambridge, with numerous notes upon them, and a fount of types for printing them."

Miles Smith was from early youth a close student of the classics; extensively read in the Greek and Latin Fathers; accurately versed in Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic; and well acquainted with Rabbinical literature generally.

Richard Brett was distinguished alike for his piety and learning, "skilled and versed to a criticism in the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldaic, Arabic and Ethiopic tongues."

John Boyse, the son of a clergyman by a pious mother, was early instructed, had read the whole of the Bible before he was five years old, and before he was six could write Hebrew in an elegant hand; at fourteen he was admitted into St. John's College, Cambridge, became distinguished for his knowledge of Greek; read in the University Library in summer from four o'clock in the morning, till eight in the evening, without intermission; was ten years

chief Greek Lecturer in his college, and voluntarily read a Greek Lecture for some years, at four in the morning in his chamber, which was attended by many of the Fellows.

Sir Henry Saville was a very learned man and great benefactor of learning; he founded two Professorships at Oxford; published a splendid edition of Chrysostom's works; supplied libraries with rare books and manuscripts; was called the Mæcenas of the age; was at one time Greek Tutor to Queen Elizabeth; was Fellow, and for thirty years Warden of Merton College, in which station he acquired great reputation; and was afterwards chosen Provost of Eton College; and greatly increased its fame by the learned men with which he filled it.

Andrew Downes was one of the learned men whose notes accompany Sir Henry Saville's famous edition of Chrysostom's works. He was Regius Professor of Greek in Cambridge University, and was accounted one of the best scholars of his time.

Launcelot Andrews—Fuller says of him: "The world wanted learning to know how learned this man was; so skilled in all (especially the Oriental) languages, that some conceive that he might, if then living, almost have served as interpreter general at the confusion of tongues."

John Laifield—"Being skilled in architecture, his judgment was much relied on for the fabric of the Tabernacle and Temple."

Richard Kylbye was educated in Lincoln College, where he was successively Fellow and Rector, and after some ecclesiastical preferments was appointed Hebrew Professor in the University of Oxford.

"*William Spencer*, Greek Lecturer in Trinity College, and afterwards chosen to be Professor of Divinity in Gresham College, London; on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and several heads of Colleges at Cambridge, several of the nobility and of King James himself, who thought it a suitable recommendation for one of the translators of the Bible."

John Harmer was Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford; for nine years chief Master of Winchester School, and for seventeen Warden of the College there. He translated Beza's sermons into English, and several of Chrysostom's works into Latin. He was well read in the Fathers and Schoolmen, so that he held public disputations with some of the celebrated Catholic Doctors during his travels on the Continent.

"*Thomas Holland* took his degrees in Exeter College, Oxford, with great applause;" was Regius Professor in the same, then Master, "being accounted a prodigy in almost all kinds of literature; was eminent for his piety, and towards the close of his life, spent the greater part of his time in prayer and meditation."

"*John Reynolds*.—His memory was little less than miraculous, he himself being the truest table to the multitude of voluminous

books he had read over, whereby he could readily turn to all material passages in every leaf, page, volume, paragraph, not to descend lower to lines and letters. He died before the work was completed. As he approached his end his whole time was spent in prayer to God, in hearing persons read, or in conferring with the translators. He was a Puritan, greatly venerated for his learning, piety, humility and disinterestedness.

Mr. Edward Lively, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University, was said to be profoundly learned in the Oriental languages. He also died before the completion of the work.

Laurence Chadderton was thirty-eight years Master of Emanuel College with great credit. He was a Puritan; noted for his strict observance of the Sabbath; never allowed his servant to be detained from public worship to cook his victuals. "I desire as much," said he, "to have my servants know the Lord as myself."

Such, then, was the character of the age, and of the men selected for the translation of the Scriptures. Out of the great contest between Popery and Protestantism, had grown up an age of Classical and Biblical Literature. Never before or since have the destinies of nations, the fortunes of kings and princes, the rights and liberties of the people, been so much involved in great ecclesiastical principles to be determined by an appeal to classical and especially to oriental and biblical literature. Never before or since has there been felt such a pressing necessity for a thorough knowledge of these studies. The great field of modern science had not as yet aroused the intellectual world. The great intellectual forces of the day were concentrated upon the study of classical and biblical literature. This was the great age which collected together the productions of past ages, digested them and from them drew the materials for the grammars, the lexicons, the dictionaries, and editions of classical books which have constituted the great store house for all succeeding ages. To make grammars and lexicons, &c., is one thing, to alter, whether for the better or the worse, is another. The present age is one of compilation merely from the labors of the past. The sixteenth century was therefore emphatically the age of classical and biblical literature. As to the translators, they were selected from those of the very highest repute for scholarship. "Of the twenty-five employed in translating the Old Testament, it is matter of record that thirteen were men eminently skilled in Hebrew and the Oriental languages, including six who were or had been regular Hebrew Professors in the Universities. Of the translators nearly all had received Fellowships in early life because of their great proficiency in learning. There were among them fifteen who were or had been heads of Colleges, five Vice Chancellors of the Universities, three regular Greek Professors in the Universities, seven Divinity Professors, one Archbishop, and seven Bishops. They were remarkably aged

men," averaging more than sixty. "This fact is worthy of observation as leading us to understand more fully the peculiarly venerable impress which is stamped upon every lineament of their work. This would be still further explained, could we enter into more full details, illustrating their eminent piety and heavenly mindedness." It speaks badly in the extreme for any cause that it finds it necessary to slander the memory of such men with the charges of dishonesty and incompetency. The sophistry of it, too, bespeaks weakness or want of principle. For after all that may be said in reference to the character of the translators, their version must stand before the tribunal of scholars upon its own merits; and the miserable attempt of our modern Revisionists to create a prejudice in the minds of the masses (as they call them) against the common version, by making false and wicked charges against its authors, will add nothing to their cause in the end. It destroys whatever confidence we might otherwise have had in them.

We have now examined the objections alledged against the present translation. We have seen that not a single doctrine or precept of importance is at all affected by any defects in the translation, that very little additional light could be added by mere alterations in the translation; that a large portion of the alledged objections are unfounded; and that many of the proposed alterations would be objectionable. We have seen how unjust and false are the charges of the Revisionists, made against the Christian world in general, of imposing a corrupt translation upon the "masses;" of opposition to a faithful translation of the word of God; and of persecuting these self-sacrificing, "most pious, most holy and righteous people on earth," for simply endeavoring to give "the masses the word of God." We have seen that many of their criticisms, very much resemble the miserable quibbles of Infidelity; that they are guilty in some instances of statements palpably false; and that their charges of dishonesty and incompetency against the translators are gross slanders upon the memory of the venerable christians and scholars, whose labors have blest thousands; slanders gratuitously uttered, serving no other purpose than to excite an unreasonable and an unholy prejudice in the minds of the ignorant against the common version. We have seen that their charge of a sectarian version from the translation of a few words is not sustained. The charge that the translators were trammelled by King James and made a version "to order" is utterly unfounded. The following are the Rules by which they were governed:

1. The ordinary Bible read in the church commonly called the Bishop's Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit.

2. The names of the prophets, and the holy writers with the other names in the text, to be retained as near as may be, accordingly as they are vulgarly used.

3. The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, viz: as the word *church*, not to be translated *congregation*, &c.

4. When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of faith.

5. The divisions of the chapters, to be altered either not at all, or as little as may be, if necessity so require.

6. No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words, which cannot without some circumlocution, so briefly and fitly be explained in the text.

7. Such quotations of places to be marginally set down, as shall serve for the fit reference of one Scripture to another.

8 Every particular man of each company to take the same chapter, or chapters, and having translated or amended them severally by himself, when he thinks good, all to meet together, confer what they have done, and agree for their part what shall be done.

9. As any one company shall have despatched any one book in this manner, they shall send it to the rest, to be considered of seriously and judiciously; for his majesty is very careful on this point.

10. If any one company upon the review of a book so sent, shall doubt or differ upon any places, to send them word thereof, note the place, and therewithal send their reasons; to which if they consent not, the difference to be compounded at the general meeting, which is to be of the chief persons of each company at the end of the work.

11. When any place of special obscurity is doubted of, letters to be directed by authority, to send to any learned in the land, for his judgment in such a place.

12. Letters to be sent from every bishop to the rest of his clergy, admonishing them of this translation in hand; and to move and charge as many, as being skillful in the tongues, have taken pains in that kind, to send his particular observations to the company, either at *Westminster*, *Cambridge* or *Oxford*.

13. The directors in each company to be the deans of *Westminster* and *Chester* for that place; and the King's Professors in Hebrew and Greek in each University.

14. These translations to be used, when they agree better with the text than the Bishop's Bible itself, viz: *Tindal's*, *Matthew's*, *Coverdale's*, *Whitechurch's*, *Geneva's*."

We know not what better rules could have been adopted; and we see no just ground for the charge of being trammelled. They are just such as we would now prescribe to a company of revisers. The translation then in use was to be altered as little as the original would permit; proper names to be retained as then used or altered

as little as possible, and the old ecclesiastical words retained. This was right. The translators were divided into six companies, and every chapter translated by six different individuals, revised by the company, sent for review to the other companies to be reviewed by them, and lastly by a general meeting, of the chief persons at the end of the work. These translators were further instructed to call in the aid of all the learned in the land; and every one skilful in the languages was directed to send his observations to the company, so that all the learning and talent of the day were called into requisition. "They not only examined the *channels* by the *fountain* (translations with the original,) which was absolutely necessary, but also compared *channels* with *channels*, which was abundantly useful in the Spanish, Italian, French and Dutch languages."

Says Fuller, "Those who have compared most of the European translations with the original, have not scrupled to say, that the *English translation of the Bible, made under the direction of King James the First, is the most accurate and faithful of the whole.* Nor is this its only praise; the translators have seized the very *spirit* and *soul* of the original, and expressed this almost every where with pathos and energy. Besides, our translators have not only made a *standard translation*, but they have made their translation the *standard of our language.* The English tongue in their day was not equal to such a work, "but God enabled them to stand as upon Mount *Sinai*," to use the expression of Adam Clark, and "to crane up their country's language to the dignity of the originals, so that after the lapse of two hundred years, the English Bible is, with very few exceptions, the standard of the purity and excellence of the English tongue. The original from which it was taken, is, alone superior to the Bible translated by the authority of King James." The same learned man says, "This is an opinion, in which my heart, my judgment, and my conscience coincide."

The following remarks of *Walton*, will, we think, apply in part to some of our modern critics: "The last English version made by divers learned men at the command of King James, though it may justly contend with any now extant in any other language in Europe, was yet carped and caviled at by divers among ourselves; especially by one who being passed by and not employed in the work, as one though skilled in the Hebrew, yet of little or no *judgment* in that or any other kind of learning, was so highly offended that he needs must undertake to show how many thousand places they had falsely rendered when as he could hardly make good his undertaking in any one."

Louth says, "The vulgar translation of the Bible is the best standard of our language."

"*Bishop Horsely*" says, "When the translators in King

James the First's time began their work, they prescribed to themselves some rules, which it may not be amiss for all translators to follow. Their reverence for the sacred Scriptures induced them to be as literal as they could, to avoid obscurity; and it must be acknowledged that they were extremely happy in the simplicity and dignity of their expressions. This adherence to the Hebrew idiom is supposed at once to have enriched and adorned our language; and as they labored for the general benefit of the learned and the unlearned, they avoided all words of Latin original when they could find words in their own language; even with the aid of adverbs and prepositions, which would express their meaning."

Middleton says "The style of our present version is incomparably superior to any thing which might be expected from the finical and perverted taste of our own age. It is simple, it is harmonious, it is energetic; and, which is of no small importance, use has made it familiar, and time has rendered it sacred."

Dr. Geddes says, "The highest eulogiums have been made on the translation of James the First, both by our own writers and by foreigners. And indeed if accuracy, fidelity, and the strictest attention to the letter of the text, be supposed to constitute the qualities of an excellent version, this of all versions must in general be accounted the most excellent. Every sentence, every word, every syllable, every letter and point, seem to have been weighed with the nicest exactitude, and expressed either in the text or margin with the greatest precision. Pagninus himself is hardly more literal, and it was well remarked by Robertson, above a hundred years ago, that it may serve for a Lexicon of the Hebrew language as well as for a translation."

Whitaker says, "The highest value has always been attached to our translation of the Bible. *Sciologists*, it is true, have often attempted to raise their own reputation on the ruin of that of others; and the authors of the English version have frequently been calumniated by charlatans of every description; but it may safely be asserted, without fear of contradiction, that the nation at large, has always paid our translators the tribute of veneration and gratitude which they so justly merit. Their reputation for learning and piety has not descended with them to the grave, though they are alike heedless of the voice of calumny, and deaf to the praise which admiring posterity awards to the great and the good. Let us not therefore too hastily conclude that they have fallen on evil days and evil tongues, because it has occasionally happened that *an individual as inferior to them in erudition as in talents and integrity, is found questioning their motives, or denying their qualifications for the task which they so well performed.* Their version has been used, ever since its first appearance, not only by the church, but by all the sects which have forsaken her; and has been justly esteemed by all for its general faithfulness, and the

severe beauty of its language. It may be compared with any translation in the world without fear of inferiority; it has not shrunk from the most vigorous examination; it challenges investigation; and in spite of numerous attempts to supersede it; has hitherto remained unrivalled in the affections of the people."

John Taylor of Norwich, the author of an excellent Hebrew and English Concordance, says, "you may rest fully satisfied, that as our translation is in itself by far the most excellent book in our language, so it is a pure and plentiful fountain of divine knowledge, giving a true, clear, and full account of the divine dispensations, and of the gospel of our salvation, insomuch that whoever studies the Bible, the English Bible, is sure of gaining that knowledge and faith, which if duly applied to the heart and conversation, will infallibly guide him to eternal life."

The London Quarterly, speaking of Lowth, Blayney, Horsely, Newcome, says, "That these and other profound scholars have materially assisted the cause, and produced many valuable elucidations of particular passages, is gratefully acknowledged by all who are acquainted with their works. Yet with all the respect which we feel for their labors, we venture to express a doubt whether any new translation of even a *single book of Scripture*, has appeared since the publication of the authorized version, which taken as a whole has come up to the standard, either for the general fidelity and correctness with which it conveys the sense of the original, or the dignity, simplicity and propriety of language in which that sense is conveyed."

Such is the testimony of some of the world's best scholars to the great excellence of our present English version. To this we will add, (and hold ourselves responsible for it before the learned world,) that there is not a translation of any of our classical authors, Latin or Greek, equal to it. We have various translations of Cæsar, Sallust, Livy, Ovid, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Tacitus, Juvenal, &c., and of Xenophon, Thucydides, Euripides, Homer, Plutarch, Josephus, &c., and we assert that among all these not one is equal to the translation of the Bible, taking our common version, notwithstanding the fact, that any one of these is so much easier translated, for various reasons that might be assigned.

ART. II.—ON THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD.

Next to the hope of personal salvation, is the hope of the conversion of the world. No doubt, there will be some wicked men till the end of time; but the time is coming when they will be rare exceptions to the general rule. Piety will be the prevailing character of the population of the world, and of every particular country. Aware that this doctrine is rejected by some wise and good men, we wish to present the evidence by which it is sustained, as fully as our limits will permit.

I. It is plainly taught in many of those passages which relate directly to the Redeemer:

1. Sometimes He is described as the conqueror of Satan, and the destroyer of his works. Three texts may suffice as specimens of this class.

Genesis 3: 14, 15. And the Lord God said unto the serpent— I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.”

It is surely unnecessary here to offer an argument to prove the reference of this passage to the spiritual interests of men. By serious Christians, universally, it is justly regarded as the first intimation of mercy to our fallen race—general indeed; but not obscure.

The phrase, “*He shall bruise thy head,*” is equivalent to, *He shall conquer thee.* So in Psalms 110: 6., “*He shall wound the heads over many countries,*” evidently means, *He shall conquer many countries.* Whatever may be thought of this particular criticism, there can be no doubt as to the general meaning of the threatening. It is, that Christ should frustrate the designs of Satan, and repair the mischief which he had done; and in view of the nature of the subject, this is equivalent to what we have stated.

All the predictions of this chapter contemplate man in his mortal state. “*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*” So far as their direct meaning is concerned, none of them go beyond this point. Of the war between Christ and Satan, the consequences are eternal; but the conflict and the victory take place in time. It is here, those who were the slaves of Satan become the citizens of the Redeemer’s kingdom. If Satan can retain men

in bondage till their death, his ulterior designs in reference to them will infallibly be effected. Satan, then, had now become the prince of this world; God addresses him *in that character*, and threatens him with an overthrow. What could be the meaning of such a threatening, uttered in such circumstances, but this—that he should cease to be the prince of this world—should lose his kingdom? We can conceive of no ulterior design, as entertained by him, which was not inseparably linked with the idea of retaining the world in rebellion against God; of course, his defeat must consist, primarily, in the return of the world to its allegiance to its rightful sovereign. And that is the conversion of the world.

Let us now turn to another passage. In anticipation of his crucifixion, and only a few days before it took place, our Redeemer exclaimed, "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." The Evangelist adds, "This he said, signifying what death he should die. (John 12: 31-33.

It will, of course, be admitted that the "prince of this world," here spoken of, is Satan; and after the explanation given by the Evangelist, it seems hardly possible to misunderstand the passage, if we will attend to the connexion between verses 31 and 32. The former tells us that Satan is to be cast out, or to lose his dominion over the world; and the latter, that this is to be effected by Christ drawing all men unto himself, in consequence of his crucifixion. For example: the drawing here mentioned cannot be merely the common strivings of the Holy Spirit. These can never deprive Satan of *one* of his subjects. It is only by the conversion of men that Satan, as the prince of this world, can be cast out. The only remaining question is, in what sense are we to understand the phrase "all men?" It certainly does not mean, *all men of all generations*. Our Saviour is evidently looking, exclusively, to future events, which are to take place *in this world*. The power of Satan, as "*prince of this world*," would not be affected by the conversion of those whose connexion with this world is already terminated, even were such an event to take place—a supposition manifestly inconsistent with the unequivocal teachings of the word of God. Nor can the whole meaning of the phrase *all men*, as here used, be, *some of all classes*. We know the phrase is sometimes used in this sense. But if nothing more were meant here, this would neither imply nor secure the casting out of Satan as "the prince of this world." The mere loss of some subjects of all classes falls very far short of the deposition of a monarch. We must conclude, then, that such multitudes of men are to be drawn to Christ, that Satan shall no longer have a kingdom in the world. We are not, indeed, to infer that there will be absolutely no unconverted persons. Such an inference, we think, is forbidden by other

portions of the word of God ; certainly it is not required by this. The mere fact of owning some slaves is perfectly distinguishable from the possession of a kingdom. And when great numbers are in question, the use of the word "*all*" does not necessarily imply that there are absolutely no exceptions ; it is enough if the exceptions constitute but an extremely small proportion of the collective body described. No one hesitates to say, "*All must die* ;" but two exceptions have taken place, and more will take place at the second coming of Christ.

In this passage, then, we are unequivocally taught, that the death of Christ secured infallibly the downfall of Satan's kingdom—the conversion of the world. As to the certainty of this result, the case is just the same as if the two events had occurred at the same moment. *Then*—when Christ was lifted up upon the cross—*then*, Satan, as a prince, was *virtually* cast out. The process of his *actual* ejection commenced soon after, is still progressing, and will be completed in due time. Such is the plain teaching of this passage ; and such is precisely the doctrine which we propose to prove.

The last passage of this class which we shall adduce, is in Revelation, 20: 1-3—"And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled; and after that he must be loosed a little season."

Satan, as we learn from other Scriptures, is a liar—the father of lies. By falsehood he seduced our first parents from their allegiance to their creator, and thus acquired dominion in this world. By falsehood and deceit his kingdom has been upheld ever since. So far as men on earth are concerned, to be freed from the deceits of the Devil, and to be freed from his power, are the same thing ; or, at least, inseparably connected. The passage before us points to a time when *the nations* shall be thus freed. What nations ? Manifestly, the nations which he has hitherto deceived. The language will scarcely, if at all, admit of any other construction—*he shall deceive the nations no more*. If he has hitherto deceived all nations, all nations are to be undeceived. Further confirmation, if any be needed, may be derived from the manner in which this result is said to be attained. He is bound and imprisoned ; and his prison is the bottomless pit. Nothing short of the conversion of all nations can correspond with such a representation as this. It is indeed, believed by many, that the globe we now inhabit is to be inhabited by saints after their resurrection, who, of course, will be entirely free from Satanic influence. On the merits of this theory we have no occasion to express an opinion at present. The

reference of this passage is manifestly different. Glorified saints will never more be exposed to the wiles of the Devil; but we are here told that Satan, after his imprisonment, "*must be loosed a little season.*"

Gospel truth, as all Christians are aware, is the opposite of Satan's lies, and the Divinely appointed means of undeceiving his dupes. Through its instrumentality, men are "turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." Hence, in predicting the destruction of the influence of the great deceiver, the Revelator, in effect, predicts the universal diffusion and success of the Gospel. But, for the establishment of our position, it is sufficient that the influence of the deceiver is to be destroyed. The implication as to the instrument shows the harmony between this and other portions of the word of God.

The texts on which we have commented differ widely in phraseology, and occur in different parts of the Bible; on comparing them together, we discover a most wonderful correlation, establishing their identity as to subject and general meaning, and precluding, (as far as language can do it,) the possibility of doubt as to what that meaning is. In each, the subject is, the destruction of the power of a certain being; who is that being? In the first of these passages, he is called "*the serpent,*" and the context identifies him with the original tempter of our first parents. In the third, he is called "the dragon," "that old serpent," "the Devil," "Satan;" and what is said of him identifies him with the great deceiver of the nations. In the second, he is spoken of as "the prince of this world," and the great opposer of Christ. None of our readers will require an argument to prove that all these descriptions relate to the same being. Who is his antagonist? In the first, he is called "*the seed of the woman*—a title which, we all know, belongs to our Saviour, in a sense in which it is not applicable to any other person. In the second, the antagonist of "the Prince of this world" is the speaker, and the speaker is Jesus. In the third, the nature of the event, as compared with the uniform and acknowledged teachings of Scripture, connects it infallibly with the power of Jesus. Where, and among whom, is the revolution here predicted, to take place? In the first passage, it seems, evidently, to be on earth, and among mortal men. There is nothing to suggest a different idea; nothing is said about any other world, or about the state of man after the death of the body. The bruising of the heel of the seed of the woman, is connected with the bruising of the serpent's head; and there is no more reason for referring one to the eternal world than the other. In the second, these points are quite too clear for controversy; and in fact, have never been disputed. In the third, the manner in which the nations are mentioned naturally suggests the idea of man still in this world and in his mortal state; and the prediction, that Satan is to

be loosed after his imprisonment, implies that he is again to deceive the nations; and this settles the question.

It is evident then, that all these texts relate to the same subject, and exhibit the same leading idea. They all relate to the destruction of the power or influence of Satan over mortal men. That destruction, we know, must be the work of Christ; and in two of these texts it is distinctly represented in that light.

Indeed, a single figure runs through the whole series, and is developed with a fullness, regularity and consistency, which would be admirable, even if these passages were successive portions of one continuous and connected discourse. In the first, Satan is represented as conquered; in the second, as deposed from his sovereignty, and succeeded by his conqueror; in the third, as chained and imprisoned, that he may not excite rebellion, or raise disturbances.

Moreover, the progressive development of the subject is just as wonderful as the progressive development of the figure. Each of these three passages affords some information as to the manner in which the work in question is to be effected. Each succeeding passage brings into view some circumstance not mentioned in the preceding; and all these circumstances are just such as, according to the acknowledged teaching of other portions of Scripture, must belong to the work, if its nature accords with our interpretation. The first brings into view the sufferings of the Saviour—*the bruising of the heel of the seed of the woman*—but it neither indicates the mode of his suffering, nor tells us *how* his sufferings are connected with his victory. The second decides both these points. When men are spoken of as drawn to Christ, the direct reference uniformly is to the renewing work of the Holy Spirit. This must be evident to every one who will read the 6th chapter of John, with attention and candour. Our saviour, then, predicted that he should be lifted up, or crucified; in consequence of which, the hearts of men should be renewed by the Holy Spirit; and thus Satan should be deposed, and his own kingdom established throughout the world. But as yet, we have heard nothing of the instrumentality through which this revolution is to be effected. We know that Satan's kingdom is a kingdom of falsehood; his subjects are his dupes; when they are undeceived, and not before, they become Christ's subjects; the Gospel contains those truths which are the opposites of Satan's lies, and is accordingly, the appointed means of undeceiving his dupes, and thus transferring them to the kingdom of Christ. Bearing this in mind, we turn to the third passage, and find it predicted that Satan shall be bound, in such a sense, that he shall deceive the nations no more; which is just saying, in other words, that they shall be converted to Christ by means of the truths of the gospel. Omitting for the present, all disputed points, we gather from these three passages the

following items of information. Christ will repair the mischief which Satan did by seducing our first parents into sin. This work consists in bringing into his own kingdom, by the renewing operation of his Spirit, those who were formerly subjects of Satan. Of this change his death upon the cross is the procuring cause. It is effected by means of his gospel, which, instrumentally, undeceives the dupes of the Devil. Now we cannot deduce all these particulars from any two of the texts before us; but putting the three together, we find them stated in the precise order here specified.

It is evident, then, that these texts reciprocally explain one another; and if the language of one of them leaves any point doubtful, we are authorized to settle it by appealing to another. Now, whether the criticism which we have offered on the first be received or rejected, the language of the first can hardly be construed in a manner which will not imply that Satan's attempt to destroy man shall, on the whole, prove to him a mortifying failure. That God could mortify Satan without saving any of the human family, is admitted; but a threatening to that effect would be to us no intimation of mercy to man. The head of the serpent, then, is to be bruised—the design of Satan is to be frustrated, by the salvation of men; this must mean much more than that some, possibly a very small proportion, of his captives are to be rescued, or that his success is to be somewhat less complete than he had hoped. Will any one say, this is doubtful? Then we turn to the second passage. There we read that Satan, as "*the prince of this world,*" shall "be cast out." This evidently implies that he is not to have a *kingdom*—though he may have some slaves—in the world. But perhaps it will be suggested, the change may be effected by the destruction of the wicked, even though the number of the saints should be comparatively small. The words which follow, however, preclude this supposition. They tell us that "the prince of this world" is to be cast out, not by the destruction of men, but by their being drawn to Christ. Is there still room for doubt? We turn to the third passage, and find the same subject presented under a different form. We know that Satan reigns by deceit; and here we are told that he shall lose the power of deceiving the nations. Is there a question as to the extent of the change? That question is answered; for we are told that Satan is to be bound, and banished from the world—"cast into the bottomless pit." This forbids the idea that he may still be able to deceive *any* nation. And if it is suggested that this may possibly refer to the state of things after the close of probation, the answer is, that he is afterwards to be loosed a little season.

We learn, then, that the serpent's head shall be bruised—Satan's designs utterly frustrated. To explain this, we are told that, as "*prince of this world,*" he is to be cast out—to lose his kingdom; and this is to be effected by Christ's drawing men unto him-

self. And in still further explanation, we are told that, whereas Satan reigns by deceit, he is to be bound and cast into the bottomless pit, "that he may deceive the nations no more." If all this does not prove that the world is to be converted, we are utterly at a loss to conceive how anything can ever be proved from the word of God.

2. Let us next consider what may be learned on this subject from those portions of Scripture which relate to the Covenant of Redemption, representing the salvation of men as the reward of our Saviour's obedience unto death. If the reader will examine Isaiah 52: 13, and onward to the close of ch. 53, he cannot fail to perceive that the whole passage is one connected description. The subject is, the sufferings of Christ and their reward; and these two topics, instead of being treated of separately, are intermingled throughout. Because his soul has been made an offering for sin, "he shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied;" and "shall justify many." And as to the number, we are told that, "He shall sprinkle many nations"—cleanse *many nations* from their sins, as under the Mosaic law, he who was ceremonially unclean by the touch of a dead body, was cleansed by sprinkling. And it is added, that the acknowledgment of his supremacy shall be universal among the nations meant. None shall be considered too wise to be his disciples, or too great to be his subjects. "*The kings shall shut their mouths at him*"—confessing their own immeasurable inferiority—waiting in silence to receive his instructions and commands, and not daring to raise any objection or cavil against either. "For that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider." The phrase "*many nations*," it is true, does not necessarily mean *all nations*; but it implies nothing inconsistent with that idea, which is abundantly established by other Scriptures. Moreover, every objection which is made against the doctrine, that *all nations* are to be converted, lies equally against the statement that *many nations* are to be converted.

We turn next to Psalm 22: 27-29. "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee. For the kingdom is the Lord's: and he is the governor among the nations. All they that be fat upon earth shall eat and worship: all they that go down to the dust shall bow before him: and none can keep alive his own soul." We think it evident from the connexion, that this passage relates to the reward of our Redeemer's sufferings. Be this as it may, here is an unequivocal prediction of the conversion of the world. "All the ends of the world," "all the kindreds of the nations" are to turn unto the Lord, and to worship him—the prosperous and the afflicted, the living and the dying, alike. And not only are universal terms employed; but it is evident that this

passage relates to what is to take place among men, while in their mortal state. *They that go down to the dust shall bow before him.*

3. There is a very numerous class of texts relating directly to the kingdom of Christ. Of these it may suffice, at present, to notice two.

Psalm 2 : 6-8. "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." We may safely assume that the king here spoken of is the Messiah. The kingdom described embraces the Jews; for his throne is set in Zion; but it is not confined to them. It is a universal kingdom. The uttermost parts of the earth are given unto him for his inheritance and possession. It is true, the next verse reads, "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." But this relates, not to those who are said to be given to him, but to the rulers and kings, mentioned both in the former and in the latter part of the Psalm. This is certain, because none are ever spoken of in Scripture as given to Christ, but those who are to be finally saved by him; others are put under his power; but this is a very different idea. Our Saviour clearly exhibited this distinction, when he prayed thus: "Glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee; as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." Here the distinction is obvious, between those who are merely put under his power, and those who are given to him. To all who are given him our Saviour is to give eternal life; and in the passage under consideration, we are told that the heathen and the uttermost parts of the earth shall so be given unto him. This implies the conversion of the world.

In the 72nd Psalm, Solomon's reign is contemplated as a type of the reign of the Messiah: accordingly we find predictions which cannot without absurdity be supposed to find their full accomplishment in any but the Redeemer. The following may suffice, as a specimen: "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents. The kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him." (v. 8-11.) Language could not express more clearly the idea of universal Sovereignty. Moreover, the reference is, not merely to his unlimited power, but to the affectionate subjection which he is to receive. All nations and all kings are to fall down before him, and serve him. Nor can the reference be to the state of

things which shall exist among the saints after their resurrection, for we are distinctly informed that there will still be some enemies to the Mediatorial King, though they will be very few, and without power to do mischief: "*His enemies shall lick the dust.*" Yes; there will, no doubt, be some wicked men; just as, at present, some men are dumb, and some are idiotic. But they will be too few and inconsiderable to require notice in a general view of the moral state of the world.

Thus we have given a few examples of the manner in which the conversion of the world is foretold, in those portions of the word of God which relate directly to the Redeemer.

II. Let us next notice some of the promises which are made to the Church.

In the covenant of which circumcision was the token, God said to Abraham, "Thou shalt be a father of many nations," (Gen. 17-4.) The same promise was, on other occasions, expressed in other terms: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Now, that these are but varied forms of the same promise—in other words, that the phrases, "*many nations,*" "*all the families of the earth,*" and "*all the nations of the earth,*" as here employed, are to be understood as equivalent to one another, is evident from many passages in the New Testament. For example; In Galatians 3: 7, Paul affirms, "that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham"—and in further confirmation of the same idea, he immediately adds, "And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." Here it is irresistibly implied, that the children of Abraham and the nations that are to be blessed in him, are the same. Another thing evident from this passage is, that the promise belongs to all believers, and to them only; whence it follows that the blessings promised are spiritual blessings, the blessings of everlasting salvation. And this, too, is abundantly confirmed by other portions of the word of God. "All nations," then, "all the families of the earth," are to be made believers in Jesus and heirs of eternal life. How are these terms to be understood? If an event is spoken of as a blessing to a nation, or a person as a benefactor to his country, no one supposes the whole meaning to be, that a few individuals, or a few families, are benefited. To justify such an expression, the whole mass of citizens must be taken into the account, and the experience of the benefit must be, at least, the general rule. These promises, then, cannot mean less than, that piety is to become the prevailing character through all the nations and families of the world.

Throughout a large proportion of the Epistle to the Romans, Paul is avowedly arguing from the Abrahamic covenant. In

chapter the eleventh, he formally proves from it the future conversion of the Jews, but that the conversion of the great mass, the multitude, the "fulness" of the Gentiles is included, he assumes without an argument. "Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." (verses 25, 26.) The converts, then, are to be, "*many nations,*" "*all nations,*" *all the nations of the earth, all the families of the earth, all Israel and the fullness of the Gentiles.* All these phrases, being applied to the same subject, must be understood as equivalent to one another. Let the reader take them together, and judge for himself of their import.

III. Let us now examine some of those texts which exhibit this doctrine in connexion with human agency, christian duty, and devotional exercises. There is a sense in which a man may be said to convert sinners. Our example, at least, of this mode of speaking, may be found in Scripture. See James 5: 19, 20. In the same sense, the apostles were commanded to "raise the dead." In neither case is the work affected by the power of man, or as the natural result of anything done by him. God does the work; but he does it in connexion with some word spoken, sign given, or act done by man, having first made known that connexion, so far as is necessary for the guidance of the human agent. With this explanation, we state that the Christian ministry was instituted, expressly, though not exclusively, for the conversion of the world; and the power of the risen Redeemer is pledged for the success of the enterprise. Matthew 28: 18-20. "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Nothing can be more idle than the attempt to limit this commission to the apostles. Its own terms declare that it is to continue in force till "the end of the world."—Here, then, is a permanent commission—the institution of a permanent office: and on the incumbents, collectively, is imposed the duty—"teach all nations." Few of our readers will need to be informed that the word here rendered "teach" signifies to make disciples. Now, this implies that they are to be converted. Accordingly, the Saviour adds, *baptizing them.* We know, from other scriptures, that adults are not to be baptized till they believe; but the Saviour does not say, *Baptizing them that believe;* but having mentioned "*all nations,*" he adds, "*baptizing them*"—*baptizing all nations.* Of course, it is implied, so far as adults are concerned, that they are to be made believers. We repeat,

then, that the ministry is charged with the duty, not merely of preaching the gospel to the nations, but of converting the nations; and of this great work every individual minister is to do his part. Let it not be said, ministers are to do this work as extensively as may be in their power. The Saviour has defined the extent, *make disciples of all nations, baptizing them*. Nor does he say, merely, that his ministers must *attempt* this work. Here is not a word which can be construed into an admission that a failure, either total or partial, is possible. On the contrary, it is distinctly intimated that a failure is impossible. The Redeemer introduces the command with an assertion of his own unlimited power; and, at the close of it adds a promise to be with his ministers; in other words, to make them successful by the exertion of his power. Two thousand years before, God had promised to Abraham, that in his Seed all the nations of the world should be blessed; and now, accordingly, the promised Seed of Abraham institutes the office of the gospel ministry, and charges it with the duty of instrumentally converting all nations. Thus, these two passages reciprocally cast light on one another. The one contains a gracious promise; in the other we find express provision made for the fulfilment of that promise. The one tells us that all the nations of the world are to be blessed in Christ; the other tells us that, under the authority of Christ, and in consequence of the exertion of his power, all nations are to be made disciples, and baptized accordingly.

We next ask attention to the following words in the Lord's Prayer: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." (Matt. 6: 10.) It will, no doubt, be admitted, that these two sentences and the one preceding, relate to the same general subject; and that, in explaining either of them, this relation should be kept steadily in view. In Scripture, a new era, involving a remarkable increase or improvement of anything, is often spoken of as the beginning of that thing. Thus, referring to the time of our Saviour's personal ministry, John says, "The Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified." The simple meaning, confessedly, is, that the influences of the Holy Spirit were not yet bestowed in the abundance and extent which belong to the Christian dispensation. So, the introduction of the Christian dispensation is frequently described as the coming of the kingdom of God; though the same kingdom existed before, as is evident—not to mention other proofs—from the words of Christ to the Pharisees, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof," [Matt. 21: 43.] What, then, is referred to in the petition—"Thy kingdom come?" The introduction of the Christian dispensation? Is this all? It cannot be: for the Christian dispensation has now subsisted through many generations, and yet nothing has been witnessed bearing, in its nature and extent, any

proportion to the evident import of the next petition: "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." Is the whole reference to the state of glory, to which the saints will be admitted at the resurrection? Then, this model of devotion, this comprehensive summary of all matter proper for prayer, contains absolutely not a word about the conversion of sinners—no petition which implies a wish for the success of the gospel. Such an idea, we need not stop to prove, is utterly inadmissible. Here, then, is evidently a petition for the coming of the kingdom of God, in such a sense that his will shall be done on earth—in every land and in every community—as it is done in heaven—a petition for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom throughout the world. As to the comparison—*Thy will be done in earth, as it is done in heaven*—we may observe that it implies resemblance, but not equality. Thus we are commanded to be perfect, as our Father in heaven is perfect; and husbands are required to love their wives, as Christ loved the Church. In neither of these cases could the idea of equality be admitted without absurdity and impiety.

Let us now compare this passage with two others which have already been examined, merely arranging them in the order of their dates. In the first, we find God promising to Abraham, that in his Seed all the families of the earth should be blessed. In the second, we discover that the promised Seed, before his death, instructed his followers to pray that earth might be made to resemble heaven in the prevailing character of its intelligent inhabitants. Of course, we infer that this petition explains the meaning of the promise to Abraham. In the third, it is recorded that the promised Seed, after his resurrection from the dead, appointed a permanent order of men, whom he charged with the duty of making disciples of all nations, baptizing all nations in his name, teaching all nations to do whatsoever he had commanded—and solemnly pledged his whole power as Mediator for the success of the undertaking. Now, is it not obvious that, in making this appointment, and connecting with it such an assurance of success, his immediate design was to provide the principal instrumentality through which the promise and the petition were to be fulfilled? We see not how this mode of connecting these passages can be objected to, if it be admitted that the promise to Abraham had reference to spiritual blessings, and that Jesus is the promised Seed. Admit it, and the conclusion is inevitable; all the families of the earth are to be blessed in Jesus; all nations are to be made obedient to him; our world is to become like heaven in the holiness of its inhabitants; for all this the faithfulness of God, and the power of the Mediator are pledged; and it is all to be effected in answer to the prayers of Christians, and mainly through the instrumentality of the gospel ministry.

It was to be expected that such a doctrine as this, if taught

with the frequency and in the manner which we have indicated, would enter into the recorded devotions of inspired saints. Nor is this expectation disappointed. When inspired saints present their adorations to the Holy One, it is in such language as this: "Praise waiteth for thee, O God, in Zion: and unto thee shall the vow be performed. O thou that hearest prayer, *unto thee shall all flesh come.*" (Psalms, 65: 1-2.) When they exhort others to praise him, they say, "Make a joyful noise unto God, all ye lands. Sing forth the honour of his name: make his praise glorious. Say unto God, How terrible art thou in thy works! through the greatness of thy power shall thine enemies submit themselves unto thee. *All the earth shall worship thee and sing unto thee: they shall sing unto thy name.*" (Psalm 66: 1-4.) When they pray that blessings may be bestowed on the people of God, this is their argument: "God be merciful unto *us* and bless *us*: and cause his face to shine upon *us*; that thy name may be known upon earth, thy saving health *among all nations.*" (Psalm 67: 1-2.) "Then shall the earth yield her increase; and God, even our own God, shall bless us. God shall bless *us*: and *all the ends of the earth shall fear him.*" (Psalm 67: 6-7.) When bowed down with affliction, they comfort themselves by meditating on the promised conversion of the world. Here is a specimen: "My days are like a shadow that declineth: and I am withered like grass. But thou, O Lord, shall endure forever, and thy remembrance unto all generations. Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion: for the time to favour her, yea, the set time, is come. For thy servants take pleasure in her stones, and favour the dust thereof. *So the heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, and all the kings of the earth thy glory.*" (Psalm 102: 11-15.)

Let it be carefully observed, our expectation of the conversion of the world is not founded, merely, on a few scattered and difficult texts, found in the obscurer portions of the word of God.—This doctrine was included in the very first intimation of mercy to fallen man. Two thousand years later, it was still more clearly revealed to Abraham, and made prominent among those promises on which the visible Church was founded. Two thousand years more passed away, and the promised Redeemer appeared; expressly foretold the accomplishment of that promise, as the infallible consequence of his death; commanded his followers, before his death, to pray for it; and after his resurrection, expressly appointed the gospel ministry, as the chief instrumentality for its accomplishment, distinctly pledging his own Omnipotence that it should be so accomplished. This doctrine runs through the whole Bible. It is taught in the writings of Moses, in the Psalms, and in the Prophets; in the Gospels, the Epistles and the Apocalypse. It was included in the very purpose for which the Redeemer was originally promised. It is taught in those Scriptures

which announce the design and consequences of his death; and in those which treat of the extent and glory of his kingdom. Accordingly, it has heightened the adorations of inspired saints, comforted them under their afflictions, and furnished them with argument in prayer. We have quoted but a very small proportion of those texts of Scripture in which it is taught. But, on the mere strength of the evidence already adduced, we think ourselves authorized to say that no doctrine is taught more unequivocally; and it would not be difficult to show that none is taught more frequently: And yet, there are wise and good men, who reject this doctrine as unscriptural. The views of an eminent divine of this class will be examined, if Providence permit, in a future article.

ART. III. — GEOLOGICAL SPECULATION, AND THE MOSAIC ACCOUNT OF CREATION.

What is the real province of Geological Science, and what the true boundary of its researches ?

In answer to these questions, we hope to shew that *speculations*, about the preadamic antiquity of the earth, do not lie within the proper sphere of this Science; that they constitute simply a diseased excrescence upon it, a *fungus growth*, which mars its beauty and justly excites the alarm and opposition of Believers in Revelation.

“Geology,” says Sir Charles Lyell, “is the Science which investigates the successive changes that have taken place in the organic, and inorganic kingdoms of nature; it inquires into the causes of these changes, and the influence which they have exerted in modifying the surface, and external structure of our planet.”

MacCulloch says, “But even the philosophical geologist does not inquire how the great Creator of the universe produced the globe that we inhabit.”

The definition of Geology given by Dana is, “the science which treats of the structure, and mineral constitution of the globe, and of the causes of its physical features.” It is described by Hitchcock as, “the history of the mineral masses that compose the earth, and of the organic remains which they contain.”

“The Science,” says Cleaveland, “of the compound minerals or aggregate substances which compose the earth, the relations which the several constituent masses bear to each other, their formation, structure, position and direction.”

Broad as are these definitions, taken from the advocates of the preadamic theory, they evidently do not cover the ground under debate. All questions, then, pertaining to the *mode* and *time* of the first formations of the earth do not lie along the path, which the Geologist has marked out for himself, and their discussion is extraneous to his proper work. He here departs from the field he has undertaken to cultivate, and unfurls his sail upon the tempestuous seas of Speculation with neither compass, helm nor ballast, and his unstable bark, at the mercy of every wave, is “tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine,” the more rapid his progress the greater his departure from the haven of true wis

dom. These gratuitous lucubrations of unwise and visionary Geologists, have contributed more than all other causes to the production of that jealousy which exists among thousands of pious persons against the science—and are not of any possible practical utility either in this, or any other department of human knowledge, which strips the abettors of the doctrine of every excuse, and they stand convicted of the unnecessary agitation of questions pregnant only with mischief. We regard this preadamic doctrine as dangerous to religion, and perfectly useless to Geology, and can discover no good reason why it is so tenaciously held by certain religious men. We cannot understand the hallucination which so infatuates them with this theory, that they incorporate it in their very descriptions of phenomena. It has given them new eyes, and taught them a new language.

So MacCulloch, in his strange argument in favor of theories generally, makes a most remarkable confession, "In none," says he, "can the work of observation proceed without general principles; without theory. Not understood, facts are useless; but not understood, they are not seen. He who *knows what to see, sees*; and, without knowledge, the man and the quadruped, equally seeing, see to the same purpose. And if we are ever to wait for future discoveries, the result is, that we neither *know* WHAT WE WANT, NOR WHERE to seek, nor *how* to use what we may have obtained." Vol. 2d p. 382.

Now this is a bold endorsement of that result, which constitutes the great danger of theories, or as he evidently means, hypotheses, in scientific investigations and gives to them a pernicious tendency. Hypothesis can only be of value when it is made to hold a subordinate place, but it is a remorseless tyrant when we allow it such a mastery that *he only can see*, "who *knows what to see*." In the direction of his theory, the shade of a shadow is solid substance, a mere appearance is *demonstration*, and even chasms in the evidence are readily filled up from a fertile and inventive imagination. We must suspect that new vision, for the language of the *SEERS* does not sound like the language of Moses, "who was the first historian of our race, was its divinely Inspired Law-giver, and who spake with God face to face as a man speaketh with his friend."

But, says the preadamic theorist, must I not believe "incontrovertible evidence?" We answer, undoubtedly, you must.—But have you *any* evidence, much less any "incontrovertible evidence" to sustain your doctrine? Are your alleged facts *indubitable*? If so, why then has there been so much controversy among the different schools of Geology respecting those very professed facts? It is a matter of history that the Wernians and Huttonians were mutually opposed to each other in their observation and

description of those facts. While the one class saw every where the marks of water, the other was equally confident that the signs of fire were evidently visible.

Thus from the same phenomena they drew conclusions mutually destructive, because they had adopted different hypotheses, and with their powers of vision thus hoodwinked they only saw such things as the *master* required or allowed them to see. Both schemes cannot be true. And yet they have severally been advocated warmly, and with vast ability by men of learning on either side. Sometimes the one party would obtain the popular favor; and then again the fickle goddess would award the Laurel to the opposite party, and thus Geology vacillated between Neptune and Pluto, uncertain at which shrine it would worship.

The facts do not incontrovertibly establish those points most essential to the Systems of the Theorizers. What confidence then can we place in those facts as to the decision of the present question? If they are equivocal and dubious upon the *foundation* doctrines, why may they not be also *de*-ceptive in this instance? Some one will say that the dispute between these two contending parties has now closed in the permanent establishment of the Plutonian doctrines, which are at the present time entertained by the majority of Scientific men. History admonishes us not to be too precipitate in following the majority. In the days of Cuvier the current was equally strong in favor of the opposite theory.—It was confidently asserted that the “Water theory” had completely quenched the fire doctrines, and the Plutonian was not recognised in Scientific circles. So confident were Geologists in the truth of those doctrines, that they administered sharp rebukes to christian men who opposed the doctrine, yet the admonition was more decorous, than the biting Sarcasm of Mr. Miller against the Antigeologists. However those doctrines passed to the shades, and so may the present theory.

However patent the geological facts may be, on this question the reading of their hieroglyphic characters is obviously conjectural. Different scholars read different lessons from them. Then what right has geology to dogmatize upon such treacherous evidence? Is it not the height of presumption for her upon such grounds to challenge the Inspired Volume? Reason would suggest the utmost caution when theorizing upon such dubious and often controverted facts; especially when our speculations seem to run counter to the word of God. Any science, which makes such high demands as are made by Geology ought to be sustained by indisputable evidence and unanswerable arguments, or be treated with utter contempt. Is Geology thus sustained? Is the chain of its evidence complete, or its argument valid?

Mr. Miller regards his facts as *demonstrated*, and Geology as a *demonstrative* science, ready to take its place by the side of Astronomy and Geometry.

We do not hesitate to assert that the doctrine of the gradual production of the formations older than the fossil strata, is unsupported by even the shadow of evidence; it rests only upon mere assumption, however ingeniously defended it may be, by skilfully constructed sophisms. The narrative in Genesis leads us to believe, that the earth as it came from the hands of the Creator, was in a finished and perfect state, at once fitted to sustain vegetables and animals of the highest orders; and completely adapted to the ends for which it was created; hence, the Lord pronounced it "very good." Geologists should have proven, that the Creation spoken of in Genesis is not an absolute creation out of nothing, but a mere remodeling of matter already in existence: that we have no account of the first or original Creation; before they ventured upon the postulate, that only the ultimate atoms were created, and then left to the operation of material laws, to be developed in their highest forms during the lapse of interminable ages. It is one thing to show that it *might* have been *thus* formed, but quite a different thing to prove that it was actually *so* formed, and this last is the question under debate and assumed in the Geological postulate. Will any one assert that Deity could not create instantly the earth in a perfect state, every way fitted for the abode of his rational creature man. OMNIPOTENCE does not *need* *interminable* ages for the production of desired results. Why then do men exhibit so great a desire to exclude the Great First Cause, and to ascribe all the phenomena in relation to our Globe, to the operation of the feeble agency of *second causes*—the want of requisite energy, being supplied by giving them almost boundless ages for the production of their slow imperceptibly increasing results? A substitution of the INFINITE IN POWER for the *almost infinite* in Time. Who does not feel, when reading "The Mosaic Vision of Creation," by Hugh Miller, that *he* has virtually no place in his Diorama for ЯЕHOVAH. All appears upon the canvass, as the work of natural and material laws developed in the *creeping* ages. His Chapter abounds with all that is beautiful in composition, but its total divesture of the Divine agency in his *imagined* unfolding scenes, would be entirely suited to the tastes of an avowed Atheist. We do not accuse Mr. Miller of any infidel tendency, but admitting that an Infidel was writing that chapter, would there be any necessity to alter a single sentence.

The CAUSE we have postulated being sufficient to produce the effect in an instant of time, it is unscientific to call in the aid of any other cause. If we must admit, at any stage, an *absolute creation* by the arm of Omnipotence of substances out of nothing, can any reason be given why so *much time* must be allowed to Almighty Power for the elaboration of final results? Reason and the Bible alike oppose the doctrine of the *gradual* development of the earth into a *habitable* state for man during the lapse of *interminable* ages.

The advocates of the *almost eternal* existence of the earth, previous to the creation of the human race, rest their theory principally upon three positions: 1st. The nature and order of the formations, usually known as primary and transition; 2d. The absence of human relics in the lower fossiliferous strata; and 3rd. The Great thickness of those formations.

The Geologist postulates respecting the condition of our Globe. "In the beginning," that it was matter in the form of vastly minute atoms widely dispersed; that a nucleus being somehow established, the atoms gravitated, and formed around it as a common centre; that the sudden condensation of the vapory mist liberated such an amount of latent caloric as to bring the whole into a state of fusion; that the refrigeration immediately began by the radiation of heat into space; that a crust was thus formed of "oxidated metals and metalloids, constituting the various rocks of the *granite* series;" that this crust in cooling, cracked and thus numerous depressions were formed, which permitted the granite to disintegrate; that the debris of the granite was deposited in successive layers at the bottom of the seas and lakes, was there crystallised, and then elevated by subterranean fires, and thus formed gneiss—that the gneiss passed through a similar process of disintegration and ignition, for the formation of the schistose rocks, &c. Thus the surface of the earth in all the by gone ages was alternately depressed, disintegrated, deposited in seas, and then elevated by internal fires, until it was finally adapted to the abode of man.

Now, let it be remembered, that this "atomic theory" is of Pagan origin—that the "fire mist" is unsupported by a single fact, and the whole will assume its true character of *wild* speculation; nothing more than "the baseless fabric of a vision." To the whole scheme, the laws of gravitation are fatally opposed. Did the "mist" of all the planets and suns mingle? and are the ultimate atoms of these Heavenly Bodies the same? If so, why are some luminous and others opaque? If they are not, how did they occupy the same spaces in the same time? If they were different yet mingling, how were they separated? Not by gravitation for it would have equally attracted all of each kind in a definite sphere? Nor could the separation have been by chemical affinity for that attraction, only acts at insensible distances. Is gravitation sufficient to overcome the immense antagonistic force of the vast quantities of caloric combined with that "mist," which an eminent philosopher has calculated would have been many times more rare and light, than any gas the Chemist has ever produced in his Laboratory, if, as it is supposed the matter of which our solar system is formed, was originally distributed equally through that vast sphere in space, of which, the orbit of Neptune, supposed to revolve upon an axis, would be the boundary? Is gravity able

to produce such a result? Can *gravity* condense a gas? Can it form a single drop of dew? If a mineral substance is volatilized by immense heat, so that its ultimate particles are sublimated, could either gravity, or chemical affinity reduce it to a mass and give it crystalline form?

Again—insurmountable objections to this geological speculation, will immediately occur to any one even slightly acquainted with the chemical constituents of the granite rocks. It is impossible for granite to be the ultimate basis of all other formations. The elements of granite are not sufficiently numerous,—and even if the elements were sufficiently numerous, it was necessary not only that the granite should disintegrate, but its component parts ought to be decomposed so that the ultimate particles might obey the impulses of cohesive attraction; but even then, what reason could be assigned, for the new arrangement which the particles are supposed to assume. Does the chemist ever attempt to form homogeneous crystals of several kinds by dissolving their various elements in the same menstruum? Would the atomic particles of quartz, feldspar and mica, interpose no obstacle to the formation of crystals of either kind? If the chemical affinity is sufficient to unite the crystals, why not sufficient to combine the minuter particles despite the attraction of cohesion?

If we could obtain diagrams, we could in a few words demonstrate the *absurdity* of this Geological doctrine. Any intelligent person may construct his own diagram, and from it he will find that according to the postulates of this theory, the gneiss and schistose rocks must each, in their separate localities, rest immediately upon the granite, and that it is impossible for the schistose to rest upon the gneiss, or the gneiss upon the schistose rocks; for the debris of the disintegrating granite being carried by the various streams and spread out upon the bottom of the first seas, is there heated by internal fires and converted into gneiss, and then elevated, so that the original beds of the original seas become the dry land, gneissitic continents, and original dry land, the granitic continents are depressed and becomes the granitic beds of the second seas—and the debris from the disintegrating gneiss must of necessity be distributed over the *granitic* beds of those second seas, these by internal heat to be converted into schistose rocks, and be then elevated, as the third dry land the schistose continents resting upon the first granitic continent—which renders the whole theory about these formations, absurdly contradictory.

For the principal geological facts which oppose this theory we refer our readers to the learned and able work of Dr. Boase on "Primitive Geology," where he will find the facts collated and discussed. By most weighty arguments this author proves that granite, gneiss, and the slaty rocks, belong to the same age; and consequently he has removed the very foundations of this specula-

tive theory. Upon this same point, Dr. Charles A. Lée, in his work on Geology, gives with commendation the opinion of a celebrated geologist, he says :

“Bakewell justly remarks that granite, gneiss, and mica slate might with propriety be regarded as belonging to *one* formation, as they are *essentially* composed of the same minerals, varying in different proportions, and accordingly are rather *modes* of the *same* rock, than different species. We often indeed, see them passing into each other, as one of their constituent minerals becomes more or less abundant.” p. 71.

Upon the *order* of the formations Mather states that “When granite rises above the surface, the beds of other rocks, in the same district, rise toward, and lie against it, but there are instances where they appear to pitch under the granite.” p. 92.

So Prof. Tuomey in Geological Report of South Carolina, says : “Table Rock, (a mass of gneiss,) rests unconformably upon the upturned edges of underlying slates.” p. 73.

Thus the testimony of these geologists rebuts their own most cherished speculations, which are thus proved to be a mere chimera of their own imaginations.

On this part of the Geological theory Mr. Miller does not commit himself in any decided utterance that we have noticed, in relation to the earliest condition of the Creation. Even of that portion of which he has written, beginning with the gneiss and mica slate formations, he appears to have confused if not unintelligible notions, and is *apparently*, if not really, contradictory in his enunciations. In his Lecture on The Two Records he remarks that,

“The geologist, in his attempts to collate the Divine with the geologic record, has, I repeat, only three of the six periods of creation to account for,—the period of plants, the period of great sea monsters and creeping things, and the period of cattle and beasts of the earth. He is called on to question his systems and formations regarding the remains of these three great periods, and of these only. And the question once fairly stated, what, I ask, is the reply ? All geologists agree in holding that the vast geological scale naturally divides into *three* great parts. There are many lesser divisions—divisions into systems, formations, deposites, beds, strata ; but the master divisions, *in each* of which we find a *type* of life so *unlike* that of the others, that even the unpractised eye can detect the difference, are simply three ; Palæozoic or oldest fossiliferous division ; the Secondary, or middle fossiliferous division, and the Tertiary, or latest fossiliferous division.” * * *

“That which *chiefly* distinguished the Palæozoic from the Secondary and Tertiary periods was its *gorgeous flora*. It was *emphatically* the *period* of plants,—‘of herbs yielding seed after their kind.’ In no other age did the world ever witness such a

flora; the youth of the earth was *peculiarly* a green and umbrageous youth—a youth of dusk and tangled forests, of huge pines and stately araucarions, of the red-like calamite, the tall tree fern, the sculptured sigilaria, and the hirsute lepidodendron. Wherever dry land, or shallow lake or running stream appeared from where Mellville Island now spreads out its ice wastes under the star of the pole, to where the arid plains of Australia lie solitary beneath the bright cross of the South, a *rank and luxuriant herbage cumbered* every footbreadth of the *dank and steaming soil*. * * * The geologic evidence is so complete as to be patent to all, that the *first* great period of *organized* being was, as described in the Mosaic record, *peculiarly* a period of herbs and trees, 'yielding seed after their kind.'

In a foot note in reply to some strictures of Mr. W. P. Foulke we find that Mr. Miller bounds the Palæozoic from the Secondary division by a line drawn between the Permian period, and the Triassic deposits. And again he writes on page 221 :

"There was a time when life, animal or vegetable, did not exist on our planet, and when all creation from its centre to its circumference, was but a creation of dead matter. * * * Ages pass by, and the Palæozoic creation is ushered in, with its tall araucarions, and pines, its *highly organized fishes*, and its *reptiles* of comparatively low standing."

And again he remarks, on page 222 :

"And now, as yet other ages pass away, the CREATION of the great Secondary division takes the place of that of the *vanished Palæozoic*."

To the same effect he states in his invective against the anti-geologists, page 402 :

"The known fact,—a result of modern science,—that the several formations (always invariable in their order of succession) have their *groups of organisms peculiar* to themselves, * * * that not a *single organism* of the lower beds is to be detected in the middle ones, nor yet a single organism of either the middle or lower in the beds that lie above."

But if we understand his *scientific* reason for the rejection of Dr. Chalmers' scheme, it is because there is no such chasm, no "chaotic gulf," between the earlier and more recent formations, and I confess that his statements on the question are by no means satisfactory. Other points of greater moment are involved in the foregoing quotations.

Mr. Miller contends that the Geologist has to account for only three of the six periods of creation, and yet he attempts in his DIORAMA to explain the work of each of the six days of the Mosaic Record; and that too, in face of his own declaration.

"And respecting the work of at least the first and second days, more especially that of the second, we can still but *vaguely guess*."

The science *necessary* to the right understanding of these portions of the prophetic record has still, it would seem, to be developed, if, indeed, it be destined at all to exist; and at present we can indulge in but *doubtful surmises* regarding them." p. 195.

But are *vague guesses* and *doubtful surmises* to be admitted as legitimate in an argument constructed for the purpose of invalidating that interpretation of the Biblical narrative, which Dr. Hitchcock, himself an advocate of the Preadamic theory, is willing to admit, "is the most natural," though it "makes matter only six thousand years old." (Religion of Geology, p. 45.) In such an argument we have a right to demand the *exclusion* of every postulate or premise that cannot be satisfactorily "proven." If we remove Mr. Miller's *vague guesses and doubtful surmises* we are relieved from the principal part of that *necessity* which these theorizers contend, demands a modification of the ordinary and natural understanding of the language of Moses. Surely in no case can a *vague guess and doubtful surmise* be allowed to take the place of scientific induction and demonstrative reasoning; they are evidently far below "*demonstrated facts*."

Having abandoned his position that his work of reconciling the "two records" only required him to begin with the Polæozoic formations, he has treated us with a very poetic picture of the earlier works of creation, a beautiful play of the *imagination*, but it is all *fancy*, and would be harmless, if it only served to amuse the over curious antiquarian philosopher. We give a specimen of what we mean. The past history of our world he divides into six periods, the first of which he calls the "Azoic period, and he thus describes it.

"During the Azoic period, ere life *appears* to have begun on our planet, the temperature of the earth's crust seems to have been so high, that the strata, at first deposited *apparently* in water, passed into a semifluid state, became strangely waved and contorted, and assumed in its composition a highly crystalline character, such is peculiarly the case with the *fundamental* or *gneiss deposits* of the period. In the overlying mica schist there is still much of contortion and disturbance, whereas the clay slate which lies over all gives evidence, in its more mechanical texture, and the regularity of its strata, that a gradual refrigeration of the general mass had been taking place and that the close of the Azoic period was *comparatively quiet and cool*. Let us *suppose* that during the earlier part of this period of excessive heat the waters of the ocean had stood at the *boiling point even* at the *surface* and much *higher* in the profounder depths, that the half molten crust of the earth, stretched out over a molten abyss, was so *thin* that it *could not support*, save for a short time, after some convulsion, even a *small island* above the sea level. What in such circumstances, would be the aspect of the scene optically exhibited from some point in

space elevated a *few hundred yards* over the sea? It would be simply a blank in which the *intensest* glow of fire would fail to be seen at a few yards' distance. A continuous stratum of steam, then, that attained to the height of even our present atmosphere, would wrap up the earth in a darkness *gross* and *palpable* as that of Egypt of old,—a *darkness through* which even a *single* ray of light would fail to penetrate. And beneath this thick canopy the unseen deep would literally “boil as a pot,” wildly tempested from below; while from time to time more deeply seated convulsion would upheave sudden to the surface *vast* tracts of semimolten rock, soon again to disappear, and from which waves of bulk enormous would roll outwards, to meet in wild conflict with the giant waves of other convulsions, or return to hiss and sputter against the *intensely* heated, and fast foundering mass, whose violent upheaval had first elevated and sent them abroad, such would the *probable* state of things during the times of the *earlier gneiss* and mica schist deposits—times buried deep in that *chaotic night* or “evening” which must have continued to exist for *mayhap* many ages after that beginning of things in which God created the heavens and the earth and which *preceded* the *first day*.” p. 197.

More blunders could hardly have been crowded into the same compass of lines,—our space will not allow a discussion and we must dismiss them with only a passing notice.

1st. In the first sentence of his description of his Azoic period, he supposes that the temperature of the earth's crust, (and be it remembered, that, it is the disintegrating granite from which gneiss is to be formed) was so *high*, that the gneissic strata *deposited in water*, passed into an *igneous* semifluid state by coming into contact with the “*intensely heated*” first crust. Now let any person of common observation say how many degrees of caloric would be necessary to reduce gneiss, or rather the debris of granite, to igneous semifluid condition, and that too *under water* in an unconfined state? While the water was free to combine with the caloric and form steam and pass off into the upper regions, the *requisite temperature* could *never* be obtained.

2nd. In a subsequent sentence, Mr. Miller appears to be ignorant of the power of water to conduct caloric, and thus supposes that the surface of the “circumfluous enveloping waters” may only be at the boiling point, but that a higher temperature might be in the “*profounder depths below*,” and that too while the whole unconfined mass of water is free to “*literally boil as a pot*,” “*wildly tempested from below*.” Does he know any of the facts connected with the smelting of ores, or any of those connected with the conversion of water into steam? Does not the very existence of the circumfluent ocean absolutely *require*, that the crust (if we may be excused for using a word which we believe to convey a false notion) of the globe, which universally, according to Mr.

Miller's *own postulate*, serves as the bed of the shoreless waters, should have passed *far below* the temperature of a half molten state?

Mr. Miller admits in his description of the first day's work that there was then produced a succession of light and darkness, the alternation being caused by rotation of the planet; this we regard as an important admission against his *dioramic* hypothesis; for here is a *regular, ordinary* day, of evening and morning, passing before the *vision* of the Seer, and the presumption is so strong, as to render it certain that the term describes *that* period of time, unless it had been clearly proved that each of the six periods, was separated by such an interval of prolonged night that the backward seeing prophet, would have the attention so absorbed in the contemplation of the greater, as to be insensible of the lesser day, though innumerable times repeated. But the period of darkness separating his "*module*" days he describes as—

"Unreckoned ages, condensed in the vision into a *few brief moments* * * * the first scene of the drama closes upon the seer; and he sits *awhile* on his hill top in darkness, solitary, but not sad, in what seems to be a calm and starless night," p. 207.

And why should the mind of the seer be so impressed with these "*few brief moments*," as to forget the phenomenon so often repeated before him, especially when the creation of that particular, constantly, regularly recurring *light* was the only act of creation which he *then sees*? This point comes up in another part of our Review, and we pass it over for the present.

Mr. Miller's dramatic representation of this first day's work is poor and contemptible in contrast with the Graphic description of Moses; his pencil thus fully, in dubious lines sketches the result of the Omnipotent "*Fiat*."

"At length, however, as the *earth's surface* (?) gradually cooled down, and the enveloping waters sunk to a lower temperature,—let us *suppose*, during the later times of the mica schist, and the earlier times of the clay slate—the steam atmosphere would become less dense and thick, and at length the rays of the sun would *struggle* through, at first doubtfully and diffused, forming a faint twilight, but gradually strengthening as the latter ages of the slate passed away, until, at the close of the great primary period, day and night,—the one still dim and gray, the other wrapped in a pall of thickest darkness,—would succeed each other as now, as the earth revolved on its axis, and the unseen luminary rose high over the cloud, in the east, or sunk in the west beneath the undefined and murky horizon," p. 198.

This tamesentence ignores the Divine Agency and describes the introduction of light as the slowly produced result of material laws: and this omission of Divine Agency is in perfect harmony with the omission of "*Light*" from his rehearsal of the various acts of crea-

tion on his 177th page ; but he has improved on that point in a subsequent effort, thus

“The creative voice is again heard, “Let there be light” and straightway a *gray diffused* light springs up in the east, and casting its *sickly* gleam over a cloud-limited expanse of steaming, vaporous sea, journeys through the heavens towards the west,” p. 207.

Mark his epithets, “*gray diffused*” “*sickly gleam*” which he employs to describe the effect of *Jehovah's* mandate, and then turn to the mosaic narrative :

“And God said, let there be light, and there was light,
And God saw the light that it was good.”

And you at once feel that you have passed from the fogs and steaming vapors of the seas of speculation which ever “*hiss and sputter* against the intensely heated” rocks of divine truth, into the unclouded effulgence of a God-created light. The *result* of the Divine command was both instantaneous and “*good,*” not “*gray diffused* with *sickly gleam.*”

Mr. Miller has another epitome of his cosmogony on p. 275, which we regard as at fundamental variance with most important doctrines of both Testaments, which demands exposure but our limits forbid an entrance upon that field, and we shall only use it, so far as it may aid us to understand his language in his other efforts to collate the facts and reconcile the two Records. In the preceding quotations we find him speaking of “the earth's surface,” as covered with “the enveloping waters,” and that too consistent with “the intensest glow of fire” from the surface of “our present earth, existing as a *half extinguished hell,*” (p. 275,) for “the gradual refrigeration” has so far cooled down the “*molten*” globe as to allow a “half molten crust” to be “stretched out over” the “molten abyss, yet “so thin” that it could support “a small Island above the sea level” only “for a short time,” and yet as “a thin covering of cloud, prevents the surface heat of the planet from radiating into the *spaces beyond,*” much more, “a cloud, thick and continuous, as must have wrapped round the earth” would have *prevented* “the radiation, and consequently the reduction of that internal heat of which it was itself a consequence,” and “though the heavens are still shut out by a *gray* ceiling of thick vapor,” yet “the heat glows less intensely,” and “a low, *dark archipelago* of islands raise their *flat* backs over the *thermal waters,* instead of the *small island* over the “molten abyss,” though they are only “inconspicuous and “scattered islets,” of “*bare hot rocks,*” yet being “covered with smoked glass” they become “a vast green house” for luxuriant vegetation, of “ferns lepidodendra and coniferous trees,” and all this before the work of the

third day, when "God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear;" and before he said, "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb and the fruit-tree."

But Mr. Miller apologises in a most ungracious manner for the fact that his Seer did not give a full account of the creation as the various representations of the "Diorama" passed before him, by insinuating either that the Archipelago of Islands, their vegetation, and animals were too inconspicuous to be seen from the "hill-top" of observation, or the Seer was so absorbed by other "sights" these escaped observation, pp. 199 and 200. But we are not at all astonished that a *Seer*, placed upon a stand-point "within the cloud" formed by the steam arising from the "unseen deep" as it *hisses and sputters* against "the half molten crust of the earth," producing "a darkness gross and palpable as that of Egypt of old," should see very imperfectly; we wonder how he could see through that "*darkness*" at all, we wonder why the steam did not blind him entirely; we wonder still more that a sane man should require a Seer to see through such clouds of steam, such gross darkness. I am told that in common law a witness is not allowed to depose to things he professes to have seen in the dark; but why should Moses be thus hoodwinked? Was it to destroy his credibility? At any rate the manager of the diorama ought to have thrown more light upon each scene that the spectator might have had such a distinct view of every object, that his description might be literally and specifically true.

Mr. Miller is here hopelessly at variance with the Mosaic narrative, in causing the dry land, and vegetables to appear before the third day, and in causing animals to come into being before the fifth day: and that discrepancy, in his "*reconciliation*" with the cosmogony, caused the majority of learned men to reject the indefinite day theory. The theory has not answered to remove the difficulties of the case and is wholly useless. The idea of our author that the Seer failed to see the dry land, vegetables and animals before the times mentioned in Genesis, was no proof of the non-existence of these things, but only that they were too *inconspicuous* to be observed by the narrator, is too absurd, ever to obtain favor among men of science. We give the account in the author's own words under his description of the work of the second day.

"The invertebrate life of the Silurian period, or even the ichthyic life of the earlier Old Red Sandstone period, must have been comparatively inconspicuous from any subærial point of view elevated but a few hundred feet over the sea level, even the fero islets of the latter ages of the period, with their ferns, lepidodendra, and coniferous trees, forming, as they did, an exceptional feature, in these ages of vast oceans, and of organisms all but exclusively marine, may have well been excluded from a representative diorama that exhibited optically the grand characteristics of the time."

He repeats the same idea in the description of the work of the third day and substantially in that of the fourth, and from the prominence it holds in his "Harmony of the Two Records" we infer that he considered it, as the master idea which would close the controversy by the removal of all discrepancy. But we ask in all seriousness if that is the only feasible plan, which this renowned Geologist, could devise, "to collate the Divine with the geologic record." If so, then he must have felt that the cause of the inspired record was well nigh hopeless. As far as we can see, Moses has lost more, than he has gained by Mr. Miller's explanation; as the most superficial examination will clearly evince. Moses testifies that at the commencement of the third day; "God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear;" and it was so." Mr. Miller replies, ah Moses! you have allowed yourself to be so absorbed in the atmospheric phenomena—"the dappled cloud lets" "the beauteous semblance of a flock at rest," that you did not discover that ages before that third day, "God said, Let the waters give place, and let *"the islets"* the *"Archipelago of Islands"* appear." Again Moses relates that during that same third day, "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 it was so." "You are again mistaken Moses," says Mr. Miller, "for long ago in by gone ages, "God said, Let *"vegetable existences"* appear, and it was so." Again Moses ventures to declare that at the beginning of the fifth day, "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 brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: And God saw that it was good." "Let me inform you Moses," says Mr. Miller, "that you have made another blunder, for the geological record says that in the second period of creation these living creatures were found in the waters, and birds walked upon the shores of the ancient seas of those remote ages.

Moses writes again, "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping things, and beast of the earth after his kind; and it was so." Mr. Miller turns to his geology, and finds that Moses is in fault even here, for land animals existed myriads of years before that sixth epoch. In the narrative next following, the inspired writer declares, "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them, and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field." Here is another error in the Biblical record, for, says

Mr. Miller, many of the creatures, in entire genera lived and became extinct ages before man appeared upon earth, and they could not be brought to receive names from Adam, and besides it would have required an "enormous expense of miracle" to *ferry* the sloths and armadillos, the megatherium and glyptodon, the kangaroo and wombat, the macropus and phalcolounys, across the various seas from the different continents and Islands to receive their names, and then to refer them to their native lands." But are such transportations "expensive miracles" to omnipotence? for the narrative declares, that the Lord God brought them together, and the *dispersion* subsequent, was equally easy in his hands.

Moses records thus, "And God said, Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life I have given every herb for meat; and it was so." Ah, no! says the geologist, it was *not so*, for I can prove that many of these animals and birds, have always been, as they now are *carniverous*, and not *gramniverous*, as their fossil remains indicate; and therefore he scorns the idea that man's fall could have been in any way so connected with a change in the physiology of animals, as that the Lord should for the punishment of man's sin inflict death, and so transform the nature of the lion, that it would no longer be content with primitive food. Of course to the mind of this profound thinker, the prophecy of Isaiah, is all fancy where he declares that in a future age, "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion, and the fatting together, and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." And if the nature of animals may be changed from *carniverous* to *gramniverous*, and lose all their disposition to hurt and destroy when the ruins of man's sin shall all be retrieved, we see no absurdity in the proposition that their present disposition was superinduced in consequence of man's fall.

Moses represents the whole work of creation as having been accomplished in six days, the word being specifically defined in the narrative, and again the Lord on Mt. Sinia delivered the command, "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work," &c. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is," &c., the analogy requiring the word in the

one case to be an exact equivalent of the word in the other ; but says Mr. Miller, the geological evidence is complete, that it was not ordinary days but vast periods of indefinite length, and the command is simply this, "Work during six periods, and rest on the seventh, for in six periods the Lord created the heavens and the earth, and on the seventh period He rested." p. 176. He fortifies his position by the fact that in the fourth verse of the second chapter of Genesis, the word "day" is evidently used to cover the whole time of the six days employed in the work of creation : therefore he assumes "that *each* of the six days of the Mosaic narrative in the first chapter were what is assuredly meant by the *day* referred to in the second—not natural days, but lengthened periods." Now we confess that this appears to us wonderfully unexact to be used in an argument where pretensions to demonstrations are made. Reduced to an illustration from Algebraic quantities it is simply this, the word "day" in chapt. 2nd, being represented by the unknown quantity A, is equal to the sum of all the six days of the 1st chapt., represented severally by the unknown quantities B, C, D, E, F, G, therefore each of the six days is equal to A. That is, $A=B+C+D+E+F+G$. Therefore $B=A$, $C=A$, and the others in the same way, which is manifestly absurd, for a part cannot equal the whole.

Again, we remark that the narrative contained in the 1st chapter and first three verses of the 2nd chapter of Genesis, is independent of the narrative which begins with the 4th verse of the 2nd chapter, and there is no propriety in displacing the definition of the word "day" given in the first narrative, and substitute instead thereof a meaning which may be attached to it in the 2nd narrative, even if it could be done without the absurd blunder of making a part of a thing equal to the whole.

But Mr. Miller frankly states, "Premising that I make no pretensions to even the slightest skill in *philology*," and yet he again declares, "I would in any such case, at once, and without hesitation, cut the *philological* knot, by determining," &c., that is, he boldly lays down dogmatically, an absolute criterion by which interpretation is to be accepted or rejected.

"In what light," says he, on what principle, shall we most correctly read the prophetic drama of creation? In the light, I reply, of scientific discovery,—on the principle that the clear and certain must be accepted, when attainable, as the proper exponents of the doubtful and obscure. What fully developed history is to the prophecy which of old looked forwards, fully developed science is to the prophecy which of old looked backwards." p. 194.

We shall in the sequel attempt, upon the ground of his own premise, to show that the principles of interpretation are more clear and certain than the preAdamite theory, which theory has no well grounded claim to be one of "the established geologic doc-

trines," nor to be regarded as a "fully developed science;" for the present we only remark that he speaks upon the doctrines of hermeneutics with as much confidence as if he were indeed a master in that science. It is a fact also worthy of notice that the ablest of all those authors, variously and frequently quoted by Mr. Miller, are directly opposed to his interpretation of the word *day* in the 1st chapter of Genesis; among whom we find the names of Chalmers, of Smith, of Hitchcock, and of the German writer, Rev. John Henry Kertz, D. D. While we are unable to consent to many of the positions of this last named author, yet he has some sound and judicious remarks upon the question raised by Mr. Miller, in the foregoing quotation, which we are constrained to give to our readers. In administering friendly counsel to "the *man of science*." Dr. Kurtz says, "Let him not forget that if nature be a book full of Divine lessons and teachings, yet is the BIBLE the lexicon and grammar, whereby alone the etymology and syntax of its sacred language, the form and history, the sense and signification, of the single words, may be learned,—that it alone is the teacher of that criticism, hermeneutics, aesthetics, and logic, whereby the "disjecta membra poetæ" are to be arranged, explained and understood." (The Bible and Astronomy, p. 20.)

"But none the less may the pretended, or supposed contradiction, rest upon an erroneous interpretation on part of the student of nature, in that he, too, may approach the Book of Nature with unwarrantable pre-suppositions, and there read from its pages what he himself put into them." * * *

"It were the gravest possible self-delusion for the student of nature, or any one else, to imagine that the results of his empirical investigations require him to deny the Biblical doctrine of the creation of the world. Not science, but speculation (for error may exist in the magnet or compass no less readily than faith or truth) is to blame for such vain assumptions."

"And here again it is not natural science that is to blame; but unbridled speculation, or rather an already existing tendency of thought or imagination, which carries speculation with it, and thus does violence to the results of scientific investigation, in order to force them to say what is most pleasing to the unbelieving ear." (The Bible and Astronomy, pp. 28 and 29.)

The confidence of the German in the *certainty* of the teachings of the Bible, stands in remarkable contrast with the boasting reliance of the Scotchman in the speculations of his cosmogony; while Mr. Miller is ready to give up the Bible, if the Bible cannot be made to utter the *demandèd* "Shibboleth" of Geology, Dr. Kurtz does not hesitate to declare.

"If he do not succeed in solving the supposed contradiction, let him securely remain in the fortress of the Word, under the

cheerful conviction that the contradiction is either merely an apparent one,—none at all—or that the error lies *upon the side of science.*" Ibid, p. 31.

We find an important division in the ranks of those geologists who attempt to reconcile the dogma of geology, with the teachings of inspiration, by adopting a new interpretation of the sacred volume. We find no two agreeing in all respects; in fact they hold irreconcilable doctrines, and we might leave them to settle their internal disputes before we notice their doctrines; were it not, that those doctrines are of pernicious tendencies. Some attempt to remove the difficulty, by making the word *day* in the first chapter of Genesis mean an indefinite period of time, while others find a chasm of innumerable ages in the beginning of the chapter; the precise place where this chasm is to be found, has not been decided by them. These men hold the speculation about the high antiquity of the earth as absolutely, undeniably, demonstrably true, and consequently suppose that the only remedy is to interpret the scriptures anew, being aided by geology. On the other hand, we most firmly believe that the speculation in debate, is absolutely, ruinously false, a monstrosity in science, and a snare in theology. We regard the promulgation of such speculative opinions with detestation and dread. We have no fears of *scientific* truths, but "philosophy falsely so-called," has always opposed the Bible, openly when she dared or secretly if success was otherwise impossible. Now we attempt to remove the difficulty by proving that this dogma is not a legitimate induction from the *facts* of geology. We shall now proceed to the consideration of those arguments which support the old and set aside the proposed interpretations.

1st. We begin with the indefinite day theory. That the word "*day*" is sometimes used indefinitely we readily admit, but this admission is not a sufficient ground to sustain the new theory; for when the word is used thus indefinitely, its sense is indicated in the context. To assert that it is so used in the present case, is nothing less than to beg the question, or to assume the very point in debate. The obvious, and regular meaning of the word denotes one revolution of the earth upon its axis, and every other sense is metaphorical. We can discover no appearance upon the face of the narrative, which requires a figurative sense in the present case. So far from there being any indication that the term as employed in this narrative, is to be indefinitely extended, we find the word in the fifth verse carefully defined, and specially limited to the time of one revolution, which, upon every principle of just and truthful interpretation, is a demonstrative conclusion against the indefinite extension. Suppose in writing a narrative, you use a new term, and to avoid misapprehension, you carefully state what you mean by the term; would it not be an unwarrantable presumption in an

interpreter in after ages, to substitute a more recent and casual meaning for the one you have given? Would it not in fact so alter the sense of the narrative that it ceases to be your narrative? Precisely such is the result of the case in hand. The advocate of this new doctrine rejects the meaning given by inspiration, and adopts his own. Of course it ceases to be the language of the inspired penman. Moses said that "God called the light day;" but this class of geologists says Moses was mistaken, for it must have been a thousand years or more. Let us read the passage with their definition, "God called the light *a thousand years.*" The sense is changed if not destroyed. Besides, in the text, "*day*" answers as the correlate of night, which relation disappears in the new translation.

2nd. Again, the constant repetition of the phrase, "the evening and the morning," in the narrative of each day's work, shows that a natural day is meant. This particularity, (used no where else) seems to have been designed by the spirit of Inspiration to preclude the possibility of any mistake as to the meaning of the word.

We hesitate not to assert as our opinion, that those geological vagaries were distinctly before the Omniscient mind, when He dictated to Moses the special phraseology of this chapter. The phrase, "the evening and the morning," is wholly unmeaning upon the indefinite day hypothesis, and to admit it, would be derogatory to the scriptures. This, however, is only a beginning of that violence, which is done by these geological interpreters of the word of God. According to their laitudinarian principles of construction, the Bible can be made to mean anything, or nothing at all, just as the exigencies of their theories may require. We feel no sympathy with such licentiousness.

3rd. The meaning of the term day, in the Mosaic narrative of the creation, is determined by other portions of scripture. The reason given in the fourth commandment why men should work six days, and keep the seventh as a Sabbath to the Lord, is thus stated, "For in *six days* the Lord made *heaven* and *earth*, and *sea*, and *all* that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it."

I cannot discover how any language can more clearly express, not only the duration of the time, creative energy was employed in bringing all things into existence, but also the extent of that creation. Yet, Dr. Buckland would persuade us that it is no true creation, but only a new arrangement of matter already in existence; and Dr. Pye Smith tells us that the whole work was confined to the south-west corner of Asia. These belong to that class of men, who claim to be the *only* geologists, and the *only* judicious friends of religion; and of course, from the lofty arrogance of their tone, they are infallible. "Verily, they are the men and

wisdom will die with them." Is it not evident that the days we are to work, are precisely such days as those in which the Lord created all things; and this Sabbath day is to be as that seventh day on which the Creator rested from all His works, and which He blessed. But if these days are periods of a thousand years, then the reason of the command fails, and as our lives do not reach beyond three score years and ten, our obedience is impossible. We remark further, that at this very point there is a conflict between the scriptures and this class of geologists, full as serious as that which arises from their dogma of the earth's antiquity.

It is in relation to the causes that have operated in the production of the phenomena which pertain to our globe. These men bastardize our world, remove all agency of the *first cause*, and give a *pro-creative self-generating* power to matter, thus they only see the results of secondary causes. But the Bible speaks of the Omnipotent operation of the great first cause. This discrepancy we must however pass over for the present, and have only alluded to it to apprise our readers, that these men contradict the scriptures in more points than one.

4th. Another argument against the indefinite day theory, is to be found in the division of time into weeks. This division is universal, ancient, and entirely arbitrary; founded on no natural phenomenon such as the rotation of the earth upon its axis, producing day and night; or the changes of the moon, marking the Lunar month; or the revolution of the earth in its orbit, establishing the year. This rotation of time, we may reasonably regard as a *monumental* record of the days of creation, more difficult to explain away than the "foot-prints" in the sandstone. This "medal of creation" is by no means a fanciful "vestige," and requires no critical skill and ingenious talent to decypher. Unlike the facts that are made the basis of geological speculation, it may be read, and clearly understood, by the unlettered peasant.

5th. We argue finally, that there is no necessity to give the word "*day*" a metaphorical sense, so as to make it mean an indefinite period, because it does not remove the difficulties of geological speculation. The quantity of time thus obtained, is not enough to satisfy the wants of the dogma, and the order of the Mosaic narrative does not suit, therefore many of the most able geologists have abandoned this explanation, and have adopted the theory which we shall hereafter notice. Amongst the most learned advocates of this indefinite day theory, is Dr. Keith, to whom our literature is indebted for some works which are valuable. He endeavored to give plausibility to the speculations by supposing the diurnal motion of the earth to have been at first very slow, so as to have been ages in making one revolution. He supported his supposition by reference to the rotary motion of the moon, which takes about twenty-nine days to accomplish one period. This

postulate is not sustained by a single geological fact, and is unscientific. If such had been the length of the day on one side of the globe, the night would have been of equal duration on the other side, and thus there would have been a manifest difference in the strata, or material deposits and fossil remains of the two Hemispheres. The one class growing in the light and heat of the enduring day, would possess the greatest vigor and luxuriance of growth, and attain to vast dimensions; while the other class under the darkness and chill of a night of countless ages, would plainly exhibit the blighting influence of that "deadly night-shade" in their stunted growth and shrivelled forms, even if it were not fatal to both animal and vegetable life. We said that the Doctor's postulate was unscientific. The excess of the equatorial over the polar diameter of the earth, is demonstrative of the rapid rotary motion of our globe, when in a plastic and yielding state. But this is not the only blunder which these geologists have made in their great zeal to sustain their speculations. They have sought aid from the fantastic vagaries of the nebular hypothesis of the distinguished La Place. This speculation of the Astronomer respecting the gradual formation of the solar systems, based upon the telescopic appearance of the nebulous spots in the heavens, would have been treated with the utmost contempt by all men of learning, had not the author's deserved reputation given to it a meretricious importance. It also obtained favor with some, because it seemed to furnish an argument by analogy for the overthrow of the Mosaic Cosmogony. These nebulae are at an immense distance from the earth, and according to the hypothesis are thin vapory "mists," or matter in an "atmospheric state." Now can any one conceive how such bodies can be seen at such distances? A body filling the orbit of the earth, would have no appreciable parallax at the nearest of the nebulae—would appear only as a point. Yet this theory makes us see the ultimate atoms of "atmospheric matter," at that immense distance, even though it is invisible, when in contact with us. Every principle of a sound and sober philosophy would teach us, that every luminous spot in those nebulae is a luminous body of not less dimensions than our own sun. It is said that one of the first effects of Lord Rosse's telescope, (the largest in the world) was to disprove the entire hypothesis by disclosing the fact that these nebulae are cluster of stars, not in a forming state, but actually perfected. Thus failed also the splendid analogy about which Dr. Keith has so learnedly written, as shedding light upon, and giving plausibility to, the speculations of this school of geology. There is a constant tendency on the part of men engaged in the investigation of science, to overleap the bounds of the human mind, and attempt the explanation of those things which lie beyond the province of our reason.

We reject this indefinite day theory, because it conflicts (as we

have shown) with the scriptures, and is also manifestly unscientific.

The arguments we have thus employed against the *indefinite day theory*, may derive additional importance by some quotations from several writers of acknowledged authority on the geological side of the question. Less than twenty years ago a volume was issued from the pen of Dr. Jon Pye Smith, on "Scripture and Geology," in which the author remarks in relation to this theory, that it had been favorably entertained by Parkinson, Cuvier, Jameson, Silliman, and some others; "but," says he, "it is now so generally relinquished, that more than a brief mention of it will not be necessary." Dr. Smith gives four reasons for the rejection of the hypothesis, the third is in the following words:

"Upon the very face of the document, it is manifest that in the first chapter the word is used in its ordinary sense. For this primeval record, (terminating as was remarked in a former lecture, with the third verse of the second chapter,) is not a poem, nor a piece of oratorical diction; but a narrative, in the simple style which marks the highest majesty. It would be an indication of a deplorable want of taste for the beauty of language to put a patch of poetical diction upon this face of natural simplicity. But, one might think that no doubt would remain to any man, who had before his eyes, the concluding formula of each of the six partitions, "And evening was, and morning was, day one," and so throughout the series, repeating exactly the same form; only introducing the ordinal numbers, till we arrive at the last, "And evening was, and morning was, day the sixth." (Scripture and Geology, p. 174.)

Respecting this mode of reconciliation Dr. Buckland remarks: "A third opinion has been suggested, both by learned theologians and by geologists, and on grounds independent of one another, viz: that the days of the Mosaic creation need not be understood to imply the same length of time which is now occupied by a single revolution of the globe; but successive periods, each of great extent; and it has been asserted, that the order of succession of the organic remains of a former world, accords with the order of creation recorded in Genesis. This assertion, though to a *certain degree apparently* correct, is not *entirely* supported by geological facts; since it appears that the most ancient marine animals occur in the same division of the *lowest transition* strata, with the earliest remains of vegetables." (Bridge Water Treatise, vol. 1 page 34.)

Dr. Hitchcock has in a condensed statement given a number of objections against that interpretation, which makes the "*demi-urgic*" days stand for periods of time of vast duration; we give his second, fourth and sixth. He says:

"2. In the fourth commandment, where the days of creation are referred to (Exod. XX, 9, 10, 11,) no one can doubt but that the six days of labor and the Sabbath spoken of in the ninth and tenth

verses, are literal days. By what rule of interpretation can the same word in the next verse be made to mean indefinite periods?

* * 4. Such a meaning is *forced* and *unnatural*, and, therefore not to be adopted without urgent necessity. * * 6. Though there is a general resemblance between the order of creation, as described in Genesis and by geology, yet when we look at the details of the creation of the organic world, as required by this hypothesis, we find *manifest discrepancy* instead of the *co-incidence* asserted by some distinguished advocates of these views." * *

"It appears, then, that the objections to this interpretation of the word *day* are more geological than exegetical. It has accordingly been mostly abandoned by men, who, from their knowledge *both* of *geology* and scriptural exegesis, were best qualified to judge." (Religion of Geology, pp. 65 and 66.)

It is also well known that Dr. Thos. Chalmers rejected this interpretation, but we have not his words by us. We will close this part of the argument, by several quotations from Dr. Kurtz. He says:

"The first and most significant inquiry should ever be, how does the record itself regard the days of which it speaks? If it contain reliable data, from which we cannot but infer that the days are to be understood as natural days, neither astronomy nor geology has a right to a single word in the whole matter. We believe most firmly, that this record, explained, merely on its own merits, and with the aid of other Scripture, and were there no outside, no foreign influences at work, the days could only be regarded as natural days."

"The days of creation were thus measured by the natural advent, and departure of the light of day, by the occurrence of evening and morning. This standard of measurement is given by the record itself, and must be applied alike to each of the six days of creation."

"The record itself, in the description of the first day, points out unequivocally the proper interpretation of the word *day*." (The Bible and Astronomy, pp. 119, 120, 121, 122.)

If we are unprepared to admit the geological interpretation of the word *day* in the Mosaic narrative, we have the consolation to know that we have men of no doubtful authority on our side. That scheme of interpretation which demands an interval of time of myriads of ages between the first and second verses of Genesis, will now be considered, inasmuch as that Mr. Miller's theory embraces both modes of interpretation.

We now turn our attention to the theory of interpretation which professes to find a chasm of almost interminable ages somewhere, in the introduction of the first chapter of Genesis. The advocates of this interpretation, suppose that Moses simply asserted,

in the most general terms, that "*in the beginning*" God created the heavens and the earth, which *beginning*, was countless periods of time antecedent to the creation of man and his congeners, recorded in the subsequent portion of the chapter. Here the wildest and most visionary geologist, has the most unbounded scope for the play of his unfettered imagination, and the most abundant time for the production of his phenomena, (both ideal and real) though only one grain of sand had been deposited in a thousand years.

1st. Our first argument against this plan of interpretation is based on the fact that the interpreters do not agree among themselves as to what place in the narrative the alleged chasm is to be found. Now this is conclusive against the existence of any such violent interruption of the narrative. Each one makes a break in the record where he thinks his theory will best tally. We cannot suppose that a writer, possessing such pre-eminent abilities as Moses, would not be able to make it apparent where so important a pause is to occur in his narrative, and we must therefore conclude that he designed his narrative to be what it appears to be, really consecutive.

2nd. We object to the theory, because it is based upon a violent perversion of the language of inspiration. Nothing in the narrative would lead us to suppose that countless ages had intervened between the beginning of creation, and the creation of light spoken of in the fifth verse, as a part of the work of the first day. "Bereshith," translated, "in the beginning," has the force of an ordinal number, and having a preposition prefixed without a noun, is used as a substantive, and denotes the commencement or beginning of a connected series of events, or order of arrangements, of which it stands at the head. The word occurs forty-three times in the Hebrew Bible. In seventeen places it is translated "beginning," for the most part denoting the commencement of a regular series of events, but in some few cases it has a metaphorical sense, as "the beginning of wisdom." In twenty-one places it is translated by the English word "first," as a regular ordinal, and in the remaining places it is translated chief, as "chief ointment." Thus the "*usus loquendi*" would inevitably connect the first and fifth verses together, and date the act of the first verse as the first act of the first day. The regular use, then, of this word, absolutely forbids the new geological interpretation, which is such a violation of the laws of language, as would, if once admitted, unsettle the meaning of words, and render all language uncertain.

3rd. In the common Hebrew Bible, the pause does not occur until after the fifth verse, which closes the first day's work, and shows that all the preceding verses are to be taken in connexion. Again, we find a rehearsal of the creation in the beginning of the second chapter, in the most emphatic terms, and utterly subver-

sive of the new interpretation. "Thus," says Moses, "the Heavens and the Earth were finished, and all the host of them." What heavens and earth does he mean? Why, undoubtedly the same heavens and the same earth of which he spoke when he said "in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth." This language occurs immediately upon the close of the sixth day's work, and is followed by this declaration: And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made," &c. These verses ought to be read in connexion with the first chapter, for the internal evidence shows a continuance of the same narrative, until the fourth verse of the second chapter, at which verse the style is altered, and a new name is introduced, by which to designate the Deity. Now this is a most important fact, bearing upon the subject, which has been entirely overlooked by those who have conducted the controversy. I do not see how we can come to any other conclusion, than that the creation of man was coeval with that of the heavens and the earth.

4th. An attentive consideration of many other passages, will force upon us the same conclusion. We again refer you to the fourth commandment, and remind you that it is there said that the heavens and the earth, and the sea, and all that in them is, were made in *six* days. The allusion to the first chapter of Genesis is too evident to be mistaken, and establishes beyond all reasonable controversy, that the first verse is immediately and directly connected, in point of time, with the transactions of the six day's work. In the one place it is declared that, "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and then follows a detailed specification of that creation, in the work of six days, summed up in the first verse of the second chapter. "Thus the heavens and the earth *were finished*, and all the host of them," and in the other place it is said, in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day. It seems to me that the language is as luminous as a sun-beam, and that the literal and common understanding of the words is not only true, but also the only possible interpretation.

5th. We argue against this method of interpretation in question, on the ground of the inextricable difficulties into which it has ensnared its christian advocates. Surely that must be a most dangerous, and unscriptural position, which forced the able and learned Dr. Chalmers to attempt the relief of his embarrassment by a suggestive denial that Moses teaches the creation of the world out of no pre-existing materials—which led Dr. Pye Smith to confine the creation described by Moses, to the southwest corner of Asia; and which involved Dr. Buckland in a labyrinth of contradictions. We cannot understand why these men have objected to our translation of the Hebrew word "Bara," rendered "created," in the first chapter of Genesis, if they really believe their own theory, "that

the creation there spoken of, occurred millions of years before the creation of man. Dr. Buckland, in the Bridgewater Treatise, has left the question of the creation of matter, in precisely such a position as would suit the notions of the pantheistic Sir Charles Lyell, President of the London Geological Society, and of the infidel author of the vestiges of creation." In the note furnished by Dr. Pusey, he denies that the word means creation out of nothing; but does not tell us that such is the doctrine of the Bible, nor where it is to be found. To say the least, he has left his remarks in an unfavorable position for the true doctrines of the scriptures.

Now the doctrine that "God created all things out of nothing" does not rest upon the sole meaning of the word, it is clearly written by the pen of Inspiration. The Apostle Paul refers to the Mosaic narrative and says, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Of this passage Dr. Bloomfield says, "the sense is that the world we see was not made out of apparent materials, from matter which had existed from eternity, but out of nothing, so that by His fiat the material creation was brought into existence, and formed into the things which we see." According to an Apostle, Moses does teach the creation of all things out of nothing, though Dr. Chalmers constructively denies this when he asks the question, "Does Moses ever say that when God created the heavens and the earth, he did more at the time alluded to than transform them out of pre-existing material?" Upon the authority of the Apostle we answer *he does*. Which authority is best, judge ye?

The criticism of Dr. Buckland, by which he attempts to remove the force of the arguments we deduce from the fourth commandment is a most singular specimen of logic. He says the word there used is "Asah," *made*, and not "bara," *created*, and as it by no means necessarily implies creation out of nothing, it may here be used to express a new arrangement of materials that existed before. But he had before proved by a quotation from Dr. Pusey, that, "making," when spoken of in reference to God, is equivalent to "creating." What then is the evidence against our argument? Just nothing at all. For, according to his own shewing, "making" in this sense is equivalent to "creating;" therefore, the fourth commandment, "Asah," *made*, has the force of "Bara" *created*, and our argument remains unimpaired. But his theory must be supported, even at the expense of his consistency.

As we reject this whole plan of reconciliation of "the two records," it is a reasonable demand that we state how we propose to avoid the difficulty of the alleged discrepancy. Our position is simply this, the *discrepancy* is only *alleged*, it has not been made out, and consequently we are under no necessity to disturb the

ordinary, natural interpretation of the Mosaic narrative. As far as we are able to comprehend the arguments of Drs. Buckland, J. P. Smith, Murphy and Hitchcock, of Messrs. McCulloch, De La Beche, Lyell, Miller, and several minor authors, the dogma of the antiquity of the earth is utterly unsustained, and where such men fail we utterly despair of ever seeing satisfactory proof of the momentous proposition. The geological speculation respecting the condition of our globe previous to the deposition of the fossiliferous strata has already been noticed as far as our limits will allow, and we flatter ourselves with the hope that our readers will conclude with us, that those postulates of the Geologists, not only can never rise above the authority of a supposition, but are also absurdly false. We now turn to the evidence claimed to be derived from the fossil strata, and here we must examine the agents *causing* or producing the deposits, or the conditions under which the various formations were made; the fossil criterion and the real extent of the formations.

I. The argument of the preadamites requires a state of things, in the agents operating, and the materials operated upon, entirely similar and identical with the present order, otherwise we rest upon *conjecture* or *speculation*, and not *fact*, for proof. If the same agents are operating, and upon the same materials, then we must have the same results, and thus the fact is deduced. The chemist says that a certain substance is the result of certain elements or agents, and he establishes the **FACT** by *destructive* analysis, or by *synthetical* reproduction. The geologist lays down his doctrine, his hypothesis, or speculation, but nature's laboratory will not bring forth the required *fact*. The moment any *formation* demands the introduction of a new agent or new element, for its reproduction, that moment we are borne from the stable foundation of *fact*, into the sea of speculation. The different resulting formations have imperiously demanded other agents and other conditions of things, to produce the prodigious changes; but then, to borrow an illustration from De La Beche, the geologist chains a mouse to a heavy piece of ordnance and requires him to drag it, but because the disparity between the strength of the mouse and the weight of the cannon is as one to a million of millions, he gives to the mouse a million of million of years to do the work, whereas if the necessary force had been attached, the resistance would have been overcome in minute. "The proof is incontrovertible that *mighty forces* have been in play under the direction of the Almighty, in producing the astonishing results which appear in the present state of the earth." The Bible narrative leads us to the conclusion, that special and extraordinary agents were called into operation by the Divine Being, for the production of those marvelous changes, and the same Inspired Book informs us why those unusual agents were called into action. They are the attestation of the Divine dis-

pleasure against the apostasy of man. "Cursed is the ground for *thy* sake," is the Lord's language to Adam. Who can limit the malediction of Jehovah, aroused by the rebellion of man, and filled with the irresistible energy of Omnipotence? Here is a cause operating that is fully competent to accomplish the most extensive changes in the condition of our globe; and we should remember that the object of that agency was to *sterilize* the earth, to lessen its primeval fertility. This was probably done by sweeping into the seas the light friable, and highly productive virgin soil of the new world.

We hold that the world on the morn of the first Sabbath day was in the state of the highest perfection when God pronounced it good, and the pure devotions of the sinless pair rose in sympathy with the song of "the morning stars," and in unison with the loud swelling chorus of "the sons of God." That *Paradise* was not the creation of a poet's imagination; it was the *glorious* and *perfect* work of God, and worthy of his infinite perfections. The sun has never since shone upon a more lovely and magnificent scene. How different is the representation of geology. According to the speculations of that science, the new world was in an imperfect condition, and has been ever since improving, so as to be fit for one race of animals after another, until man appears upon the stage, the first species above the baboon tribe, in the order of progressive development. The geologist needs *time*, because he places the earth under the simple and comparatively inert operation of second causes. But the Bible places the world from its first creation under the *special, particular*, and all-powerful providence of the living God, who plans, directs and energetically controls all of its changes, so that even a sparrow falls not to the ground without his notice. This Agent does not need the time of unnumbered ages, and the Bible makes the true, real and proper age of man to be contemporaneous with that of the world; and we think the argument fairly presented on this point, will satisfy every Christian mind that the common and obvious interpretation of the Bible is not only the true one, but also in more perfect accordance with the real phenomena of the world than all the speculations of this school of geology.

The actual preservation of a large portion of the fossils imperatively demand a *rapid* deposition of the various strata. If those organisms, whether vegetable or animal, had been left uncovered for any time, they would have been totally destroyed or greatly injured. They must have been immediately protected from the destructive agencies that now speedily decompose them. And it is reasonable to conclude that these fossil strata under the operation of sufficient agents were all formed since the creation of man.

But it is asked why then are there no remains of man found in those strata? which involves the next point the value of the

evidence of fossils, in favor of a high antiquity of the earth vastly beyond the age of the human race. On this point we remark first, that it is unreasonable to expect to find human fossils in any of the lower formations. How could human bones be buried in those rapidly forming strata, when according to the Mosaic narrative nearly one thousand years elapsed between the creation and death of Adam. Thus those strata had a thousand years to form under circumstances which render it impossible for such fossils to be deposited. We think that the time was sufficient for the formations.

In the second place on this mere negative evidence, we remark that we know nothing about the mode of sepulture practised by the Antediluvians. They may have buried as we do, or have burned the dead as did some of the ancients; and in either case, it is not reasonable to demand their existence in the mud and marsh of seas, and lakes. We cannot suppose the race so devoid of feeling as to cast out their dead upon the open fields, horridly to putrify upon the ground in their sight, and their remains if ever found, will be found in what was the then primitive soil.

Again, Dr. Hitchcock supposes that the phenomena warrant the belief that the continents which once stood above the waters now occupy the beds of our present oceans; under which supposition human fossils should be sought in those beds rather than on the dry land.

It is undoubtedly true, that the lower fossils embrace only the inhabitants of seas, lakes, and rivers, or of such animals as obtained their sustenance upon the margin of water courses. The mere *absence* of other animal remains under such circumstances, is no satisfactory, conclusive proof of the non-existence of land animals, because their habits did not expose them to destruction in water, mud or marsh. The monstrous and unscientific inductions of this class of geologists, their immense and widely sweeping generalizations upon such *merely and entirely negative* evidence, have even alarmed one of their number, whose own speculations bear no impress of the sobriety of humble inquiry after truth. Writing of some recent disclosures, proving the existence of air breathing animals before the formation of the "coal measures," Sir Charles Lyell remarks, "Never, certainly, in the history of science, were discoveries made, more calculated to put us on our guard for the future, against *hasty* generalizations founded on *mere negative evidence*. Geologists have been in the *habit of taking for granted* that in epochs anterior to the coal, there were no birds, nor air breathing quadrupeds in existence; and it seems still *scarcely possible* to dispel the *hypothesis*, that the *first creation* of a particular class of beings *coincides* with our *first knowledge* of it in a *fossil state*, or the kindred dogma, that the first appearance of life on the globe, agrees chronologically with the

present limits of our *insight* into the *first creation* of living beings, as deduced from organic remains. These limits have shifted even in our own times more than once, or have been greatly expanded without dissipating the *delusion*, so *intense* is the *curiosity* of man to trace the present system of things back to a beginning. *Rather than be disappointed, or entertain a doubt* of his power to discern the shores of the vast ocean of past time, into which his glances are penetrating like the telescope, into the region of the remoter nebulae, he cannot refrain from pleasing *his imagination* with the idea, that some *fogbanks*, resting on the bosom of the deep, are in reality the *firm land* for which his aching vision is on the stretch." (2nd Visit to the United States, vol. 2, p. 235.)

This is in truth, a virtual yielding of the whole proposition for which we are now contending, viz: that the *mere negative* evidence of the *absence* of human fossil remains, cannot disprove the position that man existed "from the beginning of the creation which God created." We wish the reader to turn back and notice the words we have italicized in the quotation from Mr. Lyell, and remember that he belongs to that school of geology to which we are opposed, and that he is writing of his own coadjutors. He says that their generalizations are *hasty*, founded on *mere negative evidence*, that they have been in the *habit* of taking for granted things not proved; that the clearest proof can scarcely *dispel* their *hypothesis*, or dissipate their *delusions*, that *rather than be disappointed, or entertain a doubt*, they do not refrain from pleasing their *imaginings* with *fogbanks*, which they mistake for *firm land*. Such is the description of these geologists, given by one of their own number, and yet they demand the right to *lead*; denounce all who dissent from their *imaginings*, and even venture to alter and amend the reading of the Divine Oracles to harmonize with their dogmas. Such an invincible inclination to *see* and *believe* according to an adopted hypothesis, totally disqualifies them for the work of *investigation*; such reluctance to *entertain a doubt*, must always produce self-conceit, pride of opinion, and arrogance; such power to *please the imagination* can easily be deceived by "*fogbanks*," if it has not power sufficiently *creative* to supply all defect in phenomena.

We now consider another evidence offered to prove the high antiquity of the earth, viz: the extent of the fossiliferous strata. How little importance is to be attached to this testimony we shall endeavor to show. The claim of its value rests mainly upon the assertion that these fossiliferous strata universally maintain a certain order of superposition, and consequently the true age of the world may be found by piling these several formations upon each other. We meet the argument by proving that the order of suc-

cession which it is said belongs to these formations can no where be found *in fact*. Dr. Buckland, who makes much pretensions to knowledge on this subject, and claims to have studied the science *in the field, and in curious caverns, the caves of hyenas and the dens of bears, as well as in public museums and university cabinets*, has given, in the second volume of his Bridgewater Treatise, a map to illustrate the various formations, and their relations to each other. This map he calls an "IDEAL SECTION of a portion of the earth's crust, "an imaginary section constructed to express," &c. I confess that this language of the great geologist appears to me to be contradictory if not absurd. How can "an *ideal, imaginary section*" be "a *portion of the earth's crust*." Still the words show, that with all the extensive search he could not find any *such section really, actually* existing in any portion of the world. Such a regular, consecutive succession of formations has not yet been found; it remains a *desideratum* of this school of geology, and is destined *so* to remain. Dr. Buckland then has virtually given his authority against the doctrine of successive superposition, though he almost invariably assumes it as true. That *assumption* is the main pillar upon which the geological edifice rests; remove that and the superstructure tumbles to the ground. Upon such shadows geologists construct their theories, and venture to assail the common interpretation of the Scriptures. We say that the assault is upon the interpretation, yet we fear that some would sooner give up the BIBLE, than relinquish their *fond theories*.

We bring other authority still from the ranks of the opposition to bear upon the discussion, as such testimony must always have great weight. McCulloch in his chapter "On the particular order of succession among Rocks," says, "It has been so often and so confidently said that a definite and constant order of succession existed among ALL ROCKS, that it had passed into an *axiom* in geology. Time has not dissipated this *phantom*, though it is gradually fading from among the *realities* in which the science abounds. As there are few among the *dogmas* of geologists which have more contributed to *improve the progress of investigation*, it will be useful to examine the grounds on which it still holds its place. The first step in forming a firm foundation is to remove the *tottering materials* of the old one." Vol. 1st, p. 268.

"Every rock, from granite upwards, ought, therefore, to be found in every place unless that branch of the general theory is abandoned, which denies an extensive waste and removal of the superficial rocks. Thus this *hypothesis* is at *variance* with *facts* at the very outset; since, whatever identical or analogous rocks may exist extensively in many parts of the world, no *one* is universally continuous. * * * Hence, wherever any series of similar strata exists in two places, they should be found in the

same order, and no interior stratum should in any place be absent. That this is not the *fact*, will be fully shown in the subsequent remarks on the successions of rocks; and thus the doctrine in question is proved to be in every way unfounded." p. 269. "It is unnecessary to commence these remarks by detailing the *imaginary order* of succession formerly received." p. 270. This "*imaginary order*" to which Dr. McCulloch refers may remind the reader of Dr. Buckland's "ideal section." *Imagination* has indeed had a large share in the construction of geological theories.

Dr. McCulloch has given many examples of great irregularities in the succession of these formations. In fact the irregularities are so numerous, that it is wonderful that any sane man should ever have attempted to establish any order of succession. For the order of Aberdeenshire is not the order of Arran; that of Cornwall is not that of Perthshire. It matters not what section we take, we shall find some neighboring section essentially different. Our author not only proves the *omission* of many strata, but shows that the order is also inverted. He thus writes, "of all these groups, I must now remark, that although any one may be *deficient*, there is no instance, as it is said, of the order being inverted; but it must be *plain* that where an *arrangement* approaches so much to an *artificial* order, it would *not* be very easy to prove an inversion." p. 278.

"There are but three distinct and principal rocks in the secondary series, namely, sand stone, shale, and lime stone; although a variety of circumstances, arising from minute changes of character, relative position, or imbedded fossil bodies, give rise, in them, to many different, and often constant varieties. If these were to be considered merely according to their *fundamental distinctions*, the result would be, that they are *repeated* in every possible kind of disorder, and in *endless alterations*. But to give the subject every advantage, as well as those to which it is really entitled, let all the distinctions, that have been made, be granted, as far at least as these are *constant*, and as far as they are not *merely dependent on place*; in which latter case, it is plain that the whole question would be resolved into a *petitio principii*." p. 273.

"In the case of *individual* strata in a *group*, whether in the primary or the secondary, or in the coal series, as well as in gneiss and quartz rock, an *inversion* is as common as an omission, and to what degree that really does extend among the primary, we can not, for the reasons just given, as yet decide. But in the secondary it is not yet known for example, that chalk does, and it is not probable, that it will, occur beneath the red marl; though from the deficiency of the latter, and of all the intermediate strata, it might be in contact with the coal series, or even with granite. Still, however, we must not establish this as a *canon* in the science; be-

cause, *a priori*, these appears no chemical or physical reason why it ought to be so. To lay down such laws, is to throw obstructions in the way of our own progress, to *fabricate* a science instead of deducing one. To do less, by making rules which apply *only* to the cases whence they are derived, is to do nothing; it is to cheat ourselves with the *shadow* of a science." p. 279 and 280.

These remarks, of this author, do certainly give a sad representation of the manner in which Geologists do reason, not upon *facts*, but upon the "*phantoms*" of a diseased vision, upon the "*dogmas*" of an "*artificial*" system. They do not listen to the instructions of *natural* phenomena, but attempt to say what *ought to be*, rather than what *is*. Some, in order to avoid the conclusive reasoning of Dr. McCulloch upon this point, denominate the formations that are so irregular by the term "subordinate." "Thus," says Dr. McCulloch, "*fidelity* and *logic* are here alike made to yield to an *imaginary* convenience." p. 282.

Having given a minute description of the various formations of England, he further remarks :

"It must now be observed that the series of secondary strata in a complete form, as it is *thought*, by those who have *investigated* this subject *most minutely*, is *far* from exhibiting this succession in any *one* place. It is not merely that the *whole series* terminates at some point beneath the uppermost or London clay, as for example at the coal series, or the red-marl, or the Lias, but numerous members are in many places wanting. This succession must therefore be considered as in some sense as an artificial one; constructed according to some *presumed* principles in the science, and a picture of what nature *might have given*, rather than *what she has actually produced*." p. 293.

Such is the testimony of Dr. McCulloch, a witness placed upon the stand by Mr. Miller and his co-adjutors. They have underwritten for him as possessing a mind of rare endowments, consequently they cannot in law, question his evidence, however adverse that evidence may be to their cause. We think we have conclusively proved that all these formations do not exist in any one single locality in a regular and entire order of superposition; consequently geologists have *no right to assume* it, and upon it claim the knowledge to a great depth of the crust of the earth. But it is replied, that certain criteria exist, by which the ages of these formations may be determined, and thus the right obtained to give the order of superposition. There are two of these criteria; 1st. the mineral contents, and 2nd. the fossils of these formations. If they place any confidence in any other mode of testing these strata, we have not as yet heard of it. We shall then, at once examine the criteria named, and trust to be able to show in the most triumphant manner, that they can establish nothing in favor of the argument of Geologists. We take up the criterion of mineral

contents, that is that the various formations uniformly manifest certain mineral characters, and are thus unequivocally identified. McCulloch, in speaking of this mineralogical classification, says, "But to render such an arrangement unexceptionable, the Geological order of Nature should itself be *constant*, which *it is not*; while the mineralogical classification is not only imperfect, even in its own internal mechanism, but at frequent variance with the Geological one, as I have fully shown. It is therefore *useless* for its own declared objects, and *pernicious* when adopted for Geological purposes." Vol. 2. p. 67. Dr. Buckland says, "Indeed the mineral character of the inorganic matter of which the earth's strata are composed, presents so similar a succession of beds of sandstone, clay and limestone, repeated irregularly, not only in different, but even in the same formations, that similarity of mineral composition is but an *uncertain* proof of the contemporaneous origin while the surest tests of the identity of time is afforded by the correspondence of the organic remains; in fact without these, the proofs of the lapse of such long periods as Geology shows to have been occupied in the formation of the strata of the earth, would have been comparatively few, and indecisive. Bridgewater Treat. vol. 1. p. 93. Thus, this celebrated author throws the entire stress of his belief, in the high antiquity of the earth, upon the second of the two criteria we have mentioned, and has virtually abandoned any dependence upon the evidence of mineral character; we shall subsequently show, that the criterion upon which he so confidently depends, is equally "indecisive," and worthless. We quote now a remark from Sir Charles Lyell, and we do so, because he is the great *Apollo* of this school of Geology. "If," says he, "any Geologist retains to this day the doctrine once popular, that at remote periods marine deposits of *contemporaneous* origin were formed *everywhere* throughout the globe, with the *same mineral* characters, he would do well to compare the succession of rocks on the Alabama River, with those of the same date in England." 2nd. visit, &c. These authorities are certainly enough to set aside the first criterion we have mentioned; we now turn to the second.

Upon this subject we remark, that the present mode in which organic beings are distributed upon the face of the earth, and in the waters of the ocean, present at least a violent presumption against this doctrine. In fact the presumption is so strong as to throw the "onus probandi," upon the shoulders of our opponents, and requires them not to guess and surmise, but to prove by the most satisfactory evidence, that the *present* is not the *ancient* order of distribution. They must prove not only that there were no *zones* of climate, but also that the same torrid temperature existed at the poles that now exists at the equator. We feel confident that such positions cannot be proved. It is not enough to find the fossil remains of animals of equatorial regions in high latitudes, for they

may have been transported to those regions by some great overthrow on our planet; that they were thus transported cannot be disproved.

Upon the value of fossils as a test for the identification of on-temporaneous formations, M. De LaBeche thus remarks. "It has even been supposed that in the divisions termed formations, there are found certain species of shells, &c., characteristic of each. Of this supposition, extended observation can alone prove the truth; but it must not be supposed as some do now that in any accumulation of ten or twenty beds characterized by the presence of distinct fossils in a given district, the organic remains will be found equally characteristic of the same part of the series at remote distances. To suppose that all the formations into which it has been thought advisable to divide European rocks, can be detected by the same organic remains, in the various distinct points of the globe, is to *assume* that the *vegetables* and *animals distributed over the surface of the world, were always the same, at the same time, and that they were all destroyed at the same moment* to be replaced by a new creation, differing specifically, if not generically from that which immediately preceded it. From this theory it would also be inferred that the whole surface of the world possessed an uniform temperature at the same given epoch." (Geological manual p. 33.) The opinion of this renowned Geologist, respecting the value of the evidence, to be drawn in favor of the doctrine of superposition of the fossil remains, is easily obtained from the above quotation, while we observe that he has a strong yearning towards the criterion, but dare not trust to it, because he doubts its truth. The Edinburg Encyclopedia contains an article on "organic remains," in which we find a learned, able, and conclusive argument against the evidence to be derived from fossils in favor of contemporaneous formation of strata. The whole argument is too long for quotation, and to quote less, would do injustice to it, we therefore refer our readers to the article itself, and content ourselves with giving the conclusion at which the author arrives. "It seems therefore quite unnecessary to pursue this argument any further, since it must be sufficiently plain, that the evidence in question is worthless or worse." The argument of this writer, if candidly considered, shakes to the very foundation the doctrine under discussion, and in connexion with Dr. Buckland's remarks about the mineral characters, sets aside the criteria which Geologists have adopted to ascertain the age of the several formations. It follows necessarily, that the relative ages of different strata can only be determined by being actually in place, one above the other, and we have already seen, that comparatively but few of the strata are thus super-imposed, and that there is no order that is invariable. Even where there is a succession of strata in any one place, we are liable to be much mistaken in our estimate of the perpendicular

depth of the whole formation, for the strata are liable to "thin out," as geologists term it. Perpendicular sections are unquestionably the only sections upon which reliance can be placed, to ascertain the true depth of these formations. Hence, the secondary formations among mountains are not to be calculated by the height of the mountains, especially if the elevation has been the result of "upheaval," in which case, the real thickness must be far less than the height of the mountain. We repeat our firm conviction, notwithstanding the confident pretensions of some, that no man has any reliable knowledge of the crust of the earth, to the depth of the four thousandth part of the semidiameter of the globe, and we regard all such pretensions as mischievous conceits.

We shall now proceed a step further in our argument, and attempt to show that sufficient time has elapsed since the acknowledged time of man's appearance upon earth, for the production of all these formations which are made the evidence of the doctrine in dispute. And if we succeed in making out the point, the whole question must in all fairness be yielded by our opponents, for they simply claim time upon the ground, that these phenomena could not be produced except in the lapse of interminable ages. We shall now take the geologist upon his own grounds, and reason with him upon his own *facts*, and we will see how the thing will result. The time of man has been enough for his phenomena according to his own showing. The data of our first argument will be extracted from D. Christy's 18th letter on geology. He has taken one species of fossil shell fish, while there are three thousand. He calculates the increase at five for each, each year for two thousand years, while the increase is greater, perhaps more than twice as great. He has taken one whose shell contains only the tenth of a cubic inch of solid matter, while many far exceed that proportion, and the quantity thus produced surprised the professor himself. The question is this, "suppose one female to bear five young for five years, and then cease bearing, each one of the progeny bearing according to the same law for two thousand years, what will be their number? The answer given by a Prof. of Mathematics of a respectable college, makes the quantity of solid matter to be enough to make as many billions of worlds like this, as would be expressed by 1,370 places of figures. If any man doubts the truth or correctness of the calculation, let him ask an answer from some able mathematician, and we will have a confirmation of the answer. Now, with such a scientific fact before us, the wonder is, not that we have so *much*, but that we have so *little* of these secondary formations. Instead of the time being *too short*, it is much *too long*; and it becomes geologists to show why three thousand species have not produced a far greater quantity of depository matter than they have as yet found. So

much for the contribution of shells to the secondary foundations. We shall in the next place give the sediment from rivers.

Numerous streams flow from our high lands into our lakes and seas; some of these are occasionally, some periodically, and others always, charged with sedimentary matter, all however bearing a portion of the dry land into the lakes, seas, or oceans into which they empty. Calculations have been made to ascertain the quantity of matter carried down by some of the rivers. Mr. Lyell gives us the result of certain experiments upon the waters of the Ganges, in which he sets down the *animal* deposit of solid matter to be 6,368,077,440 cubic feet; he thinks that the Burrumpooter conveys an equal quantity, and that the Yellow River in China, daily conveys 48,000,000 cubic feet of deposit, or 17,420,000,000 annually. To give us some idea of the quantity of matter carried down by the Ganges, Mr. Lyell says that 2,000 ships of 1,400 tons burden would be daily loaded with the daily deposit, and the yearly sediment would cover about 660 acres of land, 500 feet high. When we remember the numerous rivers which intersect the earth, it is but reasonable to conclude that 100 times as much matter is carried down by the whole of them; we shall then have every year about 33,000 acres covered 100 feet high, or 660,000 acres covered 50 feet high, which in 2,000 years would cover an area of 1,320,000,000 of acres; a result truly astonishing, and perhaps equal in bulk to the whole secondary series of strata. And we shall find equal cause for surprise if we turn our attention to the work of some of the rivers of Europe. So rapidly does the Rhone form land at its mouth, that the tower of Tignaux, erected on the shore so late as 1737, is already more than a mile from it. The ancient town of Adria, was a seaport in the time of Augustus, but it is now twenty miles inland, in consequence of the deposits of the Po and the Adige. From these particular results, we at once see that our general calculation is not too large. We must not forget that the work of denudation and transportation must have been more active during the first two thousand years of the world, than during any subsequent period of time, in consequence of the first condition of our globe, and because also, that natural agents are, upon philosophical principles, more active in the beginning, than in the subsequent progress of their operation.

From the positions which we have taken, and which we think we have sustained by scientific facts, and arguments based upon the authority of the opposing class of authors, it evidently appears, that the *real* facts and phenomena connected with the earth, do not require such almost infinite lapse of years for their development, as has been contended for by some geologists.

We believe that the Bible and the *REAL* geology are in the most perfect harmony. It is only the "*ideal*," the "*imaginary*"

geology, its *rash, hasty* generalizations—its *phantoms* and forced conclusions, its speculations and hypotheses, that oppose the teachings of Inspiration. That the dogmas of this speculative geology do conflict with the scriptures is admitted by all parties. This collision confirms the Infidel in his infidelity. The friends of Revelation have attempted to reconcile the discrepancy, but have disagreed about the mode of conciliation. One party have attempted to remove the discrepancy by giving a new interpretation to the Scriptures, but they are sadly at variance among themselves, and their very manner of handling the *inspired record*, has excited the fears of many friends of religion. The other party adheres to the common interpretation of the Bible as the true one, and reconcile scripture and geology by lopping off the *excrescences* of the science. This we have attempted in the foregoing pages. We deny none of the *facts* of geology. We deny the conclusions of geologists resting upon mere speculations, theories and hypotheses, or on arguments sophistically drawn from what is only at best *negative evidence*, when no necessity so demanded the contrary, that the non-appearance involved absolutely the non-existence; and especially we deny that geology can in any way give us the chronology of the creation and history of the world. This is no part of her domain. She has no prerogative here, consequently we resist her usurpations, and would confine her labors to her own proper sphere.

The real questions in debate are simply these: Mr. Miller contends that geology furnishes indubitable evidence that this world has existed myriads of ages previous to the existence of man—we deny that any such evidence is logically or rationally derived from the real phenomena of nature. Mr. Miller contends that the doctrine of the high antiquity of the earth can be reconciled with the teachings of the Bible, but rejects the schemes of reconciliation proposed by Dr. Chalmers and Dr. J. Pye Smith, because they run counter to the evidence of geology, and we have endeavored to show that his own scheme of one chasm of vast duration between the primary and secondary formations, of six subsequent chasms or periods of day followed by periods of night is equally opposed to geology and the Bible. We have shown that what he relied upon *as facts* are not *all facts*, some are only “ideal;” that the evidence furnished is not *indubitable*, for different observers have come to opposite conclusions; that there is a wonderful want of uniformity in the phenomena, so much so, as to render null and void all the general conclusions of which they have been made the basis; that this doctrine about the age of the world, is not reached by any of the *facts* in the science, as we have demonstrated, by calculations that may be *tested*, that the human period has been sufficiently long for the production of all the real phenomena, after you have deducted all the errors, that

have been grafted upon the science, arbitrary and unnatural, and all the groundless and unphilosophical assumptions; and that the doctrine is not demanded by any exigency of geology, does not forward scientific investigation, and is of no importance to man. Thus a violent presumption is raised against the doctrine, which its advocates are bound to remove at the very threshold of the discussion; which they do not meet with open and manly argument, but only rail, whine or declaim, against those who will not consent to take fogbanks for firm land.

We had intended to devote a portion of our article to a consideration of Mr. Miller's theory in relation to the Deluge, but we have already exceeded the space we allotted to ourselves, and must only make a few passing remarks. Years ago we had attentively studied the theory propounded by Dr. J. Pye Smith, in relation to the Noachian flood, and supposed we had discovered insuperable objections to it; the theory of Mr. Miller is essentially the same, and we had hoped that he would have given, at least one scientific fact to disprove its universality; or at least to give testimony to prove that such *marks* are left upon the region of his local flood, as are found no where else, and which would prove that the waters could not have passed beyond the barriers he has proposed, for their restraint. He elsewhere remonstrates against an "expense of miracles," and yet his scheme involves as much miraculous agency as the universal Deluge would require, unless, "*mayhap*" he intends to teach that the Divine Being had no direct agency in it, that it was solely the result of second causes, fortuitously acting, that it was not punitive, and that Noah was saved by accident rather than by special Providence. His objections to the size of the Ark, to the numbers of beasts and birds, to the breaking up of centres of distributions, and their re-establishment savors more of the infidel flippancy of Nott and Gliddon than of the sober reasonings of a christian man. If the flood was designed by the Lord to be partial, where was the necessity for the Ark? Why not have allowed Noah to go out from the land devoted to destruction into the adjoining regions of safety? Was it not a miracle which prevented the escape of a single member of the human race outside of the Ark? Especially as some would in all probability have been very near the southern borders? Did the descendants of Cain reside in the same country with the other descendants of Adam? Now we say that not one geological fact proves Mr. Miller's theory, which is nothing more nor less than an attempt on the part of these geologists to escape the argument which a universal deluge would furnish against their chronological geology. But we cannot now discuss the question, and leave it for other hands, or for our own at another time, if our life is spared.

The eloquent language of Dr. Kurtz may be made an appropri-

ate close of our article by substituting geology for astronomy :
“Such, then, has been the position taken by astronomy, or rather the parasite speculation which has attached itself thereto, to feed upon it, and convert all its wholesome lessons into hostile attacks against the christian faith ; and that noble science which above all others should be an unceasing song of praise to the glory of the Creator, has been degraded to the purpose of casting into the dust, not only the precious jewel of Divine love, and condescension, his incarnation in the person of Christ, but also, the majestic crown of His greatness and glory, His creative dignity.”
(The Bible and Astronomy, p. 57.)

ART. IV. — EDWARDS AND THE THEOLOGY OF NEW ENGLAND.

THE fundamental principle of the philosophy of Edwards, that which seems to have governed the rest, and determined his whole scheme, was on the subject of causation. He denies that the creatures are endowed with any properly causative force; and attributes all effects to God, as the immediate and only cause. We design, in this article, to examine this principle, and trace its relation to his theology, and to subsequent theological developments in New England.

Edwards' theory is very fully stated, in the argument on identity, which occurs in his treatise on Original Sin. An English writer in the controversy with Taylor, of Norwich, spoke of human depravity as "a natural consequence and effect of Adam's first sin." Upon this Taylor says, "Here 'R. R.' supposes the course of nature to be a proper cause, which will work, and go on by itself, without God, if he lets or permits it; whereas the course of nature, separate from the agency of God, is no cause, or nothing. If he shall say, 'But God first sets it to work, and it goes on of itself,' I answer;—that the course of nature should continue itself, or go on to operate by itself, any more than at first produce itself, is absolutely impossible. But suppose it goes on by itself, can it stop itself? Can it work any otherwise than it doth? Can the course of nature cease to generate? Or can it produce a holy instead of a sinful nature, if it pleases? No advocate for original sin will affirm this. Therefore if it is a cause, it is a passive cause, which cannot stop, or avoid producing its effects. And if God sets it to work, and it cannot cease working, nor avoid producing its effects till God stops it, then all its effects in a moral account however must be assigned to him who first set it to work. And so our sinfulness will be chargeable upon God."*

The position thus assumed by Taylor—that God is the only cause, is by Edwards admitted, and vindicated with zeal, as will be abundantly seen in what follows. He undertakes to show that there is no real identity possible, in things which exist in different time and place—that the moon for example which exists at the present moment, has no identity with that which existed

*Taylor's Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin. Newcastle, (Eng.) 1845. p. 189.

one moment since, or shall exist the next instant. It is not the same; but each is a new and distinct creation; and identical in no sense, except that God has determined them to be accounted one. The cause of the continued existence of every created substance "must be one of these two; either the *antecedent existence* of the same substance, or else the *power* of the *Creator*.* But it can't be the *antecedent existence* of the same substance. For instance, the existence of the body of the *moon* at this present moment, can't be the *effect* of its existence at the last foregoing moment. For not only was what existed the last moment, no active cause, but wholly a passive thing; but this also is to be considered, that no cause can produce effects in a *time* and *place* in which itself is *not*. 'Tis plain, nothing can exert itself or operate, *when* and *where* it is not existing. But the moon's past existence, was neither *where* nor *when* its present existence is.

Therefore the existence of created substances, in each successive moment must be the effect of the *immediate* agency, will and power of *God*." He then supposes the objection, that "the established course of nature is sufficient to continue existence, where existence is once given;" to which he replies, that the course of nature is nothing, separate from God, and that, "as Dr. Taylor says, 'God the original of all being, is the only cause of all natural effects.' "A father, according to the course of nature begets a child; an oak according to the course of nature produces an acorn or a bud; so according to the course of nature, the former existence of the trunk of the tree is followed by its new or present existence. In the one case and the other, the new effect is consequent on the former, only by the *established laws and settled course of nature*; which is allowed to be nothing but the continued immediate efficiency of *God*, according to a constitution that he has been pleased to establish. Therefore as our author greatly urges, that the child and the acorn, which come into existence according to the *course of nature*, in consequence of the prior existence and state of the parent and the oak, are truly immediately created or made by God; so must the existence of each created person and thing at each moment of it be from the immediate *continued* creation of God. It will certainly follow from these things that God's preserving created things in being, is perfectly equivalent to a *continued creation*, or to his creating those things out of nothing, at *each moment* of their existence." Hence he concludes "that God's upholding created substance, or causing its existence in each successive moment, is altogether equivalent to an immediate production out of nothing, at each moment. * * * Consequently God produces the effect as much from *nothing*, as if there had been

*The Italics throughout are Edwards' own.

nothing *before*. So that this effect differs not at all from the first creation, but only *circumstantially*; as in *first* creation there had been no such act and effect of God's power *before*; whereas his giving existence afterwards, *follows* preceding acts and effects of the same kind, in an established order."

"Now, in the next place, let us see how the *consequence* of these things is to my present purpose. If the existence of created *substance*, in each successive moment, be wholly the effect of God's immediate power in that moment, without any dependence on prior existence, as much as the first creation out of *nothing*, then what exists at this moment by this power, is a *new effect*; and simply and absolutely considered, not the same with any *past* existence, though it be like it, and follows it according to a certain established method. And there is no identity or oneness in the case, but what depends on the *arbitrary* constitution of the Creator, who by his wise sovereign establishment so unites these successive new effects, that he *treats them as one*, by communicating to them like properties, relations and circumstances; and so leads us to regard and treat them as *one*. When I call this an *arbitrary constitution*, I mean, that it is a constitution which depends on nothing but the *divine will*; which divine will depends on nothing but the *divine wisdom*. In this sense, the whole *course of nature*, with all that belongs to it, all its laws, and methods, and constancy, and regularity, continuance, and proceeding, is an *arbitrary constitution*. For it don't at all *necessarily* follow, that because there was sound, or light, or color, or resistance, or gravity, or thought, or consciousness, or any other dependent thing, the last moment, that therefore there shall be the like at the next. All dependent existence whatsoever is in a constant flux, ever passing and returning; renewed every moment, as the colors of bodies are every moment renewed by the light that shines upon them; and all is constantly proceeding from God, as light from the sun. 'In him we live, and move, and have our being.'

"Thus it appears, if we consider matters strictly, there is no such thing as any identity or oneness in created objects, existing at different times, but what depends on God's *sovereign constitution*. And so it appears, that objection we are upon, made against a supposed divine constitution, whereby *Adam* and his posterity are viewed and treated as *one*, in the manner and for the purposes supposed, as if it were *not consistent with truth*, because no constitution can make those to be *one* which are not one; I say it appears, that this objection is built on a false hypothesis; for it appears that a *divine constitution* is the thing which makes truth, in affairs of this nature."

To render his meaning if possible still more clear and explicit, he illustrates it in a marginal note. The rays of the sun falling on the moon, and reflected from it, are none of them the same for

two consecutive instants of time. "Therefore the brightness or lurid whiteness of this body is no more numerically the same thing with that which existed in the preceding moment, than the sound of the wind that blows now, is individually the same with the sound of the wind that blew just before. * * * And if it be thus with the brightness or color of the moon, so it must be with its solidity, and every thing else belonging to its substance, if all be, each moment, as much the immediate effect of a new existence or application of power. The matter may perhaps be in some respects still more clearly illustrated by this: The images of things in a glass. * * * The image constantly renewed by new successive rays, is no more numerically the same, than if it were by some artist put on anew with a pencil, and the colors constantly vanishing as fast as put on. * * * * * And truly so the matter must be with the bodies themselves, as well as their images. They also cannot be the same, with an absolute identity, but must be totally renewed every moment, if the case be as has been proved, that their present existence is not, strictly speaking, at all the effect of their past existence; but is wholly every instant, the effect of a new agency or exertion of the power of the cause of their existence. If so the existence caused is every instant a new effect; whether the cause be light, or immediate divine power, or whatever it be."*

Certain words and phrases are used by Edwards in a peculiar sense in this connection. One of these is 'nature.' This word is frequently employed by writers in a loose and inaccurate way, as expressing the mere energies of the characteristics of substances. But does it mean nothing more? We believe that both in the usage of accurate writers, and in the common apprehension, it includes also the idea of power. It expresses the attributes or powers, in their relation to the substances, viewed as potential causes, whence they derive their several energy and direction. Such is the sense in which it is invariably employed in the Scriptures. Thus, Rom. 2: 14, "When the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves. Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness." In this place, the apostle by 'nature' indicates a *power* within, which he otherwise calls "the law written in their hearts," the minister of which is "conscience," testifying against the corruptions which they love, and in behalf of God's sovereignty and holiness, which they reject. So in 1 Cor. 11: 14, "Doth not even nature itself teach you, that if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him;" to nature is here attributed the potentiality of a teacher. Again, Eph. 2: 3, "Ye were by nature children of wrath." Here nature

*Edwards on Original Sin. Part 4, ch. 2.

is the designation of a power, which Paul elsewhere (Rom. 7:25) calls "a law of sin;" and which generates death. In the same sense the word is used by Augustine, and by Calvin, and other Reformed writers. This definition however is in direct antagonism to the whole view here taken by Edwards; and he consequently adopts a different one, and employs the word accordingly. "Nature is nothing, separate from the agency of God;" and "the settled course of nature" is "nothing but the continued immediate efficiency of God." Of the propagation of corruption, he says, "'Tis as much agreeable to an established course and order of nature, that since Adam, the head of the race of mankind, the root of the great tree with many branches springing from it, was deprived of original righteousness, the branches should come forth without it. Or, if any dislike the word *nature*, as used in this last case, and instead of it, choose to call it a *constitution*, or *established order* of successive events—the alteration of the name won't in the least alter the state of the present argument. Where the name, *nature*, is allowed without dispute, no more is meant than that established method and order of events, settled and limited by divine wisdom."*

'Constitution' is another word employed by our author in a peculiar sense. By it he does not mean, a system of fundamental principles, adopted at the beginning, by the Creator, in harmony with which he, in creating the universe, made and endowed the creatures; but an act of mere executive sovereignty, in order of nature subsequent to creation, by which he is supposed by decree to constitute or make the creatures to be something else than essentially and creatively they were. Thus, the color of the moon, its solidity, and every thing else belonging to its substance, he affirms to be at each moment a new and immediate effect of creative power, which "differs not at all from the first creation, but only *circumstantially*; as in *first* creation there had been no such act and effect of God's power *before*; whereas his giving existence afterwards *follows* preceding acts and effects of the same kind in an established order." Thus "what exists at this moment, by this power, is a *new effect*, and simply and absolutely considered, not the same with any past existence; though it be like it, and follows it according to a certain established method." But by a sovereign act of God, these things, thus created different and distinct, are decreed to be one. This decree is what Edwards calls, a constitution, and is, he says, "the thing which makes truth in affairs of this sort." In reference to the Pelagian objection to the propagation of sin, he says that it "supposes there is a oneness in created beings, whence qualities and relations are derived down from past existence, distinct from, and prior to any oneness that can be sup-

*Edwards on Original Sin. Part 4, ch. 2.

posed to be founded on divine constitution. Which is demonstrably false," since each moment, what seems the same with some preceding existence, is in fact a new creation, and "simply and absolutely considered, not the same with any past existence;" but is made so by a constitution of God, who "so unites these successive new effects that he treats them as one." As created, then, they are not one; so that this "constitution" is superimposed after creation, and is not the law of creation itself.

In the places which we have quoted, Edwards denies in various forms, the doctrine of creature causation—the possibility of any power in a created thing, apart from the immediate energy of God. He asserts that "the course of nature is no proper active cause, which will work and go on by itself without God, if he lets and permits it;" that "separate from the agency of God, it is nothing;" that "God, the original of all being, is the *only cause* of all material effects;" that the course of nature "is nothing but the continued immediate efficiency of God." To the same effect is what, in another place, he says, respecting the propagation of corruption from Adam: "'Tis true, that God by his own almighty power, creates the soul of the infant; and 'tis also true, as Dr. Taylor often insists, that God, by his immediate power, forms and fashions the body of the infant in the womb; yet he does both according to that *course of nature* which he has been pleased to establish. The course of nature is demonstrated by late improvements in philosophy, to be indeed what our author says it is, viz: nothing but the established order and operation of the Author of nature. And though there be the immediate agency of God in bringing the soul into existence in generation, yet it is done, according to the method and order established by the Author of nature, as much as his producing the bud or the acorn of the oak. * * * 'Tis agreeable to the established course and order of nature, that since Adam the head of the race of mankind, the root of that great tree with many branches springing from it, was deprived of original righteousness, the branches should come forth without it. * * * Where the name *nature* is allowed without dispute no more is meant than that established method and order of events, settled and limited by divine wisdom. If here it should be said that God is not the author of sin, in giving men up to sin, who have already made themselves sinful; because when men have once made themselves sinful, their continuing so, and sin's prevailing in them, and becoming more and more habitual, will follow *in a course of nature*: I answer, let that be remembered, which this writer so greatly urges, in opposition to them that suppose original corruption comes in a course of nature, viz: 'that the course of nature is nothing without God.' He utterly rejects the *course of nature's* being a proper active cause, which will work and go on of itself, *without God*, if he lets or permits it; but

affirms that the course of nature separate from the agency of God, is *no cause*, or *nothing*; and, that the course of nature should continue itself, or go on to operate by itself, any more than at first produce itself, is *absolutely impossible*.* These positions would seem to be unequivocal. Taylor's design in the places quoted by Edwards, was to deny such a causative relation between parent and child as might convey corruption to the latter. To this intent it is that he says that "nature is nothing," that "God is the only cause," and that the child in its entire being is an immediate creation of God, and as such free from taint. The premises thus assumed by Taylor, Edwards accepts without reservation; and only avoids his conclusions, by taking the ground, that God can by a constitution make things to be true, which in themselves are not true.

The same view of creative causation is involved in Edwards' doctrine of identity. If it be so, that the creature that now is, instantly vanishes, to give place to another equally evanescent, it is evident that there is no room for the exertion of any power by the substance thus so transient. It, and all cotemporaneous substances are annihilated at the same instant, and give place to others, which as they are immediate productions of creative power, must receive all their primary impressions, and realize their first impulses from the creative energy; and these alone they ever feel. For with the first instant of existence, they are gone, and others fill their place. In fact, the position is formally stated, as unquestionable and fundamental, "that no cause can produce effects in a time and place in which itself is not;" "nothing can exert itself or operate when and where it is not existing;" an axiom of the Aristotelian philosophy, which, in whatever sense true, is certainly false in that intended; since it is here expressly designed to separate all present created existences and their phenomena from any efficient relation whatever, either to their antecedents or successors. In fact, the axiom as thus employed, is contradictory to any conceivable exercise of power by a creature; for the very idea of power in exercise, is that of an energy put forth of the substance in which it dwells; and perpetuated after the cessation of the impulse in which it originated.

The conclusion to which the argument of Edwards is directed, renders his meaning, if possible, yet more unquestionable. He is combating the objection that the imputation of Adam's sin goes upon the false assumption that he and we are one. He urges that "the objection supposes there is a oneness in created beings, whence qualities and relations are derived down from past existence, distinct from and prior to any oneness that can be supposed to be founded on divine constitution. Which

*Edwards on Original Sin. Part 4, ch. 2.

is demonstrably false; and therefore the objection wholly falls to the ground." That is, since a given existence—a man or a tree—"simply and absolutely considered, is not the same with any past existence, though it be like it, and follows it according to a certain established method," and its identity, in successive periods of time, is constituted by the mere sovereign establishment of God; and this divine constitution "is the thing which makes truth in affairs of this nature;" it follows, that the same authority can decree us to be one with Adam; and such decree shall make this to be truth in the case—shall make us to be really one with him.

We are well aware that it is impossible to reconcile these opinions, with doctrines which are maintained by Edwards, in other parts of his works. Inconsistency is the common characteristic of error. And we are not interested in these, as the sentiments of Edwards; so much, as that they are the principles which, put forth with the authority of his great name, have revolutionized the theology of New England.

The scheme has an air of piety, by which Edwards was betrayed. It seems to honor God, by making things dependent on him, in the most absolute and intimate manner. It in reality dishonors him; denying his power, his truth and his holiness. It limits his power, by assuming that he cannot create a substance endowed with true perpetuated power. Thus, in fact, the doctrine is irreconcilable with the real existence of creation at all. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." What is meant by this statement? It asserts the production of substances, of given form, and other specific attributes. These attributes are powers, which we intuitively attribute to the substances. Such is the constitution of our minds—such the impress stamped upon them, by the Creator, that we universally, necessarily, and immediately, identify the effects which we find attaching to a substance, with powers which we attribute to it as of its essence, constituting it an efficient cause of these effects. But when we attempt to describe the heavens and the earth, and in so doing enumerate these powers or properties, we are told in respect to each one—"It is nothing but a continued immediate efficiency of God, according to a constitution that he has been pleased to establish." By the time the description, and the application of this principle is completed, the creation has vanished; there remains nothing but the power of God, putting into operation, ("we speak as a man") a series of phantasmagoria, for the deception of the observer! Nay, here again the principle follows us. If its testimony is adequate to set aside all our intuitive apprehensions, so as even to overthrow the testimony of consciousness to our real and continuous existence and identity, through the successive periods of our life, there is no reason that can be assigned, why we should rely on the testimony of that same consciousness, to the reality of our present existence. If

all effects are to be referred to God as the sole and immediate cause, so must the self-consciousness which we realize; and before we are aware, our conscious spirit is robbed of existence—the universe is blotted out—and nothing remains, after the juggle has wrought, but God, and the phenomena of his existence! His word testifies that he has formed a creation. It declares that he has given to his creatures powers to be exercised by them—to his intelligent creatures, powers, for the right use of which they must account to him. We are assured, that having finished the creation, God rests from all his works. (Gen. 2: 2, 3. Heb. 4: 4.) The indelible conviction of the potentiality of our own nature, and that of all the creatures, is enstamped by the hand of God on the soul of man. Upon the right or wrong use of these powers by us, and all moral agents, are suspended the destinies of eternity. The alternative is, the rejection of all this testimony, or, of the theory in question.

In fact, here we have that form of pantheism, which makes God the only real existence; of which the universe of mind and matter is the phenomenon. We know nothing of substances, except their properties or powers; and if these be referred to God as the immediate cause, there is nothing left, of which to predicate existence.

This doctrine, again, is utterly irreconcilable with the holiness of God. If it be so that God is "the only cause of natural effects," there is, and can be, no other author of sin. He has said, that it is that abominable thing which he hates. He has declared that he is angry with the wicked every day; and that although he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn unto him and live—although he afflicts not willingly, yet he will visit the workers of iniquity with a fearful destruction; snares, fire, and brimstone, an horrible tempest—this shall be the portion of their cup. He has shown his abhorrence of sin, by the fearful tide of indignation, which was poured on the head of his own beloved Son, when our iniquities were laid upon him. Yet in contradiction to all this, the doctrine in question involves, immediately and unavoidably, the conclusion that so far from being hateful to God, he is the efficient and only cause of every sin of every creature.

We have incidentally stated that Edwards avoids this conclusion, by the distinction between a privative and a positive cause. He takes the ground that "in order to account for a sinful corruption of nature, yea, a total native depravity of the heart of man, there is not the least need of supposing any evil quality *infused, implanted, or wrought* into the nature of man, by any *positive* cause or influence whatever, either from God or the creature; or of supposing that man is conceived and born with a *fountain of evil* in his heart, such as is any thing properly positive." He distinguishes in man two sets of principles—those which are "in-

separably connected with mere human nature," and certain "superior principles that were spiritual, holy and divine, wherein consisted the spiritual image of God, and man's righteousness and true holiness." "When man sinned, and broke God's covenant, and fell under his curse, these superior principles left his heart." "So light ceases in a room, when the candle is withdrawn; and thus man was left in a state of darkness, woful corruption, and ruin." "It were easy to show how every lost and depraved disposition of man's heart would naturally arise from this *privative* original; if here were room for it."

This is an entirely inadequate view of the nature of corruption and sin. Every creature of God, so far forth as it is his creature, is perfectly good. All its attributes and functions, and all their moral exercises are good. And if any creature be stripped of one half of these, still will it be good. Take the case of Adam. He was not endowed with one set of attributes by which he was constituted a man; and another, by which he was a holy being. Take from him those faculties, in the right exercise of which he displayed the image of his spotless Maker, and in so doing you rob him, not so much of holiness, as, of humanity. His holiness consisted in a right tendency and exercise of the moral powers with which he was endowed; and his apostasy and corruption was the reverse. So, too, in regard to the daily actions of men; the character is determined not by the nature or quantity, but the object of the exercises and affections. Hatred itself, however intense, is not sin; unless directed to a wrong object. God and all holy beings hate sin, with perfect hatred. Love, even, has in itself no virtue, except as it is bestowed aright. The wicked are lovers; but "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God," and therefore hateful to God. Corruption and sin, then, do not proceed from a privative cause; but from the movement of the moral powers in wrong direction. Here it is unavoidable that we recognize a positive cause, which has turned the moral powers of man into devious paths; making him to love sin, and hate holiness, and the Holy One. And shall we admit that the blessed God is in any form the author of this apostasy? Shall we for one moment tolerate the suggestion that—privative or positive—he is its only cause? "Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted of evil, neither tempteth he any man. But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lusts and enticed." James 1: 13, 14.

It will be said that Edwards asserts expressly—and truly, if the words be taken in a certain sense—that "only God's *withdrawing*, as it was highly proper and necessary that he should, from rebel man, being, as it were, driven away by his abominable wickedness, and men's natural principles being *left to themselves*, this is sufficient to account for his becoming entirely corrupt, and bent on

sinning against God." "Now for God so far to have the disposal of this affair, as to *withhold* those influences without which *nature* will be *corrupt* is not to be the *author of sin*." True; but of what value are such statements; when the author hastens to protest, that by nature he means the power of God; and the course of nature, "the established method and order of events, settled and limited by divine wisdom," "the continued immediate efficiency of God"? As we have already seen, he expressly repudiates any defence, which supposes any power in the sinner apart from the immediate agency of God—any cause but God.

In fact, should we allow the validity of Edwards' distinction between a privative and a positive cause, yet upon his theory of causation, the objection of Whitby applies with crushing force: "In the nature of the thing, and in the opinion of philosophers, *causa deficiens, in rebus necessariis, ad causam efficiens reducenda est*. In things necessary, the deficient cause must be reduced to the efficient." If there be no cause in the creature, except the power of God—if nature be nothing but the established order of his agency, it matters not what the form in which the cause of sin is stated, whether privative or positive; it at least is referred to God as its only cause. He is supposed to have withheld from the creature, powers essential to give his actions a character of holiness; and at the same time communicated to him impulses which necessarily developed the opposite result. Thus is God made the author of sin.

Edwards' doctrine of identity stands or falls with this theory of causation. He supposes us shut up to the alternative that the cause of the continued existence of a substance is either "the antecedent existence of the same substance," or else "the immediate agency, will and power of God." But the fact is that the very idea of an effect is, something distinct from the cause, and abiding after it. It is something effected—something done, and so remaining. And the idea of creative causation is that of the production of substance—of something that exists and has powers; and not of mere transient shadows. Such is the scripture idea of creation. "He spoke and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast." Psalm 33: 9. The reason of the present existence of any creature, is not then its antecedent existence; nor is it the immediate agency of God. But it now is, because God at the first made it; gave it substance, and so determined its continuance; and having thus created it, now sustains it by that providential care in which "he upholdeth all things by the word of his power," thus continuing to the creatures the same being which he bestowed at first. Nor does identity consist in an arbitrary relation, determined by a decretive act of God's sovereignty, at variance with the creative plan, and contrary to the essential reality; but in the continuous

evolution of unchanging forces, implanted by creative power, in conformity with sovereign wisdom.

Edwards' theory of identity, elaborated as it was, to meet objections to the doctrine of original sin, determined the form in which he held that doctrine. His view is that we were not natively one with Adam, in any such sense as would involve the derivation of qualities and relations from him; since not only at each instant are we new and distinct creations, emanating from the immediate power of God—but in particular, the phenomena of generation are nothing but the established order in which by his own immediate agency, and not by any creative causation, he brings into existence both body and soul. Yet by the assertion of his arbitrary sovereignty, God has put forth a constitution by which the state of the case "simply and absolutely considered" is set aside, and we are constituted one with him. We do not now enter into the question of the soundness of this view. The relation however which it sustains to his doctrine of identity, is such that it stands or falls with that theory.

Not only was the theory of Edwards a departure from the received doctrine of the Reformed churches on this point, but in another respect he deviated, on a question in itself of much more importance. Whilst he retained the name, he in reality denied the doctrine of imputation. He teaches our responsibility for Adam's sin to be, in the order of nature, subsequent to, and based upon our own corrupt assent to that sin. Thus he says: "The first being of an evil disposition in the heart of a child of *Adam*, whereby he is disposed to *approve* of the sin of his first father, as fully as he himself approved of it, when he committed it, or so far as to imply a full and perfect *consent* of heart to it, I think is not to be looked upon as a consequence of the imputation of that first sin, any more than the full consent of *Adam's* own heart in the act of sinning; which was not consequent on the imputation of his sin to himself, but prior to it in the order of nature. Indeed the derivation of the evil disposition to the hearts of *Adam's* posterity, or rather the co-existence of the evil disposition, implied in *Adam's* first rebellion, in the *root* and *branches*, is a consequence of the *union* that the wise author of the world has established between Adam and his posterity; but not properly a *consequence* of the imputation of his sin; nay, rather *antecedent* to it, as it was in Adam himself. The first depravity of heart, and the imputation of that sin, are both the consequences of that established union; but yet in such order, that the evil disposition is *first*, and the charge of guilt *consequent*; as it was in the case of Adam himself."* Again, in reply to the objection, that "sorrow and shame are only for personal sin," he says: "Nor is it a thing strange and

*Edwards on Original Sin. Part 4, ch. 8.

unheard of, that men should be ashamed of things done by others, whom they are nearly concerned in. I am sure it is not *unscriptural*; especially when they are justly looked upon in the sight of God, who sees the disposition of their hearts, as fully *consenting* and *concurring*." Speaking of the supposed absurdity of the race being held to partake of the sin of the apostasy, he says that there is nothing absurd in such a union "truly and properly availing to such a consequence, * * * and by virtue of the full consent of the hearts of *Adam's* posterity to that first apostasy. And therefore the sin of the apostasy is not theirs, merely because God *imputes* it to them; but it is truly and properly theirs, and on that *ground* God imputes it to them." Again—"The affair of *derivation* of the natural corruption of mankind in general, and of their consent to and participation of the primitive and common apostasy, is not in the least intermeddled with, or touched, by any thing meant or aimed at, in the true scope and design of this place of Ezekiel;" (Ezek. 18: 1-20). So, he speaks of the teachings of the word of God "concerning the derivation of a depravity and guilt from *Adam* to his posterity."* In these latter places the order of enumeration implies what the others assert—an imputation of the guilt of the first sin, because of the actual corruption, which is found in every heart. It is not our business to reconcile this position with others which Edwards maintains. That this was his doctrine on the subject of the imputation of *Adam's* sin, seems however unquestionable. Not only does he assert it again and again, in unambiguous terms, but quotes with approval the statements of Stapfer on the subject; which confessedly were at variance with the received doctrine of the Reformed.

This doctrine of mediate imputation—although, practically, it or something similar is inevitable, upon the adoption of Edwards' theory of identity—is irreconcilable on logical principles with that theory. If there be no real identity among things, except by the process which Edwards designates by the phrase, "divine constitution," and if by such a constitution we and *Adam* are one, it follows, that in the same sense precisely in which the sin of eating the forbidden fruit was chargeable to him, subsequently, it was chargeable to us. But although Edwards was led astray, by the subtlety of his own philosophy, his soul instinctively recoiled from his conclusions, and uttered an unconscious but powerful protest against the sufficiency of his plea—against the adequacy of a scheme, which based the whole tremendous consequences involved in original sin, upon a ground so unreal as a divine constitution, transforming the facts, and making things to be absolutely identical, which were creatively and essentially distinct. He therefore has recourse to the notion of mediate imputation, to protect himself

*Ibid. Part. 4, ch. 4.

from the difficulties which his theory had created. He thus relieves his consciousness respecting the rectitude of the scheme which he had contrived, at the expense of his own consistency, and of the doctrine which he had set himself to defend. Such was the consequence in the case of Edwards; and such, or like it, will be the result, whenever the attempt is made to vindicate the doctrine of original sin, by recourse to any system of arbitrary constructions, or legal intendments, upon anything short of a real and native inbeing of Adam's posterity in him, as the head and cause of the race.

The first advocate of the doctrine respecting imputation which was thus espoused by Edwards, was Joshua de la Place, (Placaeus) a professor in the French Reformed Seminary at Saumur. He taught that original sin consists solely in the depravity of nature, which we inherit from Adam. And when the French National Synod, which met in Charenton in 1644, condemned this, as a heresy demanding discipline, Placaeus endeavored to evade the force of the judgment, by distinguishing between mediate and immediate imputation; the former consisting in an imputation of Adam's sin, based upon our corruption of nature, by which we consent to and approve that sin, thus becoming accomplices after the fact. This kind of imputation he professed to admit; whilst he rejected the idea of an immediate imputation, based upon the relation in which Adam stood to us.* The view thus taken by Placaeus, met with no countenance at the time; and in it he had but few followers, until the rise of Edwards and Hopkins. Of the school of the latter, Edwards was the real founder—the Socrates. "As he had rejected all of imputation but the name, it is no matter of surprise that his followers soon discarded the term itself, and contented themselves with expressing the substance of his doctrine in much fewer words, viz: that God, agreeably to a general constitution, determined that Adam's posterity should be like himself; born in his moral image, whether that was good or bad."†

Two other doctrines, occupied a conspicuous and controlling place in the Edwardian theology. The first is that all holiness or virtue consists in disinterested benevolence; or, as expressed by Edwards, in "love to being, as such;" and all sin in selfishness. The second springs from this, and is the optimistic theory. If holiness consists in disinterested benevolence, then God, as a holy being, in creating the universe, is bound to devise and bring into existence the best possible system—that which will secure the greatest happiness to the greatest number.

Nor may we here overlook the doctrine of Edwards on the moral character of actions: "One main foundation of the reasons

*Turretin. Locus 9, Qu. 9: 4-6:

†Dr. A. Alexander, Princeton Review, vol. 2: p. 455.

which are brought to establish the forementioned notions of liberty, virtue, vice, &c., is a supposition, that the virtuousness of the dispositions or acts of the will, consists not in the nature of these dispositions or acts, but wholly in the origin or cause of them; so that if the disposition of the mind, or act of the will, be ever so good, yet if the cause of the disposition or act be not our virtue, there is nothing virtuous or praiseworthy in it; and on the contrary, if the will in its inclination or acts be ever so bad, yet unless it arises from something that is our vice or fault, there is nothing vicious or blameworthy in it." "Now if this matter be well considered, it will appear to be altogether a mistake, yea, a gross absurdity."* This assertion he vindicates by insisting that if the moral character of an action is to be sought in its cause, so must it be with that of the cause, and so on *ad infinitum*.

The relation of this position to the doctrine of causation already considered is obvious. If the creature be no cause, the alternative is, that all acts, as caused by the Holy One, are holy; or else that the character of our action is to be sought somewhere else than in its cause. But the argument is an utter fallacy, involving the latent assumption, that acts have a subsistence of their own, apart from that of the agent. Strictly speaking, acts are without any moral character—they are not moral agents, subjects of law, or responsible to justice. An act is nothing but the agent acting; when in common language we speak of praise or blame attaching to an action, we in fact mean to predicate these of the actor. The reason therefore why the moral character of an act is to be sought, not in it, but in the cause, is, not that it is an effect, but that it has no substance in itself; it is a nonentity, of which moral responsibility is not predicable. The actor is morally responsible, and from his nature, as the cause, do his actions acquire their character; or rather, of his moral nature are his actions the indices and types. It is that to which the morality attaches, and to which the sanctions of the law address themselves.

In this doctrine of Edwards we have the germ of the "exercise scheme" of Hopkins—that all holiness and sin consists in exercises or actions. In it, too, Edwards found the argument with which to vindicate the position that God is the efficient cause of sin. The morality of actions is not determined by their cause. God therefore may be the author of men's sins although he is the Most Holy. The holiness of the cause does not prevent the sinfulness of the action; since the moral character of the latter is to be sought in its formal aspect, and not in its source.

Such were the principles which—engrafted by Edwards into the theology of the pilgrims—at once developed the system, that

*Edwards on the Will. Part 4, Sec. 1. See also Sec. 9, *passim*.

in its various phases, was propagated by Hopkins, Smalley, the younger Edwards, Emmons, and their associates. The logical process was brief, and simple, and the conclusions inevitable. If the creatures be no cause—if God is the immediate and only cause, he is the sole cause of sin, both in Adam and us. If there be no powers in man's nature—if the phenomena of his existence and life be the immediate effects of the power of God, there can be no native dispositions or tendencies, of which to predicate holiness or sin; these can consist in nothing but acts. If Adam's nature was not the cause of his posterity, he was not the cause of their depravity; God, the only cause, produces it in them. If there is no real identity possible in things which exist at different times, and in different places; if we are one with Adam only by "constitution" and legal intendment, then his sin is not truly ours, and its punishment may not be exacted of us. God may in sovereignty act toward us as he would toward sinners; but the inflictions which are visited upon us, on account of Adam's sin, are without privitive character. Again, for the same reason, Christ could not so become one with us, as to be held really accountable for our sins, or be truly responsible for their penalty. Nor, on the other hand, can we be so united to him, as to acquire a strictly proprietary right in his righteousness. The consequence is, that Christ's atonement is viewed as made in general for sin, and not distinctively for the sins of his people; and that his work was not determinate of the redemption of any one; but only opened the way for the salvation of those to whom God should give faith. Such were the positions maintained by the earlier disciples of Edwards. They at once rejected his untenable appeal—untenable upon his principles—to the distinction between a positive and a puritive cause, to account for God's agency in the production of sin; and did not hesitate to attribute all sinful actions to the efficient agency of God. But falling back upon the optimistic principle, they held that since God was bound to produce the best possible system, we are shut up to the conclusion that the present is the best; and sin being found in this system, it is inferred that sin is an incident of the best system, and necessary to it. Sin, therefore, thus viewed, upon the whole, is not an evil; and hence it is consistent with God's holiness and goodness, to produce it. It is only evil, in that the sinner is not actuated by any such apprehensions, but the reverse. Retaining the old forms of speech, these writers rejected utterly the old doctrines of original sin, and justification.

So stood the "orthodox" theology of New England at the rise of the school of New Haven. And it is a significant fact that the first public announcement of the organization of a new school of theology, by the professors in that institution, contained a challenge to the optimists of the prevailing school to justify themselves

in assuming that God could prevent sin in a moral system. Thus did the revolting fatalism, which was involved in Edwards' theory of causation, induce a recoil to the opposite extreme, in the assertion of Pelagian free will. The divines of New Haven found in the very heart of Edwards' system some of the fundamental and most frightful features of the doctrine of Pelagius—that Adam was not the cause of his posterity—that of consequence they were not really in him in the covenant—that his sin is not theirs, nor its punishment visited on them—that depravity is not derived from Adam by his posterity—and that all sin consists in exercise or action. Accepting these as unquestionable propositions, and recoiling with just abhorrence from the idea that God is the author of men's sins, they adopted the other alternative deducible from the principle, and concluded that men are created without moral character; and that their depravity is the result of example and circumstances. Boldly repudiating the system of constituted relations and fictitious intendments, by which the Hopkinsians had kept up a semblance of orthodoxy, they utterly denied any federal union between us and Adam, or any vicarious relation between us and Christ. Every man comes into the world in the same moral and legal attitude as did Adam. Each one sins and falls by his own free will. Christ died—not as a legal substitute for us—a vicarious satisfaction for our sins—but as an exhibition of the love of God to sinners; and a display of the evil of sin; so that God may, consistently with the welfare of the universe, forgive sin. The sinner is pardoned, not justified—sin is forgiven, not taken away—and justice is waived, not satisfied. Again, supposing man's free will competent to sin in spite of God, it followed that the same power could cease to sin, independent of the spirit of God. Regeneration is therefore to be wrought by means of moral suasion, and the exercise of the unaided powers of man's own will.

Such is the New Haven system—in some of its features broadly distinguished from old Hopkinsianism; but essentially a proper outgrowth from the stock of Edwards. The radical peculiarities of the Edwardian system were all incorporated into the divinity of New Haven. The rejected features had their origin in the impossible effort to reconcile these peculiarities with the principles of the orthodox faith. Consisting in the preposterous doctrine respecting identity—the theory of “constitutions” established by God, contrary to the essential reality—and the revolting doctrine concerning God's efficiency in producing sin—their effect was to create an odium against the Reformed system, of which they were supposed to be essential elements. Thus the way was prepared, for the rapid and universal prevalence of the unadulterated Pelagianism of New Haven.

We have not paused to trace the process of defection to Socinianism, which the earlier part of the present century witnessed

in the east. Strange and incongruous as may seem the association with the name of the venerated Edwards, the relation of that apostasy to his principles, is unquestionable. The intelligent reader need but study the systems above delineated, and notice the progress of passing events in the same region, "to understand the process. It is a fact of no little significance, that after the younger Edwards had been employed more than twenty-five years, indoctrinating the people of New Haven, in the new theology, he was constrained to resign his pastoral charge, by reason of the prevalence among his people, of the "liberal Christianity" of Priestley. The system of New Haven recognizes indeed the doctrine of the Trinity. But the Son and the Spirit are thrust into a corner; the one to exhibit a dramatic display, and set an example of perfect humanity, to which the demigod of Arius were abundantly adequate—the other to testify for the truth, with a demonstration which is already perfect, in the word. As there is no room for an omnipotent Renewer and Sanctifier, so there is no need of an infinite vicarious sacrifice, to justify. If the leaders in the Socinian defection were foremost in opposition to the orthodoxy of Edwards, it was in a manner perfectly in accordance with the similar course of the New Haven school. Entrenched in the false principles of Edwards' philosophy, they assailed with fatal effect that system of grace, which nourished the faith, and stimulated the labors of that man of God.

A due regard to the facts here presented, is necessary to a just apprehension of the present state of the question, as between the friends of the Reformed theology, and a large class of the advocates of error. They constitute a most instructive admonition, of the exceeding caution with which the deductions of philosophy are to be admitted to authority, in the sphere of theology; even though researches of profoundest acumen be tempered and sanctified by the most eminent grace. We cherish the utmost respect for the teachings of a sound philosophy, in its proper place. But in all sacred science, the infallible touchstone, to which every thing must be brought, is "the more sure word of prophecy." "To the law, and to the testimony!"

It is not an uncommon mistake, to suppose that a given opinion, because opposed by the enemies of sound doctrine, must therefore be true. We have known writers, claiming to be "orthodox," who, finding the idea of a constructive and technical headship rejected and denounced by Pelagians, have been induced to embrace it, under the apparent impression that it is the alternative to the unscriptural system of New Haven. Such is not the alternative. With perfect consistency we repudiate alike the Pelagianism of that school, and the "constitutional" orthodoxy of the Edwardians. Whilst the one denies altogether any moral relation between us and Adam, and the other contrives a relation which is unreal and

constructive, we, in opposition to both, assert a headship which is real, and not constituted ; native, and not superimposed ; a responsibility on account of the sin of our great father, which is criminal and not technical merely ; and the derivation from him of a corruption which flows to us, immediately and by necessity of nature, from him the corrupted source of our being.

ART. V.—BRECKINRIDGE'S THEOLOGY.

The Knowledge of God, Objectively Considered. Being the First Part of Theology considered as a Science of Positive Truth, both Inductive and Deductive. By ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Theology in the Seminary at Danville, Kentucky. *Non sine luce.* New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1858. 8 vo., pp. 530.

In the general notice which we have already taken of this book, we promised, in our present number, to make it the subject of a more distinct consideration. That promise we proceed to redeem.

Dr. B. has been so eminently a man of action, and the impression so widely prevails that action and speculation demand intellects of different orders, that a very general apprehension was entertained, when this work was announced as in press, that it was destined to be a failure. Few could persuade themselves that the great debater was likely to prove himself a great teacher—that he who had been unrivalled in the halls of ecclesiastical legislation should be equally successful in the halls of theological science. There was no foundation for the fear. Those qualities of mind which enable a man to become a leader in any great department of action are precisely the qualities which ensure success in every department of speculation. Thought and action are neither contradictory nor opposites. On the contrary, thought is the soul of action, the very life of every enterprise which depends on principle and not on policy.* It is the scale upon which the thinking is done that determines the scale upon which measures are projected and carried out. Bacon was none the less a philosopher because he was a great statesman, and the highest achievements of Greek genius were among those who were as ready for the tented field as the shades of the Academy. The small politician, the brawling demagogue, the wire-worker in elections, the intriguing schemer and the plausible manager can never succeed in any walk of meditation; not because they are men of action, but

*Non viribus aut velocitatibus aut celeritate corporum, res magnae geruntur, sed consilio, auctoritate, sententia. Cic. de Senect. c. 6.

because they are incapable of any thing that deserves to be called action. Restlessness and action are no more synonymous than friskiness and business—and the interminable piddler, the miserable maggot of society that can never be still for a moment might just as well be confounded with the industrious citizen as the man of tricks with the man of action. He who is able to embody great thoughts in achievements suitable to their dignity, he who can think illustrious deeds is precisely the man who will think most forcibly in fitting words. Actions and words are only different expressions of the same energy of mind, and the thought in language has generally preceded the thought in deeds. Convinced that the popular impression in regard to the incompatibility of action and speculation was a vulgar prejudice, we were prepared to anticipate from Dr. B. in the field of speculative theology, as brilliant success as in the field of ecclesiastical counsel. We expected to find the same essential qualities of mind, the same grasp of thought, vigor of conception, power of elucidation and skill in evolution. We dreaded no failure. We should not have been disappointed at marks of haste and carelessness in the composition, nor occasional looseness of expression, nor such bold metaphors and animated tropes as belong to the speech rather than the essay. We knew that Horace's precept had not been observed as to the time that the work had been kept under the eye. Blemishes attaching to it as a work of art we were not unprepared to meet with, but we were certain that the thoughts would be the thoughts of a man with whom thinking had been something more than musing; the system, the system of one who had not been accustomed to sport with visions. We expected to see the truth in bold outline and harmonious proportion, the truth as God has revealed and the renewed soul experiences it, clearly, honestly, completely told. That Dr. B. has realized our expectations seems to be the general verdict of the public. The work has been received with unwonted favour. It has been praised in circles in which we suspect the author's name has been seldom pronounced with approbation. We have seen but a single notice of it in which censure has been even hinted at, and that was in reference to a point in which the work is entitled to commendation. We allude to the place to which it consigns the argument from final causes for the being of a God. That argument as it is presented in modern systems of Natural Theology, is not only inconclusive but pernicious. The God that it gives us is not the God that we want. It makes the Deity but a link in the chain of finite causes, and from the great Creator of the universe degrades him to the low and unworthy condition of the huge mechanic of the world. For aught that appears matter might have been eternal, its properties essential attributes of its nature; and He may have acquired His knowledge of it and them by observation and experience as we

acquire ours. His power may only be obedience to laws which He has inductively collected; as knowledge on our part, according to the philosophy of Bacon, is the measure of our power. The argument turns on the arrangement of things. Its depth lies in the illustrations of general order and special adaptation which the universe supplies. It does not follow that God *made* the things which He has arranged. He who uses this argument either collects in the conclusion more than he had in the premises, or he limits the finite and conditions the unconditioned. Surely no intelligent advocate of Theism can be content with a result like this. The true place for the consideration of final causes is just where Dr. B. has put them, in forming from the works of God some conception of His nature and perfections: Given a *Creator*, we can then deduce from the indications of design that He is an intelligent and spiritual being; and this is the light in which, until Scotch psychology had almost succeeded in banishing from the halls of philosophy metaphysical speculations, all the great masters had regarded this argument. The schoolmen use it to illustrate the *intelligence*, not the *being* of God. That, they rested on a very different aspect of the great question of causation. Howe elaborately demonstrates a Creator before he comes to Wisdom or Design. The process is instructive through which this argument has come to be invested with the importance which is now conceded to it; and if it were not that the mind is all along preoccupied with the notion of a Creator, if it received its impressions of God from the study of final causes alone, we should soon see that the God of contrivances was not the God in whom we live and move. Creation, as a mysterious fact, putting the nature and operations of the Supreme Being, beyond the category of all finite causes, removing God immeasurably from the sphere of limited and conditioned existence, is indispensable to any just conceptions of His relations and character. Hence the Scriptures uniformly represent the ever living Jehovah as distinguished from all false deities by his creation of the heavens and the earth. This is His memorial throughout all generations. He is not an architect of signal skill and gigantic power who works materials ready to his hand, and the qualities of which He has mastered from long and patient observation, but by a single exercise of will He gives being to all the substances that exist with all their properties and laws, and arranges them in the order in which they shall best illustrate His knowledge, wisdom and omnipotence. The finite is dependent on Him for its being as well as its adjustments, and Providence is a continued exercise of the energies of creative power and love.

But it is time to proceed to the book itself. Dr. Breckinridge treats theology as the knowledge of God unto salvation, and his aim is "to demonstrate, classify and expound those maui-

festations of the Divine Being, from which this knowledge is derived. These manifestations are Creation, Providence, the Incarnation, the Work of the Spirit, the Sacred Scriptures, and the Self-conscious Existence of the Human Soul. The grand departments of theology, that is, the great topics of which it treats, are, God Himself; the God-man who is the mediator between God and men; and Man himself in his self-conscious existence, as created and re-created by God. The system of truth which Dr. B. has developed from these sources and digested under these heads, is that which in all ages has been the life of the church—that which constituted the ancient creed and has been embodied in modern confessions and particularly in the standards of the Presbyterian church. Dr. B. makes no claims to novelty in doctrines. He has trod in the footsteps of the flock. Satisfied with the old, he has sought no new Gospel, and one of his chief merits is that he has presented the ancient truths of salvation with a freshness, an unction and a power which vindicate to them the real character of a Gospel. What he claims as his own—"that which makes the work individual"—is "the conception, the method, the digestion, the presentation, the order, the impression of the whole." In these respects he thinks he has rendered some service to the cause of theology, which, in common with Aristotle, he pronounces to be "the noblest of all sciences." As these are the points in reference to which he wishes his success or failure to be estimated, it is but fair to him that his critics should try him on his own chosen ground.

What, then, is "the conception" of the book? Surely not the definition of theology, which is neither new, nor even logically exact.* It is rather the great idea which enriches the whole plan and furnishes the model after which the whole work has been fashioned. This is both original and grand. Let us explain ourselves. Theological truth may be contemplated absolutely, as it is in itself; relatively, as it is in its effects; and elenctically, in its contrasts to error. In the first case, it is merely a matter of thought; in the second, of experience; and in the third, of strife. The result in the first case, is a doctrine; in the second, a life; in the third a victory. In the first case, the mind speculates; in the second it feels; in the third it refutes.

*What we mean is, that it is too narrow. "The knowledge of God unto *salvation*" defines only the religion of a sinner, or what Owen calls, *evangelic theology*, and cannot, without an unwarrantable extension of the terms, be made to embrace the religion of the unfallen. Calvin's gives theology a wider sense, comprehending both the religion of nature and the religion of grace. It is, in his view, that knowledge of God which is productive of piety. *Neque enim Deum, proprie loquendo, cognosci dicemus, ubi nulla est religio, nec pietas.* Lib. 1, c. 2, § 1. Theology, considered as a body of speculative truth, may very properly be defined, as the science of true religion.

The first, Dr. B. calls *objective* theology.* We should prefer to style it *abstractive* or *absolute*, as indicating more precisely the absence of relations. The second, he entitles *subjective*. We should prefer the epithet *concrete*, as definitely expressing the kind of relation meant. The third, he denominates *relative*. We prefer the old name, *polemic* or *critical*, as more exactly defining the kind of relation which is contemplated. These three aspects embrace the whole system of theoretical theology, and upon the principle that the science of contraries is one, and that truth is better understood in itself by being understood in its contrasts, controversial and didactic Divinity are in most treatises combined. The peculiarity of Dr. B.'s method is that he has separated them; and not only separated them, but separated the consideration of the truth in itself, from the consideration of it in its effects. The "conception" or idea which suggested this departure from the ordinary method was the intense conviction of the grandeur and glory of the Divine system contemplated simply as an object of speculation. The author felt that it ought to be presented in its

*We cannot altogether approve of the selection of the terms, *objective* and *subjective*, to denote different parts of a scientific treatise. Science is subjective, only when considered as the actual possession of the mind that knows; it indicates a habit, and a habit under the formal notion of inhering in some subject, or person. It is mine or yours, and subjective only as inhering in you or me. The very moment you represent it in thought, it becomes to the thinker *objective*, though as existing in the person who has it, it is still subjective. If even the possessor should make it a matter of reflection it becomes to him, in this relation, objective. The thing known or the thing thought, whether it be material, or a mode of mind, is always the object; the mind knowing and under the formal relation of knowing, is always the subject. Hence theology subjectively considered, or the knowledge of God subjectively considered, can mean nothing, in strict propriety of speech, but the personal piety of each individual therein considered as the property of his own soul. It is subjective only as it exists in him. To a third person who speculates upon it and examines its laws and operations, it is surely objective. Every scientific treatise, therefore, must deal with its topics, even when they are mental states and conditions, *objectively*. There is no way of *considering* the knowledge of God, but by objectifying it. And this accords precisely with the usage of the terms among theological writers. By *objective theology* they mean Divine truth systematically exhibited. By *subjective theology*, holy habits and dispositions considered as in the souls of the faithful. The first they also call abstract, and the second concrete—to convey the idea that, in the one case, truth was contemplated apart from its inhesion; in the other, in connection with its inhesion, or under the notion of its inhesion in the subject. We give an example from Turretin and a reference to Owen:

Theologia supernaturalis consideratur, vel *systematicè* prout notat compagem doctrinæ salutariæ de Deo et rebus divinis ex Scriptura expressæ, per modum disciplinæ alicujus in sua præcepta certa methodo dispositæ, quæ est *abstractiva et objectiva* dicitur; vel *habitualiter*, et per modum habitus in intellectu residentis, et *concretiva et subjectiva* vocatur. Loc. Prim., Quaest. 2, § 8.

Cf. Owen's Theologoumena, Lib. 1 c. 3.

To this may be added the remark of Sir William Hamilton: "An art or science is said to be *objective*, when considered simply as a system of speculative truths or practical rules, but without respect of any actual possessor; *subjective* when considered as a habit of knowledge, or a dexterity inherent in the mind, either vaguely of any, or precisely of this or that possessor." Reid, p. 808, note. We think the terms *abstract* and *concrete*, though usually employed synonymously with subjective and objective, as less liable to be misunderstood.

own majestic proportions, that there should be nothing to withdraw the gaze of the spectator from the splendid temple. There should be no contrast of a rude hut or dingy walls offending the eye—the temple should speak for itself. Contrasts here would diminish instead of increasing the effect—they would distract the attention and dissipate the impression. Dr. B. has undertaken to rear the temple of Divine truth—to place it, like the splendid edifice of Solomon upon a lofty eminence, and to leave it alone to proclaim the glory of the mind which conceived it and in which its noble image dwelt from eternity. He would have it stand before us in colossal majesty, and as each pillar, capital, wall and stone were surveyed, and as the overpowering impression of the whole structure was taken in, he would have no other direction given to those who questioned whether this were a building of God, but *look around*. The thing speaks for itself. It is a monument of an infinite mind which nothing but wilful blindness can fail to read. This is the conception. The Gospel is its own witness. And to present the Gospel so as to make each proposition vindicate itself by its own inherent excellence and its relative place and importance in the whole system—is the best argument for the divine origin of Christianity. Each part is a testimony to Divine wisdom, and the united whole a conspicuous illustration of Divine glory. Dr. B. has accordingly endeavoured to catch the image from the glass of the Divine word, to collect the scattered rays, and to present them in a picture of Divine and ineffable effulgence. He has assumed that truth must justify itself; that it must stand in its own light and that the best way to be impressed and enamoured with it, is to look at it. As the daughter of God, her high and heavenly lineage is traced in her features. Her looks certify her truth. *Vera incessu patuit Dea*. This conception in itself is not new, it is of the very essence of true faith. But to make it the regulative principle of a theological system is peculiar to Dr. B. To fashion his whole course of instruction so as to present in simple and just proportions the whole body of Divine truth; to leave that truth to its own inherent power of self-vindication; to make it a spectacle or rather an image of transcendent beauty and glory, the very reflection of the perfections of God, to be gazed at with admiration, devotion and awe; this never entered into the mind of any system-maker before. The conception, in this form, is beyond all controversy, original. With others, it has entered as an element of devotion, or a topic of sermons. With Dr. B. it is the life and soul of a scientific method—the last man, from whom, according to the popular estimate of his character, such a result might have been anticipated. The hero of an hundred fields, with the wounds and bruises and scars of the conflict scattered thick over his person, ever ready, like the war-horse in Job, to snuff the breeze of battle, could hardly

have been expected to delight in the calm visions of peaceful contemplation. The thing does him infinite honour. It shows where his heart is ; and whatever may have been the surmises of enemies, it puts beyond doubt, that his polemics have been the reflection of an earnest faith—that his rest in the truth, his abiding and satisfying sense of its preciousness, have been the secrets of his zeal in its defence. He has not fought for sect or distinction ; he has fought for the glory of God. He had a treasure in the house, and therefore, defended it with might and main. There is a polemic who fights for glory or for party ; such a combatant knows nothing of the spirit of the gospel. There is another polemic, who fights only for the honour of his God and his Saviour ; this man only witnesses a good confession, and treads in the footsteps of Jesus and the martyrs. We cannot forbear to add that Dr. B.'s theological method is a proof, in another aspect of the matter, of the singleness, intensity and earnestness of his character. What he does, he does with his might. Where he loves, he loves with his whole soul ; when he hates, he hates with equal cordiality ; and when he fights, he wants a clear field and nothing to do but fight. He has arranged his system so as to concentrate his energies upon each department—to do but one thing at a time and to do it heartily and well. In the first part he gives himself to meditation and contemplates truth with undisturbed and admiring gaze ; in the second, he gives himself to action, and girds up the loins of his mind for the Divine life ; in the third, he buckles on his armour and has an ear for nothing but the trump of war. His method is the picture of the man ; and his book, in another sense than that of Milton, is “ the precious life blood of a master spirit,” and “ preserves, as in a vial, the purest efficacy and extraction of that living intellect that bred it.” We doubt whether a mind like that of Dr. B., so single and intense, could have written successfully on any other plan.

The topics, we have seen, which he considers as making up the science of theology are God, Man, and the Mediator—in this division differing, in form more than in substance, from those who, like Calvin, refer every thing to only two heads, God and Man. The order in which he has arranged his topics is, so far as we know, wholly original. If it did not bear such evident traces of having sprung from the author's own cogitations, we might be tempted to suspect that he had borrowed the hint from one or two passages in Calvin's Institutes. The clue to his plan is the method of the Spirit in the production of faith. He has copied in his systematic exposition of Divine knowledge the Divine procedure in imparting it. As the Spirit first convinces us of our sin and misery and shuts us up to despair as to any human grounds for relief, so Dr. B. begins with a survey of man in his individual and social relations, and demonstrates that his ruin is

universal and irremediable. As the Spirit revives us by enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ and inspires us with hope from the revelation of the Cross, so Dr. B. next proceeds to consider the Mediator in His Person, States, Offices, and wonderful Work; and shows that the provisions of grace are amply adequate and more than adequate to repair the ruins of the fall. And as in Christ we know God in the only sense in which He can be a God to us, or the soul can rest in the contemplation of His excellencies, so Dr. B. makes the Divine character, perfections and glory the culminating point of his scheme. He begins with Man and ends with God to whom he is conducted through the Mediator. To each of these subjects, a book is devoted. Then, in another book, all the sources of our knowledge of God are consecutively considered, and the treatise closes with a fifth book which brings us back to the point from which we started, and encounters in the light of the whole preceding discussion those great problems of religion which grow out of the relations of the finite and infinite and which have ever baffled and must continue to baffle the capacities of a creature to comprehend. The order being that of experimental religion and the design to present truth in its integrity and in its own self-evidencing light, all that constitutes the *precognita* of theology in other systems is here omitted with the exception of two short digressions at the close of the first book on the Being of God and the Immortality of Man. It may appear a little singular, at first sight, that in a work professedly unfolding the knowledge of God, His very Existence should be treated as a collateral and incidental point—that the fundamental topic upon which most theologians lay out their strength should enter at all only as an *obiter dictum*. This apparently anomalous procedure may be explained in two ways. First, the method of the book requires that all controversies should be remitted to the third part; the Atheistic among the rest. What the child of God believes and knows, and as he believes and knows, in its symmetry and dependence is the exclusive subject of the first part. In the next place, no science is required to prove—it accepts, its principles. God's existence is as much an intuition to the spiritual man as the existence of matter to the natural philosopher. The physical inquirer, begins with the assumption that matter is. The theologian, in the same way, is at liberty to begin with the doctrine that God is. The question of His existence belongs to Ontology or to Metaphysics and not to Theology. It is a question which can only be asked by those who are strangers to spiritual perception, and who recognize no other cognition of God but that which is analogous to our cognition of other substances and their properties. There are no doubt satisfactory proofs of the being and perfections of God upon ontological grounds, but these proofs give rise to philosophical opinion—not to Divine knowledge.

BRECKINRIDGE'S THEOLOGY.

The only knowledge, however, which enters into theology, is that which is produced by the illumination of the spirit and has all the certainty, and force of sense. "The understanding here is something else besides the intellectual powers of the soul, it is the Spirit." Religion has, as Owen observes,* its demonstrations as the Mathematics and Dialectics have theirs, but the demonstrations of religion are spiritual and mighty, and as far removed from those of human wisdom as the heavens are from the earth. It should never be forgotten that theology is not a science of the natural, nor even of the moral knowledge of God. It is not a science of speculative cognition at all. It is the science of a true and loving faith. It is the science of that form of knowledge which produces love, reverence, trust, hope, and fear; which contains the seeds of every holy exercise and habit; which understands what is meant by the glory of God and rejoices in Him as the full, satisfying, everlasting portion of the soul. It is the science of the Divine life in the soul of man. Undertaking to exhibit the data of such a science, which is virtually denied the very moment its principles are not assumed as authenticating themselves, Dr. B. would have contradicted the whole purpose of his book, had he turned the questions of a Divine theology into the forms of a human philosophy. Still, as grace presupposes nature, and spiritual perception, natural apprehension, the great questions of ontology as far as they relate to the existence of God should find a place in the polemical department, so that the unbeliever may be left without excuse.

Our readers are, perhaps, all familiar with the splendid passage in Foster's essays, in which he attempts to show that, without being possessed of omniscience and omnipresence himself, it is impossible for the atheist to reach the height of knowing that there is no God. The rhetoric of the passage we have always admired, but the logic appears to us so transparently fallacious that we confess that we have been not a little surprised at Dr. B.'s partial adoption of the argument. The simple truth that there are other existences beside ourselves, "draws immediately after it," Dr. B. maintains, "the utter impossibility of establishing the truth of atheism. Because as there are existences besides myself, and exterior to myself, I must explore the whole universe and I must be sure that I have explored it all, before it is possible for me to know that one of the existences exterior to myself, some of which have been proved to be eternal, may not be God."—[p. 48.] Surely from the terms of the definition, if God is not every where, He is no where—and if I have fully explored any part of the universe and find that he is not there, I may have the absolute certainty that, whoever or whatever may exist in other portions of it, an

*Theologoumena, Lib. 1, c. 2. Cf. Lib. 6, c. 8.

omnipresent Being does not. Again, we are unable to perceive why, if it were true, that there is no God, it would be a truth, which a man could not know, as Foster maintains, without knowing all things. Dr. B. simply affirms that in its own nature this does "not admit of being established or even ascertained by such creatures as we are." If an absolute commencement of existence and the independence of the finite were in themselves true, (which is the same as saying that there is no God), and could be apprehended as realized in any object whatever; if any thing could be known to begin without being created; this would be a complete demonstration that God, in the sense of the universal, all-pervading cause, does not exist. It would completely set aside the Jehovah of the Bible. If we can *know* any one finite thing to be independent, we can know that such a Being as our God is not in the heavens. If by creatures "such as we are" Dr. B. means creatures with our intuitions and beliefs, his proposition is true. Such creatures cannot realize in thought the finite as independent or self-existent; cannot, in other words, even think the possibility of atheism. It is not, however, that they must know all things in order not to know God; it is rather that they know nothing without knowing God—the Divine existence being as much the condition of cognition as the condition of existence.

Theology being the spiritual knowledge of God, and all the topics it embraces being only so many streams which empty into this ocean, Dr. B. has concentrated his energies upon the third book which is devoted to the nature, perfections and glory of the Supreme Being. The design is to give the sum of what we actually know, and this is done in answer to two questions, Who is God? and What is God? that is, by a consideration of His names and His essence. He begins with the Names, and after explaining the grounds of their multiplicity and variety, unfolds those aspects of the Divine nature and perfections which they respectively involve. He then proceeds to the Essence of God, as manifested, 1st. in the mode of His existence, under which head the Scripture doctrine of the Trinity is carefully evolved, the Personality, Deity and Work of the Holy Ghost receiving especial and minute attention; and 2d. in the Attributes of God, the classification of which has engaged Dr. B.'s most earnest and patient labours. He has spared no pains to make his division exhaustive and complete. The central ideas are those of Being, Personal Spirit and Absolute Perfection. Personal Spirit branches out into two subdivisions, according as the notion of Intelligence or the notion of Rectitude predominates. We have, accordingly, five classes of attributes. 1. Those founded on the notion of Being—such as simplicity, infinity, independence, eternity—these the author calls Primary Attributes. 2. Those founded on the notion of Personal Spirit which implies intellect, will and power—these the author calls Essential

attributes. 3. Those founded on that aspect of Personal existence in which intelligence predominates, in which the distinction between the true and the false determines the nature of the perfection—these the author calls Natural attributes. 4. Those in which Will or Rectitude is the predominant idea, in which the perfection is determined by the distinction betwixt the good and the bad—These the author calls Moral attributes. 5. And finally we have another class of properties which are founded on the notion of absolute perfection—the *ens realissimum* or *ens perfectissimum*—these he calls Consummate attributes. Around, therefore, the three central conceptions of Being, Spirit, Most Perfect Being, we have five circles of light and beauty constantly and eternally revolving; two being, as in Ezekiel's vision, wheels within wheels. Given the notion of God simply as being: and you have eternity, immutability, infinity, omnipresence and independence: Given God as a Spirit: you have intelligence, will, power; branching on the side of intelligence into infinite knowledge and wisdom—on the side of will, into holiness, justice, goodness and truth. Given God as a Most Perfect Being: and you have really and eminently all that is beautiful and glorious and blessed in every creature and condition, concentrated infinitely and supremely in Him, the all-sufficient good, the plenitude of being, the fullness of excellence, the all in all. We think it but justice to the author that, in relation to this important portion of his work he should be permitted to speak for himself:

II.—1. The perfections of God are considered and treated in a separate manner, and are classified, only out of the necessity on our part, that we may, in this manner, contemplate God himself, more intelligibly. They are not, in fact, parts of God, nor faculties of God; but they are God himself. When we mean to say that he knows all things, we express that idea by calling him Omniscient: when we mean to say that he can do all things, we express that idea by calling him Omnipotent: and as both of these facts are true universally, necessarily and inherently in God, we express that idea by saying, these are Perfections or Attributes of God. And so of all his other Perfections.

2. Now as God is manifest in all things, it is impossible even to conjecture in how many ways and upon how many objects, he might, or does, make his Perfections known. In effect every divine Perfection is infinite: and the number of Perfections in an infinite being is also infinite—since he is subject to no limitation, and the aspects in which he is capable of manifesting himself are illimitable. As every thing he does, has for its foundation something that he is, and as every thing that he is, can be conceived of in various relations to every thing else, that he is: the Perfections which in any particular aspect of his being can be shown to belong to him, are apparently boundless. Throughout his blessed Word, the ascriptions of infinite perfections to him, scarcely admit of being numbered. In any systematic treatment of the subject, therefore, what is wanted is, not a vain attempt to enumerate the divine perfections, and give names to them; but the discovery and clear state-

ment of a method by which such of them as are known to us may be classified and contemplated by our finite understanding, in a manner consistent with its own nature and modes of obtaining knowledge.

3. There are certain Perfections of God which may be contemplated as qualifying his very being, as well as his other perfections ; conditions, if I may so express myself, without which God, cannot be said to have a being, or any other perfection. Such as these—to wit : that he is Simple, Infinite, Independent, Self-existent, Necessary, Eternal, Incorporeal, Immaterial, Immense, Incomprehensible, having life in himself. These, and the like, I would place in the first class, and call them the Primary Attributes ; meaning thereby to express the idea, that these Attributes cannot be separated from our conception of the true God ; but that as soon as we say, that such a being exists at all, we must necessarily imply, that these, and all such things are true concerning him ; because, such a being as he is, cannot exist except upon these conditions—as inseparable from his existence.

4. There are other perfections of God, which are necessarily implied, in the mode of his being, as an Infinite Spirit : perfections, without which we cannot conceive of his being a Spirit, at all ; nor conceive, if he is a Spirit, that he either lives, or imparts life—or that he exerts any of his Primary Attributes. As he is a Spirit, and as he must conceive all that he does, he must have an Intellect : and as he is a Spirit, and as he does conceive and act, he must have a Will : and possessing an Intellect and Will, and acting at all—he must possess Power commensurate with his nature and acts. These I would place in the second class, and call Essential Attributes of God ; intending thereby to express the idea that God, as he is not only God simply considered—but as he is God the infinite, eternal and unchangeable Spirit, must be endowed with Intellect, Will and Power—in a manner corresponding with his being, and with his Primary Attributes. Now there are certain conditions to be predicated of the Essential Attributes of God, which express more distinctly the nature and extent of these perfections themselves ; or which open to us, if we prefer to consider it so, additional perfections of God ; and these can be viewed more distinctly, by considering them as related in a manner, more or less direct, to these Essential Attributes. They are such as the following, to wit :

(a) As connected with the divine Intellect :—That, amongst God's Essential Perfections—are, a perfect Intuition of himself, and of all things else ; that he is omniscient, having an unsearchable, incomprehensible and eternal insight of all that ever did, will or could be ;—that he is the Fountain of all Possibilities, and all Ideas, and therefore of all Truth ; and that, from all eternity ; and by an act of his illimitable Intelligence ; so that it is not possible that he should err.

(b) As connected with the divine will : That, amongst the Essential Perfections of God are, such as these, to wit : That his will is infinitely free, pure and active ; that, spontaneously, by one act, and from eternity, in view of all things existing in his infinite understanding, his most perfect will determines all things ; that seeing all motives, all possibilities, all ends and means, the determinations of his will are complete, immutable and most sure ; that nothing is possible except as he wills it, and that any thing he wills is certain ; and that he wills every thing, not one by one, but all as a part of the boundless scheme which he proposes and the glorious ends he designs.

(c) As connected with the divine power: That God does and can do, whatever does not in itself involve a contradiction; that his Power is of every kind, and extends to every object, and acts in every form and unto every end, and that throughout the universe, and through eternity; so that no appreciable resistance can be conceived of, to him; and that no exertion or effort can be conceived of as being made by him; he is omnipotent.

5. There arises a third ground of distinction amongst the Attributes of God, as advancing from the primary conception of him merely as an Infinite and Self-existent being—we pass onward through the consideration of him as an Infinite Spirit, and arrive at the view of him, in which he is to be contemplated as an Infinite Spirit, under a particular aspect; namely, under the aspect of possessing the perfections of that boundless knowledge and wisdom, which have relation to that special distinction which we call True and False. While it is certain that a spirit must possess Intelligence, and an Infinite Spirit must possess infinite Intelligence; yet the special relevancy of a particular kind of Knowledge and the special Wisdom connected therewith, to a special aspect of his being, and to our special relations to him; begets a complete, and to us transcendently important distinction amongst the Perfections of God. Here it is founded, as I have observed, on the distinction of the *true* and *false*: in the next class upon the distinction of *Good* and *Evil*. The Perfections of the former kind, I would place in the Third Class, and call them the Natural Attributes of God; partly, as expressing the nearest approximation of the nature of God to that of the creature. Since of all spiritual things knowledge and wisdom are those in which the creature—which perceives the eternal and ineffaceable distinction between the true and the false, is naturally and universally most capable of growing. And partly, as expressing a distinction—more slight, between them and the class immediately preceding, and more marked between them and the class immediately following.

6. In like manner when we conceive of this All-knowing and All-wise Spirit, which fills immensity, as taking notice of that distinction we express by the words *good* and *evil*; and as being actuated by such affections as Love and Aversion; and conceive of such qualities as Goodness and Mercy, or Anger and Wrath, as attending their exercise; and then conceive of these being all ordered in Justice, Truth and Long-suffering; it is manifest that a view of him is obtained, different from any hitherto presented. I would therefore establish a Fourth Class, and refer to it such Perfections as Holiness, Goodness, Graciousness, Love, Mercifulness, Long-suffering, Justice, Truth and the like; and call them the Moral Attributes of God. Meaning thereby such perfections as we find some trace of in our moral nature, and which all point to that eternal and ineffaceable distinction between good and evil, already suggested.

7. And finally, we cannot avoid perceiving that there are other conceptions of God, which cannot be contemplated without exhibiting him to us, in a manner different from any suggested, in the four preceding classes. For there are views of him which necessarily embrace every thing; which necessarily show him to us in the completeness of all his Perfections. I would, therefore, establish a Fifth Class, and refer to it what I will call the Infinite Actuality of God, that is, the ceaseless movement of his Infinite Life; also his Infinite supremacy, that is the consummate dominion of that

Infinite Life of God ; also his Omnipresence, his All-sufficiency, his Infinite Fulness or Infinitude, his consummate Perfection, his absolute Oneness and his unutterable Blessedness. And, as expressive of the particular ground of distinction in these Perfections, I would call them Consummate Attributes of God.

According to this method we are enabled to contemplate God successively, 1. As he is an Infinite being and endowed with the proper perfections thereof: 2. As he is an infinite Spirit, and endowed with the proper perfections thereof: 3. As being both, and endowed with all perfections that belong to both, considered with reference to the eternal and ineffaceable distinction between true and false, which is the fundamental distinction with which our own rational faculties are conversant: 4. As being endowed with all perfections, considered with reference to the eternal and ineffaceable distinction between good and evil, which is the fundamental distinction with which our moral faculties are conversant: 5. As being endowed with all perfections which underlie, which embrace, or which result from the union of all the preceding perfections. And so the classes of his perfections would necessarily be: 1. Those called Primary Attributes, that is, such as belong to an Infinite and Self-existent being, simply considered: 2. Essential Attributes, that is, those belonging to such a being considered essentially as an infinite Spirit: 3. Natural Attributes, that is, such as appertain to an Infinite Spirit considered naturally rather than morally or essentially: 4. Moral Attributes, that is, such as appertain to such a being, considered morally, rather than naturally or essentially: 5. Consummate Attributes, that is, such as appertain to such a being considered completely and absolutely. To the development of these conceptions, and the demonstration of the Infinite Perfections of God as thus classified, the five following chapters will be devoted. [pp. 262-6.]

Were we to venture a criticism upon this elaborate and careful classification of the Divine Attributes, we would suggest that the consideration of Spirit in its Personal unity, as involving intellect and will, might be dispensed with, and that the enumeration should proceed at once to its obvious subdivisions. Nothing would be lost, by this arrangement, to the completeness of the catalogue, while much would be gained in the improvement of the nomenclature. Primary is certainly an unfortunate epithet to apply to the attributes of God, as it carries the intimation that some are secondary and subordinate. Natural is not the directest antithesis to moral. Essential and Natural are likely to be confounded. By the omission proposed, what the author calls Primary attributes, he might denominate *Essential*—a word evidently appropriate to express the properties of a being, in which existence and essence coincide. The second class of attributes founded, on the conception of Spirit as intelligent, might then be called *Intellectual*. The third, founded on the conception of Spirit as moral, might retain its present name. We should then have Essential, Intellectual, Moral and Consummate—and we are inclined to think that there is not a single perfection enumerated by the author, or capable of being conceived by the human mind, which may not be reduced to

one of these four heads. Omnipotence may strike some as an exception. Accustomed to regard it as the simple energy of God's will, directed by intelligence, they can find no place for it, unless the capital idea of the Unity of Spirit is retained as a ground of division. But the truth is, it belongs to the Consummate perfections of God, and the conception of it becomes not only grand but glorious, when it is contemplated as the fulness of God expressing itself in act—not only as a combination of intelligence and will, but a combination of intelligence, goodness and will—an energy of the Divine Life.

In the fourth book, which is devoted to a survey of all the sources of our knowledge of God, that is, of all the manifestations which God has made of Himself to man, the author has been most signally successful. Some portions of it we have read with feelings approaching to rapture. The theme is a grand one. Creation, Providence, Redemption, God's Works of Nature and Grace—these are the mighty theatres in which the Divine actor is presented. And surely it is a task of no common magnitude to write a drama, the plot of which shall be the unfolding, upon a scale worthy of His glory, of that awful and august Being whose prerogative it is, while essentially light, to dwell in thick darkness! Dr. B. felt the inspiration of the theme, and he who can rise from the contemplation of the picture he has drawn without a deeper sense of the majesty, sublimity, wisdom and goodness of God, without an impression of the Divine glory which gives a new lustre to the objects of nature, and a richer significance to the history of man; he that can study the seven chapters of this book and not be penetrated with the profoundest gratitude that he has been made capable of such conceptions as are successively brought before him, is insensible to all that is beautiful in poetry, lovely in art, and divine in truth. The legitimate effect would seem to be, to make us blind to every thing but God. We should see Him in the stars, hear Him in the winds, catch His smile in the calm serenity of the sky, and in the gayety of the fields discern the dim reflection of His goodness. Every dumb thing should become gifted with a tongue to proclaim its Maker's name. In the light of these discussions, nature becomes an august temple which God dwells in and irradiates with His light; all created things, a vast congregation of worshippers, and the glory of God, as it shines over all and upon all, is the burden of that mighty chorus of praise and doxology, which is ever sounding in the ears of the Almighty from all above and all below. Who does not rejoice that such a God reigns? Who does not glory in this, that he knows, and is capable of knowing such a being? What meaningless things are we, and the sun and moon and stars, if supreme intelligence and love are banished from the world? It is theology which puts life into natural science. Laws and phenomena are absolutely dead

things, if viewed only in themselves. They are mysterious hieroglyphics traced upon a wall or a monument, which exhibit marks of intelligence and design, but which human ingenuity has not yet deciphered. The key is wanted to unlock their secrets. That key to nature is the knowledge of God. That makes the senseless symbol pregnant with meaning, the dead image instinct with life. The obscure characters of the heavens and the earth become radiant with light, and what to the eye of ignorance and unbelief was an incomprehensible scrawl—like a page of the *Paradise Lost* to a fly or a worm—become immortal scenes in the epic of eternal truth and Providence. No wonder the whole congregation rose when Massillon pronounced those sublime words, God alone is great. And of all beings the blindest is that burlesque upon his species who can dwell in a world that is full of the Divine riches, where God surrounds him at every step, and permeates with his influence every department of being, and yet he cannot see Him. He may congratulate himself upon his wisdom, but it is the wisdom of the dog which sees only bright points in the firmament, or green spots on the globe. The incapacity of the brute for science is precisely analogous to the incapacity of the fool for theology—and astronomy and botany are not more simply and really explanations of the bright points and green spots, to the natural philosopher, than the glory of God is the secret of these sciences to the man of spiritual discernment.

Dr. B. begins this book by a very precise expression of opinion in relation to the great problem of modern Philosophy—Are the infinite and absolute positive affirmations of intelligence, or are they simply negative and contradictory extremes of all positive thought? The question is, not whether we can comprehend the infinite, though that extravagance has been maintained, but whether we can *know*, that the infinite exists, as really and as truly as we know that the finite exists. Is it, in other words, an original datum of consciousness, manifested in every cognition of the limited and conditioned? Dr. B. maintains that it is. He concurs with the great body of Divines in asserting to our conceptions of the infinite and absolute a positive and substantive value, involving the apprehension of existence, but not the comprehension of the things in themselves. His conclusion is exactly that of Cousin in the latest form in which he expressed his doctrine, though not that of Cousin in the form in which it was so successfully combated by Sir Wm. Hamilton. We have always thought that, in this celebrated controversy, both parties were wrong and both were right. Cousin was wrong in vindicating to reason an absolute comprehension of the God-head; and Sir Wm.'s refutation of this doctrine is triumphant and complete. Sir William was wrong in denying the reality of the infinite to be a positive affirmation of intelligence and resolving the belief of it into an impotence of

mind to realize either of two contradictory extremes, though according to the laws of thought, one had to be accepted as necessary. Cousin was wrong in maintaining that the relations of the finite and infinite were eternal, necessary, and fully intelligible; Sir William wrong in maintaining that they were wholly and completely unknown. Cousin arrogated too much; Sir William too little to intelligence. The tendency of philosophy with the one was to deny all ignorance; the tendency with the other to deny all knowledge. The truth here, as in most other cases, is in the middle—*in medio tutissimus ibis*. Partial knowledge and Partial ignorance are the mingled inheritance of man. Of the infinite we know that it is, though we know not what it is. God is as essentially incomprehensible, as he is inevitably apprehensible. In the pithy words of Charnock who herein expresses the deep conviction of the church of God in all ages: "Though God be so inaccessible, that we cannot know Him perfectly, yet He is so much in the light that we cannot be wholly ignorant of Him. As he cannot be comprehended in his essence, He cannot be unknown in His existence; 'tis as easy by reason to understand that He is, as it is difficult to know what He is."

The conception of God, as the Absolute, in the sense of the fulness and perfection of being to which nothing can be added and from which nothing can be taken; the totality, eminently or really, of all existence—the conception of God as the Infinite, in the sense of an exemption from all restrictions and limitations either upon His essence or perfections; infinite because absolute and absolute because infinite—this conception has not only ever been a positive and regulative principle of the human mind, but is an irresistible affirmation of the human reason. Even those who have denied to it, as Kant did, an objective reality have been constrained to admit its subjective necessity. To say that God is wholly unknown and wholly incapable of being known is to annihilate the possibility of religion. The wholly inconceivable is relatively to us the wholly non-existent. When we say that the infinite cannot be comprehended we mean much more than that our conceptions of it are inadequate and defective; we mean wholly to exclude it, as it exists in itself, from the domain of science. Its existence is an original and primary belief; its properties and relations, beyond partial manifestations in the region of the finite, transcend the sphere of Logic. Sir William Hamilton and Kant have shown, beyond the possibility of refutation, that nothing but contradiction emerges, when we apply the laws of finite thought to what is confessedly beyond them. To bring the infinite within the sphere of the understanding is to limit, to define it; to think it as a term of syllogism is to condition it. It becomes one among many. Hence Boethius* was, in our judgment, right—Aristotle before him was

*Quod autem ratione mentis circumdari non potest, nullius scientiæ sine concluditur; quare infinitorum scientiæ nulla est.

right, in pronouncing a science of the infinite to be impossible. It implies a contradiction in terms. This principle, too much overlooked by divines, is pregnant with most important results in its bearing upon theological systems. It shows where we can reason and explain; and where we can only pause and adore. In every question which touches the immediate connection of the infinite with the finite, and the solution of which depends upon the comprehension of the infinite, as a definite thing, it is intuitively obvious, that the solution must be impossible; and every system which attempts the solution only degrades God to the form and stature of a man. There is in theology a region which must be left to the dominion of faith; it can never be entered with the torch of Logic. And most fundamental errors proceed from a disregard of this significant fact and are only abortive efforts to define the indefinable. The Socinian hopes by searching to find out God, and because he cannot think the Trinity according to the laws of Logic, he denies its existence. The Arminian vainly seeks to penetrate the depths of an infinite understanding, and because predestination and free will, in finite relations, do not consist, he extends his conclusion beyond the legitimate contents of his premises. He forgets that the same reason which intuitively gives us man's freedom, intuitively gives us God's prescience; and that the contradiction between them emerges only when professing to think them as they are in God, we really think them as they would be in man. Upon no other ground than a total denial of any logical comprehension, and therefore, of any science of the infinite, can the harmony of faith and reason be maintained. Whenever we directly touch the infinite, we must expect to encounter mystery, and a religion which has no mysteries is simply a religion that has no God. Dr. B. has devoted a chapter of surpassing beauty and interest to this whole subject. These conflicts betwixt faith and reason, or rather faith and our faculties of comparison, he calls the Paradoxes of the Gospel. He shows that they "are all to be found located along that line, in which the infinite and the finite, the Divine and the human elements in religion, at once unite and are separated, and therefore, all belong, not so much to a separate consideration of any particular part of religion, as to a general estimate of religion as a system." He further adds, what harmonizes with all that we have said, "that the only method of their solution, is the application to them of a simple evangelism, and a thorough philosophy combined; for the lack of which, on the one side, or the other, there is sometimes found so much extravagance, and at other times, so much shallowness, in the mode in which the most important truth is stated."—[p. 522.] Dr. B. fully appreciates the high and awful problems with which the soul of the believer has to grapple and recognizes a Divine wisdom in faith which mocks the efforts of an earth-born philosophy. There

are things to be believed and adored, whose glory departs the very moment you compress them to the dimensions of any finite forms of thought. They spurn the bandages of logic. As well wrap a giant in the swaddling clothes of infancy as these mysteries in the terms of argument. Man has nobler functions than to deduce and comprehend. Faith is before knowledge and resumes its jurisdiction when knowledge ceases. Comprehension, after all, is a very narrow territory, bounded on all sides by an illimitable region of mystery, a region from which we emerge into the light of knowledge by faith, and when knowledge fails, we fall back upon the guidance of faith again. As pertinent to this subject the following passage from Dr. B. cannot fail to engage the attention and awaken the interest of the reader :

4. We often speak of the difficulties of religion as presented in the works of infidels and heretics. But they are not worthy to be so much as once thought of, when placed by the side of the difficulties which the soul of the true believer has mastered. Satan does not reveal his strength to his willing followers. The spirit which rests in the shallow doubts which outlie the wide frontiers of divine truth, never approaches the real problems over which the heart agonizes, and before which the intellect recoils. If the inward struggles of any earnest Christian spirit in the progressive development of its divine life, were distinctly recorded, so that they could be carefully considered by others ; they would show nothing more clearly than the utter insignificance and hollowness, the pitiable ignorance and baseness, of the common pretexts of unbelievers. These great spiritual battles are fought around and within these citadels—these strongholds of God, in each of which is entrenched one of these great Gospel Paradoxes. And if our eyes were opened so that we could see at one glance the whole vanguard of the church militant, we should behold encamped around, or lodged within these very battlements, the chief captains of the army of the Lord ; some safely and serenely reposing on the bosom of Christ, having won the great victory ; some discomfited, yet still renewedly girding themselves for the life battle ; some calmly watching and pondering, till the signal falls for the new onset ; some in the very heat and desperate grapple of the imminent deadly breach ! Who can pass his eye, even in thought, around their glorious ranks, without wonder, and love, and joy ; without perceiving under a new aspect, the high communion of the redeemed of God—in this form of their union with and in Christ !

5. It is a fatal error to imagine that we can gain any thing, either in the power or the distinctness of our spiritual experience, by avoiding these sublime meditations. And it is another error not less fatal, to suppose that the Gospel is commended to the soul of man, by our poor attempts to lower the terms of these grand paradoxes, on one side or the other, or on both. The difficulty is not created by the Gospel : it lies in the infinite nature of the case—and in the eternal nexus wherein God stands related to his own universe. As I have intimated before, so much of the difficulty as can be solved at all, can be solved only through the most intense application of the plan of Salvation, to the most profound realities of the case ; a result to which all superficial philosophy and all shallow evangelism, unitedly or separately,

are utterly incompetent. Open them, as bottomless chasms across the pathway to eternity : pile them up, as impassable mountains in the way toward the New Jerusalem : and then you will not only tell the whole truth—but you will so tell it that the soul of man can both understand and believe it. It is after that, only, we can know—or that we care to know, how these mountains can be brought low, these vallies be filled, these rough places be made smooth, these crooked ones become straight, and a highway be made for the Lord and for his redeemed !

6. And after all it is not by means of the logical faculty, that man escapes perdition. Our faith does not stand in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God. It is with the heart that man believeth unto righteousness. It is not merely—nay, it is not even chiefly—upon what we call our reason that the power of God's grace manifests itself in the new creation ; and so it is not mainly, much less merely, by means of philosophy—no matter how pure and deep, that God can be fully comprehended, much less embraced.—[pp. 522-4.]

It is not our purpose to follow Dr. B. through the detailed consideration of the sources of our knowledge of God. These are Creation, Providence, Redemption, Man himself, and the Sacred Scriptures. As Dr. B. enumerates them, "God may be known as manifested in His works, God the Creator ; He may be known as manifested in His dominion and reign, the God of Providence ; He may be known as manifested in human nature, the Word made flesh ; He may be known as manifested in the New Creation, God the Spirit ; He may be known as manifested in Revelation, the God of the Sacred Scriptures ; He may be known as manifested in the Conscious Existence of man, God the Maker and Renewer of the human soul."—[p. 330.] To each of these topics a chapter is devoted.

Up to this point the work has been mainly inductive—it has followed up successive streams of observation and of fact until they disembogued into the fulness of God. It commenced with a survey of man, as consciousness and universal experience testify that he is. It then contemplated the revealed economy in reference to the recovery and redemption of our race, the inquiry still turning only upon facts. The particulars thus collected are all generalized into those manifestations of God which constitute the sum and substance of our knowledge of His name. Having inductively reached the conclusions of the third book, the fourth recapitulates all the fields of observation which lie before us and verifies the results which we have successively attained. Induction having by an ascending series conducted us to God, we then, descend, in the way of what Dr. B. calls deduction, through the creation, primitive state and subsequent fall of man, to the condition in which we found him at the opening of the first book. His present ruin and misery are vindicated in the light of the principles previously established, "mortal existence and divine

truth are brought face to face," and the great problem of human destiny as it relates to individuals and the race calmly encountered. The questions discussed are among the most intricate that can occupy the mind of man. They cover the whole field of moral government in its essential and fundamental doctrines and in the gracious modifications which it has assumed towards our race. Primeval innocence, the Covenant of Works, the Entrance of Sin, the Fall of the Species, Election and Redemption—this is the scale of descending inquiry which is measured in the book before us—these the momentous questions upon which we must bring to bear all that we know of God. These weighty topics are dispatched in about sixty pages—a clear proof that the author, in rigid adherence to his method, has remitted the whole philosophy of the questions, to his third part. He has confined himself mainly to a connected exhibition of scripture facts and doctrines, with a reference here and there to the moral and psychological laws which are supposed to underlie them. The covenant of works, in its general features and specific provisions, he has ably presented, except that the precise nature of the change in man's relations to God, contemplated in the promise is not expressly mentioned. That change was from a servant to a son. Adoption is the crowning blessing of both covenants—the rich prize offered to our race in the garden and secured to believers on the cross. Under the law of nature man was a subject and God a ruler. The Covenant of Works was an interposition of grace by means of which man might become a child and God a father, and the filial relation supersede that of simple and naked law. This glorious adoption, which makes paternal love and goodness, instead of our own merits, the measure of our expectations and security—this priceless blessing which Adam failed to secure, is what Christ has won for us.

We could have wished that Dr. B. had dwelt more largely on the nature of sin—and particularly the first sin—as involving essentially the notion of apostacy. If he had shown that, as a subjective state, it was a falling away from God, and contained seminally the elements of every species of transgression; that it was, in truth, the universal principle of sin, the malignity of Adam's guilt and the righteousness of God's judgment would have been more vividly impressed. These notions are implied, but they are not brought out with the prominence and emphasis that their importance deserves. Indeed the whole question concerning the rise of sin in the mind of Adam, how a holy creature *could* sin—the beginning and the steps of the process—is not fairly and fully encountered. We are told that man, as a creature, was necessarily fallible—but Dr. B. is too good a logician not to know that *a posse ad esse non valet consequentia*. To say that man was created so that he might sin is not to say that he would

sin. And when he has sinned, it is no explanation of the fact to say that he could sin. A man builds a house—to tell us that he could build it is not to tell us why he built it. The pinch of the question is, how Adam came to use his power to sin? He was able to stand or able to fall. Why did he choose the latter rather than the former? Freedom of will enters here only to connect responsibility with the act, to give it moral significance and value, but not to give the grounds of it. Dr. B. proceeds to enumerate the elements of wickedness which entered into Adam's first disobedience—"unbelief, inordinate desire of forbidden knowledge, presumptuous aspirations after equality with God, the pride of the eye, the lust of the appetite, the inordinate mutual devotion of loving hearts, credulity under skilful temptation"—but the question is, how these elements ever got possession of a heart created in the image of God, and delighting in spiritual conformity with His law? We wish that Dr. B. had given more attention to this profoundly interesting question; that he had resolutely undertaken to solve the phenomenon of the origin of sin in a holy being, or to show, upon philosophical grounds, that it is incapable of solution. Had he with his evangelical views grappled with it, as Bishop Butler has done, he might have favoured us with more satisfactory results. That he has not done so is simply an omission, and an omission, perhaps, incidental to the nature of his plan.

It is with unfeigned reluctance that we differ from the author upon any subject. We have such profound respect for his judgment, that whenever our opinions have not been in accordance with his, we have felt that the presumption was against us, and that modesty and caution became us until we had thoroughly reviewed the grounds of our conclusions. Dr. B. is no rash thinker, and because he is no rash thinker, we specially regret that we cannot concur with him in his views of hereditary depravity and imputed sin. We understand Dr. B. to teach, that the native character of man is determined by the natural, and not by the federal, relations of Adam; that we are born sinners, because Adam our father was a sinner, and begat us under the law that like must propagate like. We understand him further as teaching, that inherent corruption of nature is prior, in the order of thought, to the guilt of Adam's first sin, so that unless we were born sinners we could not be involved in his curse.* In direct

*The passages to which we refer are the following:

4. I have shown in the previous chapter, when expressly considering the Covenant of Works, that the whole family of man was necessarily and was expressly embraced in its stipulations—and must, as the case might be, receive its reward, or incur its penalty. Treating now of the penalty alone, it may be proper, before proceeding to the statement of the exact manner in which it was incurred by Adam, to point out

contradiction to these statements, the truth to us seems to be, that the moral character of the race is determined by the federal, and not by the natural relations of Adam, and that inherent depravity is the judicial result, and not the formal ground, of the imputation of his sin. Natural headship, in our judgment, does nothing more than define the extent of federal representation. It answers the question, Who were included in the covenant? Those descending from Adam by ordinary generation. But apart from the idea of trusteeship, or federal headship, Adam, it appears to us, would have been no more than any other parent. There is nothing in the single circumstance of being first in a series to change the character of the relation, and no reason, therefore, why a first father, considered exclusively as a father, should have any more effect upon his issue than a second or third. The law of like begetting like is altogether inapplicable to the transmission of sin. That law contemplates the perpetuation of the species and not the propagation of accidental differences. Every kind generates beings of the same kind, but there is no law which secures the reproduction of

precisely the grounds upon which, under the case as it stood, that penalty must embrace all his ordinary posterity in the same ruin which overtook him. There are two great facts, both of them clear and transcendent, which unitedly control the case. The first is, that Adam was the natural head and common progenitor of his race. The human family is not only of one blood, as has been proved in another place, but the blood of Adam is that one blood. The whole Scriptures are subverted, and human life is the grossest of all enigmas, if this be not true. If it be true, nothing is more inevitable than that whatever change may have been produced on the whole nature of Adam by his Fall—of which I shall speak presently—before the existence of any of his issue, must have been propagated through all succeeding generations. If there is any thing perfectly assured to us, it is the steadfastness of the order of nature, in the perpetual reproduction of all things after their own kind. If the fall produced no change on the nature of Adam, it could produce none on the nature of his descendants. If it did produce any change upon his nature, it was his nature thus changed, and not the form of his nature before his fall, which his posterity must inherit.—[pp. 487-8.]

(a) Its first element is the guilt of Adam's first sin. By which is meant that on account of our natural and covenanted relations with Adam, we are considered and treated precisely as we would have been, if each one of us had personally done what Adam did. The guilt of Adam's first sin is imputed to his posterity. There is doubtless a wide difference between imputed sin, and inherent sin. We however have both—and that naturally; and it tends only to error to attempt to explicate either of them in disregard of the other, or to separate what God has indissolubly united, namely, our double relation to Adam. It is infinitely certain, that God would never make a legal fiction a pretext to punish as sinners, dependent and helpless creatures who were actually innocent. The imputation of our sins to Christ, affords no pretext for such a statement; because that was done by the express consent of Christ, and was, in every respect, the most stupendous proof of divine grace. Nor is the righteousness of Christ ever imputed for justification, except to the elect: nor ever received except by faith, which is a grace of the Spirit peculiar to the renewed soul. In like manner the sin of Adam is imputed to us, but never irrespective of our nature and its inherent sin. That is, we must not attempt to separate Adam's federal from his natural headship—by the union of which he is the *Root* of the human race: since we have not a particle of reason to believe that the former would have existed without the latter. Nay, Christ to become our federal head, had to take our nature.—[pp. 498-9.]

individual peculiarities. Now sin and holiness are accidents of the soul. They do not pertain to its essence, they do not determine the species man. The law of propagation, therefore, in itself considered, leaves these accidents to the influence of other causes. If Adam had not been a covenant head, we make no question that his posterity would all have been born in holiness, from the operation of the same cause by which he was created upright. But he having been a covenant head and having sinned and fallen, they are begotten, under a judicial sentence, which determines their moral state. They were born under the law of sin and death. We are aware that the doctrine of Dr. B. is the doctrine of Calvin, and that the Chapter in our Confession of Faith, of the Fall of Man, of Sin and of the Punishment thereof, may be interpreted in the same sense—but the teaching of the catechisms we take to be clearly and unambiguously on our side. There the imputation of guilt is direct and immediate and the true explanation of the degraded condition of the race.

The thirty-third chapter, which is one of uncommon solemnity and pathos, first contemplates the human race, as a collective whole, and takes a survey of the dealings of God for its restoration and recovery until the restitution of all things. It then descends to the destiny of individuals, and considers their career in the light of the Divine decrees, and concludes the certain salvation of the elect and the certain perdition of the reprobate—both to the infinite glory of God. The whole history of the species whether as a race or as individuals, is thus brought under review. The stream is followed from the bosom of God until it is lost in the fathomless depths of Eternity. From man in the first part of the book, we took our departure and found ourselves conducted to the knowledge of God; from God we took our departure a second time, and find our resting place the endless issues of an immortal and changeless existence. Here the work properly stops. The last chapter which we have already noticed, is not so much a part of the systematic knowledge, as a philosophical explanation of the necessary limits within which that knowledge is restrained.

And, now, having completed a general view of the whole treatise, we are, in some measure, prepared to form an opinion of the author's success in attaining the objects he aimed at, "that all confusion should be escaped, that all dislocation of truth should be avoided, that clear statements should become really convincing proofs, that the grand proportion of faith should reign without distortion, that the sublime science of God should emerge distinctly from the chaos of endless disputations, and that the unction of a glorious gospel should pervade the whole."—[p. 14.] We think it may be safely said that he has realized his own ideal, as far as it could possibly be done. He has collected with

loving industry, the scattered members of the mangled body of truth. He has joined bone to bone and limb to limb. He has brought up flesh and blood upon it. And as the image stands before us, in loveliness and beauty, we are obliged to confess its Divine original, and can almost perceive the Spirit of God enter into it and impregnate it with Divine life. The unction of the book is above all praise. The author believes with the heart. Faith with him is knowledge and knowledge is love. The doctrines of the Gospel are not treated as cold and barren speculations. They are sublime and glorious realities, the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. They are not matters about which the disputers of this world may wrangle and harangue, their existence depending upon the preponderance of probabilities and their power standing in the wisdom of men. They are things to be perceived, certified by their own light, and authenticating their own being. Their power is the power of God. Dr. B. is never afraid of the truth. He never minces or prevaricates, nor handles the doctrines of grace, to use the comparison of Rowland Hill, like an ass mumbling a thistle. On the contrary he reminds us of Cecil's inimitable description of Cadogan, who "seemed more like a man talking of what he saw, what he felt and what he kept firm hold of, than of what he had heard or read." Dr. B., like him, follows with no wary step, the teachings of Divine Revelation; knowing its foundations, "he stands upon it, as on the everlasting hills." He fills his reader with that same holy sympathy which Cadogan is said to have propagated from the unction of his own soul, until he almost entranced his hearers, and "left them like Elisha, after the mantle was cast upon him wondering what had so strangely carried him away from the plough and the oxen." We know of no book, ancient or modern, always excepting the Divine compositions of John Howe, which can compare in spiritual pathos with the work before us: The author has succeeded in his wish—"the unction of a glorious Gospel pervades the whole."

The peculiarities of Dr. B.'s teaching are, as we have seen, the separation of dogmatic from polemic theology, and the concatenation of the truths of religion upon the principle of ascent and descent, or induction and deduction. He aims to present them as a whole, and in joining them together, he follows the line of experimental religion until it leads him to God, and then the line of the Divine counsels and operations, until our history as a race and as individuals is closed in eternity. The question now recurs, and it is one which vitally concerns the interests of theological instruction in this country—Should these peculiarities be copied? Is it best to teach the truth apart from its contrasts with error? And is it consistent with our conceptions of science to follow the order of actual discovery or actual development? We confess

that we are skeptical on both points. Systematic divinity is an exposition of the truth as the Church of God holds it—an exposition of it in its dependencies and relations. The faith of the church, as a body of doctrine, distinctly apprehended and realized to reflection, is the product of many and protracted controversies, and all the creeds of Christendom, with the exception perhaps of that which goes by the name of the Apostles, are at once a confession of the truth and a protest against error. The terms in which the most important doctrines of Christianity are stated have been studiously selected—sometimes even invented—because of their implicit denial of some form of heresy and falsehood. We do not mean that the doctrine took its rise from these controversies, or that the people of God then first discovered it, as lying in his word. Nothing is of faith which is not in the bible, and godliness from the beginning has been the moulding of the soul in the type of the word. But there is a marked difference betwixt the spontaneous and reflective exercises of the mind. It is possible to know implicitly without knowing explicitly—possible to feel the power of an article and be controlled by its influence, without being able to represent in precise and definite expressions what is inwardly acknowledged. Heresy, in contradicting the spontaneous life of the church, led to reflection upon the roots and grounds of that life. Reflection elicited the truth in the clear light of consciousness. And to preserve it, thus distinctly and precisely seized, as a lasting inheritance to all time, it was embalmed in language which derived much of its point from its relation to existing controversies. We do not believe that any one ever becomes explicitly conscious of what is meant by the word Trinity, three persons in one God, until his attention has been turned to the Arian and Sabellian heresies. He apprehends enough for devotion, but the full faith even of his own soul he is able articulately to state only in its contrasts to error. It requires, indeed, a very intense power of abstraction, the very highest exercise of genius, to take the truth which exists full and entire as a habit of the mind and represent it, in its integrity, to consciousness, as an object of thought. All the aberrations of philosophy are only confessions of the difficulty which the human mind encounters in seizing and objectifying its own habitudes. As theological instruction aims at the head as well as the heart, we are inclined to think, that a steadier and firmer grasp is given of the truth by distinguishing it in the very process of teaching from every species of lie. The lie is itself an impulse to reflection. It contradicts our inner life, and we are enabled more readily to lay hold upon what God has impressed on us by His Spirit. We see the word in relations of which we had not previously been apprized. A new light is imparted to it. This is the method of the New Testament. Paul, like the builders at Jerusalem, with one

hand always wrought in the work and with the other held a weapon; and John is as particular to warn against false Christs as to commend the love and grace and mercy of the true one. It seems to us that the same law, which in a theological system, would exclude polemics from the sphere of positive teaching, would admit, in a moral system, the consideration of vices to a different part of the system from that which treats of virtues. The science of contraries is one. We suspect that Dr. B. will find, from experience, that his third part will be the part in which he is most successful in making skilful theologians. He may edify more in the first, he will teach more in the third. The first part may be more impressive, the third will be more precise and accurate. The first may strike by the grandeur of the whole, the third will interest by the clearness of the details. The first will be more subservient to devotion, the third to intellectual apprehension. Still we cannot regret that Dr. B. has produced the book under review. The qualities of his mind have ensured to his method a success in his hands which it were vain to expect from a humbler source. None of the disciples can imitate the master, and if our Seminaries should undertake to introduce this mode of teaching, as the general plan, the result would soon show, that we must either have a Dr. Breckinridge in each one of them, or send out any thing but accurate Divines.

As to the principle upon which Dr. B. has concatenated the various topics of theology, it is a natural corollary from the total exclusion of polemics. We can conceive of no order in which the doctrines of spiritual religion, considered in their positive aspects, could be more impressively presented. It is the order of the development of the Divine life. But if theology is to be reduced to the forms of a reflective science, and the truth to be unfolded in its contrasts with error, it is very desirable that some method should be adopted—a thing that has never been done yet, not even by those who have made the most confident pretensions to it—that shall reduce to unity all the doctrines of religion. There must be a ground of unity somewhere, for truth is one as well as connected. This unity must be sought in the doctrines themselves, and not in their accidents and adjuncts. It is easy to connect Divine truths by the idea of the Covenants; by the correlation of disease and remedy, the fall and redemption; or by the order of the Divine decrees as manifested in creation and providence; or by the idea of the Mediator, or the incarnation; but to connect them is not to unite them. We want a corner stone which holds the whole building together. We want some central principle which embraces equally the religion of nature and the religion of grace. Until some such central principle is developed in its all-comprehensive relations, we are obliged to have a two-fold

theology, as we have a two-fold religion—a Covenant of Works and a Covenant of Grace—with no bridge between them.

It seems to us—and we make the suggestion with all proper diffidence—that such a principle is found in the great doctrine of justification, which, in more respects than one deserves the commendation of Calvin, “*præcipuum esse sustinendæ religionis cardinem.*—[Inst. Lib. 3. Cap. 11, §1.] The only systems of religion which God has ever revealed to man consist of the answers which Divine Wisdom has given to the question, How shall a subject of moral government be justified? When that subject is considered simply as a creature, in a state of innocence, and blessed with the image of God, the answer is the religion of nature; if that subject is considered as a fallen being, as a sinner, the answer is the religion of grace. All the provisions of either covenant are subordinated to the idea of justification. They are directed to it as their immediate end, and find their respective places in the system according to their tendency to contribute to its accomplishment. This is the centre around which every other doctrine revolves, and none can be understood fully and adequately apart from their relations to it. Let us consider this matter a little more distinctly.

Justification, it should first be remarked, is not an original or essential principle of moral government. That implies nothing more than the relations of a ruler and a subject through the medium of moral law. It contemplates no change of state and proposes no alternative but uniform obedience or death. Each man is looked upon simply as an individual, a moral unit, whose responsibility terminates upon himself alone, and whose trial is co-extensive with the whole career of the immortality of his being. The law, as such, can never raise him beyond the condition of a servant. It can never relax the contingency of his life. It can never put him beyond the reach of death. Do, and while you do, and as long as you do, you live, is the only language which it can employ. It knows no state of final rewards. Under it there may be perpetual innocence, but there never can be justification. If the relations of law are the only ones which are essential to moral government—and that is obviously the case—it is clear that justification is a superadded element, a provision of infinite goodness and love, which modifies essentially the condition and prospects of man. The case seems to be this: God has never been willing to sustain only legal relations to His moral and intelligent creatures. While the very law of their being, as creatures absolutely dependent upon His will, puts them necessarily in this state, His love has always proposed to raise them higher, to bring them nearer to Himself, to make them children and heirs. He has always proposed a fundamental change in their attitude towards Him, and that change has consisted in the adoption of

sons—in the substitution of filial for legal ties. Instead of an empire of subjects, Infinite Goodness has aimed at a vast family of holy, loving, obedient children. To be admitted into God's family is to be confirmed in holiness, to have life put beyond the reach of contingency, to be forever like the Lord. It is to be entitled to higher and richer and more glorious joys than any legal obedience could ever aspire to obtain. The doctrine of justification has been engrafted upon the fundamental principles of moral government, in order to provide the way by which a being that exists necessarily at first in a legal, may be promoted to a filial relation. It is the expedient of heaven for making a servant a son. Now that there may be justification, probation must be limited as to time. Probation must be ended before the subject can be pronounced righteous, or entitled to the reward. What an act of goodness is this! Each man might have been put on an endless trial. Life might, forever, have been at hazard. In the actual provisions for justification which God has applied to our race, the trial has not only been limited as to time, but concentrated as to persons. One stood for all—another provision, rightly understood, of infinite goodness. Hence Federal Headship; and those who cavil at the representative character of Adam, would do well to remember, that they had no right to any limited trial at all, and if God chose to limit it in one respect, He not only had a right to limit it in any other, but that the probability is that if it had not been limited in both respects, all would have fallen, and fallen without hope forever. Every provision of the Covenant of Works is, therefore, a provision of spontaneous grace. But it is equally obvious that all these arrangements have been instituted to realize the idea of justification.

The same result takes place in reference to the religion of grace. The question now is, How shall a sinner be just with God? And the answer to that question in consistency with the essential principles of moral government and the requisitions of the broken Covenant of Works, necessitates all the provisions of the Covenant of Grace. They are all directed to this as their immediate end, that God may be just, and at the same time, justify those who are without works. Hence the incarnation; hence the mysterious and wonderful person of the Saviour; hence his amazing humiliation, his life of poverty, sorrow and self-denial, his death of agony and shame; hence his glorious resurrection and ascension, and his coming at the last day to judge the quick and the dead. All the facts of his history and mediation depend upon God's purpose to justify sinners through his name. And as justification is the ground or basis of adoption, the sinner who is justified becomes at once a son, and is entitled to the blessing of indefectible holiness, He becomes an heir, and has an indefeasible right to the heavenly inheritance. His life, that is,

his holiness, becomes as certain to him as Adam's life would have been to his posterity, if he had kept his first estate. Hence justification necessitates the whole work of the Spirit in the renovation and sanctification of the heart—converts the present life into a discipline in which our sins are treated as faults to be corrected, and not as crimes to be punished—and ensures the perseverance of the Saints, the resurrection of the body from the grave at the last day, and the full and complete preparation of the whole man for his eternal weight of glory. Well, therefore, may justification be called the article of a standing or falling church—it is the key to all of God's dealings with man!

This rapid sketch sufficiently indicates the grounds on which we regard justification as the dogmatic principle which reduces to scientific unity the whole doctrine of religion. It is common to both covenants, and it is evidently the regulative idea of both. It presupposes the fundamental conceptions of moral government, of law, of personal and individual responsibility. It implies that the legal cannot give way to the filial relation without a trial of the creature. To establish such a trial it modifies probation, imposes limitations both as to time and persons, and introduces the notion of Federal Representation. After the fall it presides over the economy of grace and determines the nature and extent of every provision which this stupendous scheme involves. It is the bow which spans the whole hemisphere of grace. As the law of method in theological treatises, it certainly seems to be exhaustive and complete. It has also the advantage of cutting up by the roots false systems of Divinity. They cannot be reduced upon it. It throws off Arminianism, Pelagianism and every theology which leaves life contingent and resolves acceptance into mere pardon. It throws off all such schemes as foreign to its own spirit. It plants the feet of the saints upon a rock, and in itself and its adjuncts it may well be styled the glorious Gospel of the blessed God.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *Sermons by the Rev. C. H. SPURGEON, of London.* First Series. Twentieth Edition. *With Additional Discourses an Introduction and Biographical Sketch by E. L. MAGOON, D. D.* New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1857.
2. Do. do. Second Series. Charleston: Smith & Whildon. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. 1857.
3. Do. do. Third Series.
4. *The Saint and his Saviour, or the Progress of the Soul in the Knowledge of Jesus, by Rev. C. H. SPURGEON.* Christ is all. Col. III, 11. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1857.

It must be admitted even by those who find fault with the preaching of this youth of twenty-three, that nevertheless he is the most remarkable preacher of the 19th century. Wherein does his power lie? The source of it is, of course, the pleasure of that Sovereign God (whom Spurgeon so constantly preaches) to bless to this remarkable degree the preaching of the cross. But there are features of his preaching which may be lessons to all ministers and to all candidates for the sacred office. Of these, one is his *zeal*. Spurgeon's ministry is an *earnest* ministry. To him religion is every thing, and in religion to him "*Christ is all.*" Loving his Lord, he loves men's souls. That love sends him not only among the influential but the outcast and the poor. Willing to follow the Savior, he is not ashamed to be called the poor man's preacher. This is the true spirit. The people see he is in earnest; and earnestness will persuade. Here is a man, though lauded far and wide—able to attract the Lords of the realm, yet ever willing to preach to the collier and the weaver; never ashamed to weep with the poor that weep. A second remarkable feature of Spurgeon's character is his *industry*. He is not afraid of hurting himself by too much work. It is said he averages a sermon to each day. Not yet twenty-five years old he has published three volumes of sermons besides his practical work, "*The Saint and his Saviour.*" He is always busy—as every vine-dresser of the Lord should be. Although he preaches extempore, it cannot be said that he is not a student. His sermons evince too much knowledge of the Bible, the classics and the old divinity to warrant any such conclusion. In them, it is true, we find few rounded periods or lengthened arguments long

drawn out ; but there is thought—fresh, moving thought. Thought is study ; the very study that makes the preacher. Spurgeon says he is making up a sermon wherever he goes. He observes everything—assimilates everything. Of all men the minister should be the most “diligent in business.”

Spurgeon's *directness* is also remarkable. In this age, men are refining away the vital power of the pulpit. Many are the charming Tullies who gain the plaudits of the people, but how rare a Demosthenes to arouse them to battle with their foes ! Boldness will move men. Webster said when he went to church, he did not want men to please him ; but he wanted something to stir his conscience. Spurgeon does not simply preach *before* his hearers, but directly *to* them. He substitutes no fancied euphemisms for Damnation and Hell. He does not fear to say “Thou art the man.” He spares no “whited wall” or modern Felix. Hyper-critics may call this impudence ; but it is the impudence of Nathan and Paul. The “Legate of the Skies,” while he must exhibit due regard for the tastes of his hearers and show all deference to age, intelligence and worth, must feel that he comes in the name of Jehovah ; and while he meekly renders “unto Cæsar, the things which are Cæsar's,” must, above all, “render under God the things which are God's.”

We next notice his *simplicity*. All great preaching is simple. The sermon on Mars' Hill was simple. The sermon on the day of Pentecost was simple. The sermon on the Mount was so simple that the child understands it. Spurgeon has studied the good old divines till their very style is his. His imagination is rich, but its products are as simple as the fruits of summer. He goes deep into abstruse doctrines, but lights the way for others as he goes. He draws his illustrations from the Bible, from nature, from history, from every thing ; but no matter what his themé, what his conception, his language is Anglo-Saxon and reaches Anglo-Saxon hearts.

The last element of his power we shall mention is *delivery*. It is strange how little this essential point is cultivated, while yet all admit that the magic charm of such useful men as Whitfield, Larned of New Orleans, and the late Dr. Baker, was owing, in a very great degree, to the manner in which they spoke. Men are men ; and they require to be addressed as men, if we would convince their minds or move their hearts. We are not to come forward with sanctimonious majesty, pamper the ear with sweet cadences, nor delight with the graces of an actor. This is affectation, ever an object of implacable disgust. We are to be always natural. The natural is the eloquence that moves, while it charms. Such is Spurgeon's. With full command over a rich voice, and a dignified, simple and graceful gesture, he combines another rare gift, an open friendly look, which he gives, not to a manuscript, but to his hearers, enlisting

the attention and inspiring confidence. It is said that whenever Henry Clay mounted the stump, his very bearing seemed to say, "How do you do," to every body. No wonder the generous Kentuckians loved him. This manner, sobered, of course, by ministerial reverence, will gain influence. The people want even the preacher's looks to show that he loves them. On the whole, marked by indefatigable zeal; unusual boldness, directness and simplicity; a close study of the Bible and the old theology, a knowledge of the human heart and an impressive, pathetic delivery, the career of this young man—whether it end as well as it has begun—whether God's grace preserve him on his dangerous pinnacle or he fall by some temptation—teaches some lessons it were well to appropriate and practice.

Memoir and Select Remains of the Rev. John Brown, Minister of the Gospel, Haddington. Edited by the Rev. WM. BROWN, M. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street.

A considerable portion of this work has been long in print, being given to the public in 1789, by his eldest sons, Revds. John and Ebenezer Brown. The work now before us contains the whole short autobiography of their father, of which the original editors had left out some passages, lest they should prove offensive in certain quarters. The lapse of time having removed this objection, their brother, the present editor, has given us the whole as prepared by his father. At the same time he has omitted some other portions of what constituted the *Select Remains*, as published by his brothers, viz: a few of the *Letters and Meditations*.

This book we welcome to our own table as one of the most useful ever published by the Board. It is a book good for all Christians, but adapted to be very specially useful to Ministers and Candidates for the ministry. Born of very poor but godly parents, and enjoying no advantages of early education beyond reading, writing and arithmetic, with the Assembly's Larger Catechism and those of Vincent and Flavel, he yet "by the Lord's assistance" and with "no master except in Latin for one month," acquired knowledge enough of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, to give rise to a wide spread belief respecting him that he "certainly got his learning from the Devil." The account of the way he took to learn the Greek alphabet and also the sense, is curious and entertaining, and forms a beautiful illustration of how difficulties vanish before him who is in earnest. The division in the Secession Church, which he had joined, between the Burghers and the anti-Burghers, was the occasion in Providence of removing some great obstacles in the way of his entering the ministry.

Having studied philosophy and divinity in connection with the Associate Burgher Synod, (Ebenezer Erskine and James Fisher being his teachers in divinity), he began to preach at Haddington, July 1757. In 1758 he first became an author, and published for the young ones of his congregation an *Easy Explication of the Westminster Confession and Catechism*. He afterwards became the most voluminous writer of the day in Scotland, and was critically acquainted with the three languages named above, and able also to read and translate French, Italian, Dutch and German, also Arabic, Persian, Syriac and Ethiopic. His acquirements in these languages and in natural and moral philosophy, history and divinity were not the result of great original genius, so much as of persevering, laborious, prayerful study. To these, with God's blessing, all that he attained are always attainable. And we are sure no young minister can peruse the record of John Brown's achievements from his poor and obscure beginning till he became a Professor of Divinity, in 1768, without feeling called upon, and encouraged, too, to gird up his loins for greater efforts to learn and to teach than he ever made before. His *Reflections of a Candidate for the Ministerial Office and of a Pastor*, we earnestly commend to our brethren, young and old. We design to give this little book more than one reading.

The following are some of the new Juvenile Publications of the Board :

1. *Seventy Times Seven, or the Law of Kindness, illustrating the Fifth Petition of the Lord's Prayer.*
2. *Charlie, or a Mother's Influence, Illustrating the Sixth Petition of the Lord's Prayer.*
3. *Annie Lee, a Story Illustrating the First Petition of the Lord's Prayer.*
4. *The Best Lesson and the Best Time to Learn it, by a Presbyterian Minister.*
5. *Tales in Rhyme, for Girls, by Old Humphrey.*
6. *Lena Leslie, or The History of an Orphan, by a Lady of Kentucky.*
7. *Blind Ruth, or How May I Do Good? Illustrating the Second Petition of the Lord's Prayer, "Thy Kingdom Come."*
8. *Peace in Death, Exemplified in Youthful Believers, by the Author of "Little Kadore."*

Bourdon's Arithmetic, containing a Discussion on the Theory of Numbers. Translated from the French of M. Bourdon, and Adapted to the use of the Colleges and Academies of the United States, by CHARLES S. VENABLE. Licentiate Instructor in the University of Virginia, former Professor of Mathematics in Hampden Sidney College, Virginia; former Professor of Natural Philosophy and Chemistry in the University of Georgia. Philadelphia; J. B. Lippencott & Co. 1858.

This is a treatise on Arithmetic, not designed for beginners in the practice of the art, but for those who would master the Science of Numbers. Bourdon's treatise is the one adopted in the schedule of public instruction by the University of France. Prof. Venable's long experience in teaching has convinced him that one great difficulty to be encountered "in the study of Algebra and the higher branches of analysis results from the want of sound philosophical ideas on the fundamental properties of numbers, and from the fact that the fundamental operations of Arithmetic are generally learned by rote and not pursued as a system of close reasoning." Although not precisely in our line of criticism, we will say that we should judge this book well adapted not only for students, but *teachers* of Arithmetic and other preparatory branches of Mathematics.

Prof. Venable has just entered on his duties as Professor of Mathematics in the S. C. College. We congratulate that important and cherished Institution on his accession to its corps of instructors, and on the flattering prospects which are opening again before it.

The Marrow of Modern Divinity, in Two Parts. Part I The Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace. Part II. An Exposition of the Ten Commandments, by EDWARD FISHER, A. M., with Notes by Rev. THOMAS BOSTON, Minister of the Gospel at Ettrick. Philadelphia: Board of Publication. pp. 370, 8 vo.

We hail with pleasure this casket full of virgin gold. Such a book, like the face of an old and valued friend, is always welcome. To know rightly the distinction between the Law and the Gospel, is to know the way of salvation, and to have laid the chief corner stone of all true Theology. We commend this book to all our readers. It gave rise to great controversies in Scotland and was condemned by the General Assembly in 1720, in the days of Moderatism, under the influence of prejudice and passion, and from impressions into which they were led by garbled extracts from the book, made by an unfriendly committee. There are expressions in the work which when sundered from their connections may be misunderstood, and this is the case in the writings of the most able and careful men.

Autobiographical Sketches and Recollections during a Thirty-five Years' Residence in New Orleans. By THEODORE CLAPP. Boston: Phillips, Samson & Co. 12 mo. 419 pp.

Early in life, we remember asking a learned Arminian Doctor, "How many times a man could be born again?" And that his entire unwillingness to give a specific answer contributed in no small degree to detach us from *his* theological scheme. If he could not be born again as often as he could sin away a New Birth, we saw an aspect of cruelty belonging to *that* scheme, greater than seemed to attach to any modification of Calvinism then known to us.

Now we really wish Mr. Clapp may live to experience what must be to him (according to chap. vii of the work,) a fourth New Birth, and that it may be of the Apostle Peter's 'incorruptible' character. A birth of nature and of grace are all of which we ordinarily expect to hear in the Christian's Autobiography. Our author must have professed himself the subject of both these to have been an accepted student for the ministry at Andover, or the second regular pastor of the Presbyterian Church at New Orleans. In speaking of his attachment to this last place, he thus narrates a *third* birth. "It is natural that I should love a place where I was permitted, for the first time, to catch glimpses and revelations of the infinitely Beautiful; where amidst perplexities, discouragements, and despair, the Holy Spirit came to my relief, and enabled me to gaze upon the outspreading glories of an everlasting, universal Father, the unchanging friend of man, however low, fallen, dark, or depraved; the place where, *in the twinkling of an eye, I became a new man, was born again,* and with an indescribable rapture looked out upon another and more glorious universe than that which addresses the senses."* This is Mr. Clapp's account of his conversion to what he elsewhere calls 'liberal christianity,' or as he immediately explains it, to Universalism and Unitarianism. Somewhat incongruous is this with his previously 'scrutinizing for the space of eight years' the whole Bible, and not finding that any "part of mankind will be eternally miserable;" and with his "ten years of studies confined to the original Hebrew and Greek Scriptures," before he arrived at Dr. Channing's conclusions from them;

*Autobiography p. 162.

†There is an instructive anecdote of Dr. John Taylor (author of the Hebrew Concordance) and John Newton, which may not be familiar to all our readers, and which has some application here. Dr. Taylor was visiting at the house of Newton, and after a long conversation, in the course of which the former said, he could not find the Divinity of Christ in the whole Heb. Old Test., he rose to retire to bed. Taking up a chamber candlestick, with an extinguisher attached, which had been accidentally left on the wick, he, once or twice, in absence of mind, attempted to light the candle by that upon the table. 'Ah,' said Mr. Newton, 'that is the reason why you cannot find the Divinity of Christ in the Old Testament. You attempt to light your candle with an extinguisher upon it.'

and still more incongruous with the fact of his being during all the time a regular and honest preacher of ——, we are really puzzled to say *what* — to his people. Such, however, are his statements. Afterwards he speaks of his new views as enabling him to 'recall a single day in New Orleans, during which he 'received an amount of happiness more than sufficient to counter-balance all the sufferings of his life.*

We have read the whole of this book—beginning with his strange account of his 'change of Theological opinions'—to do justice, at once, to that change and the well-known popularity of the author.

It is amusing; written in an easy style—demanding little thought. The anecdotes of his predecessor, Mr. Larned, of his benefactor, Mr. Touro, and of the epidemic years of New Orleans, are interesting; the last, which are abundant, may be suggestive both of useful caution and a pious *courage* to all who become exposed to the dangers of such a climate. But we have looked in vain for a plain common-sense reason for the entire revolution in his religious views and preaching announced; for the discussion or interpretation of a single passage of Scripture bearing on the momentous topics involved. There is no such passage in this volume of 419 pages. He caricatures his old faith as rendering it "self-evident" [to him] that the vast majority of his fellow beings must perish everlastingly; and that 'no hopes could be rationally entertained for the final deliverance even of those who die idiots, or in infancy;' (but to whom beside himself all this was self-evident he saith not), and on this ground chiefly, "proclaimed from the pulpit for the first time his firm conviction that the Bible does *not* teach the doctrine of eternal 'punishment.'" His first announcement of his Unitarianism is on this fashion. A young man dies who had very distinctly declared 'a few days before' his disbelief of the Trinity—and our preacher consoles a pious mother, doubtful of his faith—"yon say your son was honest, and most exemplary in the discharge of all his duties. What more could he have done? *If he is lost, who then could be saved?*" To give every word of his pastoral comfort, the only other inference was,—'Madam, in the unseen world, the catechism of *our church* is not the criterion by which persons will be acquitted or condemned.' From this christianity without Christ, either in doctrine, person or name—well might the lady in a few weeks turn away to another church.

We have only space to observe that this Autobiography—establishes chiefly the fact—how much and how long an *Eloquent Trifler* with Religion and its most solemn sanctions can be popular. The virtuous Jew in this 19th century; the devoted Catholic; even the moral Atheist, and most scriptural

*Autobiography p. 164.

christian, stand upon pretty near the same level of Immortal Hope, with the author—who singularly quotes respecting himself, at one time, what we (omitting the severest line) are fearful was but too true all the time of which he writes.

Distrustful *sense* with modest caution speaks ;
 It still looks home and short excursions makes ;
 But rattling nonsense in full volleys breaks,
 And never shocked and never turned aside,
 Bursts out resistless with a thundering tide.

T. C.

A History of the Presbyterian Church in America, from its Origin until the year 1760. With Biographical Sketches of its Early Ministers. By the Rev. RICHARD WEBSTER, late Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Mauch Chunk, Pa. ; with a Memoir of the Author, by the Rev. C. Van Rensselaer, D. D. Published by the authority of the Presbyterian Historical Society. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson. 1857. pp. 720. 8 vo.

The collecting of materials for the history of the Church in the United States is no easy, nor enviable task. The amount of drudgery it implies ; the fragmentary character in which every thing comes to hand—a hint here, a date there, some mere fragment of an old mouse-eaten letter not fragrant with the perfumes of “Araby the blest,” some record in an old family bible, some grant of land or recorded will or bill of sale in some public office, some old newspaper or soiled pamphlet, some private diary happily preserved, some account book of some old merchant, the memory of some old way-worn male or female pilgrim that has survived their generation, who can tell us of the wars, of the hardships our ancestors endured in the settlement of the country, and of the perils encountered from the Indians, the Spaniards, and the French, some muster-roll of a captain, or receipt for goods, horses, and cattle impressed for the public service by some commissary or other, some record of texts preached from, or some register of births, burials, and marriages, kept by some minister more faithful in these things than the clergymen of this day are known to be—these multifarious, tantalizing and often baffling sources of information to which the historian of our day is compelled to resort, have their effect in making all the first histories of the church in any country a collection of isolated items, rather than a continuous, digested and philosophic treatise.

We confess to some measure of disappointment on our first perusal of Webster's History. It appeared to be a collection of independent facts, rather

than a regular and concatenated history. But in the above mentioned circumstances, and in the way in which the book was produced, at such snatches of time as he could redeem from the severe and conscientious performance of his ministerial duties, and in the fact that the publication is a posthumous one, we find his just apology. Still we agree with one of his sincere and appreciative friends who in extolling his virtues and mental endowments uses the following language :

“ We would not allow the partiality of friendship, even over his grave, to lead us from the strict truth,—as he would always and under all circumstances have been rather artist than statesman, so he had not so much the large comprehensiveness and far-seeing sagacity of the true historian, as the keen observation, the acute insight, the delight in an event, the homelike feeling, the fondness for anecdote and incident, which make the biographer. And it is no mean thing to be known to after-times, for how long we may not yet say, as *the Biographer of the Presbyterian church in America.*”

The facts mentioned on pp. 67, 68 and 109, are interesting to Presbyterians in this State. Among the biographies appended to the volume, those of Francis Makemie, William Orr, Hector Alison, James Campbell, Daniel Shaw, Hugh McAden, John Martin, John Maltby, William Richardson, are also of interest to Presbyterians of our own region. We hope the publisher of this history will be remunerated for his outlay, and that the Presbyterian Historical Society, the first volume of whose publications is now before the world in this work, will be encouraged to persevere in their efforts to redeem the history of the Presbyterian Church in these United States from oblivion.

The Technobaptist. A Discourse, wherein an Honest Baptist, by a course of Argument to which no Honest Baptist can object, is convinced that Infant Christians are proper subjects of Christian Baptism. By R. B. MAYER. Boston: Printed by John Wilson & Son. 1857. pp. 172. 12 mo.

The above title, with a little explanation of its enigmas, reveals the true scope of the author. “ Infant Christians ” are those newly born of the Holy Spirit, *τα τέκνα του θεου*. Technobaptism is “ Believer’s Baptism,” in the restricted sense in which our Baptist brethren use the term. Technobaptism, though the etymological equivalent of Paedobaptism, is intended in this coinage to be its opposite. The author believes himself to have demonstrated by the logic of Aristotle, and by the triangles of Euclid, that in the Christian Church, infants of believing parents cannot be lawfully baptized. The discussion is carried on in the form of a dialogue between A., C. and B ; i. e., an Arminian, a Calvinist, and a Baptist. The form of dialogue gives a pleasant

variety to discourse and has its *advantages* in dialectics. It is much in its results like a game of skill, played by one person, representing his own party with his right hand, another with his left, and a third with his right foot; the right hand is sure to be victor, especially as it is guided by the one interested will. If it should so happen that the Great Teacher in his conversation with Nicodemus, meant by "the kingdom of God," the invisible rather than the visible church—and who can prove that he did not so mean?—or if it should be that referring to his visible kingdom, adult men, such a Nicodemus was, were alone in his mind, the argument falls, and the rule of infant membership remains unrepealed.

Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa. Being a Journal of an Expedition undertaken under the Auspices of H. B. M.'s Government, in the years 1849-1855. By HENRY BARTH, Ph. D., D. C. L., Fellow of the Royal Geographical and Asiatic Societies. In Three Volumes. Vols. I and II. New York: Harper & Bros. 1857. pp. 557, 709.

Dr. Barth, the author of these volumes, seems almost to have been born with a passion for foreign travel. "Although plunged for many years in the too exclusive study of antiquity," he never lost this native instinct. "As soon as I left home," says he, "and became the independent master of my own actions, I began to combine travel with study and to study while travelling; it being my greatest delight to trace running waters from their sources, and to see them grow into brooks, to follow brooks and see them become rivers till at last they disappeared in the all-devouring ocean. I had wandered all around the Mediterranean, with its many gulfs, its beautiful peninsulas, its fertile islands—not hurried along by steam, but slowly wandering from place to place, following the traces of the settlements of the Greeks and Romans around this beautiful basin, once their *terra incognita*. And thus when venturing upon the adventurous career in which I subsequently engaged, it had been the object of my most lively desire to throw light upon the natural arteries and hydrographical network of the unknown regions of Central Africa." [Vol. 2d, p. 167.] In the travels to which he thus alludes, he had journeyed through the Barbary States, around the Great Syrtis, through the "picturesque tract of Cyreniaca, towards Egypt, often through desert tracts unattended by any companion, through Syria and Asia Minor to Constantinople. During this journey he spent most of his time with the Arabs and became familiarized with their customs and occupations. When the British Government was about sending out Mr. Richardson on a mission to Central Africa, an offer was

made through Chevalier Bunsen allowing a German traveller to join the expedition, he contributing £200 towards his own personal expenses. Dr. Barth, then lecturing at the University of Berlin, and Dr. Overweg, a clever and active young geologist, both availed themselves of this offer. The objects of the expedition were the exploration of the country, the establishment of friendly relations with the chiefs and rulers, and eventually the introduction of legitimate commerce, which might displace the traffic in slaves. Beginning at Tunis, he penetrated southward to Yola, within about nine degrees of the Equator, where his further progress to the South was interrupted, and he was ordered by the Governor of the country to return. Retracing his path to Lake Tsad, he accompanied a predatory expedition eastward to Kanem, and thence to Mandara, he then travelled as far as Massena in the country of Bagirmi, S. E. of Lake Tsad, and after this penetrated westward as far as Timbuctu, a description of which journey is contained in the third volume, which has not yet issued from the press. These travels extend through 24° of latitude from N. to S., and over 20° of longitude from E. to W., while the information, and itineraries obtained from the lips of intelligent natives relate to about one third of the Continent of Africa. These enterprising and daring travellers encountered many perils, and hardships, and suffered much from exposure in unhealthy regions. Mr. Richardson, the chief of the expedition, succumbed under these influences, dying in March 1851, and Dr. Overweg in September, 1852. Dr. Barth was thus left the only survivor, and he was reduced more than once to a state of great weakness, from which however, he happily recovered.

The reader is surprised as he follows the traveller, at the number of monuments yet remaining of Roman civilization, as tombs, gateways, and military stations, often with inscriptions, extending quite to the great desert. He is astonished also to find the desert of Sahara, to be so different from his early impressions. He finds it to be made up of mountain passes with intervening vallies and plains, the mountains of sharp conical form, far more than is usual elsewhere; the vallies and plains barren, rugged and desolate, sometimes with a scanty, but often also with abundant herbage, and sometimes clothed with fertility and beauty. South of the desert, the country assumes an inviting aspect. Towns and villages are met with; Agades, with a present population of 7,000, with evidence of one much larger in former times; Katsena, with a population of 8,000; Kano, with a population of 30,000, and in the busy season of the year probably containing 60,000 people, where are sold goods from England, France, Saxony, Venice, Trieste, and Nuremberg, besides many articles of native manufacture. Through all these regions the Mohammedan religion prevails, and men are met with ac-

quainted with Mohammedan literature, and the written history of their own land. At Massena, in the heart of Africa, he met with a man, not only versed in all the branches of Arabic literature, but who had read (and possessed a manuscript of) those portions of Aristotle and Plato which had been translated into Arabic. His father had written a work on Hausa, and had sent him to study in Egypt. This man had become blind, yet on one occasion he found him sitting in his court-yard surrounded by a heap of manuscripts which he could only enjoy by touching them with his hands. We find side by side large empires, with numerous chieftains, and with no inconsiderable military power, with barbaric wealth and magnificence; and naked pagan tribes perpetually encroached upon by their more civilized and powerful neighbors, or torn from their peaceful homes and reduced to slavery. Indeed, through all these countries domestic slavery prevails, and Dr. Barth represents the slaves in Africa as in general well treated and not over-tasked by their African masters. But the process by which they are reduced to bondage is full of cruelty and crime. He accompanied an expedition of the Bornus, composed of 10,000 cavalry and a larger number of foot, into the country of the Musgus, a pagan people, whom he represents as living in quiet villages and engaged in peaceful pursuits. Suddenly they are attacked and fleeing in all directions, and in the evening the results are found to be from 500 to 1000 captives. To the great horror of Barth and Overweg not less than 170 full grown men "were mercilessly slaughtered in cold blood, the greater part of them being allowed to bleed to death, a leg having been severed from the body." Three days after another village was attacked, and that which had "a few moments before been the abode of comfort and happiness, was destroyed by fire and made desolate. Slaughtered men, with their limbs severed from their bodies, were lying about in all directions, and made the passer by shudder with horror. Such is the course of human affairs in these regions."

"Having accomplished these great deeds, we returned," says he, "to our encampment. Here we remained the two following days, while the most important business was transacted. This was the partition of the slaves who had been taken during the expedition; and the proceeding was accompanied by the most heart-rending scenes, caused by the number of young children, and even infants, who were to be distributed, many of the poor creatures being unmercifully torn away from their mothers, never to see them again. There were scarcely any full grown men."

We commend these extracts to the consideration of those among us, few we believe in number, who are inconsiderately advocating the revival of "the slave trade." These scenes must become more and more numerous in

proportion to the demand. The remaining volume will give the journal of Dr. Barth from Kukawa through Sokoto and along the Niger to Timbuctu.

This expedition has added greatly to our knowledge of the Geography and Ethnography of Central Africa, completing and correcting what had been in part accomplished by Oudney, Denham, Clapperton, Lyon, Ritchie, Smyth, and Warrenton. Overweg before his death had circumnavigated Lake Tsad, and visited its islands inhabited by savage men, but he died on its shores, hard by the boat in which he had made his voyage, and which was transported for this purpose on the backs of camels across the desert, a martyr to science. Barth discovered the Benuwe, the eastern tributary of the Niger, which by its means affords an uninterrupted navigation for 600 miles into the heart of the country. The western branch is interrupted by rapids about 350 miles from the coast, but above these has an open navigation for nearly 1000 miles, into the very heart of Western Africa, rich in its fertility and abounding in products. By means of these rivers he anticipates the introduction of an European trade which will conduce to the civilization of her numerous tribes. By the same channel, too, Christianity may find its way to the interior of this dark continent. Where the Mountains of the Moon are laid down in old maps, he found nothing to correspond. "Here we stood awhile," says he, of the position he occupied by a sheet of water some two miles wide, "and looked with longing eyes toward the opposite shore; it was a most interesting and peculiar scenery, highly characteristic of these level equatorial regions of Africa. What an erroneous idea had been entertained of these regions in former times! Instead of the massive mountain ranges of the Moon, we had discovered only a few isolated mounts; instead of a dry, desolate plateau, we had found wide, and extremely fertile plains, less than one thousand feet above the level of the sea, and intersected by numerous broad water courses with scarcely any inclination. Only towards the South West at the distance of about sixteen miles, the low rocky mount of Tuburi was seen."

A few more such explorations and this mysterious continent will yield up its secrets to the civilized world.

Missionary Travels and Researches in S. Africa, including a Sketch of Sixteen Years' Residence in the Interior of Africa, and a Journey from the Cape of Good Hope to Loanda on the West Coast, thence across the Continent down the River Zambesi to the Eastern Ocean. By DAVID LIVINGSTONE, L. L. D., D. C. L., &c., &c., &c., with Maps and numerous Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1858. pp. 730, 8 vo.

We have examined this long expected book with reference to the subject of Slavery as an institution existing in Africa, and of Christian Missions as they have operated in that country under Dr. Livingstone's observations and through his own agency.

As to the first point we confess ourselves much disappointed. He gives us but little information. It is only here and there that he makes any reference to the matter. All the most important of his hints we copy, not for the *satisfaction* of our readers but the justification of our complaints:

"This tribe (the Mambari) began the slave trade with Sebituane only in 1850, and but for the unwillingness of Lechulatebe to allow us to pass we should have been with Sebituane in time to have prevented it from commencing at all. The Mambari visited in ancient times the chief of the Barotse, whom Sebituane conquered, and he refused to allow any one to sell a child. They never came back again till 1850; and as they had a number of old Portuguese guns, marked "Legitimo de Braga," which Sebituane thought would be excellent in case of any future invasion of Matebele he offered to purchase them with cattle or ivory, but the Mambari refused every thing except boys about fourteen years of age. The Makololo declared they had never heard of people being bought and sold till then and disliked it, but the desire to possess the guns prevailed, and eight old guns were exchanged for as many boys; these were not their own children, but captives of the black races they had conquered. There never was known in Africa an instance of a parent selling his own offspring.—[pp. 105-6.]

"One (half-caste Portuguese slave-trader) who resembled closely a real Portuguese, came to Linyanti while I was there. This man had no merchandize, and pretended to have come in order to inquire what sort of goods were necessary for the market. He seemed much disconcerted by my presence there. Sekeletu presented him with an elephant's tusk and an ox; and when he had departed about fifty miles to the westward, he carried off an entire village of the Bakalahari belonging to the Makololo. He had a number of armed slaves with him—and as all the villagers, men, women and children, were removed, and the fact was not known until a considerable time afterwards, it is not known whether his object was obtained by violence or fair promises. In either case slavery must have been the portion of these poor people. He was carried in a hammock, slung between two poles, which appearing to be a bag, the Makololo named him the "Father of the Bag."—[pp. 198-9.]

"The two native Portuguese traders of whom we had heard, had erected a little encampment opposite the place where ours was about to be made. One, of them, whose spine had been injured in youth—a rare sight in this

country—came and visited us. I returned the visit next morning. His tall companion had that sickly hue which made him look fairer than myself, but his head was covered with a crop of unmistakable wool. They had a gang of young females in a chain, hoeing the ground in front of their encampment to clear it of weeds and grass; these were purchased recently in Lobale, whence the traders had now come. There were many Mambari with them, and the establishment was conducted with that military order which pervades all the arrangements of the Portuguese colonists. A drum was beaten and trumpet sounded at certain hours, quite in military fashion. It was the first time most of my men had seen slaves in chains. ‘They are not men,’ they exclaimed, (meaning they are beasts), ‘who treat their children so.’”—[p. 312.]

This last sentence seems to signify the contrary of what the author states in our first quotation.

“We were apprised that if the late Matiamvo took a fancy to any thing, such for instance, as my watch chain, which was of silver wire, and was a great curiosity, as they had never seen metal plaited before, he would order a whole village to be brought up to buy it from a stranger. When a slave trader visited him, he took possession of all his goods; then after ten days or a fortnight, he would send out a party of men to pounce upon some considerable village, and killing the head men, would pay for all the goods by selling the inhabitants. This has frequently been the case, and nearly all the visitants he ever had were men of color. On asking if Matiamvo did not know he was a man, and would be judged, in company with those he destroyed, by a Lord, who is no respecter of persons? The ambassador replied, ‘We do not go up to God, as you do, we are put under the ground.’”—[p. 342.]

“The Portuguese home-government has not generally received the credit for sincerity in suppressing the slave trade which I conceive to be its due. In 1839, my friend Mr. Gabriel saw thirty-seven slave-ships lying in this harbour, waiting for their cargoes under the protection of the guns of the forts. At that time slavers had to wait many months at a time for a human freight; and a certain sum per head was paid to the government for all that were exported. The duties derived from the exportation of slaves far exceeded those from other commerce, and by agreeing to the suppression of this profitable traffic, the government actually sacrificed the chief part of the export revenue. Since that period however, revenue from lawful commerce has very much exceeded that on slaves. The intentions of the home Portuguese government, however good, can not be fully carried out under the present system. The pay of the officers is so very small, that they are nearly all obliged to engage in trade; and, owing to the lucrative nature of the slave trade, the temptation to engage in it is so powerful, that the philanthropic statesmen of Lisbon need hardly expect to have their humane and enlightened views carried out. The law, for instance, lately promulgated for the abolition of the carrier system, (carregadores), is but one of several equally humane enactments against this mode of compulsory labor, but there is very little probability of the benevolent intentions of the legislature being carried into effect.—[pp. 429-30.]

“The way in which slaves are spoken of in Angola and Eastern Africa must sound strangely even to the owners when they first came from Europe. In Angola the common appellation is, ‘o diabo,’ or ‘brutu;’ and it is quite usual to hear gentlemen call out, ‘o diabo, bring fire.’ In Eastern Africa on the contrary, they apply the term ‘bicho,’ (an animal), and you hear the phrase, call the animal to do this or that. In fact, slave-owners come to regard their slaves as not human, and will curse them as the ‘Race of a dog.’”—[p. 484.]

Now we submit that these statements and a few others like them, constitute a very meagre account from a man who has resided 16 years in Africa, and crossed the continent more than once, respecting slavery and the slave trade in Africa.

Dr. Livingstone’s early education was limited, as he states, and his training to be a Missionary contemplated his engaging chiefly in the work of a pioneer. His favorite idea had been to go as a Medical Missionary to China. The opium war in that country turned him towards Africa. He makes no pretensions at all to “literary qualifications” He would “rather cross the African Continent again than undertake to write another book. It is far easier to travel than to write about it.” He joined the London Missionary Society, though brought up in the Kirk of Scotland by Presbyterian parents, because “it sends neither Episcopacy, nor Presbyterianism nor Independency as the Gospel of Christ to the Heathen;” and “this exactly agreed with his ideas of what a Missionary Society ought to do.”—[p. 6.] Nor does he “intend to specify with any prominence the evangelistic labours to which the love of Christ has since impelled” him. “This book will speak not so much of what has been done as of what still remains to be performed before the gospel can be said to be preached to all nations.”—[p. 4.]

Our readers therefore need not expect any greater satisfaction from this book on the subject of Christianity in Africa than on the subject of Slavery in Africa. All we get is a few hints. A very large portion of the work is occupied with details of personal adventures with lions, buffaloes and other *vermin*, as our American pioneers would call them, during the author’s various journeys. What is said about Christianity in Africa is perhaps what we might expect from a Missionary of no particular creed, and no very definite ideas about religious truth. We give some specimens:

“Neither Cyriano nor his companions knew what the Bible was, but they had relics in German-silver cases, hung around their necks, to act as charms and save them from danger by land or by water, in the same way as the heathen have medicines. It is a pity that the Church to which they belong, when unable to attend to the wants of her children, does not give them the sacred writings in their own tongue; it would surely be better to see them good Protestants, if these would lead them to be so, than entirely

ignorant of God's message to man. For my part, I would much prefer to see the Africans good Roman Catholics than idolatrous heathen.—[p. 395.]

“This district is said to contain upwards of 40,000 souls. Some ten or twelve miles to the north of the village of Ambaca there once stood the missionary station of Cahenda, and it is now quite astonishing, to observe the great numbers who can read and write in this district, This is the fruit of the labors of the Jesuit and Capuchin missionaries, for they taught the people of Ambaca; and ever since the expulsion of the teachers by the Marquis of Pombal, the natives have continued to teach each other. These devoted men are still held in high estimation throughout the country to this day. All speak well of them, (os padres Jesuitas), and now that they have gone from this lower sphere, I could not help wishing that these our Roman Catholic fellow-christians, had felt it to be their duty to give the people the Bible, to be a light to their feet when the good men themselves were gone.—[p. 414.]

“All speak well of the Jesuits and other Missionaries as the Capuchins, &c, for having attended diligently to the instruction of the children.”—[p. 144.]

And so the Missionary who was indifferent about the distinctions that divide the Protestants, shows a like indifference to the questions which separate us from Roman Catholics! He sends directly to the upper sphere the “good men,” “the devoted Jesuits and Capuchins,” who were so diligent in teaching the children and other heathen, without troubling himself to enquire what doctrines they instructed them about! Nor does it once occur to him to enquire how it happened that these “Roman Catholic fellow-christians of ours,” did “not feel it to be their duty to give the people the Bible.”

As to the relations of the gospel to commerce, Dr. Livingstone says: “Wherever a missionary lives, traders are sure to come; they are mutually dependant, and each aids in the work of the other.”—[p. 39.] But he never stipulates any thing respecting the character of the traders!

“We can no more hope for healthy feelings among the poor either at home or abroad without feeding them with truth, than we can hope to see an ordinary working bee reared into a queen-mother by the ordinary food of the hive. Sending the gospel to the heathen must, if this view be correct, include much more than is implied in the usual picture of a Missionary, namely, a man going about with a Bible under his arm. The promotion of commerce ought to be especially attended to.”—[pp. 33-34.]

This idea of *feeding the truth into the poor heathen* by the blessings of commerce is very much like the idea Sechele, the African chief, who befriended Livingstone had about *whipping it into his people*. “He once said, “Do you imagine these people will ever believe by your merely talking to them? I can make them do nothing except by thrashing them; and if

you like I will call my head men, and with our litupa (whips of rhinoceros hide) we will soon make them all believe together."—[p. 19.]

Christianity, as we are perfectly aware, presupposes Society as the normal condition of man, when it comes to save him. Christianity contemplates mutual duties amongst men which imply that men are dwelling under some form of social organization together. Christianity aims at training children in families, and the family leads at once to the State. And accordingly all Missionaries to wandering barbarians endeavour to persuade them to settle down in some permanent place of residence, and labour with their hands, instead of depending on the chace, which carries them continually away from the school and the church. But the Africans for the most part are not such wanderers. They dwell in villages. They cultivate the ground. They have a form of social organization. And we are persuaded Dr. Livingstone is being led away by an *ignis fatuus*, when he theorizes, as he does in a great many places, upon the necessity or advantage of commerce and trade to the success of the gospel in Africa. The Apostle Paul, a far greater Missionary than Livingstone, says nothing about "*traders*" going with him to discharge his obligations to the Barbarians. With him the doctrine of Christ crucified, and nothing more nor less, was the power of God and the wisdom of God to the salvation of men. We are satisfied that the benevolent and simple hearted Livingstone's mind is just reflecting faithfully the general sentiment of his dissenting brethren in England, that after all American Slavery is the greatest evil in the world, and that Missions to Africa are chiefly designed for its destruction. As a faithful British subject he also sympathizes with the wish of all good Englishmen that British commerce and manufactures may still flourish the world over. Accordingly his heart is not single in its desires for Africa. Not alone the gospel, not alone Christ and him crucified, but trade and the gospel, christianity and cotton growing side by side together form the aim and object of his earnest desires.

What we quote below from Dr. Livingstone will justify what we have said. The author is doubtless a good man, and he bears occasionally a clear testimony to the success of the gospel itself (without the cotton) in Africa. But he is one of that class of good men who deify civilization, and who thus bow down before that idol of modern Society. It is evident that he never draws any nice distinctions between conflicting moral or religious opinions, and so, unconsciously no doubt, he assumes that civilization is a moral and regenerating power. He does not believe in the power of civilization or commerce independently of the gospel, but he holds that they are the necessary supplement of the gospel. He forgets, however, that after he

has "pushed commerce" into those highland healthy regions of Africa which he traversed and perhaps discovered, and after his English fellow-subjects, with the co-operation of the "liberal and friendly Portuguese," have accomplished the noble work of developing the rich resources of that rich country," the whole result so far as those influences of commerce, trade and civilization are concerned, will simply be that there has been established amongst the now simple sons and daughters of Africa, a more developed organization than exists amongst them at present, of the World, the Flesh, and the Devil! What more can science and civilization do for any man than they did Nena Sahib? Yet they left him, as it has been well expressed, "obscene as Belial and cruel as Moloch!" And what did trade and commerce with christian nations so called, ever teach any Heathen people, but those vices which have but the more rapidly and fatally ruined them body and soul!

The time was, and not long since, when the world despised Christian Missions, and the Church of Christ was content to trust only in the power of the Word. Those were the healthful days of Modern Missions. They have been succeeded by a period of greater respectfulness on the world's part to modern Missionary efforts. Now is the time of danger for Missions. Let Christian people beware, lest the world join them in the work of Missions to the Heathen, to *change the nature of the work*. It is not the colonization of unconverted Africans on the coast of Africa, nor yet the civilization of unconverted Africans in the centre of Africa, which constitutes the work Christ commands to be done with respect to her people. The Church's work for Africans in America is *to give them the gospel*, and her work for Africans in Africa is *to give them also the gospel*. And we must let the potsherd strive with the potsherds of the earth!

We close this notice with the extracts referred to above:

"The Portuguese are thus near the main entrance to the new central region; and as they have of late years shown, in an enlightened and liberal spirit, their desire to develop the resources of Eastern Africa by proclaiming Mozambique a free port, it is to be hoped that the same spirit will lead them to invite mercantile enterprise up the Zambesi, by offering facilities to those who may be led to push commerce into the regions lying far beyond their territory. Their wish to co-operate in the noble work of developing the resources of the rich country beyond, could not be shown better than by placing a village with Zambesian pilots at the harbor of Mitilone and erecting a light-house for the guidance of sea-faring men."—[p. 718.]

"As far as I am myself concerned, the opening of the new central country is a matter of congratulation only in so far as it opens up a prospect for the elevation of the inhabitants. As I have elsewhere remarked, I view the end of the geographical feat as the beginning of the missionary enter-

prise. I take the latter term in its most extended signification, and include every effort made for the amelioration of our race, the promotion of all those means by which God in His providence is working, and bringing all His dealings with man to a glorious consummation. Each man in his sphere, either knowingly or unwittingly, is performing the will of our Father in heaven. Men of science, searching after hidden truths, which, when discovered, will, like the elective telegraph, bind men more closely together—soldiers battling for the right against tyranny—sailors rescuing the victims of oppression from the grasp of heartless men-stealers—merchants teaching the nations lessons of mutual dependence—and many others, as well as missionaries, all work in the same direction, and all efforts are over-ruled for one glorious end.”—[pp. 718-19.]

“When we get beyond the hostile population mentioned, we reach a very different race. On the latter my chief hopes at present rest. All of them, however, are willing and anxious to engage in trade, and, while eager for this, none have ever been encouraged to cultivate the raw materials of commerce. This country is well adapted for cotton; and I venture to entertain the hope that by distributing seeds of better kinds than that which is found indigenous, and stimulating the natives to cultivate it by affording them the certainty of a market for all they may produce, we may engender a feeling of mutual dependence between them and ourselves. I have a two-fold object in view, and believe that, by guiding our missionary labors so as to benefit our own country, we shall thereby more effectually and permanently benefit the heathen. * * * * * We ought to encourage the Africans to cultivate for our markets, as the most effectual means next to the Gospel, of their elevation.”

“It is in the hope of working out this idea that I propose the formation of stations on the Zambesi beyond the Portuguese territory, but having communications through them with the coast. A chain of stations admitting of easy and speedy intercourse, such as might be formed along the flank of the Eastern Ridge, would be in a favorable position for carrying out the objects in view. The London Missionary Society has resolved to have a station among the Makololo on the north bank, and another on the south among the Matebele. The Church—Wesleyan, Baptist, and that most energetic body, the Free Church—could each find desirable locations among the Batoka and adjacent tribes.”—[pp. 720-721.]

“Our chief hopes rest with the natives themselves; and if the point to which I have given prominence, of healthy inland commercial stations, be realized, where all the produce raised may be collected, there is little doubt but that slavery among our kinsmen across the Atlantic will, in the course of some years, cease to assume the form of a necessity to even the slave-holders themselves. Natives alone can collect produce from the more distant hamlets, and bring it to the stations contemplated. * * * * *
* * * * * By linking the Africans there to ourselves in the manner proposed, it is hoped that their elevation will eventually be the result. In this hope and proposed effort I am joined by my brother Charles, who has come from America, after seventeen years' separation, for the purpose. We expect success through the influence of that Spirit

who already aided the efforts to open the country, and who has since turned the public mind toward it. A failure may be experienced by sudden rash speculation overstocking the markets there, and raising the prices against ourselves. But I propose to spend some more years of labor, and shall be thankful if I see the system fairly begun in an open pathway which will eventually benefit both Africa and England."—[pp. 724-725.]

Mormonism—its Leaders and Designs. By JOHN HYDE, Jr., formerly a Mormon Elder and Resident of Salt Lake City. 2nd Edition. New York: W. P. Fetridge & Co., No. 281 Broadway. 1857. pp. 335, 12 mo.

The author of this book very truly remarks, (p. 1), "To have been a Mormon is to be an object of suspicion. To be an apostate is to be regarded with distrust. To be an apostate Mormon is to be doubly distrusted." Still we think there is internal evidence enough, that this is a true account of Mr. Hyde's experience as a Mormon. He was converted when a youth in England under representations of the facts and doctrines of Mormonism very different from what he found at Utah. He has renounced the error and is seeking to expose it. The shocking details into which Mr. Hyde enters, render the book unfit for general perusal—but whoever requires to know this system may here find, we judge, a very faithful exhibition of it.

In regard to some points of great interest we give the following statements upon the authority of Mr. Hyde.

At Salt Lake City there are about 15,000 people; in the whole territory not more than 50,000 at the outside. These are chiefly English, Scotch, Welsh and Danes—not more than one-third of the whole being Americans. But these Americans have all the power and offices and emoluments in their hands. The number of practical polygamists in the country is comparatively small, but in this number are to be reckoned nearly all the Americans. The American Mormons are the most bigoted and zealous of all.

The women of Utah are very unhappy under the practical operation of the system, but many of them are fanatical believers of every thing uttered by Young; and many others who would gladly leave can not, because they have not the means nor the power. That desert which must be crossed is like the walls of a prison.

The territory of Utah never can sustain a large population. Irrigation is indispensable for the production even of cereals. Along the benches of the mountains there is a strip of alluvion which affords all their tillable land and this they must water by means of the mountain creeks. But timber is also very scarce. It requires two days for a team of mules to bring in a

load of fire wood from the mountains. Cutting down the timber which fringes these mountains tends to dry up the springs, by exposing the soil; and this materially lessens the creeks and diminishes the supply of water, while the increasing population demands a greater abundance. But this is not all. "The summers are a continued drought, but the winters bring deep snow and frightful storms. The trees, before they were so much cut down, used to retain much of this snow on the hills, which melting gradually in the spring produced full creeks. It is now blown in clouds into the valleys, burying up feed and killing off stock frightfully. In 1854-5 the snow was from four to six feet deep. It was followed by very little water in the streams in the spring, because the snow had been deposited in the valleys instead of on the mountains, and last winter (1856-7) the snow was still deeper, and this spring there is still less water in the creeks. Add to this the crops for the last three seasons have been eaten up by grass-hoppers and blue worms or filled with smut. The harvests have been light, and many starving persons were compelled to subsist on wild roots through the winter. The future promises nothing better, but with the continued influx of population they must either constantly find new valleys to settle or starvation and removal will be inevitable."—[p. 45.]

Brigham Young was born in Vermont, June 1, 1801. He was brought up a farmer. He is illiterate, but shrewd, far-seeing and eminently practical. His energy and strong will bend the people into implicit obedience. He is far superior to what Smith was in every thing that constitutes a leader. Smith had only *tact* and used circumstances. Young has *genius* and controls them—as witness how he removed successfully, without strife, without discord, almost without a murmur, through a desert unknown and dangerous, for 1030 miles, that heterogeneous mass of people, poor, unprovided, shaking with ague, pale with suffering, and hollow and gaunt with hunger! "But to carry on Mormonism demands increasing talent and skill. Its positions and progress is constantly beset with fresh and greater difficulties. The next President must be as superior to Young as he is to Smith, or Mormonism will retrograde. But such an one does not live in the Mormon Church."

"In person Brigham Young is rather large and portly, and has a handsome face, an imposing carriage and a very impressive manner. He is much more an observer than a reader, and thoroughly knows men, a point in which Smith was very weak. *Men* not books; *deeds* not words; *houses* not theories; the *Earth* and not Heaven; *now* and not hereafter, is Brigham's view of matters.

"The magnetism that attracts and infatuates, that makes men feel its weight and yet love its presence abounds in him. Even his enemies have

to acknowledge a great charm in the influence he throws around them. The clerks in his office and his very wives feel the same veneration for the prophet as the most respectful new-comer."

Thus far of Young's physical and intellectual qualities. As to his moral character Mr. Hyde necessarily paints him in very dark colors. He is not only very licentious, but intemperate and grossly profane. And yet he is no hypocrite. He is a man in positive earnest. "The whole secret of his influence, (says our author), lies in his real sincerity."—[p. 170.]

Two alternatives seem now to present themselves to the Mormons. One is war with the U. S.; the other their removal to some island or country outside our territory. These two were the only alternatives from the beginning. The Mormons never could have been admitted as a State of this Confederacy. This is a Christian Country. Polygamy is an anti-christian institution. It must not be set down as a mere *domestic institution* like slavery which every State must regulate for itself. We resent every such comparison as insulting to us of the South. Nor can it be said that Polygamy is a *religious question* with which Congress has nothing to do. The Mormons have no more right to make this a religious question beyond enquiry by Congress than the Chinese would have to bring their Infanticide to our Pacific coast, and setting up a Chinese State there, demand admission into this Union. We repeat this is a Christian country. The Constitution of the United States never intended to deny such a character to this Confederacy. It looked only to preventing any established sect to the detriment of all other sects of christian believers. The framers of that instrument never expected any such interpretation to be put upon their language as would compel this youthful country to receive into its bosom, without the possibility of a single objection, all the abominable practices and immoral institutions of Mohammedan or Pagan nations.

THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN
REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

An Association of Ministers,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

VOL. 10. JULY, MDCCCLVII. NO. 2.

COLUMBIA, S. C.
STEAM POWER PRESS OF E. H. BRITTON.

1857.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—MIRACLES—By REV. J. H. THORNWELL, D.D., LL.D.	161
II.—A VINDICATION OF THE SCRIPTURAL MESSIANIC INTER- PRETATION OF THE LIII ^d . CHAPTER OF ISALAH—By REV. JAS. COHEN,	201
III.—THE TEACHINGS OF THE DEAD—By REV. THOS. SMYTH, D.D.,	233
IIII.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MDCCCLVII—By REV. J. B. ADGER, D.D.,	276
V.—CRITICAL NOTICES,	334

AGENTS.

E. H. BRITTON, GENERAL COLLECTING AGENT, COLUMBIA, S. C.

Rev. A. W. Miller, Petersburg, Va.	Mr. J. Whiting, Montgomery, Ala.
“ S. A. Stanfield, Harmony, N. C.	Rev. R. S. Gladney, Aberdeen, Miss.
“ A. A. Morse, Anderson C. H., S. C.	Nash & Woodhouse, Richmond, Va.
Mr. J. Rosser, Camden, S. C.	Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., San Francisco.
“ John Russell, Charleston, S. C.	Mr. Joseph M. Wilson, 228 Chesnut
“ Wm. E. Mills, Mt. Clio, Sumter,	street, Philadelphia.
South Carolina.	Mr. Jas. Armour, Memphis, Tenn.
“ John R. Dow, John's Island, S. C.	Rev. J. M. Becton, Larissa, Cherokee
“ W. G. Foote, Savannah, Ga.	Co., Texas;
Rev. J. P. McMullen, Havanna, Ala.	W. N. White & Brother, Athens, Ga.
Rev. Wm. Flinn, Milledgeville, Ga.	J. D. Ghiselin, Jr., Norfolk, Va.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

Is published Quarterly, in April, July, October, and January, at Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance.

☞ All Communications should be addressed to the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review, Columbia, S. C. No subscriptions taken for less than a year, and subscribers should remember that a subscription cannot be discontinued legally until all arrearages are paid, nor after the first number of a volume is published. The volume commences with the April number, and not at the beginning of the year.

☞ A few copies of the back volumes can be had at reduced prices.

TO OUR PATRONS.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW has encountered difficulties during the past year, which have occasioned its temporary suspension. Its editorial corps was broken by the removal of one of its most efficient members, by the sickness of another, and the engagement of another still in a different enterprise. Our subscribers too, were tardy in their payments, and we had expended for the two last volumes, not more than was due us from our patrons, but \$1200 dollars beyond our actual receipts. Under these circumstances, it will not be a matter of wonder that our hearts failed us, and that we shrunk from assuming the responsibilities which the continued publication of the *Review* would have occasioned. Still the want of such a periodical in this Southern portion of our land, as this aspires to be, has been deeply felt, and many have urged us to go forward in its publication. This we have been tempted to do. Our editorial fraternity is again complete in its original number. Dr. Thornwell's labors are secured to the enterprise to as great an extent as before, and we have sought the aid of able contributors. If our present subscribers will now promptly meet their arrearages for the past, and our brethren will aid us in obtaining new subscribers, we will cheerfully resume those labors which have hitherto been performed amidst much discouragement and without pecuniary reward.

A large extension of patronage must be secured to ensure the complete success of this enterprise; and unless our friends stand by us at the present juncture, and exert themselves on their part to sustain the *Review*, they must not be surprised if its affairs became involved in confusion, and a journal so necessary to the Southern Church, be at length finally abandoned. Such is our confidence in our brethren, that we anticipate no such result. But we earnestly ask of our subscribers the immediate payment of all sums owed to the *Review*, as an act of simple justice to ourselves. Our engagements are all cash engagements. Workmen must be paid, and we have never yet allowed them to wait for what was their due.

It will be perceived that we appear in something of a new dress, with an enlarged page, increasing very considerably the amount of reading matter, but without enhancing the cost to the subscribers.

An apology is due to our readers for the delay which has occurred in the issue of this number. It has arisen in part from changes in the office of our publisher, Mr. E. H. Britton, and in part from the difficulty of procuring type for the *second* article in the preceding pages, our font of Hebrew being exceedingly limited. The grammatical analysis accompanying that article, will be deemed by some superfluous. It is designed only for those who may find it convenient and auxiliary to a true understanding of the original.

THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN
REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

An Association of Ministers,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

VOL. 10. OCTOBER, MDCCCLVII. NO. 3.

COLUMBIA, S. C.
E. H. BRITTON, PRINTER.

1857.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—THE SABBATH CONTROVERSY—BY REV. R. L. DABNEY, D. D.	337
II.—THE MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION OF THE LIII ^d . OF ISAIAH, (continued from last Number,) BY REV. JAS. COHEN,	377
III.—THE ALPHABET OF NATURAL THEOLOGY, BY REV. E. F. ROCKWELL,	411
IV.—THE INFLUENCE OF STIMULANTS ON THE MANIFESTATION OF MIND, BY J. MC. F. GASTON, M. D.,	436
V.—OUR PROBLEM, BY REV. A. F. DICKSON,	451
VI.—THE TESTIMONY OF THE ROCKS, BY REV. W. D. MOORE,	463
VII.—CRITICAL NOTICES,	473

AGENTS.

E. H. BRITTON, GENERAL COLLECTING AGENT, COLUMBIA, S. C.

Rev. A. W. Miller, Petersburg, Va.	Mr. J. Whiting, Montgomery, Ala.
“ S. A. Stanfield, Harmony, N. C.	Rev. R. S. Gladney, Aberdeen, Miss.
“ A. A. Morse, Anderson C. H., S. C.	Nash & Woodhouse, Richmond, Va.
Mr. J. Rosser, Camden, S. C.	Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., San Francisco.
“ John Russell, Charleston, S. C.	Mr. Joseph M. Wilson, 228 Chesnut
“ Wm. E. Mills, Mt. Clio, Sumter,	street, Philadelphia.
South Carolina.	Mr. Jas. Armour, Memphis, Tenn.
“ John R. Dow, John’s Island, S. C.	Rev. J. M. Becton, Larissa, Cherokee
“ W. G. Foote, Savannah, Ga.	Co., Texas.
Rev. J. P. McMullen, Havana, Ala.	W. N. White & Brother, Athens, Ga.
Rev. Wm. Flinn, Milledgeville, Ga.	J. D. Ghisclin, Jr. Norfolk, Va.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in April, July, October, and January, at Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance.

All Communications should be addressed to the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review, Columbia, S. C. No subscriptions taken for less than a year, and subscribers should remember that a subscription cannot be discontinued legally until all arrearages are paid, nor after the first number of a volume is published. The volume commences with the April number, and not at the beginning of the year.

A few copies of the back volumes can be had at reduced prices.

TO OUR PATRONS.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW has encountered difficulties during the past year, which have occasioned its temporary suspension. Its editorial corps was broken by the removal of one of its most efficient members, by the sickness of another, and the engagement of another still in a different enterprise. Our subscribers, too, were tardy in their payments, and we had expended for the two last volumes, not more than was due us from our patrons, but 1,200 dollars beyond our actual receipts. Under these circumstances, it will not be a matter of wonder that our hearts failed us, and that we shrunk from assuming the responsibilities which the continued publication of the *Review* would have occasioned. Still the want of such a periodical, in this Southern portion of our land, as this aspires to be, has been deeply felt, and many have urged us to go forward in its publication. This we have been tempted to do. Our editorial fraternity is again complete in its original number. Dr. Thornwell's labors are secured to the enterprise to as great an extent as before, and we have sought the aid of able contributors. If our present subscribers will now promptly meet their arrearages for the past, and our brethren will aid us in obtaining new subscribers, we will cheerfully resume those labors which have hitherto been performed amidst much discouragement, and without pecuniary reward.

A large extension of patronage must be secured to ensure the complete success of this enterprise; and unless our friends stand by us at the present juncture, and exert themselves on their part to sustain the *Review*, they must not be surprised if its affairs became involved in confusion, and a journal so necessary to the Southern Church, be at length finally abandoned. Such is our confidence in our brethren, that we anticipate no such result. But we earnestly ask of our subscribers the immediate payment of all sums owed to the *Review*, as an act of simple justice to ourselves. Our engagements are all cash engagements. Workmen must be paid, and we have never yet allowed them to wait for what was their due.

It will be perceived that we appear in something of a new dress, with an enlarged page, increasing very considerably the amount of reading matter, but without enhancing the cost to the subscribers.

An apology is due to our readers for the delay which has occurred in the issue of this number. It has arisen in part from changes in the office of our publisher, Mr. E. H. Britton, and in part from the difficulty of procuring type for the *second* article in the preceding pages, our font of Hebrew being exceedingly limited. The grammatical analysis accompanying that article, will be deemed by some superfluous. It is designed only for those who may find it convenient and auxiliary to a true understanding of the original.