

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

AT

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

VOLUME XV.

COLUMBIA, S. C.:
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF C. P. PELHAM.

1863.

BX
~~DKPR~~ 8901
 759 5688
 v. 15

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV.

NUMBER I.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT IN THE WORK OF FOREIGN MISSIONS. By the Rev. J. LEIGHTON WILSON, D. D., Secretary of Foreign Missions, Columbia, S. C., - -	1
II.—THE LAW OF THE SABBATH, IN ITS BEARING UPON NATIONAL PROSPERITY. By the Rev. EDWARD MARTIN, Nottoway C. H., Va., - - - - -	23
III.—THE DIVINE PURPOSE IN THE CLASSICS. By the Rev. J. H. BOCKOCK, D. D., Appomattox C. H., Va., - - -	30
IV.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1862. By the Rev. JOSEPH R. WILSON, D. D., Augusta, Ga., - - - - -	52
V.—HYMN-BOOK MAKING. By the Rev. A. F. DICKSON, Orangeburg C. H., S. C., - - - - -	61
VI.—CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF ABBEVILLE DISTRICT, S. C. By M. E. D., - - - -	78
VII.—MOTLEY'S DUTCH REPUBLIC. By the Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Prof. Ecol. Hist. and Church Polity, Columbia, S. C., - - - - -	94

NUMBER II.

I.—DELITZSCH ON GENESIS. By the Rev. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., - - - - -	161
II.—SUPERIORITY OF THE GREEKS IN LITERATURE AND THE FINE ARTS. By the Rev. Prof. E. F. ROCKWELL, Davidson College, N. C., - - - - -	198

ARTICLE	PAGE
III.—THE RELATIONS OF LANGUAGE. By the Rev. R. C. KETCHUM, Clarkesville, Ga., - - - - -	205
IV.—THE PURITANS. By the Rev. JOSEPH M. ATKINSON, Raleigh, N. C., - - - - -	230
V.—LIFE, CHARACTER, AND GENIUS OF THE LATE REV. JAMES H. THORNWELL, D. D., LL. D. (With a Portrait.) By the Rev. B. M. PALMER, D. D., New Orleans, La., - - - - -	255

NUMBER III.

I.—ON THE NATURE AND USES OF ART. By JOSEPH LECONTE, M. D., Professor of Natural Science, South Carolina College, - - - - -	311
II.—THE PEOPLE AND LANGUAGES OF WESTERN AFRICA. By the Rev. J. LEIGHTON WILSON, D. D., Secretary of Foreign Missions, Columbia, S. C., - - - - -	349
III.—LETTER TO THE REV. DR. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE. By the Rev. JOHN H. BOCOCK, D. D., Appomattox C. H., Va., - - - - -	372
IV.—REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE CHURCH. By the Rev. A. W. MILLER, Petersburg, Va., - - - - -	405
V.—PSALMODY AND THE UNION. By the Rev. EDMUND L. PATTON, President of Erskine College, S. C., - - - - -	448

NUMBER IV.

I.—THE WAR OF THE SOUTH VINDICATED. By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., - - - - -	479
II.—ON THE NATURE AND USES OF ART. (<i>Concluded.</i>) By JOSEPH LECONTE, M. D., Professor of Natural Science, South Carolina College, - - - - -	515
III.—GEOLOGY AND ITS ASSAILANTS, - - - - -	549
IV.—RELIGION AND POLITICS. By the Rev. JAMES A. LYON, D. D., Columbus, Miss., - - - - -	569

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—NO. 1.

JULY, MDCCCLXII.

ARTICLE I.

PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT IN THE WORK OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

AN ADDRESS TO CANDIDATES FOR THE MINISTRY.

I ask your attention, my respected young brethren, to the subject of personal engagement in the work of Foreign Missions. I have no apology to offer, and I presume you have none to ask, for claiming your attention to a matter of such unquestionable importance. It may be taken for granted, that in taking the necessary steps for fitting yourselves for the work of the ministry, you have already settled the question of your call to this sacred office. It is to be hoped that, in adopting this conclusion, you were guided by the Holy Ghost; and that the only object you had then, and the only desire you have now, in seeking this office, is to honor your Redeemer in the salvation of your fellow-men.

The next question which will naturally occupy your thoughts, and especially of those of you who are approaching the close of your studies, is, where you are to exercise those ministerial functions for which you are now fitting

VOL. XV., NO. I.—1

yourselves. This inquiry, if prompted by right motives, and conducted in the proper way, brings you at once face to face with the question, whether you are to labor in your native land, or are to become Foreign Missionaries—this primary question having been settled, either way, others, of a subordinate nature, will present themselves for consideration, but with these we shall have nothing to do at present. Yet it is a matter of momentous importance to your happiness, your usefulness, and the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, that the main question be settled in accordance with the Divine will.

In the discussion of the subject before us, it is not our purpose to hold the balance between the claims of the home and the foreign fields, but to place the latter, the foreign work, in its true and proper position; and we wish it to be distinctly borne in mind, throughout all the remarks we shall offer, that constant reference is had to the existing difference in the actual condition of the two fields; in other words, that one is a Christian land, where the Gospel is habitually dispensed, and where all have some knowledge of the Christian salvation, whilst the other is wholly without the light of the Gospel, and where none have any knowledge of this salvation whatever.

Before proceeding to the main points of our discussion, it is necessary to notice one or two false assumptions that have connected themselves with the subject.

One of these relates to the order in which the different nations of the earth are to be evangelized. No question is raised in relation to the fact that all are to be brought to the knowledge of the Saviour. The Gospel, according to the Divine command, is to be preached in all the world, and to every creature, and through this means all the peoples, and kindreds, and tongues among men are to be brought under the dominion of the Lord Jesus. The field to be cultivated is the world—the whole world. But by what process, or according to what order, is this to be

brought about? According to the theory we have under consideration, our own country is to be thoroughly evangelized first; after that, those nations which stand next in the scale of civilization; and, last of all, the more degraded Pagan nations of the earth. The more popular form of the argument is, that our own countrymen must be converted before we can undertake any thing of importance for the rest of the world; and the reason alleged in support of this view is, that when our own country is thoroughly evangelized, and all her resources are consecrated to the Lord, we shall be enabled to prosecute the foreign work with a more vigorous and powerful arm. But the question arises, who authorized this particular mode of procedure? Not the Lord Jesus; for He commanded His Gospel to be preached in every nation, and to every creature, irrespective of any such plan. Not the Holy Ghost; for He has placed the seal of His approbation to the truth, wherever it has been proclaimed. Not the Apostles or primitive Christians; for they went every where, making known the unsearchable riches of Christ. Not the providence of God; for that, at the present moment, is laying open all the heathen nations of the earth to the influences of the Gospel. The theory betrays a human origin, and, on this account alone, ought to be regarded with distrust. Against it there lie two very serious objections. One of these is, that it presumes to understand the unrevealed purposes of Almighty God, and lays down a programme, if we may so speak, by which He is to proceed in the conversion of the nations to Himself. But who knows that it has been decided in the councils of Heaven that our own country is to be first among all the nations of the earth to be fully and completely evangelized? Who knows that this great favor may not be reserved for India, for China, or for poor, miserable, degraded Africa? Would it be any novelty in the economy of Divine grace, if the first should be last, or the last first? But an equally serious objection is, that it entirely misapprehends

the nature and functions of the Christian ministry. When we speak of evangelizing this or that nation, according to a certain order, it implies that the work of conversion belongs to men; whereas, it is peculiarly and exclusively the office of the Holy Ghost. Our work (and we can not keep this too distinctly before the mind) is to spread the knowledge of the truth among men, leaving it for the Holy Ghost to make it effectual to their salvation, and bring about the evangelization of the different nations, according to His own plan and order.

The other false assumption has reference to our relation to the work. It is a very common idea, especially among young men about to enter the ministry, that they are to labor in their native land, as a matter of course, unless they have some special call to go abroad. It is not easy to account for the prevalence of this idea, unless it be found in the fact that the great body, even of intelligent Christian men, have no proper appreciation of the claims of the Foreign Missionary cause. If any thing is to be taken for granted at all, the converse of this general proposition is, perhaps, nearer the truth. When we remember that the command of the Saviour, to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, remains, even to the present day, substantially unfulfilled; when we call to mind the fact that all in our own country, or very nearly all, have some knowledge of the Christian salvation, and would know what to do to be saved, if they were so disposed; and when we couple with this the still further fact, that the heathen are entirely without this knowledge, and would not know what to do, even if they felt the most intense desire to be saved, we can hardly see how any young man, possessing the necessary qualifications to be a Foreign Missionary, can reconcile it with his conscience to remain at home, without some plain indication of Providence that it is his duty to do so. The most natural course is to go where the principal work is to be done; where the necessities of poor human nature are the

greatest; and where the Saviour may be most signally honored, because requiring on the part of his followers greater hardships and self-denials.

OBSTACLES IN THE WAY OF ENGAGING IN THE FOREIGN MISSIONARY WORK.

Some of these are weighty and insurmountable, whilst others are erroneously regarded as such. We shall bring under review a few of the leading ones of either class, commencing with those that are not insuperable. Among these may be mentioned:

(1.) That the *want of a call* to this particular work is often alleged as a reason for not engaging in it. But why, it may be asked, is a more special call needed for the foreign than the home field? Both are included in the same great commission, and both are under the same divine supervision. The only difference in a call from these two fields is, that in one case it proceeds from the particular church or congregation where the individual is expected to labor, whilst in the other it must be presented through the agency appointed by the Church, in her collective capacity, to represent the heathen. Any undue stress laid upon a call coming directly from the people, is not only a slight to the authority of the Church, as expressed by her highest judicatory, but is an act of injustice to the heathen, inasmuch as it is out of the question for them to present a call on their own behalf. But, in either case, we ought to know that the call is in accordance with the Divine will. But how can this be ascertained? So far as the foreign work is concerned, we answer, in no other way than by reference to His will in relation to the evangelization of these nations; and His will can be inferred only from His word, His Spirit, and His providence. What, then, is the testimony of His word? "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Again: where has this

Gospel been preached among any of these nations, whether in the days of the Apostles or subsequently, that it has not been sealed upon the hearts of men by the Holy Ghost? Furthermore, has not the providence of God been specially active, for years past, in removing all the outward obstacles to the introduction of the Gospel among these nations? Here, then, is a call endorsed by the three-fold authority of God's word, Spirit, and providence. If you can not read your commission to become Foreign Missionaries in all this (provided you have the necessary qualifications for the work), I do not know where you are to go to get more explicit instructions.

(2.) *Personal preference* ought to have very little weight in settling a question of so much importance. When you made choice of the calling of the ministry, if you acted from right motives, and with an intelligent view of its duties and obligations, you made an entire surrender of yourselves to the service of the Lord Jesus, and you have not now any right to choose where you are to go, or what duties you are to perform, but you are to be governed by the calls and indications of His providence. The calling of a soldier furnishes an analogous case. When he enlists for the defence of his country, he places himself at the direction of his commanding officer, and obeys every command, and performs every duty assigned him, irrespective of his personal wishes, or of the dangers involved in the performance of that duty. So it should be with the Christian soldier. His only rule of conduct should be the will of his great Captain, and at His bidding he should be ready to go to the utmost ends of the earth, and even lay down his life, if that were required.

(3.) Nearly allied to this are the wishes and preferences of your personal friends and relatives. If they oppose your going on a Foreign Mission, from what you know to be honest and conscientious convictions of your want of adapt-
edness to the work, their objections deserve your most

serious consideration. Your friends may have a more correct view of your character and adaptation to such an undertaking than you have yourselves, and their counsels, therefore, ought not to be slighted. If, on the other hand, you have reason to believe that their opposition arises mainly from a selfish unwillingness to part with you, or from a want of a proper appreciation of the claims of the Foreign Missionary cause, it ought to have no influence whatever upon your final decision. The Saviour admits of no rivalry with His claims. "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me." He that would be a sincere and consistent disciple, must take up his cross and follow Him through good and through evil report.

(4.) The want of *personal holiness* is frequently, but very improperly, assigned as a reason for not engaging in this work. No one can help feeling the sincerest respect for scruples of this kind, when they arise, as they often do, from a deep sense of personal unworthiness to engage in so holy a cause. But the same objection would lie against entering upon the work of the ministry at all. In neither case can we reasonably expect the blessing of God to attend our labors, unless we cultivate a spirit of personal piety, and He is as ready to grant us the necessary grace for the one as the other. The proper course, therefore, for one who feels his insufficiency is, not to turn away from the work, but to seek the grace necessary to render him an effective laborer; and there is no surer way, perhaps, of reaching this desired attainment, than by casting one's self upon the Lord Jesus, to go, if need be, to the remotest ends of the earth, relying solely upon His promised aid to help and sustain in every possible emergency.

(5.) The claims of patriotism do not exonerate us, as ministers of Jesus Christ, from going to the heathen. Those claims, we readily admit, especially in circumstances like

the present, are very strong; and in no case ought they to be treated lightly. Still, however, we must not forget that the claims of Christianity are paramount to those of patriotism. The Master to whom we profess fealty, and to whose services we have solemnly consecrated all our energies, includes within His realms the whole race of man, and the work He has expressly assigned His ministers is to proclaim throughout the whole of those realms the glad tidings of salvation. We are, therefore, as His chosen ministers, citizens of the world; and our business is not with any one nation or particular branch of the human family, but with the whole race of Adam.

(6.) It is not a sufficient reason for dismissing the claims of Foreign Missions, that you are regarded as having peculiar qualifications for distinguished usefulness at home. This is often said in relation to young men of more than ordinary gifts; and many, as we have had painful reason to know, have dismissed the subject from their minds on this ground alone. But this is a sad and grievous mistake, and can not be resisted with too much energy. Paul did not act on this principle. Henry Martin, Alexander Duff, and other modern Missionaries, of scarcely less note, had all the talents necessary to have occupied the first positions of influence in their native land; but they never thought of this, as a reason for turning their backs upon the heathen: nor is it probable that any of them would have done as much for the upbuilding of the Redeemer's kingdom, or have acquired the world-wide influence they did, if they had staid at home. Besides this, we know of no gifts or attainments that would render a young man especially acceptable and useful at home, that would not equally enhance his usefulness and acceptability abroad. Popular oratory, distinguished scholarship, refined manners, amiability of disposition, and whatever else would endear a young man to the heart of a civilized and Christian community, would render him no less acceptable and effective

as a Missionary among the heathen. Some of these nations give more attention to the cultivation of personal manners than we do ourselves; and, in relation to those that stand lowest in the scale of civilization, it is a great mistake to suppose that, because, they are without refinement themselves, that therefore they have no appreciation of it in others. No where in the world will you find closer observers of the manners, disposition, and general deportment of men, and no where have these things a more positive influence, than among these uncultivated races; and, surely, in the study of their customs, their habits, their superstitions, their systems of false religion, and especially their languages, there is scope enough for the exercise of the strongest intellects of the Church. So far, therefore, from admitting the claim of the home-field to a monopoly of the best talents of the Church, we hold that the foreign field has, to say the least, a just claim to a full and equal share.

(7.) The fact that you have received a call to the care of a church, or some other position of usefulness in your native country, even before your studies are completed, is no certain evidence that the call is from God, or that you are thereby exonerated from going to the heathen. You might have two of these calls on hand at the same time, and as it would be impossible for you to respond to both, it would be certain that one of them was not from God; and why might this not be the case with both? But if you are bound to examine every call that is presented to your consideration (and you undoubtedly are), are you not equally bound to consider those unuttered, but not less real calls, that are coming up to you from all parts of the heathen world? Is it nothing to you, that one hundred millions of perishing men in Africa virtually cry out, "Come over and help us?" Is there nothing to move your compassion or to call for your aid in that profound ignorance and untold misery that afflicts every portion of India,

China, Japan, and all the rest of the heathen world? Is there no voice in those special interpositions of Divine providence that are laying open all these nations to the influences of the Gospel? Has the command of the Saviour, that His Gospel should be preached to all these nations, lost its power and authority over the hearts of men?

REAL DIFFICULTIES IN THE WAY OF ENGAGING IN THE FOREIGN MISSIONARY WORK.

But there are real hindrances in the way of entering upon this work, and we propose now to point out a few of the more weighty and serious of these.

(1.) We may have dependent friends and relatives, thrown upon us by the providence of God, whom we may not leave, even for the high and holy purpose of becoming Foreign Missionaries. Aged and infirm parents, who have no other dependence; a feeble and dependent brother or sister; children, who are dependent upon us for education and general training, and whom it might not be possible or desirable to take with us to a foreign land, belong to this class. These relationships are providential, and are not to be overlooked or disregarded. They are indications of God's will that we are not to take part in this great work, whatever may be our desires or qualifications in other respects.

(2.) We may be debarred, again, from taking part in this work by the want of health or constitutional vigor. Most of the countries to be evangelized have climates different from our own. Three-fourths of the heathen inhabitants of the earth are to be found in tropical regions. A change from a cold or temperate to a hot climate, is a severe trial to the soundest and most healthy constitutions; and, of course, must be much more so to a feeble one, especially where there is a predisposition to diseases peculiar to warm climates. Too much care, therefore, can not be exercised in relation to this matter. To send a young man

with a feeble or unsound constitution to labor in one of these trying climates, would not only be an unjustifiable waste of missionary money, but might do the young man himself irreparable injury. As the field of missionary labor is enlarged, however, we shall have brought within the range of our choice a much greater variety of climate; so that one who could not endure the heat of Africa, would do well in the plateau lands and mountain regions of New Grenada; and one who found the climate of India and Siam too relaxing, might enjoy a more bracing air in Northern China and Japan.

(3.) The want of capacity to acquire a foreign language, may be regarded as a serious, if not insuperable, difficulty in the way of engaging in this work. It is scarcely possible for any one to become an effective Missionary without acquiring the language of the people for whom he is to labor. The use of interpreters, except as a temporary expedient, is a most indirect and unsatisfactory mode of reaching the heart of any people. The only true index we can have to the character of a heathen community, and the only way by which any material influence can be brought to bear upon their conduct, is through the medium of their own language. It is of indispensable importance, therefore, to the Missionary, that he understand the language of the people among whom he is to live. The difficulties of acquiring these languages, however, are often exaggerated. There are but few young men of ordinary abilities who could not, with proper patience and perseverance, master almost any of these heathen languages. In all the range of our observation, we have never known but two individuals who, after proper effort, failed to accomplish the task. As a general rule, living languages are more easily acquired than those that are known as the dead languages; and those who have succeeded in acquiring a creditable knowledge of the latter, need have no serious fears about the former. Among the different heathen na-

tions there is as much variety in language as there is diversity in climate. The Chinese, the Japanese, and a few of the Indian dialects, are regarded as intrinsically difficult; whilst the Hindi, the Siamese, and most of the dialects of Africa, are comparatively easy. Reference can always be had to this in assigning to young men their fields of labor.

(4.) Having stated some of the more specific reasons for not entering upon the missionary work, we may now state, in a more general way, that where the convictions of an individual, that he ought to labor at home, are very strong and decided; where he is conscious of no shrinking from the perils and hardships of the missionary life, but would be willing, so far as he knows his own heart, to go any where at the bidding of his Saviour; and where these personal convictions are sustained by the hearty and spontaneous concurrence of views on the part of his friends, his teachers and his ecclesiastical advisers, we should regard all this as the voice of God, settling the question of his duty to remain at home. Due care ought to be exercised, however, in scrutinizing the motives of his own heart, as well as the reasons assigned by his advisers, for his remaining at home.

Now, in reviewing the reasons and arguments adduced on either side of the question before us, let it not be said that we have made the road to the foreign field so broad, and that to the home work so narrow, that we would promote the good of the one at the expense of the other. If this were really the case, our argument would not only be one-sided, but our plan, put in practical operation, would be injurious alike to the interests of religion at home and abroad. The Church at home is the source of the missionary spirit; and if the fountain be dried up, the streams must necessarily cease to flow. But this is not the legitimate result of the course we are advocating. On the contrary, we firmly believe that there is no way by which the Church can more effectually increase her strength and

power, than by proper efforts to make her influence felt in every direction. There is in the economy of Divine grace a scattering that increaseth, and a withholding that tendeth to poverty. The missionary spirit, rightly construed, is the very life of the Church; and where that prevails, there can scarcely be spiritual dearth. What the Church at home needs is, not so much the multiplication of her ministers—though she needs this, too—as the infusion into those she already has, and those about to enter her service, of the spirit of their divine Master. A given number of men, possessing the zeal of Paul, of Luther, of Wesley, or of Whitefield, would do far more to promote the piety of the Church, and secure the salvation of sinners, than any multiple of that number without their zeal. It even one-half of the members of each successive graduating class from our Seminaries should become Foreign Missionaries, instead of being an injury, we believe, under God, it would be the indirect cause of the richest blessing to all our churches. Who knows what influence it would not exert in stirring up her ministers to the proper standard of piety and zeal; in calling pious young men to the ministry, to take the place of those who go abroad; and in calling forth the energies of the Church at large? May this not be the very means that God has appointed for bringing the Church up to the true standard of piety? Does any one seriously believe that the Church will ever make shipwreck of the faith, or destroy her own life and power, by following too closely in the footsteps of her great Leader?

QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE MISSIONARY WORK.

Have I the qualifications to become a Foreign Missionary? This is a question that must necessarily occupy many of the thoughts of every young man who turns his attention to the subject of personal engagement in the work. It is an essential element in the question whether we are called by God to this work or not. Much that

might be said under this general head has been anticipated in the previous part of our remarks. What remains to be said might be included in one general statement, viz.: that those very traits of character, attainments in piety, knowledge and scholarship, that would render a man an effective minister at home, would make him no less so as a Foreign Missionary. There is no safer criterion, perhaps, by which to judge of a man's fitness for the Foreign Missionary work, than the estimate entertained of him by his friends, his associates in study, and his instructors. If they can render a united verdict in his favor, no stronger recommendation can reasonably be asked. If, on the other hand, he is wanting in any of the qualities already mentioned, and especially if any doubts are entertained about his usefulness at home, he ought not to be thought of as a Foreign Missionary. But we may, without unduly protracting our article, point out a few of the more obvious and important qualifications of the Missionary.

(1.) One of the first and most indispensable of these is, unreserved consecration to the service of the Lord Jesus. In directing his steps to the heathen world, he must not be governed by the impulses of romance, the love of adventure, or any motives of personal ambition, but by a simple desire to honor and obey his Redeemer. This ought to be the actuating motive in choosing the work in the first place, and the controlling, sustaining principle in all his future labors. He is to remember that the work has been authorized by the Lord Jesus, that His honor and glory are involved in carrying it on, and that He will assuredly sustain all those engaged in it, whatever trials, disappointments and temporary reverses He may allow them to encounter.

(2.) Habits of industry and study are indispensable to a successful Missionary. To acquire a foreign language, though it be comparatively easy, requires much study. Nor is less study necessary to understand the character of the people, their habits of thought and action, their super-

stitutions, their traditions, and their systems of false religion. These things are not patent to transient observation, but can be understood only after the closest investigation and scrutiny. But, more than all, the translation of God's word into these languages, which some of the Missionaries, at least, must undertake, is one of the most difficult and laborious tasks that can be laid on any man's shoulders.

(3.) A cheerful temperament and habit are of great importance to the Foreign Missionary. The circumstances of missionary life call for its daily exercise: so much so, that a man of a peevish, morose, or jealous disposition will sink down at once, and leave the work altogether, or will remain only to annoy his associates in labor. A cheerful disposition, therefore, can not be cultivated with too much diligence. The Missionary ought to be able to look at the bright side of every picture, and learn how to draw comfort and encouragement even in the most adverse dispensations of providence. He must be patient and persevering in his efforts to bring men to the knowledge of the Saviour; must know how to make allowance for the ignorance, the perverseness, and ingratitude of the heathen; must be able to check any uprising of fretfulness in his own bosom towards them, by remembering that if Christ can bear with them, he ought; and by remembering, also, how much more forbearance the Saviour has exercised towards himself, than he is called upon to exercise towards them. The Missionary is also to sustain himself by looking forward, by the eye of faith, to the fulfilment of all those rich promises made by the Saviour in relation to the latter day glory, when every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess to Him; when He shall see of the travail of His soul, and be satisfied; when the heathen shall be given to Him for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession; and when all on earth, as in heaven, shall unite in ascribing honor, and power, and glory, and dominion, to Him that sitteth upon the throne.

MOTIVES TO ENGAGE IN THIS GREAT WORK.

We proceed, in the last place, to glance at some of those motives that should impel young men to take a share in this great work. These, however, are so numerous, so weighty, and so varied withal, that it is difficult to determine which should be selected for more special consideration. We can do little more than glance at a few of the leading ones.

(1.) The opportunity it offers us to honor the Redeemer. This is the highest motive that can be presented to any Christian mind; and it is a matter of wonder that every Christian disciple does not earnestly desire to avail himself of it to show his attachment to his Saviour. There are other places and ways, it is true, by which He may be honored; and if He makes it our duty to stay at home, our services, if faithfully performed, will not be less acceptable. But going to a far-off heathen land, to spend one's life in complete isolation from all that the human heart usually counts dear, requires a measure of faith, self-denial, courage, and devotion to His cause, which must be more than ordinarily pleasing to the Saviour, and which can scarcely fail to impress the minds of men with the sincerity of His followers, and the power of that religion by which they are governed. And when it is remembered what the Saviour has done for us, what He is still doing, and what He has promised yet to do; when we remember what transporting hopes He has enkindled in the hearts of men, and what ample provision He has made for their salvation; when we remember what glorious results He has promised to bring about through the agency of the Church, even the subjugation of all the heathen nations of the earth to His dominion; and when we reflect how short is the term of human life, in which alone our agency can be employed in bringing about these glorious results, is it not surprising, amazing, that we do not all earnestly desire to have a share in

it? Is it not surprising that we need to be reminded of our duty at all? Is it not strange that I should now be using all the little powers of persuasion that God has given me, to induce you to engage in a work of which there is not an angel in heaven that would not count it an honor and a privilege to be a sharer?

(2.) Another motive is to be found in the example of Apostles and primitive Christians. If ever there was a set of men on earth who, it may be taken for granted, understood the mind of their Master, or the nature and extent of the work He gave them to perform, it was they. They commenced their labors, it is true, at Jerusalem. This was not only the most natural course, but it was in strict accordance with the command of their ascended Saviour. Some of these men, there is reason to believe, spent the whole of their lives in labors in their native land. But this was not the case with the majority of them, and especially with those whose lives and labors are more fully spread out in the word of God. These, according to the testimony of the Scriptures, went every where, proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ; and although we have in the Acts of the Apostles but an imperfect outline of their actual labors and journeyings, yet from this very source we learn that there was scarcely a village, town, or city in Palestine, Samaria, Asia Minor, Macedon, Greece, or Rome, that could not testify to the untiring zeal of these holy men. And in ages immediately following, as we know from reliable history, the Gospel was preached, and Christian churches were founded, in almost every portion of the earth that was accessible in that day. Now, did those holy men transcend their commission? Are not our duties and obligations co-extensive with theirs? Should we have less desire to honor the Redeemer? Are not the souls of our fellow-men as precious now as they were then?

(3.) The circumstances and necessities of our fellow-men all over the heathen world, furnish another powerful mo-

tive to stimulate our zeal. It is true, they have reduced themselves to the lowest depths of degradation by their own wilful rebellion against Jehovah. But have they less claim to our sympathy and compassion on this account? It is not for us to assume that there can be no salvation for the heathen, except through the medium of the Gospel. But so far as we have any knowledge on the subject, or any authority upon which to base our action, we are shut up to the conclusion that there can be no salvation for adult heathen without some knowledge of the Gospel. Is it not an established article in the creed of every evangelical denomination, and the utterance of every evangelical pulpit in the land, that there is and can be no salvation for mortal man, except through faith in the merits of a crucified Redeemer? But, in the language of God's word, "How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except they be sent?" No, let us be honest with ourselves, to our fellow-men, and to the great Head of the Church, and realize and confess that these millions of our fellow-men must go down to their graves and to the judgment seat unblessed, unless we impart to them in this world the light of the Gospel. And what will be their astonishment, aye! their overwhelming anguish, when they come to see in the clear light of eternity that they might have been saved!—that there was provided, from the foundation of the world, just such a Saviour as they sometimes felt they needed! What bitter reproaches may we not suppose they will utter against those of us who possessed that Gospel, and who ought and could, but did not, impart it to them!

(4.) The intervention of God's providence, within a few years past, in removing obstacles and laying open all the great heathen nations of the earth to the influences of the Gospel, furnishes another most weighty motive for entering

upon this work. For long centuries these nations have not only been dwelling in the deepest heathen gloom, but they have been, in a great measure, inaccessible to the Missionary. Why this was permitted is one of those mysteries of Divine providence which we may never be able fully to solve in this present world. But however deplorable may have been their condition in times past, a better and brighter day, we firmly believe, is now beginning to dawn upon them. There are at the present moment many unmistakeable signs that God's set time to favor these nations is drawing nigh. Actual experiment has shown that missionary labors may be carried on in Africa, notwithstanding the intensity of her torrid heat, the insalubrity of her climate, and the savage character of her people. Recent explorations have revealed all the secrets of her geography, her populations, and her abundant, but as yet undeveloped, resources; whilst the commerce of the civilized world is furnishing means of access to almost every portion of her benighted inhabitants. For many long centuries China, with her four hundred millions of immortal beings, seemed to have been surrounded with impassable walls, and there were no human means by which the light of the Gospel could be made to shine upon her benighted inhabitants. But, in the providence of God, all those walls have been thrown down, and the Gospel of Jesus Christ may now be proclaimed, without let or hindrance, throughout the whole of her vast dominions. Japan, for more than three centuries, was cut off from all intercourse with the Christian world by the severest legal enactments; and South America, for nearly an equal period, was almost as effectually barred from all evangelical influences by papal intolerance. But Japan has relaxed her austerity, and South America now stretches out a friendly hand to the Protestant Missionary. Now, what has brought about all these changes? Surely, naught but the providence of God. And is there no lan-

guage for us in these providences? Is not God thus saying to us, Go up and possess the land?

(6.) Another motive to excite our zeal is to be found in the fact that there is no risk, no uncertainty, in relation to the results of this great enterprise. In all human undertakings, there is of necessity great risk and uncertainty. If we spend our energies in the acquisition of wealth, we may fail altogether, or succeed only to learn how worthless and unsatisfying wealth is. We may earn the highest reputation among men that the human heart can possibly desire, and yet live to see that reputation withered and blasted in our own grasp. We may aid in laying the foundation of the best human government that can be conceived, and yet live to see that government crumble to atoms. But what we do for the upbuilding of the Redeemer's kingdom can not possibly fail. His is an everlasting kingdom, and must endure, though the heavens and the earth pass away. God has promised to His Son to give Him the heathen for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession; and His promises are yea and amen. When, therefore, we labor for the upbuilding and extension of His kingdom, we labor for what can not possibly fail; and though we may not know it fully here, we shall be able in the light of a better world to see that we have not labored in vain.

(7.) In the next and last place, let us draw an argument from the condition and circumstances of our southern Zion. As a Christian body, we have just launched upon a new and independent existence. We were brought to this measure, not so much as a matter of choice, as the result of an overruling providence. God, undoubtedly, had some great and special object in separating us from our northern brethren. What that object was, we already see in part, and will no doubt understand more fully hereafter. At the commencement of our career, every thing is as favorable as could be desired. Harmony and unanimity of views on

the part of those who were intrusted with the duty of arranging and completing the external organization of the church; the full confidence and hearty support of all the churches embraced in this organization; freedom, at the beginning, from many of the inconveniences and incumbrances that clogged our former ecclesiastical connexion; soundness in the faith on the part of our churches, and a very general appreciation of the solemn and responsible duties imposed upon us by the providence of God in this new relation, are favors for which we can not feel too thankful to the great Head of the Church. But if we would have this church of ours take a high and commanding position among her sister churches; if she would secure for herself a precious and enduring name on earth; and, above all, if she would endear herself to the heart of her great Head, she must devote her energies to the work of spreading the knowledge of the Gospel among all the nations of the earth. This is one of the two great ends of her being as a church. As a people, we have all the means, the facilities, and, I believe, the *heart*, to take a large share in this work; and the great question now is, will her sons and daughters become the willing and ready agents in carrying it on? This question is submitted to your prayerful consideration, and it is for you, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to answer it.

At the present moment we are in the midst of trials, such as most of us never expected to witness on earth; and such, we may humbly pray, as may not again visit our land. But are we to draw no practical lessons from these troublous scenes? Where has there ever been witnessed such sublimity of patriotism, such outpouring of wealth, such sacrifice of self and kindred, such readiness to forego every thing that is dear to the human heart, as have been shown in these Confederate States since the commencement of our present conflict? Do we not all feel that society has been stirred to its very lowest depths? Where is the mother

that has refused to give up her son, the sister her brother, or the wife her husband, for the defence of the country?

But why all this? It is simply to defend ourselves and our posterity from an impending human despotism. But there is a more terrible despotism than any with which we are threatened. It is that crushing, unresisted despotism that the arch-enemy of God and man has been exercising over the heathen nations of the earth for these many long centuries. For those who lie crushed beneath his iron tread, the Son of God has poured forth His blood, and commands us to go forth and preach deliverance to them. Shall we not emulate the zeal, the energy, and the indomitable perseverance of those who are battling for civil liberty? Shall we do nothing to free these millions of our fellow-men from the terrible bondage in which they are held? May we not hope to see the time when God's people will display as much zeal and earnestness in emancipating these millions from their spiritual thralldom, as is now displayed by our countrymen in warding off this threatened political despotism?

THE LAW OF THE SABBATH, IN ITS BEARING UPON NATIONAL PROSPERITY.

To those who believe in a God, and in a world to come; who believe that there is such a thing as sin, and that it will not go unpunished; it can never be a matter of small moment to know what God requires, what constitutes sin against God, and what will be the punishment of sin.

It is supposed that none will deny that as the aggregation of individuals constitutes nationalities, so the prevalence of any particular disposition or habit of good or evil in a greater part of the individuals composing a body politic, or in the constituted ruling or governing powers, gives a tone or character to that nation which they constitute, or over which they rule and preside: that is, that nations may be godly or ungodly, righteous or wicked; that there may be national sins and national punishments, national goodness and national blessings; or, in the language of Scripture, that "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

It will also be conceded by all right thinking minds that, whatever else may constitute sin, if God has given to His rational creatures a law, any violation of that law, which, as it comes from God, must be holy and just and good, will be sin against God.

These things being granted—and the writer is sure that they will find a responsive affirmation in the great heart of the people of this Confederacy—it is proposed to apply these principles to one special form in which sin presents itself; and to show that if, on the one hand, we as a nation walk according to God's law, there is before us a future of great prosperity and great blessing; and if, on the other hand, we violate God's law, there is before us a future of national degradation and fearful retribution.

The question, then, which we are to discuss, is simply this: Is there any law of the Sabbath now binding on the nations and peoples of the earth? and if so, what are its sanctions, its nature, and its penalties?

That God has proclaimed a law concerning the observance of the Sabbath, is evident from many parts of His word; from which it is also clear that this is the substance of that law, viz.: That the seventh part of man's time is to be kept holy to God; that on one day in each week man is to abstain from such worldly employments and recreations as are lawful on other days, except for so much of the time as is to be taken up in works of necessity and mercy. Man is to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.

It is not necessary for the purposes of the present argument, to show which one of the seven days of the week is thus to be kept holy to God. Undoubtedly, at the first promulgation of the great sabbatic law, the seventh day was thus set apart by God. "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." It is beyond question, also, that when the law was recast, and repeated to the Jewish nation in the Decalogue, the seventh was the day appointed for this holy resting and worship; and that this continued to be the Sabbath day until the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is also a point settled beyond all controversy, that for good and sufficient reasons, into which it is not now necessary to enter, the Christian world has, since the resurrection, kept holy to God the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath.

The change in the day does not affect the principle of the law. That remains in all its original force. One-seventh of man's time is to be kept holy to God, and to be employed in His worship. What we are to show is this: that this principle is revealed to man by his Creator as a rule of moral duty; that it is not a mere police regulation of the Jewish economy, but that it is lifted into the sphere

of man's moral duty and obligation, and is, therefore, universally binding on all responsible creatures; and as such, is unrepealed and irrevocable.

Let it be remembered that a moral obligation is a perpetual obligation, binding on man as long as the constitution of his nature remains unchanged. If, therefore, the law of the Sabbath be of the nature of a moral law, it follows that the obligation to keep the law is for ever binding upon those to whom it is given. That the law of the Sabbath is of such a nature is clear, from the fact that it was given to man at his first creation, when in a state of innocence, before sin had come into the world, and before there were any indications of an atonement for sin. This law was given to man on a moral ground, without reference to a state of innocence more than to any other; therefore it is a moral law, and therefore its obligation is perpetual.

Moreover, this law was placed amongst the other moral precepts in the Decalogue, and is of the same nature or kind with them. It was with them proclaimed by the voice of God in the hearing of all the people; it was twice written by the finger of God upon the tables of stone, and lodged with them in the ark; which privileges were never conferred on any of the precepts of the ceremonial law. Hence it is plain that this law was considered by God to be a moral law, and to have the same binding force with the other moral precepts.

Besides, this law has never been repealed; it is over and over again repeated and referred to, in both the Old and New Testaments, as a law still in force; and it has, from the beginning to the present day, been recognized in some form by all christendom, and a large part of heathendom.

It follows, then, that if any precept of God's law be a moral law, the law of the Sabbath is such; and is, therefore, of perpetual obligation. Let it be remembered, therefore, that whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one, yea, in this one, he is guilty of all.

Again: It might be urged that as, in the nature of things, man's, so-called moral-natural constitution indicates that worship is one of the duties which he owes to God, his Creator, so it would also indicate that some special time should be set apart for that worship. But it is sufficient for us that we have the positive declaration of God Himself, setting forth this obligation; placing it on a moral ground, with a positive precept as to what and how much time shall be set apart for His worship. And we have the special and peculiar sanctions and penalties with which He accompanies the promulgation of this law.

The plea, then, which is so often set up, that the Sabbath was a mere Jewish or a mere ceremonial institution, and that therefore its observance is not now binding, will be seen to be utterly nugatory and worthless. The law of the Sabbath is a *moral* law, binding upon all people and nations, always and every where. The principles upon which its obligation is sought to be set aside will, when carried out to their legitimate results, suffice to set aside the precepts against murder, adultery, theft, or any other precept of the moral law, and would leave a lost and fallen race with no regulative principles save their own lusts, their own desires, or their own prejudices. Let this logic, which is so artfully used to excuse the violation of this law, have full sway, and the nations of the earth would be left without a law; the universe without a God.

There remain now to be considered, for a full apprehension of the dignity and magnitude of this subject, the special and peculiar sanctions and penalties with which the promulgation of the law of the Sabbath is accompanied.

First: When we consider the very words of the statute, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," we see that God allows us six days of the week for our worldly affairs and employments. What, then, can be more unreasonable and ungrateful than our grudging Him the seventh

part of our time for His more immediate service and worship; especially as He claims this day for His own, and it is our greatest privilege and happiness to have access to Him and communion with Him on it? For, observe what a precious promise God makes to those who faithfully keep it holy: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."—Isa. 58: 13, 14.

Second: Observe, again, the words of the law in the reason which God gives for its being kept holy by us: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day."

All these God could have completed, in all their beauty and perfection, in a moment, by a word; but He chose by His own example to fix the morality of six days for worldly labor, and of a seventh for holy rest: "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

God has so ordered it in His providence that the right observance of the Sabbath is not only no hindrance to the proper business of the week, but fits us better for its duties and labors. That this has been the experience of men the world over, admits of proof and illustration the most satisfactory and irrefragable. It stands proclaimed by the clearest and most incontestible evidence, that no man or nation of men ever, in the end, gained by the violation of this law; but they have ever suffered loss and punishment when the Sabbath has been desecrated or disregarded. One of God's servants has written it for our warning, and let not men forget his words: "In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine-presses on the Sabbath, and

bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day: and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals. There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah and in Jerusalem. Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us and upon this city? Yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath."—Neh. 13 : 15–18.

Another prophet of God declared unto the people, in words of still more solemn warning: "But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palace of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched."—Jer. 17 : 27.

Not to multiply evidence, of which there is much more, it is plain, from the dealings of God with His ancient people, and from His dealings with the nations of the earth ever since, that He looks with peculiar jealousy upon this law, and follows its violation with fearful retribution. It becomes us, then, as a Confederacy, in the infancy of our republic, already most signally blessed by marvellous interpositions of God in our behalf, to take heed unto ourselves, lest we provoke the righteous anger of our God; and it behoves our rulers that they see to it that "they bring not more wrath upon us by profaning the Sabbath."

The application of the great principles set forth in this essay is plain and pointed. "The prosperity and success of a nation depend upon the general tone of public sentiment and morals; and these, again, upon the power of true religion in the hearts of rulers and people." The nations that forget God, and despise His law, will God forsake and

destroy. But He will maintain the cause of them that remember His commandments to do them.

This question is the more momentous, as involving the destiny of this Confederacy; and all good and true men are called upon to stand up the more boldly and manfully upon the Lord's side: because of the peculiar proneness of men to break the great law of the Sabbath; because the violation of it is so peculiarly ungrateful and inexcusable on our part; and because this is one of the sins which has, in a measure, come down to us by entail from the Federal Government.

It would be an insult to the public intellect, and to the common sense of the people of this Confederacy, to attempt to show that the transaction of ordinary official business, the carrying and delivering of the mails, and the running of railroad trains, upon the Sabbath day, are not works either of necessity or mercy; and are, therefore, violations of this law of God. What shall be said, then, of the weekly violation of both the law of the land and the law of God, in the desecration of the Sabbath by the traffic in city bar-rooms, and the opening of places of amusement, by which the dissolute are encouraged in vice; and by the glaring profanation of the day, seen in many of our country stores, where our negroes are in so many instances fleeced and swindled, or encouraged, directly or indirectly, in peculation and intemperance, to a degree which often throws whole communities into disorder?

The crimes of adultery, murder, and theft, each bears its own train of retributive consequences to the perpetrator; and should they prevail to such an extent as to become national crimes, it is easy to see to what a dreadful state of anarchy and ruin society would be brought. The crime of Sabbath-breaking, likewise, bears with it its own special punishment to him who is guilty of it; a punishment cumulative with the heaviest disasters to the State, when the crime grows to such a magnitude as to become national.

Nations suffer the punishment of their sins in this world. Individuals suffer both in this world and the world to come. Public sentiment is the aggregate of individual opinion. Public morals is the aggregate of individual morality.

Let thoughtful and sober men consider, and take hold of this matter, and endeavor by all lawful means, through the pulpit, the hustings, and the press, so to mould and control public opinion, that we may be saved, as a nation, from the crime of Sabbath-breaking, and thereby saved from God's righteous wrath and indignation.



ARTICLE III.

THE DIVINE PURPOSE IN THE CLASSICS.

Homer and Hesiod flourished, probably, near the time of the prophet Elijah. That was about nine hundred years before the Christian era. Sappho is placed by the chronologists three hundred years later. That was about six hundred years before Christ. Then come Anacreon, Æschylus, Pindar, and Herodotus, in the sixth and fifth centuries before our era. Then come Socrates and his successors, and with them the real commencement of the classic epoch, about four hundred years before the birth of Christ. This is just about the date of the prophet Malachi. The voice of prophecy ceased among the Hebrews just as the light of letters began fully to shine among the Greeks. At the time of the birth of Christ, when the light of the New Testament was about to dawn upon all nations, the classical epoch was approaching its sunset. Whatever is

most valuable in Greek literature, with the poems of Virgil and Horace among the Romans, had already been produced. The classics seem to be an interlude between the two Testaments.

If we regard the rise of the nations of the world as arranged in a great scheme of divine providence, it is difficult to believe that this exquisite classic culture, which arose in Greece and Italy during this period of the significant silence of inspiration, had no meaning in such scheme of divine providence. Among the Hebrews, a vast and splendid system of types, shadows, and prophecies had been long preparing the faithful among that people for the reception of the Redeemer. True, the Hebrews were the chosen people. The Greeks were not. But all nations then, as now, rightfully belonged to Jehovah, whether He dwelt among them seated between the cherubim in the most Holy Place, or whether they ignorantly worshipped Him as "the unknown God." If the Spirit of God employed the language of the Hebrews for the Old Testament, He employed that of the Greeks for the New. It is difficult to believe that a literature thus elegant, chiefly developed after the Old Testament was ended, which was well-nigh completed when the New Testament began, which furnished the language in which the words and works of the Saviour and His apostles have their permanent record, had no more meaning in the scheme of divine providence than is usually ascribed to it, and was no step forward in preparing the world to receive its Redeemer.

Among the Hebrews an illustrious line of kings pointed steadily forwards to the crown and sceptre of a Divine King. A gorgeous succession of high priests indicated the coming of a High Priest of nobler nature. A sublime series of prophets gave assurance, both as types and by express prophecies, that the prophetic mantle was to fall on a Divine Prophet in the latter day. Among pagan nations, other than the Greeks, the blood of sacrifices was per-

petually flowing on their altars, as an involuntary prophecy of the Redeemer. Did Plato and Aristotle, Sophocles and Euripides, Pericles and Demosthenes, mean nothing in the world's great chant of prophecy and of preparation, during that four hundred years?

The operations of rural life were so ordered as to be mirrors, ready for the great Teacher when he came, in which he showed the form and lineaments of the truths which accompany man's redemption. A sower goes forth to sow his seed, and as it falls into its various places, gives us a picture of the preaching and reception of the Gospel. A merchant-man seeks goodly pearls, and shows us how a wise man understands the worth of his own soul. By hiding a little leaven in three measures of meal, a woman exhibits a picture of the spread of the Gospel through society. Men go fishing in the Sea of Galilee, and draw a picture of the Church of Jesus Christ. An enemy sows tares in a ploughed field, and we are thereby shown the mixed state of things in this world, awaiting the fearful searching of the great judgment day. A shepherd followed by his flock, is an image of the Good Shepherd and his chosen people.

Not only were these common operations of life employed in the structure of parables for the illustration of religious truth. Almost precisely the same use is made, in the Scriptures, of the objects of nature around us. The sun is an image, in a certain sense, of Jesus Christ, on the pages of one of the prophets: "Unto you that fear my name, shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings." The rain, also, speaks Him forth, when it descends to refresh the ground: "He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass; as showers that water the earth." Before those whose hearts do not love Him, He shall "grow up as a tender plant, as a root out of a dry ground." To those who see some thing of His glory through His lowly guise, He is the rose of Sharon and the lily of the valleys.

The power of His Spirit in the regeneration of the hearts of men, is like the wind which "bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth."

As has been remarked by John Foster, there seems to have been established around us a great system of things of various descriptions, adumbrating to us the things which concern our salvation. Some have understood as applying to this parallelism of the world without and the world within us, that deep, dark saying of the wise man, in Ecclesiastes: "He hath made every thing beautiful in His time: also He hath set the world in their heart;" as if there were within a man's soul just such a reflexion of external things, as there is of the stars in the sky on a clear night in the surface of a tranquil lake. We do not understand that every fulfilled prophecy of the Old Testament must necessarily be quoted as such in the New Testament; that every thing that was really a type of Christ in the Old Testament had to be mentioned as a type in the New, before we would be justifiable in recognizing it as such; that every operation of human life which throws light on divine truth is introduced in the parables of our Saviour; or that every object of nature is mentioned in the Scriptures, which may properly be made an illustrative image of Christ, or of His grace. Nor do we believe that the Old Testament, the operations of common life, and the natural objects around us, are the only sources from which inspired truth may receive illustration. Ample room and verge is left for the pulpit, and for uninspired literature. We have hardly heard richer, more appropriate, or more effective illustrations in the pulpit than those drawn, if skilfully and pertinently drawn, from the classic mythology and history. We utter no hint against the delightful and instructive practice of illustrating Scripture by Scripture. We only plead for a wider range of thought, a field of illustration richer, because embracing that and some thing more be-

sides. And we feel that this is some good, at least, which the Greek and Roman culture have done to religion, in the providence of God.

Because some Deists have formerly, in the blindness of unbelief, turned away from the clear light of the Christian revelation, and attempted to construct for themselves a religion made out of the crudities and superstitions of the ancient philosophies, therefore, too often, Christian writers have adopted a strain of jealous depreciation in their reviews of the Greek philosophy; and have fallen into the temptation of treating Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Seneca, as if they were rivals of Jesus Christ, or of John, or of Paul. We do not think that this is to magnify the Redeemer and his apostles, but to degrade them in fact.

The mistake is simply a misconception of the reason why Divine Providence has put the ancient classics into our hands. It is only by regarding them as revelations of moral and religious truth, that they can be made, in any sense, rivals of the Scriptures. Such a pretension is set up for the Greek classics in these days, we should imagine, by extremely few thinking minds. On that ground we should have to make battle even with grand old Plato himself, but the victory would be extremely easy. Yet the result of such battle usually is, that the Christian combatant loses sight, by means of false issues, of the real object of the divine munificence in transmitting the classic authors from age to age—that is, the culture of the human mind in the forms of natural and beautiful thought.

Let us a little further explain what we mean.

A Christian apologist, of severe metaphysical temper, meets with a cold Deist, who asserts that “the Christian Fathers received their notions of the Trinity, not from the New Testament, but from Plato. The remedy is that easy one, to prove that the doctrine of the Trinity is taught in the New Testament; in the forms of baptism and benediction, for instance, and clearly enough otherwise, also; to

say, in fact, as one of the Christian Fathers said: "*Abi, Ariane, ad Jordanum, et vide Trinitatem!*"

But such apologist sits down thoroughly to search the magic pages of the poet-philosopher, not for those beautiful conceptions of nature with which they abound, but to prove that his tenets on morals and religion are not to be compared with those of our Lord, or those of the apostles Paul, or Peter, or John. He concludes his search, like Dr. Enoch Pond, by saying: "Such is the religion, the philosophy, the morality of Plato. And now who will venture to bring a system like this, contradicted at a thousand points by the decisions of reason, conscience, and truth, into comparison with the Christian Scriptures? Could Platonism endure such a comparison for a moment? And yet Plato was a learned man; and most of the writers of our Scriptures were illiterate men. Plato was a noble Greek, trained in the very focus of ancient wisdom; while the writers of our Scriptures were poor, despised Jews. How, then, did these Jews attain to their superior incomparable light and knowledge?"

Of course, by speaking and writing as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The triumph is easy and complete. But we feel as if it was not much more complete after this depreciation of Plato than before; and we feel doubtful whether Dr. Pond has done as much good by winning over again a battle so often fought and thoroughly won before, as he has done harm by trying Plato upon an erroneous issue. Not one man in ten thousand, we should suppose, searches the Greek Philosophers now-a-days for opinions to be embraced as religious doctrines, or sets their teachings, as sources of truth, into comparison with the clear certainty, the pure sanctity, the self-evidencing majesty of the Holy Scriptures. But how needlessly unjust to the Greek this Christian apologist permits the Deist to make him? Did not the Lord Jehovah raise up Plato in this world, and send him into life, for his own wise purposes,

just as much as He raised up Pharaoh, and Cyrus, and Darius? He had a purpose in the life of these kings. So He had in the life of Plato. But it certainly was not as revealer of correct views of morals, religion, or theology. One of His purposes may have been to show that unaided human wisdom can not attain correct opinions on those subjects. But we submit that in that point of view, it is not the proper logic to decry and depreciate Plato, but to extol him as the very acme and crown of the Greek culture. But Dr. Pond has weighed him in balances which were never intended for him, or he for them, and has only therefore found him wanting. For all that he has shown, Plato was, and was splendidly and gloriously, another quite different thing; inferior, indeed, but a good thing, and a beautiful thing, which the Lord Jehovah purposed that Plato should be. Why not depreciate Bonaparte, because he could not preach like Massillon? or Washington, because he produced no philosophical works equal to the *Novum Organum*? or Chalmers, because he could not have written *Hamlet* or *Paradise Lost*? It may be said that Plato *dealt* in discussions on moral, religious, and theological subjects. True. But no one who had so little light from revelation ever sighed for such light more earnestly than did he; as may be seen in the *Second Alcibiades*, where he pines for a heaven-descended teacher to dispel his doubts and darkness, till we almost think we hear the echo of the voice of Isaiah: "O that thou wouldst rend the heavens and come down." And, for all that we know, had he been on Areopagus when the great apostle to the Gentiles stood there to declare to Athenians the unknown God, whom they ignorantly worshipped, he might have enrolled his name with that of Dionysius the Areopagite, as a ready receiver of that heavenly revelation which he so coveted. Surely, Plato is no rival of the apostles, except in that blind and half-demented species of unbelief, which made the "Lord of Irony," Edward Gibbon, after sneering for a

life-time at the purest and most sacred truths, declare himself a Montanist! a believer in one of the most vulgar corruptions of the early centuries!

In the exordium of his sublime oration for the crown, the Athenian orator, Demosthenes, prays to all the gods and goddesses that the Athenian people may bear such good will to him in that fearful contest as he has ever borne to their city and to themselves. Plato, in his ideal republic, sets up the Fourierite doctrine, that wives shall be in common, that all children shall be the property of the State, and, of course, that no man shall know his own offspring. The Greek poems are all more or less imbued with their pagan religion. Probably one of the most consummately beautiful productions in existence is the first ode of the chorus, in the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, to the Delian Apollo. Now, when a Christian father, justly solicitous what reading falls into the hands of his gifted, imaginative, susceptible son of eighteen years of age, sees that son devote himself with almost a passion to the pages of Demosthenes, of Plato, and of Sophocles, does he fear that that son will imbibe from those pages the worship of the thirty thousand divinities of the Athenians, embraced in the appeal of Demosthenes, or the Fourierite doctrine taught by Plato, or the special adoration of the Delian Apollo, as the god of sooth-saying, so beautifully praised in Sophocles? When his son reads Homer and Virgil, does such a father fear that he will adopt the views of the unseen world given in the accounts of the descent of Ulysses and Eneas into Tartarus, and their visions of the miserable *dantes poenas* in those doleful regions? We never heard of one single instance of either description, among all the youths who have been engaged in the study of the classics among us.

What book takes a deeper hold upon a thoughtful mind advancing to manhood than Horace? How many passages of his calm, stoic philosophy we bear away from school with us! How the "*Tu ne quæsieris, scire nefas, quem*

mihi, quem tibi;" the "Persicos odi, puer, apparatus;" the "Equam memento rebus arduis;" the "Rectius vives, Licini, neque altum;" and the "Eheu! fugaces, Posthume, Posthume, labuntur anni," sing themselves through our minds in after years! But none of us, we venture to say, can mention a single instance among the companions of our years at school, of a youth converted to the creed of what Milton calls "the budge doctors of the stoic fur," by the perusal of the odes of Horace. And we can name many instances in which more of the life of the stoics would have brought them more within sound of the voice of the inspired apostles.

"But there is nothing of Christ in the writings of the Greeks and Romans. Augustine could not relish his before so much admired Cicero, because he could not find the name of Jesus in all his pages." Our hearts warm towards him who says this. We feel towards him like Cowper towards the man whom he saw singing a hymn very heartily in a church close by him: "Bless you for praising Him whom my soul loves." It would be an overwhelming argument, and would not leave another word to be said, if we brought forward the classics as books of doctrine, or of devotion, or of tenet of any kind, on any kindred subject which we expected or feared to imbibe. And in reference to books which the Christian fondles, and admits freely to intercourse with his inner emotions, it has a proper weight, and ought to be permitted to exert its influence.

Precisely the same objection, however, may be substantially raised against Shakspeare, Thomson, Byron, and Walter Scott. There is nothing like godliness, or true Christian spiritual life, in the works of either of them. Perhaps Thomson's Hymn to the Seasons might be uttered by a Christian heart; but one would wish to see some thing of Christ in it, before accepting it as Christianity. We verily believe that Sophocles and Euripides were every way as good men, and as near to the kingdom of heaven, as Lord

Byron and Sir Walter Scott. If Tyre and Sidon shall rise up in the judgment against the men of highly favored generations, because those heathen nations would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes, and have entered into the kingdom of heaven, if they had enjoyed such privileges, we see not why the Greek tragedians may not stand up in the judgment against the English misanthrope and scoffer, and the Scottish caricaturist of religion, and condemn them, on the same grounds of judgment. And we would a thousand times rather see a son, if gifted, imaginative, susceptible, and eighteen years old, devote himself to Sophocles and Euripides, than to Byron and Scott. And we solemnly believe that there is verily little more idolatry taught, and not half as much apt to be imbibed, from the pages of these two Greeks, as from those of these two Britons.

But the objection will lead us too far. There is nothing more of Christ in the lofty mountains, the clear lakes, the green meadows, the swift rivers, the mighty ocean, the gorgeous clouds, and the blue sky of heaven, than there is in the Greek classics; except as the eye of faith may see Him in them all, as the Author of all the works of God. We mean to say, with the author of the Epistle to the Romans, that it is only "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world" which "are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made, even His eternal power and Godhead." But of the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ, and of salvation through faith in His name, there is nothing revealed in the natural works of God. This life and immortality through our Saviour Jesus Christ, is that which is "brought to light in the Gospel."

The principle, therefore, which would lead us to deny our children the riches of the classic pages, would not only lead us to keep from them the writings of all unregenerate men in their own language, however splendid their genius or instructive their thoughts; but if we have fairly appre-

hended it, it would also commit Paley's *Natural Theology* and the *Bridgewater Treatises* to the Ephesian fires, as mere worthless implements of those who "use curious arts."

Nor is this all. If it is not allowable for our sons to read, in the pages of Plato and Sophocles, descriptions of Mount Hymettus, and of the plane-trees on the banks of the Ilissus, and of the twitter of the cicada, and of the calm discourse of the philosophers amid the beautiful scenery of Athenian summer, it is hard to see how it can be allowable for them to see our own mountains, to seek our own shade-trees, to listen at home to the chorus of the summer bird and bee and insect, or to live amid the beautiful air of our own summer scenery. So, then, the wonderful variety of hues and tints and shades of colors around us, in the mountains, and the fields, and the meadows, and the orchards, are made in vain. They are to be held as forbidden and ungodly luxuries. The splendid pictures which the sunbeams draw with colors of ray and shadow, and mild light, and deep shade, on the hills, in the valleys, in the morning, and in the evening; the countless different faces of the sky, in summer and in winter, in sunshine and in storm, in the fair day and in the starry night; all the sublimity of the ocean, in calm silence or amid the wild roar of the storm, are to go for nothing. We must teach our son to shut his eyes and stop his ears to these things, because they do not directly teach the story of redemption! Christianity is a more independent, a broader, a more benign, and a more fearless thing, by far, than this narrow principle would make it.

We believe we might safely venture the remark, that the religion of few generations of men any where has been injured by their excessive perusal of the Greek classics. The only probable exception remembered to this remark, is to be found at Alexandria, in Egypt, during the time of the *New Academy*, under Ammonias Saccas and his succes-

sors. There arose there a hybrid mixture of Christianity and the monstrous oriental cosmogonies with the philosophical opinions of the later Platonists. But it is as unfair to call Proclus, and Plotinus, and Iamblichus, followers of Plato, as to call Carlstadt, and Bœhmen, and Münzer, followers of Martin Luther, or to consider Hymeneus and Philetus followers of the apostle Paul.

There is said to have been a large and valuable collection of books, chiefly Greek and Roman writers, made by king Ptolemy Philadelphus in Egypt, which might have been of incalculable value had it been preserved. It was, however, burned. The pretext for this stupid act of vandalism is reported to have been, that if what was in those books was in the Koran, then they were useless; and if what was in them was not in the Koran, then they were false. There were, at one time, Christian men in this country who indulged, even in the pulpit, in wishes that all the books in the world, except the Bible, were burned. They indulged freely, and apparently with the full approbation of their hearers generally, in flings and sneers at the ungodly pride of those "who had rubbed their backs against college walls," in the peculiar phraseology of that day. For a while they exerted a powerful influence. There was a great show of godliness about these utterances. They actually generated a pride of ignorance, far more thick-skinned and incorrigible than the pride of learning, against which they spent their thunderbolts. "They read nothing but the word of God, not they." (Some of them that with difficulty.) "They knew nothing but the word of God. They did not want to know any thing. They did not believe in book-learning to preach from. They believed in religion in the heart as the qualification of a preacher. And for their parts, when they preached, they went into the pulpit and opened their mouths, and God filled them." (Nonsense and all!)

Who could argue against such great devotion to the word of God? Who could maintain that a preacher ought not, above all things, to be devotedly and experimentally a pious man? It was all in vain to plead for piety *with* education. That was a contradiction in terms, in their logic. There may be some of this leaven still lingering among us. Probably not a great deal, avowedly. Increasing light has made it rather an object of amusement than of serious combat. These were, in all probability, conscientious men, who may have honestly thought they were doing God service. It was an error which had to die by the logic of events. Probably a good deal of a similar feeling, not so gross, lingers, unperceived by its possessors, in many minds. With all its outward appearance of peculiar zeal for the word of God, it was a thoroughly false position. Intelligent men dropped off from church. The minds of those who did attend were sadly uninstructed in both the doctrines and duties of religion. And the very infidelity to which it intended to place itself in direct and special antagonism, grew rank and thick around its path.

“The classics are very seldom referred to by the inspired writers.” True. But the only one of them whom we know to have been acquainted with classical literature, the apostle Paul, twice quotes the Greek poets; once in his sermon at Athens, “As certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also His offspring;” and once in his Epistle to Titus, “One of themselves, even a prophet (*vates*—poet) of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.” In both cases it is for his own support, and not in condemnation of the books, that he makes the quotation.

The great revival of classical learning in Europe at the commencement of the sixteenth century, just as the Reformation was about to break forth, is an act of Providence to be deeply pondered. The name of Desiderius Erasmus cuts a very poor figure in the history of those times, if we

think of him as to the voluntary influence which he exerted on the great religious struggle of the day. He appears to be a sort of centaur, of half-human and half-bestial form. He is half reformer, and can laugh heartily at the superstitious prayers of the ship-load of papists to their saints when they are expecting shipwreck. But he still adheres to the papists, it would seem, from a mere disinclination to move. He can by no means advance with Luther to the full light of a simply scriptural religion. But considered as an involuntary instrument of Divine Providence to introduce classic learning just at that time, as a means of education, and as a preparation for the inspired word, just as a faithful company of those that publish it were about to spring up, Erasmus played a most important part. We can give him but little honor in the matter, except that he had the good taste to love and to patronize elegant letters. But he had little intention of benefiting Luther or the Reformation thereby. Never was there a figure in the drama of providence who saw less himself what he was doing, or who acted more for an end which he neither intended, desired, nor perceived.

The rise of the classic learning in Europe at that time was a most important and valuable preparation for the bursting forth of the word of God, and the outpouring of His Spirit, at the Reformation. If we have judged correctly, the classics, in the hands of Melancthon, Calvin, Lady Jane Grey, and a host of other eminent classical scholars of that day, of whom these are specimens, served exactly the part which they were designed by Providence to serve in the plan of redemption, that is, as instruments of the culture of the mind, to bring it to a higher, and clearer, and nobler ground of thought, and so nearer to the Gospel of Christ.

We should by no means shrink from a comparison of those writers who are the most classical with those who are the least so, or who are little so, as to all good influences

on the human mind from their writings respectively. In the great seventeenth century, Howe, Owen, Bates, and Baxter, were the princes of the pulpit of the one party, as men were then divided in religious opinion; South, Taylor, Barrow, and Tillotson, were the princes of the pulpit of the other party. Baxter was too deeply awed and impressed by the visions of eternity to deal much in literary charms. Tillotson was too much bent upon soothing the tempers of men, and withal too much of a politician, to be a very profound classical scholar. But the other three, on each side, are astonishingly replete with the riches of the classics. They have been found in many a library and in many a hand, in this generation, solely on that account. "South tells the truth with the tongue of a viper," as Richard Cecil says of him. Owen is devoted to the establishment of doctrinal truth by patient and persevering study, by all holy labor, and the deepest personal experience. Taking the other two, on each side, as more appropriately the writers of that day for after ages, Howe and Bates, Barrow and Taylor, what a wealth of classic learning they have embalmed by binding it about the sweetest and purest Christianity! How their lofty genius, especially that of JOHN HOWE and of JEREMY TAYLOR, revelled with the Greek philosophers and poets! How they lead the kings of the west, as the star led those of the east, to lay the richest of their gifts at the feet of Jesus Christ! Their pure religion is no doubt the highest element of the life of their writings. But their classic wealth lends no unimportant aid to their immortality.

As to the poets of our language, it may be questioned whether, in general, those who are most purely religious are not, also, those who are most thoroughly classical—Spencer, Milton, Cowper. Some one has said that Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* is a bridge over the gulf which divides the ancient history from the modern. So Spencer's *Fairy Queen* is a bridge,

with festoons of the most beautiful and fragrant flowers hanging over the parapet all the way, between the ancient poetry and the modern, leaving no one long to doubt that the poet is a Christian, even when he most luxuriates in the antique and the mediæval romance.

The exhaustless classic wealth of Milton in the productions of his youth, *Comus*, *Lycidas*, *Arcades*, *L'Allegro*, and *Il Penseroso*, can have escaped no attentive reader. To do the proof justice by quotations, would be to cite nearly the whole of these poems. There is, however, a passage in the *Arcades*, probably not so hackneyed to the common eye, which may be cited for its peculiarly Platonic spirit. It is in the speech of the Genius of the Woods, where he is telling what his business is in this world :

“ But else, in deep of night, when drowsiness
Hath locked up mortal sense, then listen I
To the celestial sirens' harmony,
That sit upon the nine infolded spheres,
And sing to those that hold the vital shears,
And turn the adamantine spindle round,
On which the fate of gods and men is wound ;
Such sweet compulsion doth in music lie
To lull the daughters of necessity,
And keep unsteady nature to her law,
And the low world in measured motion draw
After the heavenly tune, which none can hear
Of human mould, with gross unpurgèd ear.”

If it be thought that he does not carry his classic spirit with him into the productions of his riper age, and into those places where he speaks more distinctly of the things of revealed religion, we shall give two proofs to the contrary, taken almost *ad aperturam libri*; and which might be indefinitely multiplied. The one is from the fourth book of *Paradise Lost*, where he is describing the Garden of Eden. He says :

“ Not that fair field
 Of Enna, where Proserpine, gathering flowers,
 Herself a fairer flower, by gloomy Dis
 Was gathered, which cost Ceres all that pain
 To seek her through the world; nor that sweet grove
 Of Daphne by Orontes, and the inspired
 Castalian Spring, might with this Paradise
 Of Eden strive; nor that Nyseian isle,
 Girt with the river Triton, where old Cham,
 Whom Gentiles Ammon call, and Lybian Jove,
 Hid Amalthea and her florid son,
 Young Bacchus, from his step-dame Rhea's eye.”

The other is from the *Paradise Regained*, when he is relating the setting of the Saviour on the pinnacle of the temple at Jerusalem by Satan, and the failure of that temptation :

“ But Satan, smitten with amazement, fell.
 As when Earth's son, Antæus, (to compare
 Small things with greatest) in Irassa strove
 With Jove's Alcides, and, oft foiled, still rose,
 Receiving from his mother Earth new strength,
 Fresh from his fall, and fiercer grapple joined;
 Throttled at length in air, expired and fell:
 So, after many a foil, the Tempter proud,
 Renewing fresh assaults amidst his pride,
 Fell whence he stood to see his victor fall:
 And as that Theban monster that proposed
 Her riddle, and him who solved it not, devoured;
 That once found out and solved, for grief and spite
 Cast herself headlong from the Ismenian steep:
 So, struck with dread and anguish, fell the fiend.”

Indeed, a pretty thorough classical reading is requisite to understand Milton's poetry. Admit that he says that

“ The Ionian Gods, of Javan's issue, held
 Gods, yet confessed later than heaven and earth,
 Their boasted parents,”

were the fallen angels, come up to this world to escape their prison-house, and to obtain, after a sort, that worship as gods to which their wicked ambition led them to aspire

in heaven ; admit that he puts into the mouth of Satan that splendid eulogy on the city of Athens, in the *Paradise Regained* :

“ Look once more, ere we leave this specular mount,
Westward, much nearer by south-west ; behold
Where on the Ægean shore a city stands,
Built nobly ; pure the air, and light the soil :
Athens, the eye of Greece, mother of arts ; ”

though the poet saw and admitted “ the trail of the serpent ” over all classic letters, as over every thing else here below, he put them to their proper and beautiful uses, to praise and to adore the higher truths of God. The classics are no doubt the productions of fallen human nature. Shall we reject them for that ? We might as well refuse to admire the spring bloom of the orchards, because there is a worm at the root of many a tree ; or the green forests in their thick robes of leaves, because in some rocky cliff beneath their shade a rattlesnake may lurk ; or the smooth enamel of the meadow, because in some spot the grass may cover a viper ; or the endless gorgeous glory of atmosphere and cloud, because there the quick cross-lightning is bred ; or the ocean in its solemn roar, because sometimes its shores are lined with shipwrecks.

For the bard of Olney, all his readers know how he refreshed his tried and holy soul by a translation of Homer, and of pieces from Horace, and even by renderings of the cricket-chirpings of Vincent Bourne.

The opposition of good men to the classics, has probably sprung from confounding two different species of education—the natural, or secular, and the religious education. These two species of education flow side by side, while they are both located in the family. It is necessary to teach a child to spell and read, in order to teach him properly “ the principles of our holy religion, as contained in the Scriptures and in the Catechisms.” But when they leave this first divinely constituted seat of education, the Chris-

tian household, then they part, and go to two other divinely constituted seats of education, but very different ones. The natural education goes into the hands of the State, or the civil authorities; or, which is about the same thing, into the hands of voluntary neighborhood associations of parents, united to sustain particular schools. The religious education of the child, when he ceases to be under family training, goes to the Church, with its Bible class and its pulpit.

It is the duty of natural education to teach our children all wholesome knowledge, such as will both discipline and inform their minds—the civil authorities being ever conceded to have their eye on those things chiefly which will train up good and enlightened citizens—the mathematics, the classics, the practical sciences, all arts of reasoning, and all philosophies of life, or of truth. It is the duty of religious education to teach our children whatsoever God, in His revealed word, has commanded us—no more, no less; or, to express it otherwise, she must teach the “principles of our holy religion, as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, of which the Catechisms are recommended as summaries.” The Church has no right to control natural education; or, if she has a right at all, it is just such a right as she would have to control the food which a man might give his children. She might arraign him for inhumanity and barbarity, if it could be proved that a parent under her authority gave his child a stone for bread, a serpent for a fish, or a scorpion for an egg. But it would be a gross act of immorality, such a one as she ought to punish in connexion with any other duty, which the Church would judge of in this case. It would not be a particular scheme of education, of which she assumed to judge. It was the obvious and radical mistake of the parochial school movement, to assume for the Church a control over natural education, except as she always has controlled it, by breathing a healing breath, and diffusing an enlightened atmosphere

around it. She has as much right to err by defect, and refuse to teach the Epistle to the Romans, as she has to err by excess, and teach mathematics, or sciences, or classics. The Church, it is believed, actually suffered by the parochial movement. She has ever had an indirect, and just, proper influence on natural education, as she has a deep interest in it. Much of this she lost by the appearance of a spirit of open sectarian defiance in that movement. She can never be indifferent to the cause itself. The more education, other things being equal, the more peerlessly comes the word of God before the minds of men. The wider the circle of motive, the greater the power of truth.

Christianity, as it seems to us, abstains, every where in her revealed oracles, from meddling with the sphere of natural education. She does not teach the sciences. She gives no system of rules for the secular training of children; she commands them to no special trades or avocations. The truth is, that she takes the whole thing for granted, as the business and the duty of men acting in secular relations. She takes it for granted that every Christian parent will give his child the very best natural education which his means will command, just as she takes it for granted that every good and wise parent will guard the pecuniary interests, or the sight and hearing, or the general bodily health of his child. She leaves the parent himself to be judge of the best means of each.

The providence of God was preparing a wondrous and precious gift for man during the four hundred voiceless years between the cessation of the voice of the prophet Malachi and the awaking of that of the Baptist in the wilderness. It was, in another sense, preparing the way of the Lord. It was producing the best means of natural education; the most valuable ally of the sciences which were to rise after many centuries. It was giving birth to Euclid of Megara and the mathematics. It was rearing the gorgeous edifice of the Greek Tragedy, in which that great

cross to the proud mind, the coexistence of divine predestination and human freedom, receives a stronger corroboration than almost any where else in the grand and stately march of events on their predestined way, upon the wheels of the freest human choice, the merest human contingencies, the most unconstrained of human actions. The beautiful mythology was forming in that four hundred years. The philosophers were dreaming dreams which, though they contained very little objective truth, would yet enrich the imaginations of men for ever. Statues and pictures came into existence, which elevated the spirit of man, and have given it ideas of perfect beauty of form in all subsequent ages.

We deny the Church the right to legislate directly on the subject of secular education. But, so far as she can speak to her people as citizens, she ought to let her voice be heard at this time, (or as soon as the dark war cloud may, in the good providence of God, roll away from us,) calling aloud for a deeper infusion of classical learning into the mind of the coming generations.

There was an education meeting held at Augusta, Georgia, one evening during the sessions of our General Assembly in that city last December, to discuss the subject of a higher education among our people. It was not a meeting of the Assembly at all, but of such friends of education as might and did willingly come together, chiefly composed of persons brought there by the sessions of that body. Nor was it a meeting held on the subject of the education of indigent students for the ministry. The plans of the meeting seemed to crystallize in the form of a University for the South, of a non-Episcopalian type, and to give a more thorough education than those now in existence. The adjourned meeting was not held, as appointed, at our General Assembly in May last past, for obvious reasons. We hope it will not be forgotten, when future opportunity shall offer.

The Presbyterian church can say, with far more truth, and with a far deeper meaning than the ambitious poet :

“I must run glittering in the sunshine or I am unblest.”

Learning must ever be her indispensable ally. She has never undervalued piety in the ministry. “The Bible, the Bible alone, the religion of Christians,” has ever been her maxim. She has maintained the importance of sound doctrine to a holy life, with a faithfulness quite as strenuous as has been shown by any of her loved and respected sister churches. But she has never slighted the classics. She never dreaded that her children would be wiled away from the great and dread Jehovah, and His loving, and dying, and glorified Son, and all the holy grandeurs of revealed truth, by the beautiful toy Jupiters, and Apollos, and Minervas, of the classic mythology. She has ever nurtured herself deeply and richly with the Grecian letters. We trust that she will continue to do so; that she will make her escape from all fanatical ideas on the subject of education. We trust she may revise several of her plans in this general connexion; so that when she presents herself to God for a renewed and richer baptism of the Holy Ghost, it may be that both then and thereafter she shall purpose and resolve a deeper possession of all valuable and all elegant human learning, with which to serve Him and to adorn His doctrine.

ARTICLE IV.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1862.

PLACE OF MEETING.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America convened in the city of Montgomery, Alabama, on the first day of May, 1862, in the elegant Presbyterian church of which the Rev. Dr. Petrie is the pastor. The regularly appointed place for the meeting of this Assembly was Memphis, Tennessee; but the presence of hostile armies, on the eve of battle, near that city, the difficulties and hazards necessarily existing to prevent its hospitable homes from being reached by the ordinary channels of travel, and the preoccupation of the minds of its citizens by the demands of their own private affairs or by the wants of the numerous sick soldiers thrown upon their sympathies, rendered it altogether inexpedient to attempt a meeting there. Accordingly, the Moderator of the last Assembly notified the Presbyteries of the propriety of a change of place, and requested them to appoint their Commissioners in view of a meeting at Montgomery. The Clerks were desired to issue their proclamation, directing the Assembly to meet in accordance with this change. There was a universal acquiescence in the wisdom of the alteration; and a precedent was thus, we presume, established for the future government of the officers of the Assembly when placed in similar circumstances.

ORGANIZATION.

The Rev. Dr. B. M. Palmer, the Moderator of the last Assembly, was unable to be present, greatly to the disappointment of the Commissioners and the citizens of Montgomery. He had reached Mobile, on his way to the Assem-

bly; but the startling intelligence of the fall of New Orleans overtook him there; and he felt it to be his duty to retrace his steps immediately, that he might place himself in the ranks of the defenders of his country at a point where the most effective blows might be directed against the invaders of his home. In his absence, the Rev. J. L. KIRKPATRICK, D. D., was unanimously chosen to preach the opening sermon, and to preside until the new organization should be effected. His admirable discourse, and his dignified presidency during the period required for the usual opening formalities, pointed him out as the fitting Moderator of the Assembly, to which honorable office he was accordingly elected, without the opposition of a second nomination. The Rev. T. L. MCBRYDE, D. D., was unanimously chosen Temporary Clerk.

It ought to be added, in connexion with this, that there was another absence deeply regretted: that of the Stated Clerk, the Rev. Dr. JOHN N. WADDEL, who was detained at home by the exigencies of the war. The Rev. E. T. BAIRD, D. D., was elected to act in his stead during the sessions of this Assembly.

THE ATTENDANCE, ETC.

As was to have been expected, the number of Commissioners in attendance was small. The occupancy of the line of the Mississippi river by the enemy, rendered it unadvisable for the Arkansas brethren to attempt to be present. There was but *one* delegate from Texas, who, a chaplain in the Army of the West, was providentially enabled to attend, on his way to join his regiment. There were but *two* from the Synod of Memphis: the seat of active war lying between their homes and Montgomery. From the Synod of Mississippi there were *three*; one of whom was the Secretary of Domestic Missions, who had made his escape from New Orleans a few days before the enemy took possession. The other Synods were well represented by ministerial Commis-

sioners; the blanks in the roll being chiefly in the column of ruling elders. In all there were thirty-one ministers and sixteen ruling elders, making an humble total of forty-seven: this being considerably less than half of the whole number who had been elected to attend. These faithful brethren, however, constituted a highly respectable representation of the Church, and entered upon the discharge of their duties with godly seriousness, and under a deep feeling of peculiar responsibility. The general determination was, to transact the business with prompt straightforwardness, and with a minimum amount of speech-making. There was also manifested a purpose to dispose only of the indispensable routine of subjects which necessarily occupied the docket, and to suffer the introduction of as little new matter as possible; leaving the greater matters of Church policy for future Assemblies, to be more numerously attended in more peaceful times. Such a proof of wisdom ought to entitle this body to a place in the succession under the qualification of the "*prudent*" Assembly.

COMMITTEES CONTINUED.

It will be seen, in the published Minutes, that several important committees, appointed at the Augusta Assembly, were continued. Such was the Committee on the Revision of the Form of Government and Book of Discipline; it having appeared that, owing to the disturbed condition of the country, and for other less potent causes, the chairman (Dr. Thornwell) had been unable to convene its scattered members at any time during the four months which intervened between the meetings of the two Assemblies. It is certainly to be hoped that this highly important committee will be enabled to meet at an early day, to fix upon such propositions of revisal as they may deem wisest, and publish the result of their labors for the benefit of the several Presbyteries, in which courts the whole subject ought to be discussed, not later than next spring. Thus may we be

able to secure final action, at no distant day, touching matters which are both vital and difficult of settling. We do not plead for *haste*, indeed, but for *promptitude*. And, doubtless, the distinguished chairman and all the members of this long-standing committee, will soon be in a situation to satisfy the expectations of the Church, by taking definite action on all the points of change at issue. Many of these points, we may remind our readers, have already been elaborately discussed, in the pages of this Review and elsewhere. But we need to have a fuller, or at least a more general, discussion of them all in our lower church judicatories, for the benefit of numbers of church officers, who have as yet paid but little attention to the subject.

The committee to prepare a pastoral letter on the "Religious Instruction of the Colored People" was also continued. It is to be regretted that there was a necessity for this. There are many powerful reasons why the action of this committee ought not to be long postponed. Now that the churches are generally awaking to a profound feeling of the importance of a trust committed anew to their fidelity by the separation of the slave States from the free; now that the providence of God is distinctly calling upon all our people to do their utmost in behalf of the spiritual improvement of millions of dependents in their own homes, who have been rudely cast off from the intelligent sympathies of all the world besides; now that it is to be demonstrated that the institution of slavery, as understood and cherished in the Southern Confederacy, is open to objection only on the ground of certain abuses, all of which can be softened or entirely removed by allowing Christianity to have full sway in its development and management: now, especially, it seems to us, should the minds of God's children in this country be authoritatively instructed with reference to duty in these important premises. We would, therefore, have been delighted to see the letter, which the aforementioned committee was directed to

prepare, placed at once before the Church and the world, that the mighty work whose prosecution it is intended to enforce, might be entered upon with all the light which Scripture and conscience, which considerations of patriotism, humanity, and necessity, can throw upon this prominent path of Christian enterprise. We are, however, aware of the difficulties that stood in the way of the committee, and which, during the last four distracting months, rendered the proper discharge of their duty almost impossible. We trust that the delay will prove a blessing in the end, by securing a more thorough investigation and a more complete presentation of the whole subject, on the part of the committee, which will now have abundant time to mature a historical paper upon a theme that may well burden the most gifted minds and tax the most ready pen. Besides, the timely publication of the eminently faithful and judicious address of the Rev. Dr. C. C. Jones, in our various religious newspapers, has contributed largely to fill up a gap which the report yet to be made will, we hope, completely remove.

Whilst speaking of the continuation of committees, it is germane to say a word with respect to those committees of the first Assembly which were directed to procure charters for the trustees of this body from certain of our State legislatures. It was hardly to be expected that the gentlemen charged with this duty would be able to make satisfactory reports touching a matter which is placed out of their control, in great part, by the necessary delays of legislation. But it would, doubtless, have been highly gratifying to the Assembly, if they had found it convenient to communicate *some* information on the subject. They might have reported, at least, what they found they could *not* do, and what they had reason to believe would be the final result of their applications for charters under the laws of the States respectively solicited. An informal note (privately directed) was, indeed, read to the Assembly, whose

brief contents stated simply the fact that the Legislature of Virginia had rejected the application to pass the bill adopted at Augusta. None of the reasons which governed this rejection were given. It was also incidentally communicated that the bill in question had been passed by the Legislature of Tennessee; but of this there was no reliable assurance. We do think that this neglect on the part of these committees, (although partially excusable in view of those circumstances of the country which drew off their attention as citizens to national affairs,) is to be lamented, we had almost said reprehended. It compelled the Assembly to take new action. Feeling the importance of the subject, it was deemed necessary to raise another committee, to whom was referred the entire matter, as stated in the following resolution :

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed, whose duty it shall be to secure all necessary information as to the forms of charters, and the conditions of securing them in the several States where they may be required, and report the same to the next General Assembly; and also that the committees appointed by the last Assembly be requested to report the result of their efforts to this committee.

Pending the passage of this resolution, a discussion arose, led by the Rev. Dr. Baird, (chairman of this new committee of five,) whose remarks showed great familiarity with the subject of charters, and who took occasion to characterize as absurd the bill which the last Assembly had prepared with so much care, and finished with the hand of so much legal learning. It would seem to be a pity that Dr. Baird had not been present at Augusta last December, to have added the light of his knowledge to that of Chancellor Johnstone, Judge Shepherd, and a galaxy of forensic stars besides. As it is, however, it is evident that this subject of charters will have to be discussed on the floor of the next Assembly; for the new committee will doubtless feel itself authorized to bring another form of bill, charged with important modifications of the present one. The vital point in the existing bill has reference to the attempt

therein made (we think successfully) to combine in one great corporate body the various agencies of the Church, so that there will be a strict unity in the practice, as well as the theory, of our ecclesiastical government. And if this central idea of the charter must be abandoned, according to the desires of some, other reforms will be necessarily made, which must seriously alter the character of our "Executive Committees," and lead to their being remodelled, somewhat according to the pattern of the old and offensive "Boards."

REPORTS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES.

A large portion of the time which the Assembly allowed itself for deliberation was occupied in listening to, discussing, and approving the reports on Foreign Missions and Domestic Missions: these being the only two reports which were presented from the Executive Committees. That on Publication was received by the Permanent Clerk in time to be embodied with the other valuable matter of the Appendix; and that on Education, although ready for the Assembly, was, by no fault of any one, never sent to that body. The respected Secretaries, the Rev. Dr. William Brown and the Rev. Dr. John H. Gray, were both prevented from attending the sessions at Montgomery, greatly to the regret of all concerned. The Assembly enjoyed, however, the presence of the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson, Secretary of Foreign Missions, and of the Rev. Dr. John Leyburn, Secretary of Domestic Missions, the former in his official character only, the latter as a member as well. The reports which these two brethren presented richly deserved the close attention given to them by the Assembly, and will far more than repay a careful perusal on the part of members of the Church. It is unfortunate, speaking from a worldly point of view, that our Foreign Missionary field has been shut off from the Committee by the enemy who is ravaging the banks of the Mississippi. But

it may turn out for the best. Meanwhile, the Committee is resolved to strain every effort to fulfil the Church's mission in the promising field so lately flourishing with all the evidences of Divine favor. The Missionaries among the Indians are not likely to suffer, if human energy, directed by the grace of God, can prevent it. They are already supplied for several months to come. As to Domestic Missions, the Executive Committee appointed by the Assembly is quite broken up by the fall of New Orleans into the hands of our wicked foe; the Secretary is a refugee in Athens, Georgia; and his *ad interim* advisers consist of the brethren in the ministry and in the eldership immediately about him. Dr. Leyburn is not the man to suffer this great cause to languish, if industry, zeal, and experience, can prevent.

OTHER DOCUMENTS OF THE ASSEMBLY.

A capital review of the state of the Church is to be found in the Narrative, prepared with remarkable care by the Rev. Mr. Girardeau, of Charleston. The Assembly wisely ordered it to be read to the churches from our various pulpits. Both the Narrative of last year, written by the venerable Dr. Leland, and that of this, are fair specimens of what such public papers ought to be: well worded, chaste, fervent, instructive, discriminating.

The reports of the different Standing Committees present nothing requiring special remark. That on Systematic Benevolence, written by the Rev. A. A. Porter, of Columbia, is deserving of attention, as presenting a condensed view of a subject whose importance can not be overrated, lying, as it does, at the foundation of all our benevolent enterprises.

The letter of Dr. Leyburn, written by him as chairman of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, addressed to the President of the Confederate States, contains a straightforward, manly plea in defence of the Sabbath against the

incursions of godless army regulations. It will not do much good, however; inasmuch as statesmen, even the wisest of them, have yet to learn that to govern a country successfully requires obedience on the part of the governing powers themselves to the plain laws of Heaven. They act as if politics were wholly independent of, if not wholly above, religion. History is full of this error, especially as it relates to *Christian* countries; for the heathen have always maintained a controlling regard for the commands of their gods in all their laws and institutions.

A highly interesting "Pastoral Letter" was prepared by the Rev. Dr. Baird, chairman of a special committee, appointed for this purpose. It is addressed "To the Ministers and Members of our Churches, and Young Men of our Congregations, in the Confederate Army." It was ordered to be printed in the Appendix to the Minutes, and to be published in tract form by the Executive Committee of Publication. It must be useful; although we think that its utility would have been enhanced if the author had submitted it to a greater pressure of condensation. We hope that the Lord will bless it to those for whom it is intended!

We are pleased to see that the Assembly did not think that it went out of its way in recommending the Bible Society of the Confederate States to "the favor and patronage of our churches and people." This Society, located in Augusta, Georgia, is now energetically engaged in publishing, from stereotype plates, a large edition of the New Testament, and of the New Testament and Psalms, specially adapted to the use of soldiers. It can not want for patronage, for it is eminently deserving of it. As soon as the blockade shall have been removed, it will import largely from England such editions of the Bible and Testament as will fully meet the wants of all classes of our population.

The Assembly adjourned after a session of only four days. It did its work well, and left undone much that it felt itself unauthorized to attempt.

ARTICLE V.

HYMN-BOOK MAKING.

The determination of our first General Assembly to revise the Hymn-Book has called out a vast amount of writing on the subject. A great many good things have been said, of course; much talk on the part of a sensible people on any point necessarily includes a certain proportion of good sense. But so much of incongruity and opposition has appeared, as to show that no settled principles of reason or of taste have prevailed among us; and to show the need of some investigation for their discovery. Some thing will be accomplished by this article, if only the thought and purpose to determine these ruling principles be introduced into the mind of the Church. For we will never doubt that that mind, tuned as it is to spiritual melody, and enlightened from on high, can rise to the height of worthy praise, and worship God acceptably, not only in the spirit, but also in the manner of the worship.

Two principal questions suggest themselves, which being clearly answered, all other problems are either solved by implication, or concern the mechanism of the work. They are: the proper subjects of hymns; and the necessary requisites of good hymns. For if we can decide of what things they should treat, and in what manner they should treat of them, the work of selection will proceed easily under those two great lights.

The first question, which relates to the proper subjects of hymns, can best be approached by asking another: What part of their worship can Christians sing? This brings us at once to inquire of the spirit of lyrical composition, in which general division hymns occur as a class.

What does the world sing? Rather, of what does it not sing? Singing is the purling of the stream of life, whether

a rill leaps swiftly and starrily from the mountain, "making sweet music with th' enamelled stones," or the abounding river whispers kindly to the reeds, or thunders with many voices in the cataract. Every thought that has a thrill of emotional life in it; every feeling that mere words will not suffice for, which, spoken, leaves the heart still burdened with its sweetness or its woe, demands a voice in poetry and a hearing in song. We are not concerned with the mere lyrical shape of the poetry, but with the instinct that demands such shape as to be sung. And, discarding every other part of the subject, we look to see what men have loved to sing.

1. (a.) Addresses to loved ones, maidens wooed or won, parents, children, and friends.

(b.) Utterances of feeling concerning them; delight or lamentation, praise or dirge, exulting and complaint, all find a voice.

2. (a.) Addresses by *prosopopœia* to nature or country, to mountains, to the daisy, to the sea, to native land, or ocean isles.

(b.) Songs out of our own hearts about them, patriotic and other.

3. Historic lyrics; due to wars, victories, public disasters, or deliverances.

4. Songs born of society, or social relations and phenomena; farewells, good-nights, student glees.

5. Heart songs; one's own inner hopes, and joys, and fears, poured forth as King David begins his forty-fifth Psalm: "My heart bubbles up (like a spring) with pleasant song."

Putting aside as irrelevant so much of lyrics as is satirical or comic, we have the varieties of song before us. And what a precious and delightful thing it is, that while there is a world of thought to be uttered in words, and a world of feeling, which can not be spoken, God should give us this border land of song, beyond mere words, but

rich in voice. "Music married to immortal verse," is the consummation of human speech: the tenderest voice of love, the noblest balm of inward sorrow. The best outlet of the heart surcharged with joy in nature, or with patriotic fervors, or with victory, or with worship, is in song.

Such being the range of lyrics, and such the instinct of man's heart about song, the question next to be considered is: What limits, within this range, are imposed on our worship in hymns? It is self-evidently desirable that such variety as is not inconsistent with its nature, or with the high proprieties of religious life, should be sought; not only to avoid monotony, and consequent weariness, but because, the subjects being inexhaustible in depth, range, and beauty, and the attitude and temper of man's heart varying continually, there is a freshness, and richness, and power of Christian song, not attained, but to be approached, and climbed at, and soared for, with ever new delight and benefit. Indeed here, as in every other lofty department of human life, this is a distinct and signal part of the blessing; the perennial, spontaneous, self-rewarding endeavor after results worthy of God.

No limitations are to be taken for granted, therefore. No hasty assumption that the object of psalmody is this or that, can be permitted to narrow its field of utterance. We must look for boundaries to the standing instinctive judgments of the Church, or to the monumental example of Scripture—the Book of Psalms.

In treating of the instinctive decisions of the Church, we have two or three witnesses to bring forward. First of all, if we could discover them, would stand the precedents of the apostolic period. The dewy morning of the Christian day had its own matins, before science or fashion tuned the lay. Whatever we could find of that time, that opening worship of the *Æonian Sabbath*, would at least show us, beyond controversy, what must not be excluded; while it could not forbid that which was justified or suf-

ficiently endorsed elsewhere. Now, while it behooves us not to speak too confidently where we have not proof, there is a probability, more and more widely admitted by commentators, that certain quotations of the apostle Paul, introduced by the words, "Faithful is the saying," are taken from favorite hymns of the churches in his day.

However sceptical any reader may be on this point, certainly the possibility of their having such an origin must awaken the tenderest interest, and will justify a moment's pause upon them. And it is worthy of remark, that they all occur in the pastoral epistles. Addressed to intimate friends, where his heart had full play of personal affections, they show what was his manner of speech and thought in his least guarded moments. In them we seem to get a glimpse of what Paul's style of conversation was, fulfilling his own motto, *ἐν τοῦτοις ἰσθί*, pithy, full of counsel and apothegm, and relieved of all hardness by affectionate phrase, burning doxology, and snatches of unformed but sacred song. A most tempting theme verily; but we must not digress.

The first of these quotations is found in 1 Tim. 1 : 15 : "Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptance; 'Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.'" How happily it fits the reference he is making to his own case; how vividly it brings him before us, joining in the simple but profound ascriptions to Christ of his chosen work, and thrilling with the feeling that he, above all men, should bear witness to Him!

The next occurs in chapter 3 : 1 : "Faithful is the saying, 'If a man seeks the office of a bishop, he desires a good work.'" To us, perhaps, a bald truism, though it should not be, even now. But then, to be a bishop was to be first on Nero's list, or Pliny's, (and it made very little difference whether it were a Nero or a Pliny,) first in toils, and dangers, and contempts, and death, without earthly reward.

Plain as it is, then, there is a touch of heroism there, not unworthy of apostolic song.

The closing verse of the same chapter, though not introduced by the same formula, is thought to be of the same class: "Great is the mystery! 'God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.'" What a mass of wrought gold! Nothing formal or creed-like about it, but the whole story of a Divine Redeemer's love and power, pressed into five syllables, and chanted (perhaps in the close of their sacramental worship) by those to whom He was all.

The next chapter, 4 : 9, returns to the formula: "Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptance; 'For to this end we endure labor and reproach, because we have set our hope on the living God, who is the Saviour of all mankind, specially of the faithful.'" Very pleasant is it to mark this freshness of a true heart, this self-devotion, this reinforcing of each other's fortitude amid scorns and persecutions, in the first Christian hymns. We seem to breathe the same air with martyrs and confessors while we ponder these words.

The single quotation in Titus, 3 : 8, brings up Pliny's letter at once. "Faithful is the saying, 'Let them that have believed in God be careful to practise good works.'" These might be the very words with which their covenant began, whereby they "bound themselves, not to the commission of crimes, but to refrain from theft, from adultery; to be faithful in performing their promises, to withhold from none the property intrusted to their keeping."

One more example remains, viz: 2 Tim. 2: 11-13; perhaps the most touching and beautiful of them all. "Faithful is the saying, 'For if we have died with Him, we shall also live with Him; if we suffer, we shall also reign with Him; if we deny Him, He will also deny us; if we be faithless, yet He abideth faithful; He can not deny Him-

self.'” This may not be poetry, in strictness of speech ; neither is

“Scots wha hae wi' Wallace bled :”

but it is certainly lyrical in a very high degree. It is difficult even now to read it, without a stirred heart and moistened eye ; but think of the fierce days, the ranks of believers broken, perhaps even since the last Sabbath, by some sudden onslaught of persecution ; the plain raiment and homely faces of poverty at Philippi or Thessalonica sublimed by sorrow bravely borne, or transfigured by the vivid purpose to suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together : and its pathos and simple eloquence, stand first, perhaps, among all the hymns of the Christian ages.

If, now, we review them, to note their subjects, we find the first and third to be songs of praise—the latter, praise in rather a didactic form ; the second contains, possibly, a trace of ecclesiastical psalmody—certainly a word of honor to the chosen chief of the Church ; the fourth, an utterance of patient faith ; and the remaining two challenge to virtue, and hope, and joy.

We turn next, for a moment, to the actual selections of the Church through later ages—the hymns that successive generations of believers, untrammelled by authority, have loved and sung. And perhaps the very first that would occur, which are not versions of the Psalms, are two of Luther's, “A strong mountain is our God,” which is praise and heroic faith ; and, “In robes of judgment, lo ! He comes !” lofty description and exhortation. And if, without further delay, we call up that noble choir of the time of Wesley and the following generations, and run over in our thoughts those of their hymns that every body knows, we shall find three great classes : Worship, Contemplation, and Self-Utterance. But the great body of those hymns which directly address the Deity are borrowed, more or less directly, from the Book of Psalms. A few would be found, even in these days, which address the sinner or the

saint; but their number then, as compared with those of the classes named, would bear a very small proportion to their number now, under the same comparison. The bulk of popular new hymns now, is divided between contemplation and addresses to the two great and final divisions of mankind—those who are Christ's, and those who are not.

Nor is this appeal to the instinct of the Church, or rather to her affections, a trivial and unworthy appeal. Sacred song, as we have acknowledged, is the outlet of sacred feeling. We, who believe in the indwelling of the Spirit, believe that the Church, as a whole, is ordered in heart and temper from on high. The emotions that swell within her bosom, and seek expression in her voice, are due to those tender and sublime objects of thought which are represented by the word of God and a God-given experience. And it will not do to say that these words, whatever their form may be, in which her heavenly hopes and joys, her challenges to living triumphs or more glorious deaths, her pledges of eternal loyalty, have spoken all her heart, are ill chosen, unworthy, untrue. The hymn the Church loves must be sung, whatever a finical taste or languid criticism may think of it.

But we revert, for a moment, to the Book of Psalms—God's own exemplar of Christian song. In a rapid, and not very accurate manner, which is all our particular purpose demands, we classify them as follows:

I. Addresses of Praise,	about 18
II. Other forms of Praise,	32
III. Christian Experience,	21
IV. Christian Meditation,	19
V. Prophetic Psalms,*	9
VI. Patriotic Psalms,	19
VII. Prayers Proper,	32

* It is by no means intended to limit the prophetic element to these nine or ten of the Psalms; but as we are concerned with their relations to worship, we have merged them, as far as possible without violence, in the

This survey has doubtless sufficiently illustrated the breadth of theme that must be permitted to a book of pious song. Nor can it be right (let us say in passing) to draw any very rigorous distinction between hymns for public and for private use. There is no real difference between the worship we offer as individuals and as a congregation; and while hymns may often, and properly, take cognizance of the fact that the people are "met together in Christ's name," it is not indispensable that they should do so. Could five, out of all the readers of this Review, be persuaded to omit "Rock of Ages" from our book, because it runs

"Rock of Ages cleft for me"?

The results of this cursory survey abundantly annul the canon, which has some how found footing, that all hymns should be praise. A proposition upon its very face impossible to be received; and yet, how many eminent men invariably introduce their reading of a hymn by the formula: "Let us sing to the praise of God," whether it be the one hundredth Psalm, or

"Oh, for a glance of heavenly day!"

How many arguments and disquisitions about psalmody rest their whole weight on the assumption that singing is praise! How many solemn appeals to choirs and to lovers of sacred music are vitiated by the same fallacy! No hymn-book can be limited to hymns of praise, or bound to any narrower range of themes than the emotions of the Christian life. This, we think, we have clearly proved.

other classes. That is to say, just fifty Psalms, or one-third of the whole book, consist of addresses to God, (I. and VII.) About forty speak mainly of God and His attributes, and wondrous deeds, done or to come, (II. and V.) Forty more utter the devout emotions and inward experience of a Christian heart, (III. and IV.) And the remainder are love, and glory, and grief about Israel, (VI.)

And in proving that, we have also settled the question whether a small collection would answer the purposes of the Church. If David, pouring the worship of ancient Israel into song, needed more than a hundred Psalms wherein to express it, when the feelings and circumstances of the Church were simplicity itself, compared with the present age, and if prophets and holy men were inspired to add to the number, down to the very close of the ancient canon, is it likely that fifty or a hundred hymns will content the people now? And where are all our objections to the meagreness of a liturgy, if the hymns that can be printed on a dozen pages will suffice for our singing? If there were any part of worship which would bear those narrow limitations, it would surely be the public prayers, whose round of proper subjects is so small, and whose treatment so circumscribed by the necessities of the ordinance itself. But, as even here liturgies breed leanness, *a fortiori* are narrow limits inadmissible in psalmody, which is prayer, and praise, and meditation, and longing, and a thousand other throbs of the true heart, and melodies of the loving voice.

Perhaps it will be as easy to dispose of the much-mooted matter of doctrinal hymns at this point as at any other. It is said, and truly said, that the didactic and lyrical elements are so opposite to each other, that virtually they are destructive of each other; that to state, and much more, to argue, a theological proposition, makes the so-called hymn in which it is done, a solecism and an absurdity. This can not be denied, and it certainly rules out a number of "hymns" that have been foisted into our present collection for no other discoverable reason than that they are rhymed digests of Calvinism. We confess we never meet them without a two-fold indignation; first, at the discredit to the hymn-book and to the Church which endorses and publishes it; and still more at the imputation on Calvinism, that it needs any such setting forth, needs to

be exhibited in any such pills of doggerel to be taken by the Church.

Such is hymn one hundred and twenty-two—a summary of doctrine, (save the mark!)

“ Election! ’tis a word divine:
For, Lord, I plainly see,
Had not Thy choice prevented mine,
I ne’er had chosen Thee.”

“ For perseverance, strength I’ve none.”

“ O may Thy glorious merit be
By imputation mine.”

“ Free grace alone can wipe the tears
From my lamenting eyes.”

See, also, hymn forty-four:

“ Backward, with humble shame, we look
On our original;
How is our nature dashed and broke
In our first father’s fall!”

Others there are, but these are surely enough to show the futility of attempts in that kind. How odd a blindness it is, which can not see that doctrine is only truth in stiff, professorial raiment: that the hymn,

“ There is a fountain filled with blood,”

has the doctrine of justification by faith as clearly and justly in it as any dogmatic treatise; and has it alive, while the treatise probably has it dead: that Wesley’s noble translation,

“ Jesus, Thy blood and righteousness
My beauty are, my glorious dress,”

commends the doctrine of imputation more mightily than he ever impugned it: that Charles Wesley was glorying in the saint’s perseverance when he wrote,

“ How happy every child of grace
Who knows his sins forgiven!”

than which there is hardly a better hymn to be found!

Every hymn is the utterance of a truth ; but truth as held and cherished by the heart. Any attempt to present it otherwise in a hymn, spoils the hymn, and puts a bad flavor on the truth besides.

Under the second chief division of our subject there is little to be done, except to examine the tests which have been applied with intent to banish certain well-loved hymns from our book, because of alleged faults. One or two general remarks may save delay and digression farther on.

In the first place, then, we concede that mere popularity in past days is not a perfect criterion, because the public taste does change ; on the whole, it is becoming refined. But prudery is not refinement.

Secondly, we maintain that the last polish of fastidious scholarship does not furnish a proper criterion ; because judgment can not be committed to it without both restraining the liberty and forfeiting the sympathy of Christ's Church. A single illustration will settle that point. Suppose the admirable hymn,

“ Jesus, lover of my soul,”

to which public exception has lately been taken—suppose that hymn, and all that equally offend the same taste, were stricken from our book ; who does not know that all our churches, and nine-tenths of our ministers, would feel the loss severely—would feel that one of the most comforting and delightful elements of sacred song was snatched from them, *on a punctilio* ? In the next paragraph we must argue the question now touched upon ; now we are only concerned with the maxim, that the taste of the church must be paramount, and not that of the most exquisite critics.

Taking these two principles with us, we advance now to the dogma, that hymns must not be *erotic*. The word itself is equivocal ; but the meaning of it in this connexion

doubtless is, that such language ought not to be used as is restricted to romantic attachments in its ordinary employment. A moment's thought will satisfy us that, stated in this general way, the canon can not be maintained. Otherwise, David must not say, "O God, thou art my God;" because we employ a like phrase of possession about our elect ones, whoever they may be: neither can the language be endured, "In Thy presence is fulness of joy; at Thy right hand there are pleasures for ever more." The forty-fifth Psalm, the Song of Solomon, some noblest and most precious passages of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, yea, of all the prophets, parts of Paul's Epistles, and of Revelations, must all be rooted out.

Nor must it be forgotten that God himself has chosen this very relationship, on which to found promises and to inculcate duty. "I will betroth thee unto me for ever," "Prêpare as a bride adorned for her husband," "So shall the King greatly desire thy beauty." Such are some of His words. And it is a signal proof of the vital and victorious power of religious ideas, that they have redeemed such words from being merely amatory, and conferred upon them an intent as pure as it is lofty; so that it is rather the lover who quotes them from the Bible, than God who borrows them from man.

Only when a certain lusciousness of speech is indulged, which is rather sensual than amatory, does the charge of erotism become serious.

"Thou knowest I love Thee, dearest Lord,"

suggests nothing unworthy, though the language can not fail a little in reverence; but

"I'll speechless clasp Thee in my arms,"

and

"There He may caress thee,
And call thee His bride,"

are offensively amatory. Nor does the proof in either case lie in our assertion, but in the fact that the hymn first quoted retains its hold upon the Church, while the others have lost their hold, and are hardly ever sung.

As to the beautiful hymn so often mentioned above, we are not clear that it is erotic at all. The only expressions that give color to the charge, are "Lover of my soul," and "Let me to *Thy bosom* fly." But was Mason "erotic," when he called Washington a lover of his country? Is it amatory to say that Newton was a lover of truth? The concluding words, "of my soul," evidently qualify the offending word, and convert it from an epithet into an affirmation, "Jesus, who dost love my soul." And as to the other word, followed as it is by the reference to storms and sorrows, it loses its amatory associations altogether, and remains only slightly objectionable, as unduly anthropomorphic. Here, again, our appeal is to the facts. Do we sing these words with sentimental languors, or with a strong sense of Christ's love and protection amid the waves of trouble?

Another instance of hypercriticism, in the same kind, is that upon the line,

"My God, my life, *my love*"!

He who, knowing that the Scripture saith "God is love," and that any thing may be called one's love, or passion, which absorbs his affections, is yet offended by that line, must certainly be of a very "erotic" turn of mind.

Another fault, which ought in almost every case to banish a hymn from use, is toying with a figure of speech, just as a pleasant play of fancy. The objection here, however, is not æsthetic, but moral. It is the evident lack of earnestness. Psalmody is the play of feeling, not of fancy.

Our failing space warns us not to dwell on this point, as other rules must be illustrated, or they will hardly be believed to need mention.

VOL. XV., NO. I.—10

The language of hymns must not be vulgar; as in that nauseous line,

“Let us in Thy bowels sound.”

Nor must the figure be far-fetched; as Watts' about the clouds,

“Those wand'ring cisterns in the sky”;

and the Methodist Hymn-Book,

“Now, O my Joshua, bring me in”;

and

“He shall prop your feeble knees.”

Nor, of course, can any thing so quaint as to become ridiculous be endured. Of this we find a signal example in “The Hymns of the Church Militant:”

“Through tribulations deep,
The way to glory is;
The stormy course I keep,
On these tempestuous seas;
By waves and winds I'm tossed and driven—
Freighted with grace, and bound for heaven.

“If a dead calm ensues,
And heaven no breezes give,
The oar of prayer I use,
And try, and toil, and strive.

* * * *

“But when a heavenly breeze
Springs up and fills my sail,
My vessel goes with ease
Before the pleasant gale;
And runs as much an hour, or more,
As in a month or two before”!

And again, in Newton's unhappy hymn :

“The kine, unguided, went
By the directest road,
When the Philistines homeward sent
The ark of Israel's God.

“Lowing they passed along,
And left their calves shut up;
They felt an instinct for their young,
But would not turn or stop”!

Even an ill-used word will spoil a hymn : as,

“ I *contemplate* it can't be long
Till He will come again.”

And St. Bernard's magnificent hymn on the City of God is blemished by the line,

“ *Conjubilant* with song.”

In a word, while literary finish is not the rule, yet violation of established taste is a fatal transgression. Hymns must be simple in language, clear and unforced in thought, born of a living heart, and of such rhythm that they can be sung without violence to the sense.

We come now, in the last place, to that vexed question; the version of Psalms. Shall we sing Watts? or shall it be Rouse? If not, what shall it be? We have left ourselves little more room than will announce our judgment, for which we can claim very little regard, unsupported by the reasons on which it is founded.

As to the first and fundamental question of liberty, we will not yield an inch; no, not to win a thousand churches. We had rather go off into the woods, and sing alone, than submit to any dictation here. In truth, this question never is touched without stirring a profound indignation among the people of God.

Next, as to any prescriptive right of David's Psalms to monopolize the singing of the Church; there is not one word of ordinance on the subject, nor any Scripture example of their being sung, which conveys the slightest sense of obligation, either as acknowledged then, or as holding now. Jehoshaphat did command the singers to sing,

“ Praise the Lord, for His mercy endureth for ever,”

which is probably intended to identify a psalm; but the circumstances were unique, and utterly unlike our congregational worship. And why should David, or the Psalms bound up with David's, we know not when, be enforced

upon us; and Isaiah, and Habakkuk, and the heavenly songs in Revelations, be ruled out? Why may we not sing,

“Worthy is the Lamb that was slain”?

But there is a gleam of light in the proposal to compile a new version; especially if it be coupled with the suggestion, not to separate it from the hymns proper, but to blend them together.

We freely concede both the defects and the demerits of Watts, though he be the best single paraphrast we have. His eighteenth psalm contains nothing so worthy as Sternhold and Hopkins’

“The Lord descended from above,
And bowed the heavens most high.”

And several of the noblest Psalms he has rendered with unpardonable feebleness. Take, for instance, the thunder-psalm, the twenty-ninth. The key is found in verse third:

“The God of glory thundereth.”

From the abrupt contrasts of mountain and valley, the larger proportion of water to the land, and the more varied weather, it seems probable, though we can not find it so stated in the books, that electrical phenomena are on a grander scale in northern than in southern Palestine; where, in truth, thunder and lightning are almost entirely confined to the winter months. Now, if we suppose David to have visited Carmel during the latter part of the summer, (and he may well have done so on military or other royal errand, after the harvests of the spring were gathered,) and imagine the sullen sweep of sulphurous clouds, spreading their shadow silently over the breathless sea; white masses rolled up, throne-like, above the gloomy crypts, the cloud-caverns, where fierce thunders already rumble; the mighty pile seeming to grow without voice, or hand, or breath of wind, out of the black deep into the very zenith; the sudden lightning, struck out, as it were, by a

blow of the mace of Power; the instant, crashing roar behind it, leaping out across the unclouded blue, while Lebanon and Hermon (which is Sirion) start on their lofty seats, and break the very cedars by the shock; making the great sea cower in its bed; and running southward across Samaria and the Holy City, until far-off Kadesh trembles with awe: if, we say, David be imagined to behold and hear all this from Carmel, we can almost *feel* the tremors of delight and worship with which he whispered softly,

“The God of glory thundereth!”

and the sublime faith that turns the very thunder into the sweet music of promise,

“Jehovah will give strength unto His people!
Jehovah will bless His people with peace!”

And what of all this glorious picture has Watts given us? We really have not the heart to quote it; it is too pitiful beside the Psalm he should have rendered into verse.

It is, therefore, not only permissible, but has become necessary, that Watts' worse paraphrases should be stricken out, and that the whole world of Christian poesy be put under contribution, that at least an endurable version of the Book of Psalms be made out. And if no good account of any particular Psalm can be given, (as we believe is the case with this twenty-ninth,) *let it be left blank until its requisitions are met.* There could be no higher tribute to its power and beauty.

We have thus run, most slightly and unsatisfactorily, we confess, over the principal points to which we desire the minds of our best men to address themselves. There can be no exaggeration of the importance of the subject. Our children's worship, and thus their hearts and minds, are to be formed on the Hymn-Book, perhaps more, even, than on the Bible. Nor can we deny the multitude of good hymns now wanting in our present book, nor the many poor ones inserted there.

If we could embody every genuine and worthy Christian feeling in a song, whether the feeling spring from a view of precious truth, from God's gracious providence, or our inward life; if in language simple, fresh, clear, poetic, our congregations could utter all their heart, or warm the sluggish devotions of their worldliness into fervors and joy; if the venerable worship of the Bible-Church, pouring its streams through many ages, could flow, widening and deepening, in majestic music into the volume of our psalmody; then, indeed, our Hymn-Book would be made.

It is our duty to approach the excellence we can not attain.

ARTICLE VI.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF ABBEVILLE DISTRICT, S. C.

As early as 1765, a petition was sent up from the "Long Canes," in Upper Carolina, to the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, for ministerial aid. This section had been for about ten years filling up with descendants of the Scotch-Irish from North Carolina and Virginia, forming the "Calhoun Settlements;" so named from the distinguished civilian, Patrick Calhoun, Esq., who led the emigration, and who formed the nucleus of a very extensive family connexion, occupying, by this time, in its varied yet closely-interwoven branches, nearly all that region of country on the waters of Little River, afterwards known as the "Flat-Woods" of Abbeville.

The constant liability to Indian depredations, and the reckless habits engendered by border life, had rendered

impracticable the regular administration of the ordinances of religion, even if such had been obtainable. Indeed, so precarious had been the foothold of the first settlers, as to render them little else than sojourners on the fruitful soil they had determined to occupy. With the hardihood natural to their race, they had ventured upon the very hunting-grounds of the Indians; and dearly had they paid the forfeit of this temerity. From their primitive cabins, nothing but the wild beast and the savage roamed over these lonely streams and vales, which stretched away beyond the Unacaya mountains, to the Blue Ridge. Meditating a bitter revenge, the Cherokees made a descent, in 1761, upon the feeble colony; and, coming upon them in their attempted flight to the nearest point, Augusta, Georgia, they massacred between fifteen and twenty men, women, and children, and carried into captivity two little girls, daughters of Mr. William Calhoun, brother of Patrick. The elder of these was, after some years, rescued; the other was never heard of. The scene of the melancholy catastrophe is on a descent, just before reaching Patterson's Bridge. Attacked at the moment when they had stopped to make an encampment, and entangled by their wagons, they could make but little resistance. Some, however, were so fortunate as to make their escape. Cutting loose the horses, and favored by the night, they fled to the Waxhaws, with another portion of the company, which was in advance. Among the slain was the mother of the family, Mrs. Catharine Calhoun; and a curious stone, engraved by a native artist, marks the spot where she fell amidst her children and neighbors.

The severe measures of Grant, who in this year, with a Provincial regiment under Col. Middleton, advanced upon and devastated the Indian settlements, compelled the savages to maintain a show of peace for some years; and before 1765 the fugitives had all repossessed the homes they had abandoned. This state of security did not long

continue. The good faith of the Indians did not exclude predatory incursions, which kept the settlers in continual alarm; but though these were detrimental to peace and property, we do not learn that any others were sacrificed to the tomahawk.

In 1764, the colony was strengthened on its southern border by the arrival of the French Protestants, who had received a grant of land from the King of England, included in Hillsborough township, ten miles square, near the confluence of the Savannah and Little Rivers. In 1765, the fear of Indian invasion had extended to the French; and in addition to the forts already built, they constructed, for their own protection, one in New Bordeaux, and another in New Rochelle, a settlement on the eastern side of the river.

In addition to these, the intervening tract of country shortly received a number of accessions from Scotland, as the names still remaining testify; which, with the lawless and rude characters that naturally seek frontier life, made up at this time a pretty various and extensive population. No wonder that those religiously trained should begin to lament the absence of the sanctifying influences of a preached Gospel.

The neighborhood of the pious French could avail them nothing, except the hallowing influence of a holy and quiet example. Whilst the leader of the Scotch-Irish colony was hospitably extending to the indigent and expatriated Huguenots the friendly hand of civil laws, their ordinances and sacred rites, though hermetically sealed to him, under the exclusiveness of their foreign tongue, must have affectingly reminded him of that worship for which *his* fathers had sacrificed so much.

We may not suppose that, coming from under the teachings of such men as McKemie, Robinson, and others, these people could willingly suffer such a state of reckless indifference and forgetfulness of God to be impressed upon the

rising generation. Accordingly, again and again, a deputation was sent up to urge their necessities upon the Synod. Among the ministers appointed by this body, in 1769, to visit the Carolinas, was Mr. John Harris, then a member of the Lewestown Presbytery; and though it does not appear that his mission southward was fulfilled for nearly two years, there is no evidence that either of his co-laborers had before that time penetrated to the settlements then known as Upper (or rather Western) Carolina. On the contrary, it is asserted that the labors of Messrs. Roe and Close did not reach that section;* and whatever service might have been rendered by others was entirely transient in its character, until the arrival of Mr. Harris. In 1774, we find him a regular member of Orange Presbytery, which then embraced both the Carolinas, where he remained until, with five others, he was set off to constitute the first Presbytery of South Carolina, which met at the Waxhaws, April 11, 1785. But as early as 1773, he had formed a settlement in the "Flat-Woods," on the waters of McKinley's Creek and Little River; where, as a land-owner and planter, he bore no inconsiderable share of the losses and sufferings inflicted by the Indians and Tories.

Of the five preaching stations selected by the committee, † we can not certainly say that he occupied more than three,

* We are inclined to believe that there is some mistake in this statement. We have lying before us the copy of a report drawn up by Dr. Cummins, as a committee of the old Presbytery of South Carolina, to collect materials for the Church history of Abbeville county. This committee was appointed in 1793; the report was brought into Presbytery, and sent on to the Assembly in 1794. In this it is said that the Rev. Azel Roe and John Close, from New Jersey, tarried some weeks in the Long Canes settlement early in 1771, "ordained elders, and administered the Lord's Supper for the first time in all that land." Mr. Roe received an earnest and harmonious call to become their pastor, but the call was unsuccessful.—EDS. S. P. R.

† The movement to obtain the regular ministrations of the Gospel by the first settlers, was somewhat remarkable. Two of their number, Messrs. Russel and McAlpin, were sent to the Synod of New York and Philadelphia with a petition for supplies. Messrs. Roe and Close were appointed to

viz: "Upper Long Cane," "Lower Long Cane," and "Bull Town," or "Rocky River." We have reason to believe, however, that his missionary labors were indefatigable and zealous, and that he was ready to dispense the Word wherever at all practicable—under trees or in log cabins—and that he carried a word of encouragement or rebuke everywhere. An aged lady, born in 1769, not long deceased, gave, as one of her earliest reminiscences, the hearing him preach under a large chestnut tree near the residence of General Pickens, which was then the "block-house," on the site now occupied by Abbeville village. In this discourse he inveighed very strongly against the use of tobacco, and some other species of intemperance, affording thus a pretty good comment on the license which then prevailed.

Bold, enthusiastic, and independent, he was a man peculiarly adapted to the times, and to the work appointed him. Though not above the medium height, his sturdy frame and erect carriage commanded respect; and the serene, but honest determination of his countenance, tempered the pleasantries which often sparkled from his dark eye. Through the trying scenes of the Revolution, he labored energetically to stamp his own principles of republicanism, as well as those of his religion, upon his people. The three preaching stations before mentioned grew, under his care, to regularly organized churches about the close of

visit them. Upon the report of the delegates, on their return, those who sent them appointed a committee of five to arrange the people into congregations, that the labors of the missionaries might be facilitated. The committee were Patrick Calhoun, Andrew Pickens, John Irwin, — McAlpin, and one other, whose name has not been handed down. The region of country in which the petitioners resided was arranged by the committee, it is said, in four (five?) congregations, and the places of preaching were appointed about fourteen miles apart. The names of these places were Rocky Creek, Upper and Lower Long Cane, (Upper Long Cane still retains its name; Lower Long Cane embraced what is now called Hopewell). The other two places were Bull Town (now Rocky River) and Saluda (now Greenville).—Eds. S. P. B.

the war, having been indebted to him not only for spiritual direction, but for his manly and patriotic example in the cause of freedom.

It was the usual boast of this Christian patriot, that *every* man in his congregation was a Whig; but though the Scotch-Irish "were of the right stamp," there were many who wore the "red coat" in the surrounding country; and the vicinity of the Savannah River rendered it necessary for the well-affected to seek protection in forts against marauding parties from the Georgia side. Much of his catechetical and other instruction had to be given in these forts, which were scattered along the Savannah River, or in those nearer his preaching stations, which had been built for protection against the Indians. About three miles from the spot where the church was afterwards built, called Hopewell, a palisade fort, with port-holes, and supplied within with a school-house, minister's residence, and other log dwellings, had been constructed, on the return of the settlers to their homes. It was called Fort Boone, most probably in honor of Thomas Boone, then Provincial Governor. The father of the Rev. Dr. Gray, now of LaGrange, Tennessee, and the venerable lady before mentioned, his sister, were pupils in the school at Fort Boone, and catechumens of the Rev. John Harris.

On account of his republican zeal and influential character, he was particularly obnoxious to the Tories, and was often obliged to fly before them, when, on errands of mercy, he had gone forth alone, taking refuge for the time in canes or thickets. Not being able to lay hands on him, they revenged themselves on his property, driving off at one time nearly all his slaves to Florida. It will be remembered that the British held at that time a depot there for *such* property.* At "Bull Town" was a fort, in the

* "The British philanthropists formed a plan, in 1787, of settling at Sierra Leone a company of slaves, who had (*deserted*) to the British army, and accompanied the troops on their return to England."—Rev. Dr. VAN RENSSALAER.

vicinity of the plantation of the Rev Mr. Harris, where the Tories and Indians deployed most successfully in their nefarious system of plunder. An instance is given of a negro woman, belonging to Mr. Harris, who was chased by them for three days, with her child in her arms; she was at length caught and conveyed to the Indian Nation, but made her escape, leaving her child behind. The child was finally rescued by Colonels Pickens and Anderson, and is still living.

Though the state of things was thus desperate, it need not be supposed that the assembling together of the congregation was entirely suspended. The conscientious worshippers of God often bowed upon their arms, and a credible tradition asserts that the Rev. John Harris often preached with his gun in the desk beside him, and with his ammunition suspended from his neck, after the fashion of the times. Neither intimidated by his perils, nor discouraged by his losses, he pursued his upright and independent course, apparently forgetful of self in his zeal for the interests of his people. A little anecdote will serve to illustrate his determination, as well as his weight of character. Col. A., a worthy man, but rather pliant in his temper, lived far down on the Savannah, in a region much exposed to Tory aggression. He was a personal friend of the minister, and a member of one of his congregations; but having held a commission under the royal government, it was feared that he would compromise his principles for British favor and protection. This suspicion no sooner entered the mind of his friend, than he mounted his horse, and, taking his saddle-bags for a long visit, determined not to leave him till he came out on the right side. He staid with him several days, and on his return declared "that all was right."

The Rev. John Harris was born of Welsh parents, who settled on the eastern shore of Maryland, early in the eighteenth century. Little is known of his early training,

but there are evidences of his classical knowledge still in the possession of his descendants: some of the theological works once belonging to his library are more than two hundred years old. We hear of him first as a member of New Castle Presbytery, in 1756, which being divided, he was set off to Lewestown. Whilst here, he preached in the ancient churches of Wicomico and Monokin, names familiar to the earliest records of the colonial church. He was remarkable for the industry, energy, and punctuality of his habits, and to an advanced age attended faithfully upon the church judicatories.

As an evidence of his position as a citizen, he was at one time a member of the Provincial Congress of South Carolina; and besides, in that frontier life, in the absence of regular physicians, was very useful to his people in a medical capacity: aged persons here remember that their *parents* spoke of him as old Doctor Harris, and tradition has preserved some instances of his efficiency in the healing art.

Although very genial and tolerant in his social proclivities, he was an uncompromising champion of the faith, and it was believed would not hesitate to demonstrate his belief in his principles, by physical as well as by mental power. At the close of the war, he was the only Presbyterian minister in the region known afterward as Abbeville District; but he had some thing of a competitor in a brother of the Associate Scotch Reformed Church, who, offended at the fearless independence of the Presbyterian, and at some innovations attempted in Psalmody,* often gave vent to sentiments more bellicose than Christian. It was said to him one day, "You had better take care, old Dr. Harris

* A son of Mr. Harris, a gallant and spirited youth, having learned something of music from an Englishman in Virginia, ventured to introduce Watts, and to give his father's congregations some new tunes to vary the routine of the *old Scotch dozen*; but received for his reward the usual amount of indignation from the conscientious psalm-singers.

will get hold of you." "I dinna care," he replied; "he may hae the better of me in hither and yan, but I hae the advantage in length." Such were the men of that rude and practical age. But in that strong domestic fabric was wrought the sternest patriotism, the most unflinching integrity. It is almost unnecessary to add that Mr. Harris was very popular, and by the dignity of his character and deportment commanded respect even from those whose principles and practices he opposed. During the last ten years of his life, he resigned his pulpits principally to the younger and more demonstrative preachers with whom the church was now supplied, acting as a co-laborer with them. The last pulpit he occupied was in connexion with Mr. Mecklin, at Rocky River.

As a pioneer in religion, and as a patriot, his work was done; the churches were organized, and the country established in peace. Having purchased some land on the Savannah, he was preparing to spend the remainder of his days in that comfort which contrasted strongly with his stormy middle age, when he was attacked with a pulmonary complaint, and gradually declined. He died in 1798 or '99, aged, it is thought, more than sixty-five years. He was brother-in-law of the Rev. Hugh Henry, of Maryland, having married Mary, the daughter of Col. Isaac Handy, a patriot of the Revolution, and descended from one of the first settlers of Somerset county, Maryland.

Not far from the road leading from Calhoun's Mills to Abbeville Court House, on a place owned by Mr. J. C. Calhoun, may be seen the debris of a stone wall, enclosing the remains of this worthy missionary, and those of his wife, who followed him in a few years.

A traveller, on the road leading from Charleston through the "Flat-Woods" of Western Carolina, might have passed near enough to hear the songs of praise issuing from the log building which first distinguished the church of Lower Long Cane. It was situated in the midst of a rich country,

on a level spot, in which the large trees stood up like columns in some mighty temple. It is a rather curious fact, that the land on which it stood was given by a colonist from Ireland, on the express provision that no grave-yard should be ever made there; a condition which has not been forfeited, except in the graves of two or three foreigners.

It was in this log house that the Rev. Mr. Harris preached with his rifle by his side; here he ordained the first elders, William Calhoun, Sr., and N. Barksdale; and here, as early as 1777, he baptized several infant children, who were afterwards elders in that same church. There is no doubt that the churches were first organized in these houses, for it was not until after the country was established in peace that the attention of the people could be effectively directed to the improvement of their religious edifices.

At "Bull Town" a large frame building succeeded the log house, and the name was changed to Rocky River; and in 1787, as the contract still in existence testifies, preparations were making for the erection of the commodious "meeting house" of Lower Long Cane, which was built on a rising ground on the opposite side of the road. Previous to this, a pastor had been called from among the young men now entering the ministry. On the 29th of July, 1785, a vast concourse of people assembled at Davis' Bridge, to witness the ordination and instalment of Mr. Robert Mecklin, into the pastoral charge of Lower Long Cane* and Rocky River. Such was the eagerness of the people to witness this ceremony, that it was deemed advisable to select a suitable spot *between* the two congregations; and there, in the rich cathedral of nature, the young Presbytery of South Carolina held its third meeting within the space of two months for this solemn and beautiful purpose. It had first received as probationers, from the Presbytery of Orange, three young men, Robert Hall, Robert Finley, and Robert

* It was not until 1788 that the place received the name of Hopewell.

Mecklin—the first of whom had been placed at Upper Long Cane—names that were destined to leave a fragrance of piety, not yet utterly lost to this region. This ordination was a “a scene which could never be forgotten,” said one who was an eye-witness. And certainly it was a beautiful sight, after the terrors and turmoils of war, to behold two large congregations meeting peacefully and harmoniously in the exercise of their simple worship, which requires no “temple built with hands.” No longer were to be seen the ominous stacks of muskets, nor the sentinel pacing to and fro with straining eye; there were no more palpitating hearts nor trembling nerves; but on the green sward, and under the rich shadow of the water oaks, were groups of happy children and happier mothers, whilst the serene and hopeful expression of the assembly, seated around on logs or puncheons, was nearly as sparkling as the limpid waters which flowed at their feet. But the most touching sight of all, was the appearance of the young candidate for holy vows, in whose countenance there must have been a peculiar sanctity and devotion, to have inspired his people with so much reverence, and to have given a presage of his early translation to a purer world. The fame of Mr. Mecklin as a preacher seems to have been contemporary with his ministry; and when, at the end of three years, God was pleased to remove him to the upper sanctuary, he was remembered with feelings of veneration and love, bordering on enthusiasm. “I thought his death would have killed me,” said the intelligent and aged lady before referred to, then a youthful bride; “but we could have been reconciled if he had left us some of those *great sermons* for publication.”

Mr. Mecklin's power did not lie in the arts of elocution; for he stood before his people always with a small Bible open in his hand, whence he drew his inspiration and his learning. His theme was Christ crucified—Christ alone. “Christ all and in all,” was expounded with so much unaf-

fect pathos, solemnity, and energy, that the large crowds which he attracted were often melted down by his loving tones. It is said to have been no unusual thing to see the *whole congregation* affected to tears by the divine unction of his words and manners. This fact is accredited by more than one witness.

During his ministry, the Huguenots, settled ten miles below, on Little River, flocked to his church. They had attended, in some measure, the services of Mr. Harris, but to many of them these ordinances must have been more nominal than real; for the older French adhered tenaciously to their native tongue, and very imperfectly, if at all, understood the English. They still maintained their lay worship and their Sabbath-schools at home; yet, taught, as they had been, that they were bound to assemble themselves together, even in woods and deserts, it is not a matter of wonder that they should seek to be fed with the crumbs of the blessed Gospel, though they were obliged, many of them, to walk eight or ten miles for this purpose.

For a considerable period all, and for a longer time many, of these desolate and sanctuary-loving people owed their spiritual teachings to the ministrations at Hopewell, thinking themselves happy that here they could meet to commemorate the love of their dying Lord. "It was affecting," said one of their number, "to see them meet at this place, always saluting each other with a kiss, while tears flowed down their cheeks." "They wept, yea, they wept when they remembered Zion."

The preaching of Mr. Mecklin was in character with their zeal and enthusiasm; but while engaged in pastoral visitation in the summer of 1788, he was stricken with fever, and died. He was originally from North Carolina, but his family had settled near Rocky River Church, where his remains lie. He had been but recently married, and left no descendants.

Mr. Mecklin was succeeded by Mr. Francis Cummings, from Bethel Presbytery, who had been a pupil of Dr. Hall, and was a preacher of high character and acceptability. There are some letters existing, written in regard to a difficulty between two of his elders, which exhibit wisdom and moderation.* In 1799, the Synod of the Carolinas met at Hopewell Church, and the opening sermon was preached by Mr. Cummings, from Luke, 13 : 22. During his pastorate the French membership reached its climax at Hopewell, and it was deemed important for them to have a representation in the Session. An election was held, which resulted in the choice of Joseph C. Calhoun, Andrew Weed, E. Pettigrew, Mr. Milligan, and Pierre Gibert, Esq. These men were ordained by Mr. Cummings before the close of the century. It had been now thirty years since the death of the French minister. A new generation had sprung up. The stern necessities created by the Revolution, which had principally operated in depriving them of a settled minister, had caused their gradual dispersion among their neighbors, and familiarity with their language; and by this means had effectually reconciled them to participating in the worship of a people whom they must have instinctively recognized as holding with them "one faith and one baptism."

The charge of Episcopacy has been made against these simple worshippers. This has arisen, in part, from the fact of the conforming of the parishes on the Santee, particularly St. Stephen's, to the Episcopal Church. The protesting of a few, however, seems to exculpate the Huguenot doctrine, and proves the adoption of the ritual to have been a matter of expediency, if not of necessity. Lawson gives a charming picture of the early fruits of their beautiful and simple faith, on the Santee, in 1700; and the colonists of

* Dr. Cummings was settled near Rocky River Church, and one of his descendants held the place of residence for some years after his exit. Francis Cummings removed to Greensboro', Georgia, and the honor of D.D. was probably conferred on him by Franklin College, at Athens.

New Bordeaux might have sat for a similar picture. "They are all of the same opinion," says he, "with the *Church of Geneva*." We think the "Genevan Confession of Faith," or the "Heidelberg Catechism," afford ample means of settling this question. Witness, especially, the thirtieth article of the former; and the preface to the latter has a sentence which reads thus: "This is that which they call *confirmation*, which is nothing but a vain and ridiculous practice, destitute of foundation." This is said in reference to the superstitions which had crept into the Church in the middle ages.

It is very easy to see that the colony of Jean Louis Gibert was not in circumstances which would warrant their refusal of the condition imposed by King George, viz: a glebe and house of worship for the Church of England in their town; but if they had esteemed this a privilege, why did they not, on the death of their minister, which occurred in 1773,* while yet under the king's dominion, and in their highest state of prosperity, apply for a rector? There may have been some faint shadowings of the papal hierarchy in the modes of worship practised by the Bordeaux Church; tradition supplies us with one instance of the use of sponsors;† but it can not now be ascertained whether before or after the death of Mr. Gibert; so, also, there might have been

* The Rev. Mr. Gibert died suddenly, in the very prime of life, it is said, from eating a dish of mushroom—genus *Agaricus*—a delicacy highly esteemed by the French, but of which there was found a poisonous variety in the woods of Carolina.

† Madame —, the widow of a Huguenot, fled from France to England with her two infant daughters. Whilst in the port, she was concealed under a barrel with her children; and to prevent their discovery by the policemen, she stopped the infants' mouths with handkerchiefs. After remaining some time in England, she came on with the colony to New Bordeaux. One of the daughters married M. David; and their children were baptized in the French town, M. Beloit and wife standing as god-father and god-mother. This incident we have from Jeannie Moragne, grand-daughter of M. David.

a Roman Catholic among them, for the wreck of their literature furnishes at least one Romish manual. This, however, is no decisive evidence. It is probable that when left to their own ecclesiastical government, some innovations may have crept in among a people who were from different provinces, and who had spent some years of exile in various foreign parts; but *reading prayers* in divine service need not be looked on in this light, for this was sanctioned by the Genevan Church, and Pierre Moragne, Sr., the most orthodox and most stubborn of the Huguenots, who refused even to speak a word of English, read prayers of his own composition, both in public and private worship. The religious fervor and affectionate enthusiasm of the French Protestants was a happy element blended with the more frigid systematizing spirit of the Scotch-Irish; yet they have never been considered pliant, but have been, to the present moment, the most obstinate opposers of new measures.

The Huguenots had not long enjoyed a representation in Hopewell, when an opening was made for the exercise of their religious privileges in a more convenient and advantageous position. In 1776 or '77, their attention was called to a missionary who travelled through the neighborhood on his way to a station, probably about Ninety-Six. This was the Rev. John Springer, formerly President of the college at old Cambridge, Abbeville District, but now resident in Georgia. Immediately on his road from Barksdale's ferry was a small log school-house near a fine spring, and within a mile of the site of New Bordeaux. Here he was induced to stop and preach occasionally till his death, which occurred in 1798. But the seed sown by the wayside was not left to perish; for the Rev. Moses Waddel, also a member of Hopewell Presbytery at that time, followed soon in the footsteps of the faithful missionary, and cheered the hearts of the Huguenots by the efforts of his youthful zeal. During the extraordinary revivals which characterized the

beginning of the present century, a camp-meeting was held at this place, by Messrs. Waddel, Cummings, Robert Wilson of Upper Long Cane, Hugh Dickson, then a licentiate, and perhaps others. This was in 1803, and, as far as we can learn, was no less interesting than those of the north-eastern districts. Mr. Waddel had at this time removed his academy from Columbia county, Georgia, to the high hill which overlooks Vienna, on the eastern bank of the Savannah, and was supplying the church at Hopewell, Dr. Cummings now having charge of Rocky River alone. The interest of the French people in this extraordinary young man was such that they were not satisfied with his itinerant labors, but they solicited and obtained a regular appointment for the third Saturday and Sunday in each month. A suitable frame building had been erected near the spring, on a piece of land appropriated to the Presbyterian church at this place. Many of those who had joined at Hopewell, transferred their membership to this place, and P. Gibert and P. Moragne, Jr., were chosen elders. Of his friendly intercourse with these people, Dr. Waddel spoke with pleasure to the very last of his life—the association seeming to open a vein of pleasant memories. In the charming families of “Squire” Gibert and others, he found society congenial to his taste; here he perfected his French, which he desired to speak with fluency; and no doubt the heart of this young disciple was profited by early contact with a people of such genuine and unostentatious piety—such mild, yet firm morality.

ARTICLE VII.

MOTLEY'S DUTCH REPUBLIC.

The Rise of the Dutch Republic. A History. By JOHN
LOTHROP MOTLEY. *In three volumes.*

Three great rivers, the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Scheld, had for ages deposited their slime amongst the dunes and the sand-banks heaved up by the ocean around their mouths. A delta was thus formed, habitable at last for man. It was a wild morass of oozy islands and savage forests, amongst lagoons and shallows, partly below the level of the ocean at its higher tides, and subject to constant overflow from rivers, and to frequent terrible inundations by the sea. The coast being skirted by an extensive belt of woodland, the close tangle of thickets operated to prevent the dunes cast up by the sea from drifting further inwards, and thus formed a natural breastwork against the ocean, which time and art were to strengthen. Well was such a country named Lowland, Netherland, Hollowland, or Holland. Here contended for ages, in stubborn conflict with the angry elements, a race thus to be educated for a great struggle with the still more savage despotism of man. Here they chained the ocean with their dykes, and forced mighty streams to fertilize their soil; and here they laid the foundation of a commerce with the furthest ends of the world, and of a great republic, destined to endure for more than two centuries.

When the Empire of Charlemagne fell to pieces, the Netherlands, early in the tenth century, pass out of France into Germany. Now there arise earldoms and dukedoms and other petty sovereignties of the Netherlands, which became hereditary. There are the Dukes of Brabant, the Earls of Flanders, and the Counts of Namur, Hainault,

Zutphen. There were also the Counts of Holland, dividing sway for centuries with their constant and powerful foes, the Bishops of Utrecht, over the seven little districts of Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Overysse, Groningen, Drenthe, and Friesland; all seven being portions of Friesland in the general sense, and destined afterwards to become the United States of the Netherlands, one of the most powerful republics of history.

By the tenth century the old Batavian, and later Roman forms of government, had faded away. There is no great popular assembly, as of old; no generals and temporary kings chosen by the people. The government is by the creatures of kings, till they abjure the creative power, and set up their own. The degenerate Carloyingians have not an arm strong enough to wield the sceptre over the wide realms of their empire. The people are alternately preyed upon by duke and by prelate, and esteem it a happiness to sell themselves into slavery, or to huddle together beneath the castle walls of some little potentate, for the sake of his wolfish protection. But during the five following centuries, three forces are operating upon each other, and upon the general movement of society: the force of the sword in the hands of bishop and of baron; the power of clerks, or the force of educated mind measuring itself against brute violence; and a third force, more potent than either of the preceding, the force of gold, the power of commerce embodied in cities leagued with cities. It is commerce which plucks up half-drowned Holland by the locks and pours gold into her lap; and gold brings strength, and then confidence and courage follow. Thus the mighty power of the purse develops itself, and municipal liberty becomes a substantial fact.

Thus, in these obscure provinces, as in all Europe, modern civilization builds itself up; and society, impelled by great and conflicting forces, makes progress. Agriculture and mechanical occupations begin to devolve upon freemen

instead of serfs. Little boroughs outside the castle gates of the land's master, began to be built up, and were encouraged by the nobles, to aggrandize themselves. Then the population, thus collected, began to divide into guilds, which afterwards grew to be bodies corporate, under charters from the sovereign. Tribunals were set up under these charters, where men of the burgher class were to sit in judgment. The Schout and Schepens, or chief magistrate and aldermen, in process of time came to be elected by the communities. Thus organized, and inspired with the breath of civic life, the communities of Flanders and Holland began to move rapidly forward, owing their advancing prosperity to commerce and to manufactures; and thus, too, the cities began to participate, not only in their own, but in the general government; and towns, as well as nobles, accordingly appear in the assembly of the provincial estates. Thus, also, in lands which nature had apparently condemned to obscure poverty, the principle of rational freedom or regulated liberty was taking deepest root. Already in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Friesland was a republic, all but the name; and Holland, Flanders, and Brabant, had acquired a large share of self-government.

About the close of the thirteenth century, the long line of the Counts of Holland dies out, and the title, with all its rights, passes to the Counts of Hainault. In another half century, the Hainault line expires. And now the country passes, by marriage, under the rule of the house of Burgundy. Philip, surnamed "the Good," seeks to curtail the political privileges of the Netherlands. A worse tyrant succeeds Philip—his son, Charles the Bold. The Netherlands were for him but as a bank, to be drawn upon for money. By two measures he prostrated the provinces: the removal of the supreme court from the Hague to Mechlin, and his maintenance of a standing army. The court, however, still held its sessions in the country, and the sacred privilege,

de non evocando, the right of every Hollander to be tried in his own land, (his *habeas corpus*,) was retained.

But in 1477, Charles lost his life ; and his only child, the Lady Mary, succeeds. Within the provinces where Charles had played the tyrant, there is an elastic rebound, and all that was lost is recovered. The cities met in convention, and all feuds and parties are reconciled, in order to regain their rights. On the other hand, Louis the Eleventh seizes Burgundy ; the Lady Mary appeals to the convention at Ghent for aid, and freely promises to confirm all their old immunities. Now is formally granted by her the "Groot Privilege," or *Great Privilege*, the Magna Charta of Holland. It was a recapitulation and recognition of ancient rights, not an acquisition of new ones—a restoration, not a revolution. Its main points were :

1. The duchess should not marry without the consent of the estates of her provinces.
2. All offices should be filled with natives only.
3. The "Great Council of Holland" should be reëstablished.
4. The cities might hold diets as often as, and wherever, they chose.
5. No taxes should be imposed, and no war undertaken, without consent of the estates.
6. The Netherlands language to be employed in all public and all legal documents.
7. The commands of the duchess to be invalid, if in conflict with the rights of any city.
8. The sovereign to come in person before the estates to make requests for supplies.

Thus at one blow, the law, the sword, the purse, were taken from the sovereign's hand, and given back again into that of the Parliament.

Such, in brief, is Mr. Motley's graphic account of the rise and progress of Dutch freedom, down to the period of its formal acknowledgment in the celebrated instrument just

described. He has himself characterized it as "a recognition of ancient rights, not an acquisition of new privileges." Surely, then, it is not very consistent for him to represent it now as "a noble and temperate vindication of natural liberty." He proceeds to observe that "to no people, more than to the stout burghers of Flanders and Holland, belongs the honor of having battled audaciously and perennially in behalf of human rights."* Was it on behalf of *human* rights, or of *Netherland* rights, they contended? Did these stout burghers ever dream of acknowledging that all men had the very same? No more than Mr. Motley's forefathers or ours contended, in the revolution of 1776, for the rights of men, and not the rights peculiarly of Britons. To show the author's inconsistency with himself, in these and the many other similar expressions, which all along through this history drop from his pen, we may appeal to the reader of the foregoing sketch, every statement of which is borrowed from him, whether it is not a sketch of the history of constitutional, in distinction from natural freedom. We have said nothing not found in his pages, and we have said nothing respecting any rights except those of Flanders and Holland. But Mr. Motley is, in this particular, not only inconsistent with himself and his own statements, but he suffers himself to fall here into one of the most vulgar errors of our time. He contrasts "natural liberty, the doctrine of more enlightened days," with "natural servitude, the dogma of the dark ages." The enlightened days which the author talks about, are witnessing, in his own New England, and in the whole United States, the tame submission of freemen to a despotism which tramples their constitutional rights under foot; nay, the earnest coöperation of those freemen in every effort of that despotism to destroy constitutional liberty where alone it now exists upon this continent—in these Confederate States.

* Vol. I., p. 52.

Natural liberty is not the doctrine of any truly enlightened age, concerning man fallen and under the curse. It is, on the contrary, a doctrine of French infidelity. The turbid flow of such Jacobin ideas, alas! mingled early with the pure stream of the English doctrine of liberty, as it was asserted by our revolutionary forefathers. It mingles with and defiles the whole course of our author's observations upon the struggles of the Dutch for constitutional freedom. Mr. Motley partakes of the popular sentiments of his own people respecting human rights. His work has no doubt helped to confirm his countrymen in their creed on this subject. His charming story is the vehicle of conveying to the reader's mind, along with many just and noble political sentiments, much, also, that is false and corrupt. In opposition to these radical ideas, we assert that, as to the rights of man, whether considered in the light of the Christian Scriptures or of the soundest political wisdom, the truth is just this, that men have the same right to liberty that they have to property; that is, a right to so much of either, and no more, as they are born to, or as they may lawfully acquire. For there is no liberty worth the name, but rational and regulated liberty; and that is the creature of law, and a matter of inheritance. And thus Dutch rights and British rights have always been held to be very different from the rights of savages or of semi-barbarians, be they red or yellow, black or white.

To return from this digression. The Lady Mary espouses the Archduke Maximilian, and four years after bearing his son Philip, she falls from her horse and dies. This child is her recognized successor, and the Netherlands pass under the dominion of Austria. Thus the house of Hapsburg follows that of Burgundy, as it followed those of the Counts of Hainault and of Holland, and the puissant family of Brabant, in the rule over these provinces. Maximilian is regent now, and step by step he tramples out the liberties he had sworn to protect. He becomes Emperor in

1493, and the boy Philip, surnamed "the Fair," receives, at seventeen years of age, the homage of the different states of the Netherlands. He swears to maintain only what Philip the Good and Charles the Bold had granted; and relinquishing the Great Privilege, and all similar charters, the provinces accept him on these ignominious terms. In 1496, Philip the Fair marries Joanna, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella. In the first year of the sixteenth century is born of her the second Charlemagne.

Charles the Fifth, King of Spain, Emperor of Germany, Autocrat of half the world, is now Lord of the Netherlands. His course of policy there, especially as carried out by his son, Philip the Second, after him, resulted in the revolt of those provinces. That revolt was both religious and political in its causes. Heresy was a plant of early growth in the Netherlands. From the most ancient period, neither prince, nor people, nor prelates, there, were very dutiful to the Pope. No where did those harbingers of the Reformation, the Waldenses, the Albigenes, the Lollards, the Arnaldists, the Bohemian Brethren, endure a greater share of persecution, than in the Netherlands. Yet in the face of it, heresy flourished in that country. The Scriptures in Netherland rhyme were a potent engine in its hands. Meanwhile, the growing power and luxury of the clergy, and the Church's monstrous wealth, were provoking the hatred of many and mighty persons. Princes and barons, accustomed to the feudal right of military service from all who held lands of them, began, from the thirteenth century downwards, to dispute the title of ecclesiastics to hold vast estates without taxation, and without the performance of military duty. The Netherland sovereigns set themselves vigorously against clerical abuses of all sorts. In the fourteenth century, Wickliffe's doctrines make great progress in the land. In the next century, the invention of printing greatly advances the cause of the Reformation. At the same time, there is a great increase of ecclesiastical abuses in the

provinces. The people cry aloud there, as elsewhere, for reformation. Luther appears, and his doctrines are welcomed in the Netherlands. Charles the Fifth will suppress them by force. He introduces there the papal Inquisition. It is the bloody work of that inhuman court, and the bloody edicts of Charles, without even the pretence of sanction by the estates of Holland, which mainly distinguish the reign of Charles, so far as concerns the Netherlands. Tens of thousands of virtuous, well-disposed men and women, and not Anabaptists, were butchered in cold blood. For twenty years these dreadful edicts were the law of the land, condemning all heretics to death, but allowing repentant males to be slain with the sword, and repentant females to be buried alive, whilst the obstinate, of both sexes, were to be food for the flames.

This was the religious state of the Netherlands at the time of Charles' abdication in favor of Philip the Second, and these were the religious influences which operated in the great Netherland revolt. Let us now glance at the civil condition of the provinces at this period. Mr. Motley says, "the tendency was to substitute fictitious personages for men; a chain of corporations was wound about the liberty of the Netherlands." He says, "the people of the United Netherlands was the personage yet to be invented." "Instead of popular rights, there were state rights; for the large cities, with extensive districts and villages under their government, were rather petty states than municipalities." In his view, it was a great defect that these institutions of the provinces were in so moderate a degree democratic in their character. "There was popular power enough to effect much good, but it was widely scattered, and, at the same time, confined in artificial forms." The supreme legislative and executive functions belonged to the sovereign, yet each city made its by-laws, and possessed, besides, a body of statutes and regulations, made from time to time by its own authority, and confirmed by the prince.

The chief city of the Netherlands, and the commercial capital of the world, Antwerp, for example, had the sovereign solemnly sworn to govern according to the ancient charters and laws. The stadtholder, as his representative, shared his authority with the four estates of the city. There was a Senate of eighteen, appointed by the stadtholder out of a quadruple number nominated by the Senate itself and by the fourth body, called the Borgery. The deans of the guilds, fifty-four in number, two from each guild, selected by the Senate from a triple list of candidates presented by the guilds, composed this fourth body. Their duty was to conduct the examination of candidates claiming admittance to any guild, and to superintend the general affairs of the guilds. Then there was the board of ancients, or ex-senators; and the board of ward-masters, appointed, two from each ward, by the Senate, on nomination by the wards, whose special business it was to enrol the militia, and to attend to its mustering and training. These four branches, with their functionaries and dependents, composed the commonwealth of Antwerp. Assembled together in council, they constituted the great and general court. And no tax could be imposed by the sovereign except with consent of the four branches, all voting separately.

Now our author, of course, believes in the government of the people, directly exercised. We, on the contrary, believe in representative government, both in church and in state; that is, government by the people, but not exercised directly and immediately; government in the hands of chosen rulers. We are as great enemies as Mr. Motley can be to "arbitrary rule," where it robs a people of an inheritance of liberty which has been handed down to them from their fathers, and for which, accordingly, they are prepared by having been educated in its use and enjoyment. But we have no sympathy with his ideas of "human rights." Nor can we sympathize with his appreciation of "popular rights," in distinction from "state rights." Both are

sacred, precisely in proportion as they are just and well-founded. Indeed, what a grand and sacred struggle for state rights that is, which Mr. Motley's own people are just now ruthlessly forcing upon this free-born Confederacy. He rightly observes, that "it was the principle of mercantile association, in the middle ages, which protected the infant steps of human freedom and human industry against violence and wrong." Alas! freedom, let us tell the author, is no more an attribute of humanity, in its present fallen state, than is industry. Those "loftier ideas of human rights," which he so frequently alludes to, in a very indefinite way, are nothing but lower ideas of what liberty is, and what is necessary to be developed in any people, before they can possess or enjoy it. "State rights" go for little with Mr. Motley, as with his countrymen; yet he well remarks that "the spirit of local self-government was always the life-blood of liberty." They are its life-blood now, on this continent, where not the centrifugal force has been too much developed, as he says it was in the Netherlands, but the centripetal, and where the liberties of the Southern States, we trust, are being saved from that central Maelstrom which has swallowed up all those of our former associates of the North.

What we have been pointing out, is one of the defects of this author. His work is tinctured with radicalism. He sneers, for example, at Philip of Burgundy's sovereignty "by inheritance" over some of the provinces, and he equalizes it with his sovereignty over others of them "by force or fraud." * Now, we submit that these reproaches cast upon *inherited rights*, ill become any philosophic historian. Even for New England this is a dangerous doctrine, where there is such vast inequality of wealth. As for ourselves, we believe what the Saviour of mankind taught upon this subject. Some men are born to rule, and others to be ruled

* Vol. I., p. 184.

by them. Cæsar has *his things*, which must be rendered to him. We believe that absolute government is ordained of God, as well as republics; it follows that the rights of different nations are different, and their duties different. The charm of Mr. Motley's story of the Netherland struggle against tyranny is, that it is the tale of a people's maintaining what of liberty and self-government was theirs by right of birth, and also of the same people's legitimately acquiring in the conflict other and larger franchises. It is the same conflict which, in the seventeenth century, kings and parliament carried on in England, when the liberties of England grew apace. The same general principles were at work, and the same results were attained. It is the same conflict now waging on this continent, between the sovereign States of this Confederacy and the tyrant at Washington, who seeks to despoil them of inherited and chartered rights. It is natural, of course, that Mr. Motley, with his radical ideas, should view the position of affairs in the Netherlands differently from ourselves. He is for universal liberty and human rights. We have been taught in no such school of infidelity. The question of a creature's rights is, with us, a question of God's providence. Government is a divine ordinance, and rights a divine allotment. The rights of Dutchmen, Britons, Americans, are not the rights of all men. If Mr. Motley's radical ideas make him confound things that are not the same, and can not be made the same, it is his misfortune, and a blot upon his beautiful production. He ought to know that all true liberty for nations must be the growth of ages, a thing of gradual and very slow acquirement, a developement from within a people, and not a gift conferred, *ab extra*, upon them.

The author has been charged with perverting and falsifying history. A writer amongst ourselves has published that Motley gives an "*angelic*" portrait of William of Orange, but a "*fiend-like*" picture of Philip the Second. It is not to be denied, that both these characters are strongly drawn,

and William has certainly been charged with some faults by others, which we do not observe that Motley refers to at all. But as to Philip's character, let it be remembered that he does not stand solitary in his infamy, as described by our author. Catharine de Medici, he writes down as "the Italian she-wolf with a litter of cowardly and sanguinary princes." And, indeed, was not Henry the Second fit to be reckoned the progenitor of a race of wolf's cubs, when he leagued himself with Philip the Second to extirpate Protestantism by a murderous extirpation of his own Protestant subjects themselves? Or, will it be questioned that the Duke of Alva was the savage wretch he is here described as being? If Philip's picture is "fiend-like," what shall be said of Alva's, or of Granvelle's, or of that of Charles the Ninth, the author of the stupendous massacre of St. Bartholomew? It seems to us that Motley says well, "The time is past when it could be said that the cruelty of Alva, or the enormities of his administration, have been exaggerated by party violence." "No historical decision is final; an appeal to a more remote posterity, upon more accurate evidence, is always valid." But when "the Duke's own letters can be read; when the testimony to the Duke's crimes are from the criminal's own lips," it is certainly "vain to be expressing historic doubts" of the justice of the charges against him.* And so it must seem that when, "by the resuscitation of secret documents, over which the dust of three centuries has gathered, we are enabled to study the working of a system of perfect tyranny," when we find amongst these dusty records "a careful portrait of a consummate tyrant, painted by his own hand, in a living daily correspondence with his most trusted confidants;" surely, then we need not question the truthfulness of the picture, merely because it is "fiend-like." Have we never before heard of fiend-like dispositions in human nature?

* Vol. II., p. 505.

In the very war that is now being waged by Mr. Motley's countrymen against ourselves, has there been no display of diabolic deceitfulness or fiendish malignity? Witness the constant misrepresentations of the mendacious Northern press, and even of the chief generals of their army, stimulating their government and their army by false telegrams about victories gained, where, in fact, they met defeats. Witness the brutal attempt to starve the people of Norfolk into the profession of a loyalty they did not feel! Witness the atrocious inhumanity of some of their appliances of war, as, for example, of the bomb-bullet, made of two parts, with explosive materials within one of them, the whole arranged so that upon entering the flesh of our soldiers, and meeting with a bone, the bullet must burst and inflict the most ghastly and fatal wound.* Witness, above all, that infamous order of their general, Benjamin F. Butler, encouraging his soldiers to treat any lady of New Orleans, who should "by word or gesture" manifest her natural and just contempt and hatred for our invaders, "as a woman of the town plying her vocation"!

Let it also be borne in mind, when we stand aghast at the mendaciousness of Spanish, and even French politics, as portrayed by Motley, that Machiavelli was the common teacher of all European statesmen of that day. But, not to dwell upon this point, there can be no doubt that our author has had access to the best sources of knowledge.

* This statement is made on the published authority of M. F. MAURY, under his own name. This distinguished officer writes as follows:

"To shoot with poisoned arrows is universally admitted to be both savage and barbarous, but our men have been shot with explosive bullets. Imagine a Minie bullet to be cut in two, transversely, and a wire to be inserted endwise through the front half, or cone; the other part is then hollowed out into a cup, filled with fulminate or some other explosive substance, and then securely fitted upon the front part, and in such a manner that when the ball strikes, the wire is driven back, and so by concussion explodes the ball inside the wounded man. Is not that, think you, equal to the poisoned arrow? There can be no mistake about it, for I have seen the missile itself, and would send you one if I could find a safe conveyance for the dangerous thing. The true aim of the savage warfare is to kill and murder; of civilized, to wound and disable. Which is it that the Yankees are waging?"

He has studied this history as well in Dutch as in Spanish writers that have not been generally accessible. Moreover, it is well known that recently the governments of Europe have opened their archives to the inspection of scholars; and thus Mr. Motley has possessed himself of information upon many points not hitherto understood. His integrity ought not to be questioned without good reason. From Brandt he has copied much into his text, and we have found on comparison that he is accurate and careful. The various other Dutch and Spanish authorities followed by him, we have had no opportunity to examine; but he gives chapter and page, wherever he makes statements upon their authority, and so he could hardly venture, even if we supposed him a dishonest writer, to quote them unfairly.

Mr. Motley is a great portrait painter. His work abounds with admirable pictures of men and scenes. We are not now expressing any opinion of the justness of the portraits, but only of their skilful execution as works of art. Charles the Fifth, Philip the Second, William of Orange, the Duke of Alva, the Cardinal Granvelle, Lamoral, Count of Egmont, St. Aldegonde, Don John of Austria, Louis of Nassau, Juan de Vargas, Alexander of Parma, President Viglius, and Balthazar Gerard, the assassin of the Prince, are all life-like, exquisite pictures, now provoking the reader's admiration, and again exciting his detestation of the subject portrayed for his inspection. So, the humiliation of Ghent, the abdication of Charles, the iconomachy in the Netherlands, the origin and rise of the party of the Gueux, the siege of Alkmaar, the sack of Zutphen, the razing of Naarden, the heroic but unavailing defence of Harlem, the massacre at Antwerp, the rescue of Leyden; these are all masterpieces of historical description. The author has vast command of language, and a fine imagination. In the titles affixed to his various chapters, he is frequently a little finical, but we do not observe any such offences against good taste in the body of the work. He

is always attractive, and frequently very eloquent. In short, what he says of the manuscript history of Pontus Payen, so often referred to by him for authority, may be justly said of his own production: his striking sketches, characteristic anecdotes, minute traits, shew the keen observer of men and things: he possesses the dramatic power of setting men and things before the eyes of his readers: his work is full of color and invaluable detail.

We propose to present to the readers of this journal, who can not now obtain the work itself, a sketch of the main facts of the story, and then to offer some observations upon them.

Seven years before his accession, Philip the Second had sworn allegiance to all the charters, constitutions, and privileges of the Netherlands cities. Neither his father nor his grand-father had taken so large an oath. The object was to conciliate the people. Feeble in body, Philip was incredibly small in mind. He had a petty passion for contemptible details, and was slow of speech, but especially prolix with the pen. To one great purpose, early formed, he adhered inflexibly; and that was, the extirpation of Protestant heresy, and the vindication of his title of the most Catholic king. He was intensely Spanish, and it was his policy to rule the Netherlands by Spaniards. Herein his feelings were not like his father's, and herein he forgot one of the wisest lessons Charles had given to his son.

The truce of Vaucelles, signed the 5th of February, 1556, was, through the arts of Pope Paul the Fourth and his nephew, Cardinal Caraffa, very soon interrupted by war between France, in league with the Pope, and Spain. It was an unnatural war, considered in its religious aspects. Philip did so consider it. He was troubled in conscience at the hostile position in which it placed him, as respected the head of the Church of Rome. Nor did Henry the Second himself desire the war. An interview occurs at Peronne, between two ecclesiastics, which involved the future fate of

millions. The Bishop of Arras, afterwards Cardinal Granvelle, and the Cardinal de Lorraine, brother of the Duke of Guise, together resolved upon an end of the present war, so that the two monarchs might unite heart and hand for the extirpation of heresy. Philip determines to begin his crusade against it in the Netherlands, and, with a view to this, arranges to remove his residence to Spain. He appoints Margaret of Parma, the natural daughter of Charles the Fifth, to be Regent; three boards of council are to assist her in the government; the real power, however, was in the *Consulta*, a committee of three members of the state council, by whose deliberations she was instructed secretly to be guided on all important occasions. These three, however, Viglius, Berlaymont, and Arras, were but one, and that one was Arras.

There remained after the peace about four thousand foreign soldiers in the provinces; they were a licentious and rapacious crew, and were felt by the people to be an intolerable burthen. On the 7th of August, 1559, all the provinces were assembled, by their representatives, at Ghent, to receive the parting words of the King. They were spoken through Arras, and full and free mention was made of the "new, reprobate, and damnable sects," and the Regent was publicly enjoined to enforce the edicts for their extirpation; at the same time, the King demands a new levy, of considerable amount. The provinces return their answer, agreeing, all of them, to pay their respective contingents, but all stipulating, as an express antecedent condition, the removal of the Spanish soldiery. The King is grievously offended, but promises what he intended never to perform. Especially was he offended with Orange, at whose door, when departing for Spain, he publicly and with insults laid the thwarting of his plans.

Arras was not only a selfish flatterer, and a ready tool of the Spanish monarch, but he was also his adroit manager, and the guide of his conduct. Being a strict absolutist, he

readily opposed himself to the natural rights of the Netherlands. It was by his advice, too, that the remorseless edict of 1550, an ordinance of blood and fire, was reenacted, as the very first measure of Philip's reign. It provided that no one should sell or buy, give or possess, any writing of Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, or other heretics; no lay person should converse or dispute concerning the Scriptures, or read, teach, or expound them, unless theologically educated; no conventicles should be held; no one should give food or lodging to any suspected of heresy. What was the penalty? Men transgressing, if they did not persist, were to be slain with the sword; and women, in the same case, were to be buried alive; but if they persisted, of whichever sex, they were to be burned alive! Such was Philip's first gift to the Netherlands; and now, upon his departure, this bloody edict was to be executed with the utmost rigor. To add to the apprehensions of the people, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, the number of bishops and the force of the inquisition were to be increased. Instead of the existing four sees, there were to be three archbishoprics, to be filled by the King and the Pope, with fifteen subordinate bishoprics; moreover, each of these fifteen bishops was to appoint nine additional prebendaries, to assist him in the matter of the inquisition throughout his bishopric, two of whom were themselves to be inquisitors.

It was in 1560, the same year that John Knox and his brethren in Scotland organized the Presbyterian Church of that country, that these causes of agitation and dismay in the Netherlands began to operate. To their ancient constitutions, called *handvests*, because the sovereign made them fast with his hand, the people appealed against the dreaded threatenings of Philip's arbitrary power; of Philip's tyranny, who, of all their monarchs, had made especially fast those same constitutions. There was the constitution of Brabant, which provided that the prince should "not increase the clerical powers without the consent of the

nobility and the cities; that he should prosecute no one of his subjects, except in the ordinary and open courts, where the accused might answer, with the help of advocates; that he should appoint no foreigners to office in Brabant; and that, should the prince violate any of these privileges, the inhabitants of Brabant should be thereby discharged of their oaths of allegiance, and might thenceforward conduct themselves as free, independent, and unbound people." Similar were the constitutions and charters of the other provinces, and they were all duly signed and sealed. It was this kind of freedom to which the Netherlands had been long accustomed—the freedom of chartered rights; and of this the hand of a ruthless tyrant was now about to rob them. The clerical state was to be enlarged, against the will of nobles and of cities both, and the administration of justice was to be in the hands of bishops and their creatures, many of them foreigners, and most of them monks. It was not the rights of man, as the author so frequently allows himself to state, but the peculiar and inherited rights of Brabant and of Holland, that were assailed, and in defence of which a long and bloody contest was impending.

Foremost in resistance to aggressions upon these rights, was the Prince of Orange. He was the heir of vast estates and exalted ancestral honors. He was now the stadtholder of Holland, Zeeland, and Utrecht. At a very early age he became a page in the Emperor's household; and, with his customary quickness, the Emperor had recognized the remarkable character of the boy. At fifteen, he was the intimate, almost confidential friend of the Emperor, at whose interviews with the highest personages and on the gravest affairs, Charles would never suffer him to be considered superfluous or intrusive. Thus, carefully to observe men's actions, and silently to ponder their motives, was the favorite occupation of the Prince during his apprenticeship at court; and as he advanced to man's estate, he was con-

stantly selected by the Emperor for the highest duties. It was while sojourning at the French court, as one of the four hostages for the fulfilment of the Spanish treaty, and when hunting with King Henry in the forest of Vincennes, separated from the rest of the company, that the monarch, by a strange fatuity, confided to him the secret scheme agreed on between Philip and himself for the extirpation of "that accursed vermin," the Protestants. His fellow-hostage, the Duke of Alva, was to be the appointed agent in this dreadful business; and Henry appears to have supposed that William was also party to the plot. The way in which the Spanish regiments, detained in the Netherlands, were to further the scheme, and the whole details of it, were laid open by Henry in the most unsuspecting manner. Horror-struck and indignant, the Prince yet held his peace, and kept his countenance; and thus, he who was so rich in conversational endowments, earned his celebrated surname of "the Silent." His purpose, however, was fixed from that hour. To the further stay of the foreign troops, and to the increase of the bishops, he began to oppose the most earnest efforts with the Regent, with Arras, and with the King himself. Egmont and other influential nobles second his efforts, and upon one point they are successful—the troops are removed.

It was soon after this there began the long and mortal combat of Arras, now Cardinal Granvelle, with Orange and the two counts, Egmont and Horn. He was setting himself to monopolize all the powers of the government, and at the same time filling Philip's mind with suspicions and resentment against these nobles. They were represented as wishing to reduce the King's power to a cipher, and to set up a republic or oligarchy under themselves; they were all bankrupts, and this was their plan to enrich themselves. Their opposition to the increase of the bishops, and to the further development of the inquisition, was to throw dust into the people's eyes, and to render his Majesty odious.

The nobles write to the King, on the 11th of March, 1563, a letter of complaints against the Cardinal, and of warnings to himself. His answer, from Spain, was dictated by Granvelle, in the Netherlands. It acknowledged their zeal, but proposed, as they have made no specific charges, that one of them should in person visit Spain, for the purpose of conference. But they all declined the journey. Meanwhile, the Duchess of Parma herself grows weary of the arbitrary sway of Granvelle, and sends her secretary with no friendly reports of him to the King. The nobles formally withdraw from all share in the management of affairs. Philip takes counsel of Alva, and Alva recommends the use of force without stint, to crush the rising spirit of the Dutch. Meanwhile, the Cardinal continues to chronicle for Philip's eye all the sayings and doings of the chief men of the Netherlands. He deplores the progress of heresy, and the slackness of the inquisitors; and he entreats the King, for the love of God, to put his royal hand to the blessed work. He reports to Philip the gathering of German troops on the borders of the Netherlands, as in the employment of the disaffected rebels; and into the most suspicious ear that ever listened to a tale of treason, he poured his own conviction that a republic by the aid of these foreign troops was being planned. Thus, little by little, he spread before his sovereign's eye a canvass, on which certain prominent figures, highly colored by patiently accumulated touches, were represented as driving a whole nation, against its own will, into manifest revolt. The situation was just one of factitious popular discontent, procured by a few impoverished Catilines; not a rising rebellion, such as the world had never seen, born of the slowly-awakened wrath of a whole people, after a martyrdom of many years.

But Philip, urged by Margaret, decides to remove Granvelle. A feeling of relief is experienced in the provinces upon his departure. Orange and the other two nobles return to the council. The Prince keeps steadily in view, in all

his labors for reform, three great objects: first, the convocation of the states-general; secondly, the abolition or moderation of the edicts against heresy; and, thirdly, the suppression of the privy council and the council of finance. These were both sinks of iniquity. There was general corruption amongst the officials of the government, and the highest dignitaries were really the most mercenary hucksters. The Duchess herself, and her secretary, Armenteros, (nicknamed Argenteros, from his cupidity,) were both rolling up fortunes for themselves; and the latter, though a mere clerk, was acquiring a complete ascendancy over the Regent. Against this monster of corruption, Orange found as great a battle before him as that he had been waging against the selfish ambition and intolerable arrogance of the Cardinal. Impoverished himself, yet never did he plunge his hands into the public treasury; his honor was never tarnished by any such suspicions.

Meanwhile, the prisons were thronged with victims of the inquisition, and the streets were filled with processions to the stake. The population of Flanders, especially, is maddened with barbarities, exercised not only upon criminals, but upon men of blameless life. Peter Titelmann, the sub-inquisitor, is violating all decency as well as justice in his horrible cruelties. The four estates of Flanders complain of him in vain to the King. The Duchess herself is evidently in mortal fear of him. But there is no yielding by Philip. On the contrary, he issues new decrees against heresy. The inns are to receive no travellers, the schools no children, the alms-houses no paupers, the very graves no dead, unless orthodox in the faith. Marriages, births, and deaths, all alike are to be under the baleful shadow of the Church.

The Regent is in great difficulty respecting the publication of these edicts. Egmont is to be sent on a special mission to Spain, and the council are preparing his instructions. When it is Orange's turn to vote, the Silent opens

his lips, and pours forth vehement discourse. The time had come when the King must be told the whole truth. The whole machinery of scaffolds, inquisitors, etc., must be abolished. The Netherlands were free, and to be free. The frightful corruptions must, also, be exposed to Philip. The two lesser councils must be abolished. Above all, the canons of Trent were not to be enforced. A Catholic himself, he intended to continue such, but he could not look on with pleasure and see princes undertake to govern the souls of men, or take away their liberty of conscience and of religion.

Egmont goes to Spain, but accomplishes nothing. Philip overpowers him with blandishments and gifts. Returning, he brings back nothing satisfactory. Orange reproaches him to his face. But an assembly of bishops and doctors is called by the Duchess, in accordance with Philip's instructions; and they concluded, unanimously, that the edicts had been working well for thirty-five years, and that there should be no change in the treatment of offenders. It is thus settled that there shall be no compromise with heresy. There is great agitation amongst the people—it were better to die arms in hand, than be butchered by the inquisition. The Regent beseeches Philip to revise his instructions for the inquisitors. His reply is decisive, and produces the extremest consternation. Inflammatory hand-bills amongst the people call on the three nobles to come forth as champions of popular liberty. Orange, in the council, declares there is no middle path between obedience and rebellion, and he washes his hands, as a councillor of state, of the whole proceedings of the government. Nevertheless, a proclamation is prepared, ordering that the canons of Trent, the edicts, and the inquisition, should be published in every town and village immediately, and also once every six months for ever afterwards. The deed is done. Orange stoops to the ear of his next neighbor, and whispers: "Now begins the most extraordinary tragedy ever enacted."

This decree is answered with a howl of execration by the people. The four chief cities of Brabant formally denounce the outrage in an elaborate document, addressed to the Regent, setting forth that the recent proclamation violated many articles in their city charter.

In the early part of 1566, is formed what was called the Compromise, a league chiefly of the lesser nobles at first, but afterwards of many burghers and citizens, bound together by solemn oaths, for mutual protection against the edicts of the inquisition. Orange stood aloof from it, having no confidence in the chief movers. A new step is shortly taken by the confederates, which was to make "a Request" of the Regent. Orange gathers the chief members of the league and of the nobility together, to confer about it, and to moderate it. He desired a convocation of the states-general—but there was no agreement effected. On the 3d of April, 1566, the long-expected cavalcade of leaguers enters Brussels, two hundred in number, with Brederode at their head. Next day, one hundred more appear. On the 5th of April, they present their "Request" to the agitated Duchess. It asked for the abolition of the edicts of the inquisition. A meeting of the council is assembled. Orange seeks to calm the fears of the Regent. Berlaymont, another of the council, speaks of them as "beggars," (*gueux*,) and urges Margaret to make short work with them. No good came of the "Request," nor of the Compromise itself. The Regent put them off. They meet at Culemburg, to partake of a dinner provided by their leader, where wine and dainties were plentiful. They want a name. Brederode proposes "the beggars." It is accepted vociferously, and they all drink to the toast, "*Vivent les gueux!*" Thus originates a war-cry destined to ring over sea and land, amid blazing cities, and on blood-stained decks, and through the smoke and carnage of many a stricken field. The beggars next select a garb which the young gentlemen should wear, discarding gold lace and

velvet. It was a doublet and hose of ashen grey, with short cloaks of the same color, all of the coarsest materials. They wore, also, felt hats, and carried beggars' bowls and sacks at their side. They also, like mendicants, shaved close their beards, saving their long and pendant moustaches. Minutely and carefully were all these things reported at Madrid. Meanwhile, the rumor goes forth of a moderation of the edicts, through the influence of the Request. But when the project did appear, in fifty-three articles, drawn up by Viglius, what was it? Only a substitution of the halter for the fagot! The common people called it the *murderation*. It passes the estates of Artois, Hainault, and Flanders; and Baron Montigny and the Marquis Berghen are persuaded, very reluctantly, to carry it to Madrid, for the royal sanction. They did not know the full danger of the mission. They did not suspect how continuously Granvelle had been reporting them as renegades and rebels. Both of them fell victims to the Cardinal's treacherous wiles and the cruel craft of Philip, and neither of them ever returned out of Spain. Their mission was but an elaborate farce, to introduce a terrible tragedy. Sent to procure the abolition of the inquisition, and the moderation of the edicts, Margaret of Parma possessed at the very time secret letters evincing the King's fixed purpose to maintain both in their rigor.

While riotous nobles were profaning the sacred cause of the Netherlands, which they assumed to protect, and while a tyrant king was projecting such measures of savage bigotry for his people, these were conducting themselves in a way to put both to shame. For now was beginning to be manifested the first great popular phase of the great rebellion. The people's thirst for the exercise of the Reformed religion was mustering them in thousands, in the open fields, to sing hymns and hear sermons. They were, perhaps, emboldened by a lull of the persecution, and by the apparent success of the Request. Their preachers were,

some of them, hatters, tanners, etc., and some learned and profound scholars, as Francis Junius, Wille, De Bray, and Marnier. The assembly was sometimes of six, sometimes of ten, sometimes of twenty, and sometimes even of thirty and forty thousand persons. These preachings spread throughout the Walloon provinces to the northern Netherlands. The worshippers were mostly of the Calvinistic faith, but some were Lutherans, and some Anabaptists. The Duchess orders the magistrates of Antwerp to put down the meetings. Tumults threaten. The Prince of Orange is called on to quiet them; and his temperate firmness is successful so long as he is able to remain there. But his own government of Holland and Zeeland demands his care. Armed assemblages, utterly beyond the power of the civil authorities, were taking place at Amsterdam. Yet he could not be spared from Antwerp for a day. Meanwhile, a fresh complication with the confederate nobles was at hand, and the Prince must meet, by Margaret's orders, a committee at Duffel. The body represented was a wild, tumultuous convention of fifteen hundred cavaliers, with other armed attendants. There was a constant din of revelry and uproar, in which the cry of "*Vivent les gueux*" was incessant. It was an ill-timed and violent demonstration, without beneficial results. But the dissolution of this convention is followed immediately by a sudden and terrific explosion of popular feeling, productive of the most serious consequences. The 18th of August was approaching, when the ceremony of the Ommegang was to occur, the principal object of which was to conduct around the city of Antwerp a colossal image of the Virgin issuing from the door of the cathedral. A meeting of the knights of the order of the Golden Fleece was to be held, and the Regent desired Orange's presence at Brussels. He knew the danger of his leaving Antwerp, and warned her of it—but his presence seemed indispensable at the capital. He left; and there took place the Netherlands' iconomachy, when all the grand architect-

tural monuments of Gothic art in the Low Countries were trampled under foot. It began, on the above-mentioned day, at Antwerp, and it was all finished in the course of six or seven days. It was a sudden explosion of the popular revenge against the symbols of that Church which had so long persecuted them and their brethren. It was a violent expression of sympathy for doctrines that had taken possession of the popular heart. It was a depravation of that instinct which had led the thousands to hear the truth of the Gospel proclaimed. The Reformed ministers all denounced the iconomachy. No personal outrages, and no pillage, accompanied the movement. Yet the effects of it were disastrous to the Reformation party—it was an abandonment of the high ground occupied by the people, when, quietly and peacefully, being shut out from the public exercise of their worship in the cities, they had gone forth, a sublime spectacle, in thousands, to the preaching of the Gospel in the fields.

The immediate result of it was, the greatest terror on the part of the Regent, and her "Accord" of freedom to the Reformed worship wherever it had been already set up.

The course of the government at Madrid, whilst these events were occurring in the Netherlands, had been simply to procrastinate and to dissemble. Very plainly and honestly did Berghen and Montigny portray to the King the popular discontent, and the danger of actual revolt. Three points, they urged, must be conceded: the abolition of the inquisition, moderation of the edicts, and ample pardon for all past transactions. Daily consultations are held about these demands of the envoys, at the grove of Segovia. Philip said little, but he took notes plentifully. There had been, to his mind, three previous, and now here was a fourth link in the chain of treason. There was: *first*, the cabal against Granvelle; *secondly*, Egmont's mission to obtain a moderation of the state council, with the design of bringing it under the control of the great nobles; *thirdly*, the

insolent and seditious Request; and now, *fourthly*, this proposition of the envoys.

Philip's answer is at length given. *First*, the papal inquisition might cease for a time, as the episcopal was quite vigorous; *secondly*, the moderation proposed was inadmissible, and a new project might be submitted; *thirdly*, the pardon might be granted, but it must be so restricted as to exclude all who deserved to be chastised. This gracious answer, however, had been delayed for months, and meanwhile the field-preachings and the image-breaking had taken place.

But, immediately after this answer to the envoys had been given, the King sends for a notary, and before witnesses declares the pardon not free, and so not binding on him. He writes, also, to the Pope, that the suspension of the papal inquisition was, of course, not binding on him without the sanction of his Holiness; and that as to any moderation of the edicts, it should never be by him accepted. The whole he desired might be kept a profound secret.

When the answer of the King reached Brussels, the administration there made great efforts to represent it as what ought to be entirely satisfactory to all. The people, however, suspected the truth, and Orange was convinced of it. Viglius urges the promised visit of the King in person, and if that might not be, then the assembly of the states. Philip writes to the Regent that this assembly never should take place, but to "keep this a profound secret."

Now arrives at Madrid the news of the field-preaching, and the iconomachy, and the Accord of the Duchess. The Regent sends, also, her confession of her fault in granting it, and her excuse for the same, together with her accusations against Orange, Egmont, and Horn, as having compelled her to this course. At the same time, she reminded Philip that her promise did not bind him, and expressed the hope that he would pay no regard to it.

Philip is enraged, but dissembles. He speaks softly and gently, but he prepares to send to the rebellious Netherlands the terrible Duke of Alva.

The popular mind turns to Egmont for a leader, and he might have had the whole country at his back. But the image-breaking had disgusted him, a zealous Roman Catholic. He repairs to his government of Flanders, and there he acts the unscrupulous partisan of government against the people, in the execution of numerous offenders.

William of Orange himself executes, at Antwerp, three of the rioters; but the preaching having occurred within the city before the Accord, he arranges an agreement with the Reformed upon that basis. He allows three churches to the different sects, and stipulates for mutual toleration between Protestants and Catholics. Such a religious peace (destined to be very short lived) he also established at Amsterdam, Utrecht, and other cities of his government. By this course, he gave great offence to those who were above him, but has thereby gained immortal renown. To him belongs the imperishable honor of having practised religious toleration in an age of universal dogmatism.

At Tournay, where three-fourths of the people were of the Reformed, Horn also allowed three places outside the walls, where churches might be built for the Reformed, and the Duchess formally consented to the permission. But as the winter came on, the people urged that they should be suffered to have meeting places within the walls, and Horn agreed to it. Great offence was thus given to the Duchess, and in the King's eyes it was a fatal crime. The fierce Noircarmes is sent to Tournay, and the city forcibly subjugated, and the Reformed religion suppressed. Meanwhile, Margaret is constantly writing to Philip against the great nobles. She charges them with the design of dividing the country out amongst themselves, and having arranged a general massacre of the Roman Catholics, to commence as

soon as the King should put foot on shipboard to come to the Netherlands.

The Prince of Orange, thoroughly understanding the *situation*, and perceiving that his country was to be subjugated, and his own life sacrificed, begins now, in 1566, to think and speak "treasonably." To Egmont and to Horn he writes, accordingly, warning them both of the common danger, and proposing that they should league together against Philip, in order to remain loyal to their duty and their country. Now occurs, also, the famous Dendermonde Conference, between Orange, Egmont, Horn, Louis of Nassau, and Hoogstraten. Henceforward, however, the paths of the three chief nobles diverge. After long vacillation, Egmont had decided for loyalty to Philip; and Horn, in wrath and moodiness, had retired to his "desert." Thus the two men upon whom William had relied the most, had separated from him. The confederacy of nobles had been dissolved, without accomplishing any thing for the country. They well-nigh ruined it by their folly and incapacity. Its sacred and holy cause they had profaned by indecent orgies, compromised by seditious demonstrations, and then abandoned, when it was most in need of assistance. For many individuals of them, no doubt, it was reserved to render honorable service in the national cause. The names of Louis of Nassau, Marnix of St. Aldegonde, and Bernarde de Merode, were to be written in letters of gold upon the country's rolls; but at this moment they were impatient, inconsiderate, and out of the control of Orange. What was he to do? Valenciennes had been summoned to receive a garrison at the same time with the unhappy Tournay, and had met the demand with a peremptory refusal. Her resistance could hardly have been prevented, even by the opposition of the Prince. But why should he take the field against men or cities who, however rashly and ineffectually, were endeavoring to oppose tyranny? Had his warnings been heeded, there might have been some head

made against the common enemy. But, alas! so it was not. Till late in the autumn of 1566, he had believed in the possibility of getting convoked the states-general. Even the Regent, as well as the Roman Catholics generally, had favored the measure. But when Tournay, and also Valenciennes, had fallen, she was less alarmed, and the people began to lose courage. The Prince, therefore, remains comparatively quiescent, but watchful.

It is not long before the Duchess calls on William, and all the stadtholders and other functionaries, to take a new oath of allegiance. He indignantly refuses, and resigns all the offices he filled. In Brederode's expedition to relieve Valenciennes he took no part, as he lacked confidence in the man and his measures. But in the tremendous tumults for three days at Antwerp, which followed the destruction of Brederode's forces under young Thoulouse, the Prince showed his characteristic courage and determination, and it was his wisdom and bravery which suppressed the tumult.

Valenciennes falls at the hands of Noircarmes and Egmont. The utmost cruelty is practised upon its inhabitants. Many hundreds of victims are sacrificed by strangling and the sword. The franchises of the city are all revoked. "For two whole years," (says a Roman Catholic historian,) "there was scarcely a week in which several citizens were not executed, and often a great number were dispatched at one time." Upon its fate had depended, as if by common consent, the whole destiny of the anti-Catholic party. It fell, and the consternation was extreme, and the general submission immediate, and even abject. Other important places accepted their garrisons without a murmur. Even Antwerp had made its last struggle, and as soon as the back of Orange was turned, knelt down in the dust to receive its bridle. The country was desolate indeed. Its ancient charters were superseded by brute force, its industrious population were swarming from the land in droves, as if before a pestilence; in every village gibbets

and scaffolds were erected, and there was universal a sickening apprehension of still darker disasters ; for on the 15th of April, the Duke of Alva left Spain to go and crush out every vestige of the liberties of this people, which had for centuries enjoyed a nearly complete self-government. Thus was Philip become, by every reasonable construction of history, an unscrupulous usurper, attempting to become the absolute monarch of a free people. It was he that was attempting a revolution ; while William, according to his well-known motto, was *maintaining*.

Choosing exile in Germany, rather than behold the ruin of the country he can not then save, Orange sets out for Dillenburg, the ancestral seat of his family, upon the 22d of April, 1567. He once more warns Egmont and Horn of their own impending fate. The Regent had thanked the former for his loyalty. The King himself had especially written him a commendatory epistle. Yet the royal hand had already signed the counts' death-warrant, and it was even then in Alva's possession ! As for William, the Duke had Philip's orders to arrest him immediately, and not to let his trial last over twenty-four hours.

Alva comes to the Netherlands. He demands the keys of the chief cities. Egmont and Horn are arrested, and the populace are in consternation. The Duke establishes a new court, called the Council of Troubles, but better known, and to be for ever known in history, as the Blood Council. It superseded all other courts and all other councils. It was an absolute and thorough violation of all charters, laws, and privileges. It defined and it punished treason. It was treason to have signed any petition against the new bishops, the inquisition, or the edicts ; to have tolerated public preaching, under any circumstances ; to have omitted resistance to the image-breaking, to the field-preaching, or the presentation of the Request ; to have asserted that the King did not possess the right to deprive all the provinces of their liberties ; or to have maintained that the present tribunal

was bound to respect, in any manner, any laws or any charters. Such was treason. The punishment of it was instant death, in all cases. In three months from the time of its creation, eighteen hundred persons suffered death by the summary proceedings of this tribunal.

The provinces were in despair. Margaret of Parma shortly gets leave to retire from her post of regent, and leaves the control of all affairs to this dreadful military chief. The principal cities are fortified against their own inhabitants. In particular, the citadel of Antwerp is in a few months erected and prepared, by the labors of two thousand workmen, at a cost of fourteen hundred thousand florins, of which the citizens of Antwerp, whom it was built to terrify and to tame, had to pay more than one-fourth.

On the 19th of January, 1568, Orange and sundry other nobles are summoned to appear before the Council of Blood. The Prince replied by a brief and contemptuous plea to the jurisdiction. As knight of the Fleece, as a member of the German Empire, as a sovereign prince in France, as a citizen of the Netherlands, he rejected the authority of Alva and his self-constituted tribunal. Meanwhile, he still maintained an attitude of dignified respect to the monarch, while he hurled back with defiance the insolent summons of the viceroy; for he knew how much strength was to be derived from putting an adversary irretrievably in the wrong.

Events now marched with rapidity. William's eldest child, the Count de Buren, left, by a remarkable oversight of his wise father, to pursue his studies in the college of Louvain, is seized as a hostage for the Prince's good behavior, and carried into indefinite captivity in a foreign land. Then, upon the 16th of February, 1568, a sentence of the holy office condemns all the inhabitants of the Netherlands to death as heretics, excepting only a few persons, whose names were given. The two imprisoned nobles also were now brought to trial, after having lain in confinement for two months. The charge of treason, as treason had been

defined by the Blood Council, it was not difficult, of course, to prove against either of them, or against almost any other Netherlander. But the difficulty in the way of their condemnation was, that as knights of the Fleece, it was only that famous order which had jurisdiction of their crimes. But Alva, by the aid of President Viglius, soon disposed of that difficulty, by a bold declaration that the statutes of the Fleece did not extend to such crimes as those charged against these nobles. Of course, Philip sustained the viceroy—the execution of these nobles had been settled before Alva left Spain. A despot like Philip the Second scrupled not at any arbitrary act. As the constitutions of the Netherlands and the statutes of the Fleece stood in his way, it was necessary to stride over those constitutions, and to set aside those statutes. The sentence against them, signed by Philip in blank, had been brought in Alva's portfolio from Madrid. The proceedings against them were a mockery. Rights and justice were abrogated throughout the land. The whole country was under martial law. The entire population was under sentence of death.

Where now is William of Orange? Proscribed, outlawed, his Netherlands property confiscated, his eldest child kidnapped, surely he has private reasons enough to justify him in rebellion, were there no public grounds for it whatever. The prospects of any such movement are dark enough. The Spaniards, under the first military chieftain of the age, are encamped and entrenched in the provinces. The Huguenots have just made a fatal peace in France. The leading men of liberal views in Netherlands are captives or in exile. Confiscations have severed the nerves of war. The country is terror-stricken, paralyzed, motionless, abject, forswearing its convictions, and imploring only life. At such a moment as this, the Prince reappears upon the scene. Early in the summer of 1568, he publishes to the world his justification of all his past acts, and then begins to make war. He gets help in Germany; he has hopes from England.

He commissions his brother Louis and other friends to levy troops. Some of the cities of the Netherlands send him funds. Refugee merchants in England do the same. He sells his jewels, plate, tapestry, etc., of regal magnificence, and his gift to the treasury of the army is fifty thousand florins. Others of the patriot leaders imitate his example. But his first army of three thousand men, under De Villars, were shamefully beaten by less than half their number of Spaniards, under Sancho de Lodroño, and that notwithstanding they were entrenched. This signal misfortune happened on the 25th of April. Towards the end of June, another force of two thousand five hundred men took the field, under De Cocqueville, and were cut to pieces on the 18th of July—scarce three hundred escaped. Meanwhile, at the end of May, Louis of Nassau had gained the victory of Heiliger Lee, over the imprudent Aremberg. But it was a barren victory, and it cost the life-blood of young Adolphus of Nassau, brother of William and Louis. Alva is enraged beyond measure at this defeat. The lion is roused. The executions of Egmont and Horn are hastened, and the Duke takes the field in person against Louis. On the 21st of July, he totally routs him at Jemmingen. But *seven* Spaniards were killed, while *seven thousand* rebels perished, partly by the sword and partly in the river. The wounding, killing, burning, and drowning, lasted two days, and very few of the whole army escaped. Louis himself got off naked, and by swimming the Ems. There followed this slaughter of the army all the horrors of barbarous war, inflicted upon old men and upon females. The earth, as Alva marched back to Groningen, was made red with blood, and the sky with conflagration.

The insurrection being thus quelled in Friesland, Alva returned triumphant to Brussels. All unsoftened by success, the butchery of the Reformed there began again, under the Duke's auspices. Hundreds of martyrs, some eminent personages, were tortured unto death.

William of Orange is not disheartened by these sad reverses, although many of his friends urge him to suspend his warlike efforts. The Landgrave William, the Elector Augustus, the Emperor himself, all urged him to sit still for the present. But he knew well how little good would come of such moderation on his side. And he felt that the more impenetrable the darkness now gathering over that land of doom which he had devoted his life to defend, the more urgently was he forbidden to turn his face away from it in its affliction. He had by this time become himself a Protestant, at first of Lutheran, but subsequently of Calvinistic faith. But he was no more now than before a bigot. Toleration, now in almost all eyes a vice, he had long held, and now even more than ever, to be a virtue. "Should we obtain power over any city or cities," he wrote, in his letter of instructions to his most confidential agent, John Bazius, "let the communities of papists be as much respected and protected as possible. Let them be overcome, not by violence, but with gentle-mindedness and virtuous treatment." He considered his undertaking for the Netherlands a mission from God, and, with simple trust, he looked up to God for help in the work to which he had been called. It was this inward principle of evangelic faith which made William of Orange *sævis tranquillus in undis*—never more tranquil than when the storm was wildest and the night darkest.

And thus did the sovereign of an insignificant little principality stand boldly forth to do battle with the most powerful monarch in the world. At his own expense, and by almost superhuman exertions, he had again assembled nearly thirty thousand men. He crosses the Rhine, and then the Meuse, and boldly offers battle to Alva. But the Duke had determined upon his tactics, and would not fight. His plan was to overcome his enemy by delay. This army of the Prince was the last hope of the patriots. The winter alone would soon disperse these German mercenaries; for

without victory they would get neither pay nor plunder. He would, therefore, parry the strokes of his adversary, but not give him battle. He would hang upon his skirts, follow him move by move, check him at every turn, harass him continually, and foil all his enterprises, but not fight him.

The campaign lasted about one month. Twenty-nine times the Prince changed his encampment, and at every remove the Duke was still behind him, as close and as palpable as his shadow. Thrice were they within cannon shot of each other, twice without a single trench between them. Orange's soldiers were maddened and tantalized by these tactics. They were constantly in the presence of an enemy who seemed to court a battle at one moment, and at the next to vanish like a phantom. There was but one important action in the campaign, and that was favorable to the Duke. The Prince was disappointed, not only in the hope of a general battle, but also, and still more bitterly, in the supineness of the country. Not a single city opened its gates to him. All was crouching, silent, abject. Had a brilliant victory been obtained, perhaps the rising of the people would have been universal. There was no victory at all, and no rising at all. William sought to carry his army into France, to try the fortunes of the civil war, but in vain. They insisted on being led back into Germany. He disbanded them at Strasburg, making up in promises to them what he could not pay in money.

Thus triumphantly for Alva, and thus miserably for Orange, ended the campaign. Thus hopelessly vanished the armies of the Prince. Eight thousand had he lost in paltry encounters, and thirty thousand had he been compelled to disband. All his funds had been wasted, and no result. There seemed no hope for the Netherlands. But the war of freedom had been renewed in France, and with twelve hundred mounted men, who were willing to follow his fortunes, William, with his brothers, Louis and the

youthful Henry, set forth in the following spring to join the banner of Condé.

The haughty, and now apparently omnipotent Duke, returns to Brussels, and almost assumes the god. He institutes a succession of triumphant festivals, and requires the people to rejoice and strew flowers in his path, although coming to them covered with the blood of men who had striven in their defence. He goes farther, and rears a colossal statue of bronze to himself, as having "extinguished sedition, chastised rebellion, restored religion, secured justice, established peace!"

To add to the disappointments of the Prince, the Emperor of Germany, who had at first espoused his cause with apparent frankness, so far as friendly mediation went, now courted Philip's favor. The King had become a widower again, and the Emperor, among his sixteen children, had more than one marriageable daughter. If it were good to be the guardian of religious freedom in upper and nether Germany, it were better to be the father-in-law to the King of Spain and to both the Indies.

There arose at this time a quarrel between Queen Elizabeth and the haughty Duke of Alva. But neither the torrent of his wrath against the English sovereign, nor the complacency of his triumph over the Prince of Orange, could for a moment cause a pause in that which was his main pursuit. He was zealously engaged in enforcing the edicts with fire and with sword. But the murder of heretics had not proved as lucrative a business as he had expected. Confiscations must of necessity offer but a precarious supply to any treasury. Only the frenzy of an Alva could suppose it might form a permanent revenue. He was now determined to exhibit, by still more fierce, and in one sense ludicrous experiments, how a great soldier may be a very paltry financier. His promise to Philip had been, that a stream of gold a yard deep should flow into Spain from the provinces, the value of which should be two millions yearly

over and above all expenses of the army and government in the Netherlands. He now forms a scheme of arbitrary taxation by the crown, to be substituted for the legal and constitutional taxation of the provinces by themselves. A general assembly of the provincial estates is summoned at Brussels, and decrees are laid before them, instituting,

I. A tax of the hundredth penny, or one per cent., upon all property, real and personal, to be collected instantly; this, however, was not a perpetual tax.

II. A perpetual tax of the twentieth penny, or five per cent., upon every transfer of real estate.

III. A perpetual tax of the tenth penny, or ten per cent., upon every article of merchandise or personal property, to be paid as often as it was sold.

The consternation in the assembly was extreme. He was touching the nerve that lay in their pockets. Comparatively few men of any nation will suffer martyrdom for religious or political principle, but opposition to material and financial tyranny will generally be unanimous. Alva struck at every Netherlander now, and struck where all must be sensitive. The tenth-penny tax was absolutely monstrous; for the same article might be sold ten times a week, and might, therefore, pay away its whole worth in that space of time. The infantine simplicity of the scheme seemed a thing incredible. The ignorance was as sublime as the tyranny. But the Governor-General would listen to no arguments; his determination was as stern as it was stupid and absurd.

Here was the beginning of an earnest popular resistance to the tyrant. The city of Utrecht distinguished herself for her stubborn opposition to this taxation, and lost all her charters by it, for the time. The various assemblies of the patrimonial provinces, one after another, exhausted, frightened, hoping that no serious effort to collect the tax would be made, did, indeed, all consent, under certain restrictions, to its imposition. But they soon withdrew their consent,

as having been obtained by violence or fraud. Compromises were finally agreed to, which postponed the final struggle.

Alva grows sick of his office. His power is evidently on the wane, for the King did not heartily approve the wisdom of his financial measures. His brutality, also, had overshot the mark, and produced disgust amongst some who at first supported him heartily. He earnestly begs to be recalled from his post.

Toward the end of the year 1570, occurred an unexampled inundation, more disastrous in its effects upon the Netherlands than even the famous deluge of the thirteenth century, which gave birth to the Zuyder Zee. The people felt that the hand of God was upon them. As for the Spaniards, they loudly maintained that the vengeance of Heaven had descended upon the abode of heretics. The poor Netherlanders seemed to be doomed to destruction by both God and man.

In France, affairs grew almost as black for the cause of freedom as in the Netherlands. Condé is killed at the battle of Jarnac, and Coligny overthrown at that of Montcontour. Dark indeed were these years of 1569 and 1570 for the Reformed cause every where; but in these darkest hours for his country, never did William of Orange despair. In the autumn of 1569, he returns to Germany; but Count Louis remains with the Huguenots. The deadly peace between them and the court of France succeeded, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew was hastening on. Never had William been in so forlorn a condition as on his return from France. He had no funds to raise new levies, and was daily exposed to annoying claims from his disbanded soldiers. A deep gloom seemed to settle upon his cause. Yet was his spirit unbroken. His letters of this period show a perfect appreciation of the situation, but were also full of modest but lofty courage and pious resignation, without one trace of desponding weakness.

Early in 1571 were renewed the struggles of the Duke and the estates about the taxes. The estates were satisfied that the King was less in earnest than the viceroy. The supple Viglius is satisfied of the waning power of the Duke, and openly turns against him.

Meanwhile, Orange is slowly gathering funds from the gifts of many obscure persons, and the daring exploits of "the beggars of the sea," or privateers, who had sailed under his commission. His emissaries were sent every where, and actively canvassed the governments and peoples of Germany. To the Northern courts his missions had failed. Sweden and Denmark received his envoys with barren courtesy. He furnishes his ambassadors with documents from his own hand, pleading for arms and other assistance. These missives were stamped with the warm religious impress of the Reforming party. Sadly, but without despondency, they recalled the misfortunes of the past, and depicted the gloom of the present. Earnestly, but not fanatically, they stimulated hope, and solicited aid for the future.

At the same time, the affairs of Alva with the estates reached a crisis. The citizens were in open revolt against the taxes. In order to escape the levy of the tenth penny, no goods were sold at all. Not only the wholesale commerce of the provinces was suspended, but the minute and indispensable traffic of daily life was at a stand. The shops were all shut. The brewer would not brew, nor the baker bake. Alva is furious. He orders the hanging of eighteen of the butchers and bakers of Brussels, at their own doors. This was his method of giving a stimulus to trade. The hangman is getting ready his cords and ladders. Alva grimly waits for the rising dawn, which is to usher in his speedy triumph over the obstinacy of the tradesmen. An unforeseen event arrests the tragedy. In the night arrives the news of the capture of Brill, by Orange's sea-beggars, under Admiral William de la Marck. A reconciliation

had been effected between Alva's government and that of Queen Elizabeth, and the Netherland privateersmen had been ordered out of the English ports. It looked like a fresh misfortune for Orange; but it was a blessing in disguise. De la Marck's fleet of twenty-four vessels, nearly starving, appear before Brill, and as they must land to get food, William de Blois, the bold seigneur of Treslong, persuades the Admiral to demand the surrender of the town. The magistrates, in terror, flee the city, and it is taken. The corner-stone of the Batavian republic is laid.

Count Bossu is ordered by Alva to retake the town, but he fails. He turns towards Rotterdam, and finds the gates closed against him. Professing perfect loyalty, the inhabitants refuse to receive a garrison to enforce their obedience. By a perfidious stratagem, he is admitted, and four hundred citizens are murdered, and the women meet a fate worse than death. The city of Flushing, on the island of Walcheren, is the first that vibrates with the patriotic impulse given at Brill, and revolts. The example is followed by nearly all the important towns of Holland and Zeeland. With one fierce bound of enthusiasm, the nation shakes off its chain. The first half of the year 1572, is distinguished by a series of triumphs, rendered still more remarkable by the reverses which followed at its close. City after city, in Gelderland, Overijssel, and the see of Utrecht, all the important towns of Friesland, accepted the garrisons of the Prince, and formally acknowledged his authority. The stadtholderate over Holland and Zeeland, to which the Prince had been appointed in 1559, he now reassumed. Upon this fiction reposed the whole provisional polity of the revolted Netherlands. There was no claim, at first, of freedom, beyond what was secured by Philip's coronation oath. There was no pretence that Philip was not sovereign, but there was a determination to assert freedom of conscience, and to reclaim their ancient political liberties. The purpose of William, and of the people, was to recover

historical rights, and to shake off a sanguinary and usurping tyranny.

Louis of Nassau, meanwhile, performs a daring feat—the surprise and capture of the important frontier town of Mons. Alva is in dismay at the suddenness of all these blows. Moreover, he is without money, and is compelled to offer an abolition of the whole tax, upon condition of the payment annually of two millions of florins by the estates. He issues a summons on the 24th of June, for them to assemble on the 15th of July. His healing measures come too late. The estates did meet on the appointed day; but not at the Hague, as he proposed, but at Dort; and not in obedience to his call, but that of Orange. They met at his call as the representative of Philip, and by the authority of Philip, to wage war against Philip. They vote the most liberal supplies. They will give the whole, if necessary, to William, rather than the tenth to Alva—to their liberator all, rather than any thing to their destroyer. They also declared William the King's lawful stadtholder over Holland, Zeeland, Friesland and Utrecht. They ordain freedom of worship, both to Roman Catholics and the Reformed. They make William supreme dictator, and it was reserved for this patriot himself, by an act supplemental to their proceedings, to impose limits upon his own power.

Now begins a series of terrible reverses to the Prince and his cause. Genlis, with reinforcements for Louis, from France, is routed by the Spaniards, and Louis himself closely shut up in Mons. William takes the field with an army of fifteen thousand foot, seven thousand horse, and about three thousand other Walloon troops. He found it hard to restrain his half-paid soldiers, when the city of Roermond was taken, on the 23d of July. Yet the difference was vast between a leader like him, who restrained excesses to the utmost of his power, and Alva, who inculcated robbery, rape, and arson, upon his army as their duty.

As he marched onwards, city after city, including Mechlin, submitted cheerfully to his authority. He was sanguine of French help, notwithstanding the sacrifice made by Genlis of his army. He allowed himself to boast that Alva was in his power, and that the Netherlands would soon be free. Then it was that the earthquake of St. Bartholomew's day appalled all christendom with him, and scattered all his well-matured plans and legitimate hopes. It is not long before his army mutinies, and dissolves into nothing. Mons capitulates. The terms of the capitulation are horribly violated by the Spaniards. The keys of that city unlock every other in Brabant and Flanders. The towns all hasten to disavow the Prince, and to return to their ancient, hypocritical, and cowardly allegiance. Unhappy Mechlin is selected for an example. Alva's soldiers are to be paid their arrears at its expense. Three days did the sack continue; one for the Spaniards, and two more for the Walloons and Germans. No rank, no age, no sex, no religious faith, was spared. Roman Catholics, as well as the Reformed, were freely made victims. Thus was poor Mechlin abandoned to that trinity of furies which ever wait on the footsteps of War—Murder, Lust, and Rapine.

And now there follow what our author calls three thorough massacres. Zutphen, Naarden, and Harlem are sacked; and the story is in each case sickening. When Zutphen fell, and was given up by the cruel Duke to his ferocious soldiery, he piously remarked that it was "*a permission of God* that these people should have undertaken to defend a place so weak." Similar to this was the Christian language of Mendoza, relative to the fall of Naarden: "It was a chastisement which must be believed to have taken place by the express permission of Divine providence; a punishment for having been the first of the Holland towns in which heresy built its nest, whence it has taken its flight to all the neighboring cities." As for the siege of Harlem, it is a story of unexampled heroism. Ripperda, the stout

commandant of the little garrison, assembled the citizens and soldiers together in the market-place, warned them, by the fate of Mechlin, Zutphen, and Naarden, of the terrors before them, should they be base enough to surrender the city, and urged them to make no composition with foes as false as sanguinary, but to make one last vigorous effort for freedom. They did make it. There were about one thousand delvers, three thousand fighting men, besides three hundred fighting women, all armed with sword, musket, and dagger. With such a spirit in the maids and matrons of the city, it might be expected that the men would not surrender without a struggle. It was fierce, and bloody, and long continued. The most daring sallies were frequently made, the most patient labors were cheerfully undergone; men, women, and children, working day and night to repair the breaches in the walls as fast as the enemy could make them. They encountered the besiegers not only with sword and musket, but with heavy stones, boiling oil, and live coals. Hoops smeared with pitch and set on fire were dexterously thrown upon their necks. As fast as the Spaniards mined, the citizens countermined; and Spaniard and Netherlander met daily in deadly combat within the bowels of the earth. The siege continued all through the winter and early spring. William of Orange did all that was possible for him, in the vain endeavor to give succor to the devoted city. Batenburg's expedition for their relief was a miserable failure. He was probably intoxicated in the time of the action. At length the city surrendered at discretion, on the 12th of July. Next day the massacre commenced. Six hundred Germans of the garrison were dismissed on oath to fight no more. The remaining twelve hundred were butchered, with at least as many more of the citizens. Five executioners were kept constantly at work, with their attendants. Three hundred wretches were tied two and two, back to back, and drowned

in the Harlem lake. At last, after twenty-three hundred executions, the farce of a pardon was enacted.

The reduction of Harlem is an event which makes us wonder equally at human capacity to inflict and to endure misery. If it was a triumph to the Spaniards, it was one they might well have given in exchange for a defeat. Twelve thousand of them had died of wounds and of disease during the seven months of the siege. The Spaniards celebrated their victory, but it was evident their empire could not endure many such. If it required thirty thousand choice troops to conquer, in seven months, the weakest city of Holland, with a loss of twelve thousand men, how long a time, and how many deaths, would it take to reduce the rest of that little province? The sack of Naarden had inflamed instead of subduing the spirit of Dutch resistance; and the long and glorious defence of Harlem operated to strain to the highest pitch the patriotic hatred of her sister cities. All the treasures of the New World would not suffice to pay for the conquest of the little sand-bank thus defended by its heroic inhabitants.

The Spaniards were exultant, but Orange was neither dismayed nor despondent. His trust was in a higher power than man's. "Since it has otherwise pleased God," he writes to Count Louis, "we must conform ourselves to the divine will. I take the same God to witness, that I have done every thing, according to my means, which was possible, to succor the city." When, after a few days, the Zealanders capture the castle of Rammekens, on the island of Walcheren, he writes to his brother, in the same spirit: "I hope this will reduce the pride of our enemies, who, since the fall of Harlem, have thought they were about to swallow us alive. I assure myself, however, that they will find a very different piece of work from the one which they expect."

The tide of tyranny is at the flood, and now it begins to ebb. The government makes some awkward and fruitless

attempts at conciliation. The Spanish troops shew signs of mutiny, and even make secret overtures to Orange. With difficulty, Alva restores obedience. The town of Alkmaar is besieged. Sonoy, the lieutenant-governor for Orange of the province of North Holland, an experienced officer, is uneasy at the prospect of the unequal conflict. All looked instinctively to the Prince in every danger, and their hopes were that he had made some foreign alliance that would save them. Sonoy looked, and Sonoy hoped, as did the rest. The Prince's answer to him was full of lofty enthusiasm, such as Christian faith can best inspire. "You ask," says he, "if I have entered into a firm treaty with any great king or potentate; to which I answer, that before I ever took up the cause of the oppressed Christians in these provinces, I had entered *into a close alliance with the King of kings*; and I am firmly convinced that all who put their trust in Him shall be saved by His almighty hand. The God of armies will raise up armies for us, to do battle with our enemies and His own." In conclusion, he stated his preparations for attacking the enemy by sea as well as land, and encouraged Sonoy and the citizens to maintain a bold front.

When the Spaniards assault the town, resistance is made by every man, woman and child. Three times the attack is made, and three times repulsed. Darkness puts an end to the strife. The next day, the order is given to renew the assault, but the Spanish soldiers refuse to attempt it. The place was protected by more than mortal powers; else how could a few half-starved fishermen have so triumphed over the legions of Spain. Some of them were run through the body for disobedience, but still they refused, and the assault was indefinitely postponed. Finally, the Spaniards discovering that the dykes were about to be opened, so as to flood them with the ocean, the siege was raised.

Meanwhile, the court of France assumed a tone of compunction for the bloody deed of St. Bartholomew, and Orange reluctantly enters into negotiations with it again.

He also puts forth another appeal to the patriotism of his country, in an address to the general assembly of the Netherlands. At the same time, he puts into circulation one of the most vigorous and impassioned productions which ever came from his pen. It was "An Epistle, in form of supplication, to his royal Majesty of Spain, from the Prince of Orange and the estates of Holland and Zeeland."

Three days after the deliverance of Alkmaar, the patriots meet with another success. It was a victory on the Zuyder Zee, by Admiral Dirkzoon, with twenty-five ships, over Count Bossu, with thirty, larger and more heavily armed. The victory was complete, and Admiral Bossu was sent a prisoner to Holland. On the 17th of November, 1573, Requesens arrives in Brussels, to succeed Alva; and on the 18th of December, the Duke gladly, yet in deep humiliation, takes his departure for ever from the Netherlands.

Our author well remarks, that although his military fame was unquestionable when he came to the provinces, yet he left them a baffled man. As Alva penetrated into the heart of the ancient Batavian land, he found himself overmatched by the spirit of national freedom, (more audacious, more inventive, more desperate, than all commanders,) as he had never been, even by the most potent generals of his day. The same lesson had been read in the same thickets by the Nervii to Julius Cæsar, by the Batavians to the legions of Vespasian. And now a loftier and a purer flame glowed within the breasts of these descendants of the same people. Alva came to deal with them as with conquered provinces, but he found that the conquest still had to be made, and he left the country without having accomplished it. Neither his legions nor his strategy availed him against an entirely desperate people. He proved himself utterly deficient in every attribute requisite in a man appointed to deal with a free country in a state of incipient rebellion.

These are certainly wise and just reflections, and evince that the author has not studied history in vain. It had

been well for that United States government, which he is now representing, we believe, at some court in Europe, if they had carefully read and pondered deliberately this page of his work, before they sent their Butlers, and Hunters, and McClellans, upon similarly preposterous, absurd, and wicked enterprises, into the states of this Confederacy.

Upon the retirement of the Duke, it was industriously circulated that a change of policy was intended. But, in fact, it would seem that the Spanish government regarded this period merely as a breathing-time, in which "still more active preparations might be made," says the author, employing the term which his countrymen have made so familiar, "for *crushing the rebellion.*" Seven years of executions, sieges, and campaigns, had not brought Philip any closer to the subjugation of the provinces. The new governor was, therefore, authorized to employ concessions, but it was on the basis of the King's absolute supremacy, and the total prohibition of every form of worship except the Roman Catholic. He was authorized to concede to the people a pardon; but it was only in case they would abandon every object for which they had been so heroically contending. Towards the coming of Requesens, therefore, as successor to Alva, all looked forward with indefinite hopes of peace.

Requesens found such a state of the exchequer at Brussels, as to render some little respite to the war an absolute necessity. The army numbered sixty-two thousand men, and forty millions of dollars had been already sunk. The whole annual produce of the American mines, it seemed, would be required to sustain the war. Six and a-half millions of ducats were due to the soldiers. Seven millions of dollars were the yearly necessities of the exchequer, and to meet them, Requesens had not one stiver. He writes to his sovereign: "Before my arrival, I did not understand how the rebels could maintain such considerable fleets, while your Majesty could not support a single one. It ap-

pears, however, that men who are fighting for their lives, their firesides, their property, and their false religion, for their own cause, in short, are contented to receive rations only, without receiving pay." "He saw what few bigoted supporters of absolutism, in any age, have ever comprehended," says Mr. Motley—and the remark is a striking one, as coming from a Yankee author, and a public defender, with his pen, of the Seward-Lincoln war—"that national enthusiasm, when profound and general, makes a rebellion more expensive to the despot than to the insurgents." The policy of the Requesens administration, therefore, in a word, was to deceive the people with the idea of pardon and peace, and so to gain time.

The situation of the patriots, at the same time, was not very encouraging. They had the superiority at sea, but their land forces were mercenaries, constantly mutinying for want of pay. And then Holland was now cut in twain by the loss of Harlem and the leaguer of Leyden. The estates, moreover, were much given to wrangling about economical details. Orange had strong hopes now from France. But he was dreading the effects of the promised pardon upon the spirit of the people.

The chief military events of the administration of the Grand Commander Requesens were, the capitulation of the town of Middelburg, held by Mondragon, to the forces of Orange, and thus the evacuation by the Spaniards of the whole island of Walcheren; the battle of Mook-heath, and the overthrow and death of Louis of Nassau; the mutiny of the Spanish soldiers, and their savage occupation, for a time, of the city of Antwerp, to be renewed, two years later, with all the horrors of massacre and sack; the successful expedition of the Spaniards to the island of Duiveland, and their siege of Zierickzee; the destruction of Spanish fleets of Bergen and Antwerp; and the grand and affecting drama of the siege and the deliverance of Leyden.

The council of nobles was formally abolished on the arrival of the Grand Commander, by letter from Philip's own hand. Negotiations for peace, informal and insincere perhaps, were carried on during the whole summer and autumn of 1574. During the autumn and winter of that year, the Emperor Maximilian actively exerted himself to bring about a pacification. Commissioners of the states and plenipotentiaries of the King met at Breda, in March, 1575. Nothing was effected. On the close of the negotiations, on the 13th of July, each party blamed the other for their failure.

In the course of 1575, the foundation was laid for the union of Holland and Zeeland, under authority of Orange. He was to have absolute power in all matters of the country's defence, while the war lasted. He was to maintain the law, in the King's name, as Count of Holland. He was to protect the exercise of the Reformed, and to suppress that of the Roman religion, without, however, permitting search into any man's creed. William accepted the government July 11th.

A new and improved act of union was duly signed upon the 25th of April, 1576. This was a confederation of the estates, that is, of the knights and nobles of Holland, with the deputies from the cities and countships of Holland and Zeeland. It was a confederation of virtually independent little republics. Each municipality, (says Mr. Motley,) was, as it were, a little sovereignty. Yet, while the various members of the confederacy were locally and practically republics, the general government they established was monarchical. But the whole system was rather practical than theoretical; and so thoroughly was William absorbed in his patriotic work, that it was a small matter with him whether men called him stadtholder, prince, or king. His name amongst the people, from the highest to the lowest, was the name he liked best, and that name was "Father William." He was the father of his country. The vulgar

thought of carving for himself a throne out of the misfortunes of his people, seems not to have entered his mind. Upon one point only had he been peremptory. He would have no persecution for creeds. He stood out resolutely against all meddling with men's consciences. Thought should be toll free.

The expedition to Duiveland was the most brilliant exploit of the war, and was attended with very important results, adverse to William's cause. It cut the province of Zeeland in two, as the sister province of Holland had been severed by previous misfortunes. The Prince is excessively chagrined. He feels that the time is come when foreign assistance must be obtained. Poverty was fast rendering it impossible to keep up the conflict. He and his little country are all alone. He must throw away the fiction of allegiance to Philip, and seek the protection either of France or of England. The estates, early in October, 1575, agreed, unanimously, to declare themselves independent of Philip. Then were resumed fruitless negotiations with the other powers. Germany, England, France, all refused to stretch out their hands to save the heroic but exhausted little provinces. The Prince meditated the sublime but desperate purpose, to collect a numerous fleet, and move the whole population, with their effects, to some new home beyond the seas. The wind-mills were then to be burned, the dykes pierced, the sluices opened in every direction, and the country restored to the ocean, from which it had sprung.

Here we are compelled, for want of space, to arrest our sketch. The way in which Divine providence, at this dark hour, once more interposes for the help of the good cause, by the sudden demise of Requesens, and the consequent confusion of the Spanish councils, we need not recount. We can only refer, in general terms, to the Pacification of Ghent, that masterpiece of diplomacy on William's part, by which he bound together, on the 8th of November,

1576, the estates of Holland and Zeeland, with Brabant, Flanders, and the other provinces. The two former contained a population almost entirely Reformed, but a large portion of the people in the other fifteen provinces were Roman Catholic; and yet they are now united in a toleration of one another's creed, and the effort to drive out the foreign foe. Notwithstanding the fatal difference of religious opinion, they are now at length united in one great hatred and one great hope. There followed, in January, 1577, the celebrated "Union of Brussels"—sent, after its adoption by the states, into every province, that each particular man might be called upon, by signing or refusing to sign it, to range himself either on the side of the fatherland or of despotism. The tenor of the document was to engage its signers to compass the immediate expulsion of foreigners and the execution of the Ghent Pacification; but it also provided for maintaining the Roman Catholic religion and the King's authority, as well as the defence of the fatherland, and all its constitutions. Thus was laid a stepping-stone to the "Union of Utrecht," itself the foundation-stone of a republic destined to endure more than two centuries. The "Union of Brussels" held within itself the seeds of its own destruction. It was impossible that a permanent crystallization should take place, where so strong a dissolvent as the Roman Catholic religion had been admitted. In the sequel, the union fell asunder precisely at this fatal flaw. The next union was one which definitely separated the seventeen provinces into Protestant and Roman Catholic—self-governing republics and the dependencies of a distant despotism. The contracting parties agreed to remain eternally united, as if they were but one province. But at the same time, each was to retain its particular privileges, liberties, and laws. All the ancient constitutions were to be guaranteed. They were to defend each other with "life, goods, and blood," against the King, and all other foes. Every

conscience. Thus the seventeen provinces became a state single towards the rest of the world, a unit in its external relations, while permitting internally a variety of sovereignties. The author observes that this differed from the German confederation, in that it acknowledged no single head; from the Achaian league, in the greater weakness of its federal assembly, and the greater fulness of the sovereignty of the individual states; and from the Swiss confederacy, in the more thorough completeness of the union formed. He then distinguishes it from "the American federal commonwealth," in the great feature, that it was to be merely a confederacy of sovereignties, and not a representative republic." "Its foundation was a compact, not a constitution." "The contracting parties were states." "The people of the United States of the Netherlands never assembled—as did the people of the United States of America two centuries later—to lay down a constitution by which they granted a generous amount of power to the union, while they reserved enough of sovereign attributes to secure that local self-government which is the life-blood of liberty." Now, we are neither politicians nor statesmen, nor do we set ourselves up as judges of constitutions and laws, yet we claim to possess (as becomes every citizen) some little knowledge of the Constitution under which we lived, till lately, and of its history. And what little we do know on that subject, is enough to enable us to show, in few words, that our author is far astray in these representations of the Constitution and government of the late United States of America. Those states, when they formed and ratified the Constitution in question, were certainly distinct, independent, and sovereign communities. The thirteen colonies began the contest with Great Britain as distinct communities, and came out of it, severally, sovereign and independent states. Even the Articles of Confederation, (which was merely a league offensive and defensive,) were not ratified by any of the states till three years after the

war began, and two years after independence was declared; and three years more passed away before it was ratified by all of them. During all this period, they were separate and independent states or nations, and had their separate local governments in complete operation. And each, or either of them, might have continued in a condition of separate nationality to this day, had such been its sovereign will or pleasure. And as such sovereign and independent states, they were acknowledged, at last, by the mother country. Now, in what way did the Constitution come to be subsequently set up and established, in the room of the Articles of Confederation? It was first prepared by the states, through their delegates, in convention at Philadelphia, and then it was submitted to the states, separately and respectively, to be approved or rejected by them in their respective conventions, each acting for itself. It was the act of ratification which established it as a constitution between the states so ratifying it, and only between them, on the condition that not less than nine of the then thirteen states should concur in the ratification, as was expressly provided by the seventh and last article of the Constitution. Now, who performed the acts of ratification, except the several states, through conventions of delegates chosen in each state by the people thereof, and acting each in the name and by the authority of its state? And, as all the states ratified it, "we, the people of the United States," (the opening phrase of the preamble,) means, of course, "we, the people of the several states, who do so ratify the Constitution and form the Union. This Constitution, so ratified, was clearly a compact between sovereigns. When the question arose in the convention which framed the instrument, what tribunal should be empowered to decide in doubtful cases of its interpretation, no provision was made; for it was clearly seen that a compact between sovereignties could be interpreted only by each sovereignty for itself. Time and again it was proposed, in the convention, to

make the supreme court "the tribunal to decide in doubtful cases," but not in any form did the proposition prevail. The inference is plain.

Now, this compact between the states of the American Union, was one that came to be broken by some of the sovereignties. Even Mr. Webster, who never leaned too strongly towards state rights, said, in 1851, "If the northern states were to refuse to carry into effect the Constitution, as respects fugitive slaves, the South would no longer be bound to observe the compact. A bargain broken on one side, is a bargain broken on all sides." The northern states did, many of them, formally and deliberately, so refuse; and according, therefore, to the great New England statesman, the Constitution was not only a compact, but a compact broken; a compact broken effectually, and deserving to be discarded for ever. It has been so discarded by the Confederate States. And thus it comes to pass, that the author is living in the days of a struggle for chartered rights, every way greater, though in some remarkable particulars very similar, to the one he so laboriously, eloquently, and, we hope, honestly describes. The contrasts between these two struggles are as striking as the parallels.

A few of these parallels and of these contrasts we shall now briefly suggest.

1. There are the same elements combined in the cause and origin of these two struggles. The Dutch struggle was partly religious and partly political. The inquisition and the charters were the main points at issue. In the present contest, also, religious and political interests commingle. We struggle for our states' rights and our local governments, against a consolidated nationality, to which our fathers never gave consent. And we also struggle for the right of a free people to change their government whenever it becomes dangerous to them. The government at Washington never was, and never shall be, our master-

It never was designed, according to the Constitution, to be any thing but an agent, with limited powers, for the States; and so, in a certain sense, the servant of the States. It is, therefore, the Constitution of our fathers, as against a usurping central despotism, for which we contend; so that (as with the Dutch) not we, but our foes, are the revolutionists. We also struggle for God's word and providence, both impugned by our enemies. It becomes clearer every day, that the war is against slavery, and on religious grounds, in part. It is human reason and human piety against the Bible. If we had been willing to learn from New England wisdom a better religion and morality than the Bible's, this war had never been begun; and even now, all would at once be well again, if we would just consent to be so taught. Thus the struggle is both religious and political.

Another element in the cause and origin of both struggles is money. Alva promised Philip a stream of gold one yard deep, flowing perpetually from the provinces into Spain. The North went into this struggle to recover southern trade. She now prosecutes this war to secure the payment of its enormous cost.

There is a fourth element, which we will call the sectional element. In the case of the Dutch and Spanish there was an absolute difference of race. There is no such difference in the present case, and yet there is a difference of ideas, habits, notions, and ways of feeling, thinking, and acting, which has long constituted us two distinct peoples, and which forms a real element in the present discord. The *true and genuine Yankee* always has been hateful to the South. The whole North, nay, even the whole of New England, is not true and genuine Yankee. Some of the noblest specimens of humanity are here amongst us, who came to us from the now hostile North—and New England itself has furnished some of the very best citizens and soldiers of our Confederacy. But, however this may be, the war, as waged against us, and the government that wages

it, is *true and genuine Yankee*. Yankee principles and Yankee motives originated the war, and Yankee policy controls and conducts it. The press of the North has long been accustomed to sneer at those chivalrous notions upon which the Southron prides himself; and it would, indeed, seem as though the sense of honor, that most important element of high character, is utterly wanting in the North. If there is any thing selfish, base, cowardly, deceitful, in Yankee character, it has all been exhibited in every stage of the policy and conduct of this war upon us by the North. So that the whole North is now become *Yankee* to the people of this Confederacy. The feelings once cherished towards the tricky, mean, meddlesome, unmanly, canting, hypocritical, rapacious Massachusetts or Connecticut man, are now transferred, throughout these states, to all classes at the North. They have all assumed that character, and are acting that way towards us. We did but claim our inheritance of independence and freedom; and, believing themselves able, they have, with one accord, shewed themselves willing, to spoil us of every right for their own advantage. The property, the lives, the liberties of their southern brethren, the very honor of their southern sisters, they would sacrifice it all to their self-aggrandizing malice; whilst the means and the methods they employ, are such that we are at a loss to say which is the most despicable, their cowardice, their deceit, or their cruelty. Sprung from a common ancestry, to a great degree, yet educated under different influences, and trained to contrary ideas and principles, it has come to pass, at length, that one great hatred now unites our people against the whole North, as fierce and undying as ever the Dutch felt for their Spanish foes.

2. There is the same blind infatuation manifest in the two attempts of tyranny. Philip's scheme, to force the inquisition upon the Dutch, and to compel them to give up their charters, was a mad conception, and insane was the

obstinacy with which he sought to carry it into execution. On the part of the North, there is the same infatuation in their belief that they can subjugate us, and the same obstinate persistence in the mad attempt. It is, on their part, a war of delusions—of delusions perfectly easy to account for, as they have been all along, ever since the rise of abolitionism, misled by their own press, and other educators. The South knew the North well, for they took and read their papers. But no southern writing ever reached the North, and so the North fell an easy prey to falsehoods concerning both our slaves and ourselves. Accordingly, they imagined that a union party would be found amongst us. They will not give up the infatuation. They imagined that the non-slaveholders of the South would refuse to take up arms in defence of their own invaded soil. They have not yet awaked up to their tremendous error. They imagined that our slaves would all rise up to welcome them as deliverers. They cling still to this delusion. They imagined our people too soft, luxurious, and effeminate to carry on a determined and protracted struggle. Up to the time of McClellan's late defeats, they still persisted in believing "the rebellion almost crushed out." It remains to be seen how long they will continue to cherish this fond imagination.

8. There is the same popular heartiness in the two efforts to resist despotism. At the beginning, the people of the Netherlands were not hearty. William was, for a long time, the head and front of that movement. But when the Duke of Alva made the case plain to every person, by his tenth-penny tax, then he united all interests against his master. From that moment, the question of Dutch independence was settled. There were, of course, great sufferings to be endured, and great reverses to be met, and many a time thick clouds must appear to settle over William's prospects; but the moment Alva had

united the whole people in one earnest purpose, the case was already a determined one.

It is precisely so in our present struggle. If any did not understand the true nature of the issue at the very beginning, long since it has become perfectly plain to every one. The Yankee government has made all classes in the Confederacy of one mind. This war on our part is, in the strictest sense, a war of the people. It is not a war of our government, but it is our people's war. It is every man's war, and every woman's war, and every child's war. Both sexes, and all ages and classes, unite in its support. As for the women of our country, history shall speak their praise. They have clothed the army fighting, and they have nursed the army sick. Well might the brutal Butler strike so basely at them, in his infamous order concerning their New Orleans sisters—the women of the South are all foes of the Yankee government! There is no class of people in our whole Confederacy that does not heartily endorse and encourage the Confederate cause. The merchant, the planter, the manufacturer, the farmer, the slaveholder and the non-slaveholder, the rich and the poor, the minister and his people, the lawyer, the physician, the inhabitants of the towns and cities, and the rural population; men formerly of all the various political parties, (for there now exist no parties of this sort whatever,) people of all religious denominations alike; in one word, the whole people are united in the struggle.

One consequence is, that in both struggles the spirit of the people is seen to rise with the reverses that come upon them. Once fairly roused, Dutch patriotism only burned the brighter for the thick darkness and gloom that gathered around. The sack of Naarden inflamed, instead of subduing, popular resistance. The terrific siege of Harlem strained to the highest pitch the patriotic devotion of her sisters. And so is it in this Confederacy. There is no sacrifice our people are not now prepared to make, rather

than submit to the rule of a government they have so many fresh reasons to abhor. It is foul with the blood of their sons; it has desolated their cities; it riots in the oppression of some portions of their territory. They felt a warm indignation at the first against the despotism, but their wrath is now hot. They want offensive war; they want blood and fire to be opposed by blood and fire.

4. There is the same high religious confidence that God will give deliverance. Viewing Orange as the embodiment of Netherland feeling and spirit, this is true of the Dutch. But it is true of the people of the Confederate States in a literal sense. We do not mean to assert that all our people are possessed of evangelical faith. But, whilst we see amongst Christian people of every denomination the exhibition continually of a humble reliance on Him who has sore broken us, and of a chastened confidence in His favor to our cause, such as Orange so sublimely expressed when he said, "I have made no treaty with any great potentate on the earth, but I have entered into a close alliance with the King of kings," we behold, also, amongst all classes of the people, a lofty persuasion that this is a great providential movement, by which the states of this Confederacy are certain to become a separate and independent people. This is a wide-spread popular belief. Men who never saw God's hand any where else, can see it in this movement.

Such are some of the broad parallels which strike us, when reading this history in the midst of present events. In innumerable particular circumstances, the parallel is equally visible between our case and that of heroic Orange, battling for right against deceitful, ruthless might. Thus do we encounter once more "the perpetual reproductions of History." But let us hasten to close these observations, by referring to a few of the contrasts distinguishing, so remarkably, from one another these two great movements in the history of constitutional freedom, which, in several respects, are so entirely similar.

1. The present struggle is certainly by far the greater in that which is *at stake*.

The Netherland provinces were not the peculiar home of constitutional freedom in that day; but Americans have long been accustomed to boast that in our age she has been dwelling peculiarly upon this continent. It has long been conceded, that the brightest hopes of mankind for this world have attached themselves to the republican institutions of North America. Holland was little and obscure at the time of her struggle for chartered rights, and had she perished, the cause of regulated liberty had not been either disgraced or overthrown. But to these western shores, the eyes of thousands in older countries have been long turned, with mingled hope and fear. They have watched the solution of the American problem, anxious beyond measure to have it demonstrated that, under certain favorable circumstances, man is capable of what is called *self-government*.

There can be no doubt that the best friends, the most intelligent and sincere friends, of true liberty in Europe, are now full of disquiet for their sacred cause. They behold their best hopes and the dearest temporal interests of mankind in jeopardy. Lord Brougham (no friend to the South) said recently in Parliament, that, "gloss it over as they might, the war threatens fatal results to the character of the American people." It is perceived in Europe, that the government at Washington tramples under foot equally the constitutions of states and the personal franchises of individuals; that they are denying to the men of this Confederacy what is asserted in the Declaration of Independence—the right of every free people to abjure a government not of their own consent; and that their outcry of rebellion against us, and their attempt to force upon us a continuance of the Union, against our will, is a renunciation of the principles of the Americans of 1776, and an unworthy imitation of the mad and wicked attempts of British tyranny at that time. The friends of constitutional

liberty in Europe know how unjust, as well as absurd, is the very idea of restoring the American Union by force. They know that a republic by coercion is an impossibility. They stand aghast at the thought of all these Confederate States being reduced to the condition of subject provinces, simply because they do not choose any longer alliance with the states of the North. They are not asleep to the fatal blow which freedom's cause, the world over, must receive, should so dire a project be crowned with success.

It is such considerations as these which set forth the real importance of the struggle now carried on by us for our chartered rights and immunities. Europe does not yet perceive, but it may one day be made plain to her intelligent and honest statesmen, that it is the Confederate States which, on this continent, are the only assertors of freedom's grand and precious cause; and that here, in the South, the slaveholding South, here, after all, dwells the largest, truest, healthiest liberty in this western hemisphere: liberty not for all, but for the largest possible number; liberty for all capable of using liberty well; liberty for all to whom liberty would be any blessing.

2. There is a striking contrast between these two struggles, as to their *scale and dimensions*. The Netherlands were invaded only by hundreds, and tens of hundreds. Our foe boasts of having sent into our country seven hundred thousand soldiers, and is now calling for three hundred thousand more. There is no end to the number of ships, also, employed to cut us off from intercourse with the rest of mankind, and to penetrate our country with agents and means of terror and destruction. What quantities of powder and shot, what countless numbers of shells, of every sort and size, have been used against us! What vast expenses have been assumed to carry on this invasion! Philip's war cost him, for military expenses, seven millions of dollars per year. Abraham Lincoln's government, it is declared on the floor of their own Congress, have had to

expend, for fourteen months past, that much about every three days!

3. The undertaking of our author's countrymen is in striking contrast with that of Philip of Spain, in the immeasurably greater obstacles which they have cheerfully encountered. It will be for some future Motley—some philosophic historian of another age—to determine whether this Herculean effort illustrates better their courage or their cupidity.

It is manifest that all the material conditions of success were with the Spaniards. "Who could suppose," well remarks Mr. Motley, "that upon that slender sand-bank, that narrow tongue of half-submerged earth, one hundred and twenty miles in length, and varying in breadth from four to forty miles, one man, backed by the population of a handful of cities, could do battle nine years long with the master of two worlds, the '*Dominator of Asia, Africa, and America,*' the despot of the fairest realms of Europe—and conquer him at last? Nor was William entirely master of that narrow shoal. North and South Holland were cut in two by the loss of Harlem, while the enemy was in possession of the natural capital of the little country, Amsterdam."

Was it madness in Philip to suppose that he could subjugate three millions of Netherlanders, united heartily against him? It was some excuse for his folly that he knew that they were inhabitants of a handful of cities, and their country a few petty and insignificant provinces. But now the world looks on and sees the "universally educated," the "shrewd," "smart," "cute," Yankee nation, rushing headlong into the serious endeavor to subjugate ten millions of people, inhabitants of half this continent of North America!

Again: William's soldiers were chiefly mercenaries, and could never stand in the open plain against their accomplished enemies. For the soldiers of Philip were of "ro-

mantic valor, unflinching fortitude, and consummate warlike skill." It followed that the Hollanders were always beaten whenever it came to a fair and open fight on land, although ever superior at sea. In the present case, no comparison on the sea is admissible, for obvious reasons. But how is it on the land—how is it all over that mighty breadth of states which it is attempted to overrun, and to subdue and possess? The defence of our soil is in the hands of natives, or of men who have adopted our country for their own. It is the children of this soil, it is the owners of this land, that have banded together as one man to withstand invasion and rapine. And where, in a single instance during this war, have the men of the South not shewn themselves able, by the blessing and favor of God, to conquer their foes against odds in any fair and open field?

Again: the Netherlander had been, to a large extent, a freeman, and was contending for privileges and charters long enjoyed by him, such as they were. This made his resistance to Philip's attempt at subjugation so spirited and so stubborn. But the people of this Confederacy are the natural-born heirs of British freedom in all its fulness, and have enjoyed, moreover, for eighty years and more, all the rights and immunities of American citizens. What is yet more to the point in hand, they have long been themselves the masters of a subject race. To bring freemen of this kind and of this character under a domination, of all others on the face of the earth the most despicable and odious to them, this is the stupendous enterprise in which the Lincoln government has engaged!

The natural conditions of success were, indeed, all with the Spaniards, except the great, controlling one of their being opposed by a thoroughly roused, and united, and determined people. But the moral conditions of success, such as justice, and truth, and right, were with the Hollanders. In the case of our Confederacy, we have both

the moral conditions and the natural conditions of success all for us. If nothing else would wear out our foe, the country where we dwell will do it. If nothing else would bring him to a state of exhausted weakness, his invading this land of ours will do it. His million of soldiers will melt away like snow upon our fields. But were our country not fitted as it is to devour an invading host—were it far smaller, and far healthier, and far more densely populated than it is, the one circumstance of our people being so united in their purpose, would still make the Yankee scheme a perfectly hopeless one.

Deeply impressed ourselves with the example of patient, cheerful, heroic endurance furnished us by Orange and his Netherland countrymen, we have essayed to set it before our readers, as, perhaps, the best service we could possibly render at this time to the cause of our country. On the 25th of April, 1568, William's first army, of three thousand men, are shamefully beaten by half their own number of Spaniards. On the 18th of the following July, his second army, of twenty-five hundred, is cut to pieces, scarce three hundred escaping. On the 21st of July, Count Louis is totally routed at Jemmingen, and the Spanish loss in the fight is but seven, against as many thousands of William's men. Yet do not these terrible reverses dishearten the hero. At his own expense, and by almost superhuman exertions, he gathers another army, of nearly thirty thousand soldiers; but the masterly tactics of Alva baffle all his schemes of battle, and in about one month this army of wretched mercenaries also disbands, and the campaign ends miserably for the Prince and his cause. But if the year 1568 was dark, yet darker for the Reformed were those of 1569 and 1570. William had gone with his brothers, Louis and Henry, to join the banner of the Huguenots, in France. Condé was killed and Coligny overthrown, and William found himself again in Germany, without funds to raise new levies, nor yet to relieve himself from the annoying

claims of those he had been compelled to disband. But even now his spirit is unbroken; and while he comprehends his own weakness, he is still full of lofty courage and humble confidence in God. Not yet, however, has he sounded the profoundest depths of reverse and misfortune. In 1572, at the head of a new army, justly sanguine of French help, reasonably confident that Alva is now at length in his power, suddenly the earthquake of St. Bartholemew's day scatters all his well-matured plans, and blasts all his legitimate hopes. His mercenaries once more mutiny, and his army again dissolves. And many of the towns and cities of Belgium, which had been quick to raise his successful standard, now disown his cause, and hasten to return to their old allegiance.

These Confederate States have had their reverses, too, and by these reverses their overweening pride and self-confidence have been humbled. This single result has, perhaps, fully compensated for all our sufferings and losses. Sweet are the uses of adversity—wholesome the lessons of necessary discipline. God of our fathers, and our God, grant in mercy that we be not now again unduly uplifted by the great victories vouchsafed our army in Virginia. But what have our reverses been, at any period since the war began, in comparison with those borne by the heroic Dutch with such sublime fortitude?

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—NO. 2.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXII.

ARTICLE I.

Commentar ueber die Genesis von FRANZ DELITZSCH. Dritte durchaus umgearbeitete Ausgabe. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke. 1860; pp. 648, 8vo.

Silent leges inter arma. In a sense quite different is this true, from that in which the words were pronounced by the Roman orator in his defence of Milo. He affirmed it of the observance of laws, and not of the principles which are their basis. Literature and science, the quiet studies of the scholar, and the profound researches of the philosopher and jurist, are unheeded amid the din of war. When the halcyon days of peace return, it may again be said, *Cedunt arma togæ*, and the sword will be beaten into the plough-share once more, and the spear into the pruning-hook. But when there is on the earth distress of nations, with perplexity, the waves and the sea roaring, and men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth, it requires an absorption in study, like that of Archimedes at the capture of Syracuse, to enable one to hold on his way in the ordinary pursuits of the scholar. Halls of learning are deserted of

VOL. XV., NO. II.—21

their votaries ; professor and pupil, and in many instances the minister and men of his charge, have gone forth to do battle for their country. And the voice of wailing over our slain is heard amid the triumphs of victory. He alone can command attention who discourses on some topic directly connected with this great struggle.

In ordinary times, we could show to the reader's satisfaction that there are topics which cover all time and space occupied by human beings and their acts, more important than those things which agitate us now. Religion lifts its voice in war and in peace, and the sacred books which are the treasure-house of our faith and hope and consolation, are dear to us at all times, and especially in seasons of public sorrow.

The first book of the canonical Scriptures we have always esteemed as one of the most interesting and important in the entire canon. In the same light is it regarded by the author, the title of whose commentary we have placed at the head of this article. The book of Genesis, or of the beginning of the world and man, says he, is the anticipation of the Thora (or Law); and the Thora is the anticipation of the Old Testament; and this, the anticipation of the religion of redemption; and redemption, the anticipation of the present world and its history; so that upon the pillars of this book rests the fabric of our salvation, which projects forward into eternity. What the four Gospels are in the New Testament, the five books of the Law are in the Old. The parallel strikes deep. The Gospel of Matthew agrees, at its commencement, with the Genesis of the Old Testament. It is the *βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; and the Gospel of John has so near a relationship with no Old Testament book as it has with Deuteronomy. Not merely their beginnings, but the beginning and the end of the Old and New Testament canon coincide. Genesis and the Apocalypse, the Alpha and Omega of the canonical Scripture, run into each other, forming a complete circle. The

creation of the present heavens and the present earth upon the first pages of Genesis, answers to the creation of the new heavens and the new earth upon the last pages of the Apocalypse; the first creation, which had for its scope the first Adam, to the new creation, which takes its beginning from the second Adam. Thus the Holy Scripture forms a rounded, finished whole, to show that not merely this or that book, but also the entire canon, is the work of the Holy Spirit. Genesis and the Law in general with its *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων*, is the sacred root, the Apocalypse, the top of the tree stretching upward into the *αἰὼν μέλλων*.

Again: he claims that it is an exceedingly important book, on account of its rich contents. What is true of the entire Thora (or Law), is true of Genesis, that it is an unexhausted sea of knowledge, a mine of treasured wisdom not yet lifted to the light, a casket of undiscovered gems and mysteries, for which reason the Lord (Matt. 5: 18) says that ere heaven and earth shall pass away, every *ἰῶτα* and every *κεφαλαίον* awaits its fulfilment. *Nihil pulchrius Genesi, nihil utilius*, Luther takes pains to say, in reference to its wealth of contents. Indeed, Church exposition has always applied itself with more especial fondness to Genesis than to the other books of the Thora, though a path lies still before it, further than the eye can reach, to the complete understanding of it. The means of understanding and verifying this book lie not only in the depths of the soul, but in the depths of the earth, also, into which the description of the primeval world descends; and not merely the walls of Egyptian temples and catacombs, but the customs of the Tungusians and Delawares, not merely the rubbish of Babylonish ruins and the buried monuments of ancient Assyria, but the heights of the Himalaya and the depths of the Dead Sea, aid in the interpretation of this peculiar book. Its historical contents stretch over a term of two thousand three hundred years; or, more exactly, two thousand three hundred and six years, from the creation to the

death of Joseph. If we divide the whole history into the two great halves of a history of the primeval world and a history of the contemporaneous period, separated by the introduction of sin and the counsel of redemption consequent thereon, then the three first chapters contain a complete history of the primeval world; and the history of the author's own times follows, in three periods, of which the first reaches from the fall to the flood (ch. 4-8 : 14); the second from the covenant with Noah to the confusion of tongues and the dispersion of nations (ch. 8 : 15—ch. 11); the third from the vocation of Abraham to the settlement of Jacob's family in Egypt (ch. 12-50). These are the three first stages in the history of salvation, according to which, in divine mercy, universal and national history assumes its form. This universal and national historical foundation of the history of salvation gives to Genesis a richness of contents incomparable within the canonical literature.

The author argues the exceeding importance of this book from its very high antiquity in comparison with the literature of other nations, and even this inspires us with confidence in it. The Vedas in their present form were probably not composed after the seventh century before Christ, but were written not much earlier than this; the Rigveda only, Wilson, after the example of Colebrooke, removes back to the fourteenth or fifteenth century before Christ, and therefore to the Mosiac period, yet by a very unsafe conjecture. Of the Zend-books, those written in the later dialect, according to the investigations of Spiegel, belong to about the time of Alexander the Great; those in the older dialect are, notwithstanding this, later than Artaxerxes the Third, and scarcely as old as Cyrus. None of these books proceeded from Zoroaster himself. The Schuking of Confutse (Confucius) is of the sixth century before Christ. The question whether it contains older fragments, is, according to Gutzlaff's statement, still undecided. Only a few Egyptian papyri can measure in antiquity with the

Thora, and these, in comparison with it, are only annalistic fragments of limited contents. The Thora is a many-membered historical work, possessing unity of plan, embracing the entire world, and dating back to the sixteenth century before Christ, to which only a few of the papyrus rolls in the Egyptian collections at London, Turin, Leyden, and Berlin, reach back.

In words of similar import to these, does Delitzsch speak of the importance of the book of Genesis. Indeed, if it did not stand at the vestibule of the inspired Scriptures, how almost inexplicable would the whole volume which opens the plan of redemption be to us, and how many questions of interest to ourselves and to the entire race, as to the world and man, as to our moral disease and its remedy, as to the origin of nations and the Church of God, would be incapable of solution.

From the highest and sublimest summits of our New Testament Scriptures, we may well say, with Gregory of Nazianzen, "Let us descend to Moses, the Ocean of Theology, from which come all the rivers and every sea." *Πρὸς Μουσεία καταβαίνωμεν, τὸν τῆς θεολογίας ὠκεανὸν, ἐξ οὗ πάντες ποταμοὶ καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα.* For, as every portion of the New Testament presupposes the Old, so does every portion of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments presuppose this sacred book, in which the sources, if not of their wisdom, yet of their just interpretation, are found.

The interpretation of Genesis has reflected the different periods of Old Testament exegesis. The theological interpretation began with the Church Fathers, but was perverted and obscured by a foolish fondness for allegory. In Augustine, for example, against the Manicheans, the story of Eden is lost in clouds and vapor. Paradise stands for the *felicity of man*, the four streams are the *four virtues*, the coats of skins are a *life of immortality*, the cherubim are the *plenitude of knowledge*, the flaming sword is *temporal punishment*. He, however, afterwards, in his retractions, admits

that he had carried the figurative interpretation too far. The Middle Ages followed chiefly in the same track. By insisting on this spiritualizing and ethical method, all true exegesis was rendered impossible. The period of the Reformation, on the contrary, brought the verbal sense into favor, the word being valued as containing an exhaustless fulness of truth. The Holy Spirit, says Luther, is the simplest writer and speaker in heaven or in earth. His words can have no more than one simple sense, the one right, chief sense, which the letters give. His Latin Commentary on Genesis, which embodies his lectures on this book continued through a period of ten years and finished three months before his death, is the precious and ripe fruit of a true spiritual recognition of the letter of the Old Testament, and marks an era in Old Testament exegesis. But Calvin's distinguished gift for exegetical labors, his sagacious and penetrating mind, his earnestness of soul, and his knowledge which had its root in a deep experience of the things of God, give an unspeakable value to his Commentary on this book. In him the theological exposition of the Pentateuch reached its height. The Commentaries of these two reformers, contain more than all the Church Fathers put together; and in theological interpretation, in which Calvin especially excels, more than all who have followed after.

The Commentaries of Calovius and Gerhard among the Lutherans, and of John Mercerus among the Calvinists, are to be mentioned with respect. On the contrary, the two Arminian interpreters, Grotius and Le Clerc, regard Genesis from a mere deistical point of view—from one almost profane—and wholly foreign from that which reigns throughout the Old Testament Scriptures. Between these two writers appeared the celebrated work of Spencer, at that time head of Corpus Christi College at Cambridge. This work, which has had no small influence on subsequent writers, traces the rites of the Mosaic ritual to a heathen origin,

and holds that they were adopted by God to meet the superstitious feelings of the Jews, because they were consecrated by long use among many nations, and some of them He knew to be "*endurable trifles*." He held it to be probable that God delivered some things of peculiar sanctity under the veil of symbols and types, on account of a similar custom among the wise men of heathen nations, especially the Egyptians. He thus gave to all these rites a low and human origin; they were adopted by God on the low ground of expediency, and not with the view of foreshadowing the great atoning work which was to be accomplished in the person of His Son, and of setting forth our need of redemption through His blood.

Le Clerc (Clericus) followed in the same line. He takes a low view of all the peculiarities of the Sacred Scriptures. Circumcision is, in his apprehension, a rite so inconvenient, so devoid of decency, contributing so little to good morals, that it could not have been instituted by the Most High. Abraham had witnessed it in Egypt, and was favorably impressed by it; and out of condescension to our weakness, He commanded its practice. He suggests that the tree of life was probably a tree of medicinal virtue, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil a poisonous tree, which the prudent would avoid, but the imprudent would partake of and come to a knowledge of good and evil they did not possess before. The cherubim and flaming sword are explained of the flaming naphtha or bitumen, abounding on the plains of Babylon, as now on the shores of the Caspian, and debarring Adam from Paradise. Miracles are diminished down, and become merely extraordinary natural events; unusual, yet lying within the province of second causes.

John David Michaelis, in his Remarks for the Unlearned, (*Anmerkungen für Ungelehrte*), and in his Laws of Moses, (*Mosaisches Recht*), has followed in a path equally objectionable. Professedly, he is an apologist for the Bible,

not in the more ancient and noble sense of the word, but, alas! in the more modern sense. His own political principles, says Hengstenberg, were not the growth of a Christian soil. French writers were his teachers. With an inflated idea of his own supremacy in the walks of biblical learning, and standing almost on the low platform of those objectors to the Scriptures to whom he would recommend them, he patronizingly takes Moses under his protection, and in these intolerably gossiping works seeks to recommend him on the low grounds of political expediency. He attributed to the legislation of Moses a certain kind of artifice, in giving a religious air to rules of mere human prudence. The purification of the camp was made a religious rite, but its simple object was to prevent the existence of that noisome effluvia so apt to exist in such circumstances. The command forbidding the dressing of a kid in its mother's milk, was to accustom the people to dress their food with olive oil, and not with butter which would be less palatable. The prohibition of blood and fat, as belonging to the altar, and appropriate to rites of religious significancy, was really to discourage the use of fat by a people liable to diseases of the skin. Every ceremonial law, he strives to show is based upon some medical, dietetic, or juridical principle, instead of possessing the lofty aim of religious instruction, and of adumbrating that great plan of redemption, which was the pattern shown to Moses in the Mount. The entire arrangements about leprosy, instead of being intended to symbolize the sad disease of sin, are explained as mere sanatory regulations, or as designed to remove the shocking cases of this disgusting disease from the eyes of refined society. Moses is thus drawn down into the circle of human legislators, and all reverence for the Bible as the book of God, and of its religion as a direct revelation from heaven, is wholly lost.

This decadence from the true spirit of Old Testament exegesis, reached its lowest depths in Germany in the arbi-

trary and dry Commentary on the Pentateuch, of Vater, 1802-1805; in the learned, but, alas! unbelieving and shameless exposition of Genesis by Pétér von Bohlen, in 1835. The Scholia of Rosenmüller, chiefly drawn from Le Clerc, the philologically able *Annotatio perpetua in Genesin*, of G. A. Schumann, and especially the independent, and, in all the externals pertaining to the text, careful Commentary of Tuch, 1838, leave so far a favorable impression, as we see that at last the natural earthly element of sacred history has reached a quiet and ascertained value, after interpretation has so long allegorized and dogmatized, apart from all historical truth. Herder did great service and gained great credit, by slaying rationalism with its own weapons; by teaching men to admire and love the Scripture as a human, popular, oriental, and ancient book, for the beauty of its poetry, the depth of its meaning, and the imperishableness of its contents. But, alas! he had no relish for the Scriptures as a divine revelation, no interest in Christianity as the religion of redemption. But what Herder was for the human side of Scripture, that Hamann became for their divine side. They supplement each other, and together represent the conception of the divine and the human in this wonderful book. Herder stands in the porch, and Hamann upon the threshold of the Holy of Holies. They (says Delitzsch, to whom and to Hengstenberg we are chiefly indebted for this historic view of the exposition of Genesis,) are not alone, but preceded others who have learned to keep in view the divine and the human, the eternal and the temporal, the spiritual and the natural of Scripture. We retain this language of Delitzsch, though aware that, unless properly understood, it may imply an erroneous view of the doctrine of inspiration.

Delitzsch speaks approvingly of the writings of F. C. Freiherrn and F. A. Krummacher, as replete with fine ethical hints of profound views of the history of redemption. And he bestows high praise on the unfinished Commentary

of J. N. Tiele, (Erlangen, 1836,) and still higher on the theological Commentary upon the Pentateuch of Mich. Baumgarten, (Kiel, 1843-44,) which he says is the first continued and complete Commentary which holds itself aloof from false spiritualism on the one side and superficial dullness on the other, and seeks to present the grammatico-historical and the spiritual as the two sides of true theological exegesis. These, with the two popular works—"Bible-Hours on the First Book of Moses," by F. J. Ph. Helm, (Stuttgart, 1845,) and "The First Book of Moses, expounded by F. W. J. Schröder," (Berlin, 1846,)—Delitzsch names, as affording delightful security that the Church has ripened to the *ætas virilis ac regia* of Scripture interpretation, and that the thunder-storm of rationalism must have served to bring a new fructifying rain upon the heritage of the Lord.

Omitting various popular works of German scholars and divines on Genesis, of which that of Otto von Gerlach, translated into English, and published in 1860, by Clark of Edinburgh, as part of their theological library, is the best, we come to the work of Delitzsch, now before us. It has reached its third edition, which the author informs us has been wrought over anew, so that but few pages retain their earlier form. The many-sided researches of modern times, so far, at least, as found in the German language, the writer has passed in review, availing himself of whatever could contribute to elucidate this ancient and inspired book. His Commentary is written with much spirit, shows the author to be a man of profound learning, who does not fear to hold forth amid the sceptical scholars of his own land believing views of the Sacred Scriptures, and to trace the successive stages in the plan of redemption which they reveal. The latter part of Genesis, from chapter 12, is dispatched in a manner far too summary. Yet every student of the book knows that the weightier matters, and those which, from the brevity of the narrative and the re.

mote antiquity of the events, require the most extensive research and the most elaborate treatment, are crowded together in the first pages. Delitzsch belongs to the evangelical school of German scholars; still, there are views of his which our readers will be slow to adopt. He has, however, selected his topics with judgment, and comprises in a moderate-sized octavo much learned and suggestive exposition. In our English literature, besides the old and well-known works on the whole Pentateuch; Ainsworth's Annotations, 1699; Kidder, Commentary on the Five Books of Moses, 1713; Parker, *Bibliotheca Biblica*, 1720, 1735; Jamieson's Critical and Practical Exposition, 1748; we have Graves' Lectures on the Pentateuch, 1815; Bush on Genesis, in 1839, followed by his Commentaries on the other books; Turner's Companion to Genesis, 1841; and Jamieson, (Robert, D. D., of Glasgow,) "The Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, with an original and copious critical and explanatory Commentary," republished by Martien, Philadelphia, 1860—a book which is indeed valuable, but hardly comes up in copiousness to the promise of its title-page.

Of the various points discussed by Delitzsch in his introduction, one of the first is the antiquity of the book of Genesis. The oldest papyri which preceded the Thora, the autographs of the primitive times of which they treat, as well as the autograph of the Thora itself, which was deposited in the Ark of the Covenant, are alike irrecoverably lost. The earliest manuscripts which introduced the Thora to Europe scarcely reach the ninth century of the Christian era. One only, at Odessa, (from Derbend in Daghestan,) boasts of a higher antiquity. Are we, then, justified, he asks, to place the composition of the Pentateuch, including Genesis, in the Mosaic times, and so defy the results of modern criticism, which refer it to a period far later?

To this he replies, that the authenticity of the Thora, and the integrity of its text as well, are securities for the high

antiquity of its composition, which no monument of Egyptian literature can produce. The Jewish people itself, with its entire post-Mosaic history and literature, is the living, unperishable, and infallible papyrus on which, as with the finger of God, the text of the Thora stands written. The post-Mosaic history presupposes the Sinaitic law as already reduced to writing. The post-Mosaic literature, the oldest as well as the latest, utters a many-voiced testimony for the priority of the Thora, in the form in which it lies before us in the Pentateuch. Both these propositions he holds with unlimited assurance against all the hypotheses, in their various forms, which place the composition of the Pentateuch more or less late in the post-Mosaic period.

In proof, he adduces (1) the relations of the post-Mosaic *history* to the Thora. Both the bright and the dark side of this history, presuppose the existence of the Thora. The bright side, because the consecrated nation of Israel, with its worship and institutions, its succession of kings and prophets, as well as all its literary products, points back to the radical unity of a divine documental basis. The dark side, because the constant conflict in which the natural temper of Israel, from the time of the Judges, finds itself with the government of Jehovah, shows that this already had an objective existence in Israel, in the form of a law, which, on this account, could not have sprung from the popular sentiment of that people, but must have been a divine attestation and institute, transplanted into the centre of its ordinary natural life. We may, in addition to this two-fold proof for the priority of the Thora from the post-Mosaic history, present the following considerations. Whence is it that the post-Mosaic history exhibits no trace of the developement of jurisprudence and legislation, observable in the history of other nations? How gradually did the Roman law develope itself, from its first indication in the Law of the Twelve Tables, (449 B. C.) till it was codified in the time of the Cæsars! In the

history of Israel, on the contrary, there was in existence, from the time of the Judges, a system of law which regulated the conduct of men. The law did not first come into being in the course of the post-Mosaic history. It existed already, and yet, for centuries, as in the times of the Judges and Kings, it remained so inactive and devoid of influence, that it could not have existed as a custom or usage, it must have existed as a letter, a writing, which could be forgotten and thrown into a corner, and again brought forth and read, and assert its divine authority over Israel. This actually took place in the eighteenth year of Josiah, when Hilkiyah, the priest, found the Book of the Law in the Temple; 2 K. 22; 2 Chron. 34.

If the Mosaic Law had not existed at the rending of the nation into two kingdoms, in immoveable and acknowledged authenticity, says Delitzsch, how entirely differently would the religious institutions of the northern kingdom have been regulated! And if it was not already in existence in a written form when the kingdom was divided, when was there a time in the post-Mosaic period when it could have come into being? It could have been written in the times of the Judges, as little as the New Testament could in the Middle Ages. The period of the Judges was a period of comparative barbarism, in which Israel was dispersed into different clanships, and there was a mixture in them of Israelites and heathen of the Canaanites. There was no renowned prophet; the priesthood lay in a depressed condition; and the men of acknowledged influence knew how to handle the sword, rather than to guide the pen. Delitzsch proceeds to show that the Book of the Law could not have had its origin in the times of Samuel, or of Saul, or of David and Solomon, or in the times of the rending of the kingdom, or of the Exile, or of *Ezra*. He was a Luther, who, when the mass of the people had fallen into a heathenish barbarism and religious ignorance, as a סֹפֵר or Scribe, restored the written word of God to its former

valuation and honor. His agency was, throughout, only that of a restorer.

Thus the whole post-Mosaic history points back to the Sinaitic legislation, and a codex of the same. The Thora is the living and energetic word of God which pervades this history. The book of Genesis extends the farthest in its influence. The first chapter of Genesis contains the premises of the work of redemption, to which every atom of the world, and every pulse of its history, stands in causal relation.

But if the Thora already existed from the times of Moses as a written document, we would look for manifest traces of it in the literature as well as in the life of Israel. The sacred writers of the subsequent times would refer to it as a Mosaic writing, and would speak in expressions in which the Thora would be reëchoed. This Delitzsch illustrates, in the second place, by considering the *relation it bears to the post-Mosaic literature*. In this part of the argument he shows that its expressions are constantly repeated in the historic books, the Prophets and Psalms. That as Deuteronomy is the *δευτέρωσις*, or repetition of the Law, so the whole Old Testament is the repetition of Deuteronomy. All the history, prophecy, ethics, and poetry of Israel has its foundation and being in the Law of Moses. David is the great master of lyric song, and Isaiah of the prophetic word; but without Moses' Law, there would have been neither a David nor an Isaiah.

The Thora, or Law, is a book of *instruction*, which its name, Thora, (from *הָרָא* to show, to teach,) denotes. It has a unity of purpose, and a regular plan. In reference to the remaining books, it forms an independent and finished whole. The division into five books is no after-thought; it consisted of five books originally. It is a five-fold, and not, with the book of Joshua, a six-fold work. This is a supplemental writing, and no part of the original whole.

If we now inquire in reference to the book of Genesis, as to its position in this work of many parts, and its own internal plan, we discern, as to the first, that it contains the history preliminary to that which we are made acquainted with by the four remaining books. No more striking name can be thought of than the book of Genesis—*βιβλος γενέσεως*, the book of the generation, or origination—not of the world only—it describes not this alone—but the revelation of God as Jehovah, the redemption which was to come, the future Law, the future people of God, the future possession of the promised land. It points out to us the ancient divine or hallowed institutions, which the Law takes up and carries out; the beginnings of the Sabbath, of sacrifices, of the distinction between clean and unclean among animals, the prohibition of the eating of blood, the death penalty for the shedding of human blood, the rite of circumcision. In the organism of the Thora, or Law, it holds, throughout, a preparatory and introductory place. As to the disposition of its contents, these group themselves into five parts, holding forth the revelation of redemption in the history of Adam, (1-6 : 7 ;) of Noah, (6 : 8-11 : 25;) of Abraham, (11 : 26-25 : 18;) of Isaac, (25 : 19-35 : 29;) and Jacob, (ch. 36-50.)

If now we inquire whether the existence of such a work as the Thora is conceivable in the Mosaic period, we answer: 1. That all the preparatory conditions for such a work existed. The objection raised by Bohlen and Vatke, that the art of writing was unknown in the times of Moses, is removed by the fact that there are Egyptian papyri in the hieroglyphic and hieratic character, not only of the Mosaic, but of the ante-Mosaic period. Seyffarth, who has had in hand more than ten thousand Egyptian papyri, is a trustworthy authority, who affirms that at least two thousand years before Christ, and therefore in the patriarchal age, writing upon the papyrus existed. The night in which Israel came forth out of Egypt was the birth-hour of history.

The Egyptians lacked the true idea of a nation, and still more the idea of a God, the creator of heaven and earth. These two ideas call true historical writing into being. Israel came forth out of Egypt a united people, as no other on the earth ever was, and the God who led them, and whom they worshipped, was one God, the God of gods. 2. *The Thora answers all the expectations which we can entertain in relation to a writing of Moses in view of his personal character.* Moses belongs to those powerful minds in whom the ripe end of one historic period coincides with the creative beginning of another; in which a long past culminates, and a far reaching future has its root. He is the end of the patriarchal and the beginning of the legal dispensation. We expect, therefore, in him, as the sacred writer of history, a practical uniting of the present revelation with its patriarchal and primitive presumptions. He is as the mediator of the Law, a prophet, and, indeed, the greatest of all the prophets. We therefore expect from him unequalled prophetic disclosures, respecting the ways of God in the past and in the future. He is learned in all the wisdom of Egypt. A writing from his hand will betray manifold and intelligent allusions to Egyptian usages, laws, and facts; and the well educated man of Egypt, his native soil. And as it respects the form of such a work, we would expect from him an arrangement of the materials according to the unities of some great plan; negligence in the particulars of the recital, and yet a comprehensive and spirited aiming at the total effect and the most important matters, and depth and sublimity in union with the purest simplicity. We shall recognize in the lofty unity of purpose, the powerful leader and ruler of myriads of people; in the child-like *naïvete*, the shepherd of Midian, who, far from the various pursuits of Egypt, pastures the sheep of Jethro in the luxuriant wadys of Mount Sinai. The answer to both preliminary questions results favorably, so far, to the Mosaic origin. And yet, says this author, it would be too hasty, should we now, with-

out further research, decide that the writing of the entire Pentateuch, from Genesis to Deuteronomy, was done by Moses. Only so much, says he, stands firm thus far, as the result: first, that the Pentateuch must belong to the first period of Israelitish authorship; and also, in general, that the striking particulars touching the times and personality of Moses *can* have been written down by him, but not that they *were* written down by him. To be certain of this, we must first see what the Pentateuch says of itself. If it claims to be the work of Moses, from Genesis to Deuteronomy, we must so receive it; for, aside from the above considerations, we hold it as certainly impossible, that a work which became the creative foundation of the holy nation of Israel, and whose divine sanctity is raised above all doubt, should bear a false testimony respecting itself.

Delitzsch next proceeds to consider the internal testimony, as presented in Exod. 24 : 4-7; 34 : 27; 17 : 14; and Numb. 33 : 2; in which the book of the covenant is referred to, and Moses is directed to write the words of the covenant and the slaughter of the Amalekites in a book, and a register is given of the encampments of the children of Israel. He regards it as too wide a conclusion from these premises, that he wrote out the whole Pentateuch. He ventures no further than to determine this, that of the five books of the Law, Deuteronomy expressly sets up for itself the claim that it was composed by Moses, while the intermediate books claim for Moses only the writing of two series of laws and a list of encampments.

Delitzsch notes the fact, which, in our view, can be seen as well in the other five books, Genesis more especially, that Deuteronomy is rich in Egyptian allusions, which one would expect only of a book written by Moses' own hand, and on the confines of Egypt and Palestine. He notes the archaisms in expression contained in it, which mark it as of the same antiquity with the other books, while the love for figurative language, seen also in the Mosaic psalm, (the 90th

in the book of Psalms,) he recognizes as a characteristic of Moses. To this is to be united the internal argument of a psychological nature springing from the independence and sublimity of style with which the legislation is reproduced and carried out, the testamentary character throughout, and the unceasing transition of the language of Moses into the language of Jehovah, a phenomenon so decided and involuntary, that it can only be comprehended on the supposition that these discourses are the immediate effusion of the high self-consciousness of the mediator of the Law.

Delitzsch now proceeds to the inquiry, whether the admission of the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy carries with it that of the other books. In respect to this, he claims that Deuteronomy bears a peculiar individual impress not elsewhere found; that while the other books of the Pentateuch are allied to it most intimately in spirit and form, there is still a difference not accounted for by the difference of the situation and materials of one and the same author.

In order to arrive at a judgment as to the authorship of the other books, which he acknowledges presuppose, and, indeed, contain, records of Mosaic origin, he recurs to the well-known observation that down to the section beginning with Exod. 6: 2, 7, (the preparation by Jehovah of Moses and Aaron as instruments for the deliverance of Israel,) the interchange of the divine name, Elohim, with Jehovah, characterizes the whole writing. In this portion, the use of the names of God enables us to designate sections of four classes: those in which the prevalent name of God is Elohim, those in which it is Jehovah, those in which the names are interchanged habitually, those in which no express name of God appears.

Delitzsch touches briefly on the derivation and signification of these names of God, but does not enter at length into the discussion their signification has called forth. We will endeavor to exhibit it more in detail. The

name אֱלֹהִים the plural of אֱלֹהָ which is found as the name of God only in the highly poetic style, is not derived from אָל as either a participle from אָל in the sense of *being strong*, nor as a primitive, which Gesenius, Thesaur. (1, p. 49) seems to intimate, nor from a verb, אָלָה, *to be strong*, which some wrongly suppose to be a form from the same root, as they would derive אָלָה from אָלָה=אָלָה. It rather is a noun of the infinitive, from the root אָלָה, now lost from the Hebrew, but found in the Arabic *alaha, aliha*. This word bears, in the Kamoos, or great lexicon of Firuzabadi, the significations, *to wander about without aim, not knowing how to help one's self; to flee to one for refuge; to adore, or worship*, which is its prevailing transitive meaning. From this signification the Kamoos derives the name of God—*Alahu*. One of its conjugations has the meaning *to be stunned, or smitten with fear*. We may believe, therefore, that the idea of religious fear, which leads to the worship and adoration of Him who is the object of fear, lies at the foundation of this name of God. He is so called because He is the object of veneration and worship. We are aware that it has been objected to this exposition, that fear is the product of guilt and of sin, and is utterly inconsistent with the genuine spirit of devotion. But we can not forget, in this connexion, that the common designation of pious men in the Hebrew Scriptures is יִרְאַי אֱלֹהִים *fearers of God*, and that the wicked are characterized as those who cast off this fear. He himself is called פֶּחַד and מוֹרָא *fear* (Gen. 31: 42, 53; Ps. 76: 12; Is. 8: 12, *et seq.* Comp. 2 Thess. 2: 4.) the Fear, *e. g.*, of Isaac, *i. e.*, the one inspiring fear, whom Isaac venerated and adored. Far more satisfactory is this derivation, in our esteem, than that which makes it from אָלָה in the sense to swear, either as indicating, as Cocceius thinks, Him whose prerogative it is to pronounce a curse, and so to bind the conscience by His commination as a judge, or, as has appeared to others, as representing the Trinity engaged

in an eternal covenant which was ratified betwixt them by a solemn oath. This is, indeed, a striking and beautiful thought. But the former explanation, that the Creator is called Elohim, as being the object of reverence and adoration, is much nearer the primitive meaning of the word. There must be the realization of a being to be feared and worshipped, and to whom we are responsible, before there can be an oath taken. And then the form of the verb to *swear*, is in the Arabic *aliya*, indicating a different root, a distinction preserved in the Hebrew also.

That this name assumes a plural form, while the words standing in grammatical relation to it are usually singular, has attracted much attention. Some have connected with it the expressions, "Let us make man," or, as Delitzsch translates it, "We will make man in our image, and according to our likeness": Gen. 1: 26. The various theories respecting this plural name of God are: 1. That it is a simple plural of majesty. This is a common explanation among the Rabbins, some of whom took a low view of its use, as being merely for the purpose of bestowing honor upon God; and others, as indicating that He embraced all lordships and dominions within Himself. 2. A second view is of more modern origin, that the plural originated in polytheism, which it is assumed was the earliest form of religion, from which monotheism was gradually developed—a view advocated by LeClerc, Herder, deWette, and others, but contrary to all history as revealed in the Scriptures. Monotheism was the first religion man had upon the earth. It was when his foolish heart was darkened, that he changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. 3. That it is a plural, such as is used in abstract nouns, to express the quintessence of the separate individuals in which the quality is found, or, in individual names, to denote that the individual concentrates in himself the sum of all that quality or assembly of qualities the

name suggests. 4. That it is a numerical plural, including the angels as well as God; that it refers to God as far forth as he reveals Himself and works through a multitude of spiritual beings. 5. That it is founded on the doctrine of a trinity in the Godhead, the view taken by Peter Lombard, and current among our orthodox divines, though rejected by Calvin as *parum solida*. He seems to have been satisfied with the third view mentioned above. Sufficient for me, says he, is it that the plural number suggests those powers (*virtutes*) of God which He put forth in creating the world.

Delitzsch says the plural Elohim is not an abstract noun denoting Divinity. In the mouth of the heathen it is numerical, though then not without exception; comp. Exod. 32: 4, where it is intensive. It is, as Schelling, after Storr, has quite correctly remarked, *pluralis magnitudinis*. The idea of the majestic is, so to say, inwardly magnified to imply the highest capacity for the same. Comp. Kedhoshim, Prov. 9: 10; Hos. 12: 1. Thus the name Elohim denotes God as the one infinitely great, the transcendent, the absolute; but it designates Him according to its derivation, not as subject, but only as object; and, moreover, the plural represents the oneness of the person in the background, leaving in front the plenitude or wealth which it indicates. This is true as well of Elohim without the article, which, when used of the true God, is a proper name, as of the appellation Ha-Elohim, in which the article does not make the personality, but the unity of God prominent. The multiplicity of the one God, which Elohim, as the name of God, expresses, is wholly within God. One, adds he, can not say without obliterating the distinction between the two Testaments, that Elohim is the plural of the trinity, but may say perfectly correctly that the *trinity* is the plurality which Elohim denotes, now disclosed in the New Testament. That is, if we correctly understand what Delitzsch would say, he holds that, while the doctrine of the trinity is not expressly taught in the Old Testament,

but its full declaration was reserved for the New, it is, nevertheless, implied in this plural name of God, which does not simply mean that there is a plenitude of wealth in the Divine Being, but also the plurality in His nature which the doctrine of the trinity implies.

On the name Jehovah, derived from the future, and either to be pronounced יהוה or יהוה *Jahaveh*, or *Jahavah*, (in the Masoretic text, always with the points of אֲדֹנָי or אֱלֹהִים *Adonay*, or *Elohim*, but by us, wherever it occurs, printed יהוה according to its proper pronunciation,) is the idea of personality already stamped, because it is originally a proper name; but Elohim, from Ha-Elohim, the Adorable, became so by usage. According to its signification, Jehovah is more than the personal God. For the divine declaration, *I am that I am*, אֲהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֲהִיָּה *I will be what I will be*, Exod. 3: 14, in which the name Jehovah is explained, proves not merely this, that God determines wholly from within Himself, and so is wholly and altogether a free personality, but, since the idea of the verb הָרָה or הִרָה *φύσσει, fieri*, is not that of continuing, but rather of active existence, that is, of becoming; it points to the future, and teaches that He, in a way corresponding identically with Himself, that is, with His own independent will, controls and will control all history. In spite of Hengstenberg and Hölemann, Delitzsch was always of the opinion that Jehovah indicates not so much He who becomes—that is, we suppose, becomes what He was not, and so undergoes change—but He that is; not the one whose being, but the revelation of whose being, is taking place. (*Existens* = ὁ ἐρχόμενος, as the Apocalypse explains it.) It designates God as He who ever puts Himself forth anew, in a way cognizable by man, who, through all the *Æons*, (ages,) reveals Himself, and is, in short, the God of historic revelation. One can not venture to distinguish the one name as designating God as super-mundane, and the other

as indicating Him as mundane, for Elohim is mundane, [i. e. in the Kosmos,] as the present and acting power over all creatures ; but Jehovah is God, as the framer and disposer of history in the entire limits of the creation. Strikingly does Baumgarten remark, that Elohim is the God of the beginning and of the end, and Jehovah designates the God of the middle, that is, He also, from the beginning to the end, animates and develops all. The kingdom of power will become the kingdom of glory. Between lies the kingdom of grace, a long history, whose real substance is redemption. Jehovah is the God of the beginning and the end, acting as mediator through the course of this history—in one word, is GOD THE REDEEMER.

The name Jehovah is rightly made by Delitzsch from the future. It is not, as Grotius, and lately Ewald, (after the modern Jews,) have maintained, compounded of the future יהיה, the participle הוה, and the præter היה. For the pronunciation, Jehovah, in the Masoretic text, represents not its own vowels, but those of Adonay, which the Jews, since the captivity, in their reading, have substituted for it. Nor does the passage—Apoc. 7: 8—evidently founded on this name of God, *ὁ ὢν ὁ ᾔν και ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, which is, and which was, and which is to come—establish this tripartite derivation. It is all included in the sense of the future, which, with peculiar emphasis, expresses duration without any bounds, to which is to be added the idea of the sufficiency of God within Himself, and His immutability, and faithfulness to His own promises. Jehovah is strictly a proper name. It has no other form, no construct or suffix state, and no plural. Elohim is sometimes used of creatures, but this never. It is the incommunicable name of a personal God, and while it marks Him as self-existent, all-sufficient, and immutable, it especially indicates Him as a God of grace and truth, standing in covenant relations to His people. How natural, in different states of mind, to pass from one name of God to the other, to

pronounce His name Elohim when viewed as the almighty Creator, to be adored and worshipped, to pronounce or write it Jehovah, when His covenant relations to His creatures are present to the view, and He is regarded as their Saviour. Beautifully expressive, often, is this interchange of the Divine names, coming, as it does, without warning to the reader.

How striking, says Delitzsch, does this stand in the section—Gen. 2: 4–24—in which the world, created by Elohim, passes over into a history of redemption, which has man for its central and final point, and which testifies that God the Creator, and God the Redeemer, is the Ruler of history, is Jahavah Elohim, יהוה אלֹהִים throughout. And who would mistake it as unintentional, that Noah should call the Elohim who should enlarge Japhet, Jehovah, the God of Shem, and that Abraham more accurately designates the God whom Melchisedek names God Most High, אֱלֹהֵי עֵלְיוֹן, as Jahavah God Most High, יהוה אֱלֹהֵי עֵלְיוֹן. Such evidently designed cases prove much. Why, again, is it, that in the entire sections Gen. 6: 9–23; 9: 1–17; 20: 1–17, the name Jehovah is never used? It can not be blind chance which here prevails. And yet the author, while he honored and loved both names as holy and deeply expressive, evidently took a pleasure in adorning his work with both alternately, being influenced sometimes by reasons of which he was conscious, sometimes by an unconscious or even an æsthetic preference. So the Psalter divides itself into Elohim Psalms, in which Elohim is the predominant, but not exclusive name of God, (Psalms 42 to 48,) and Jehovah Psalms, in which this name, in like manner, is prevalent. Asaph's are Elohim Psalms. Those of David and the Korahites are of a mixed character. Delitzsch considers the reasons which Henstenberg has assigned for the occurrence of these names, but comes to the conclusion that they are not always satisfactory, but that in the Psalms, as in the Pentateuch, the custom prevailed of

adorning the style with both these significant names of God. Both were dear to the writer, and he honors God in the use of both, to the neglect of neither. Signal instances of this alternate use are Gen. 7 : 15 ; "They went in [to the Ark] as Elohim commanded him, and Jehovah shut him in"; 27 : 27, 28. "The smell of a field which Jehovah hath blessed, therefore may Elohim give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth"; Exod. 3 : 4. "And when Jehovah saw that He turned aside to see, Elohim called unto Him out of the midst of the bush."

Delitzsch next discusses the passage—Exod. 6 : 2, *et seq.*—"I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name El-Shaddai, God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them." He agrees that this passage does not prove that the name of Jehovah was unknown to the patriarchs, and was first revealed to Moses, but only that God had not made known to the patriarchs all the extent of its signification as He had revealed it to Moses. It is peculiar to the Scriptures to let the incomplete stages lose themselves and vanish in the light of the more complete, so that there is only the semblance of an absolute distinction apparent. When, for instance, it is said, in John 1 : 17, "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἀλήθεια, came by Jesus Christ," we must not deny to the Old Testament *all* acquaintance with grace and truth. Yet are תְּהִלָּתוֹ וְאֱמֶתוֹ grace and truth the stars of the Old Testament heavens; but starlight does not amount to the light of the rising sun. But though the name Jehovah was not unknown, it was more rarely used; and there is a probability, he says, that from Gen. 1 to Exod. 6, two different species of historical writing are before us, of which the one renders prominent the peculiar present of the patriarchal knowledge of God, the other, the dawning future of the same, of which the one lies nearer to the form of contemporaneous history, the other to the contents of future history. He then main-

tains that there are favorite forms of expression peculiar to the Elohist sections, and others to the Jehovistic, and gives forth his theory for the composition of the Pentateuch thus: That the kernel, or central part, of the same is the covenant roll, (Exod. 19–26,) written down by Moses himself, and wrought out in the historical order of the legislation. The remaining laws of the wilderness of Sinai, down to that of the plains of Moab, Moses announced orally, but they were written down by the priests, in whose calling this duty lay. As Deuteronomy does not suppose the written state of the entire ancient legislation, and still more, as it recapitulates the law with great freedom, we need not suppose that the entire codification had already taken place. Upon the soil of the Holy Land they began to write the history of Israel, which now reached a full period. The historiography of the Mosaic times, then necessitated of itself the record of the Mosaic legislation. Such a man as Eleazar the priest, the son of Aaron, (see respecting him, particularly, Numb. 26 : 1; 31 : 21,) may have written the large work beginning with בְּרֵאשִׁית בְּרָא “In the beginning God created,” etc., in which he incorporated the roll of the covenant, and the last words of Moses, (only more briefly,) because Moses had written them down with his own hand. A second historian, like Joshua, (see Deut. 32 : 44; Josh. 24 : 26; comp. 1 Sam. 10 : 22,) who is a prophet, and speaks as a prophet, or one of the זְקֵנִים elders, upon whom the spirit of Moses rested, (Numb. 11 : 25,) and many of whom survived Joshua, (Josh. 24 : 31,) completed the work—not certainly by the prompting of his own will, or from the dictate of his own nature—but by the authorization of some one else, and incorporated in it the whole of Deuteronomy, the spirit of which had moulded that of the compiler himself. So, perhaps, arose the Thora, not without advantage being taken of other written documents by both narrators. Exod. 11 : 3, and Numb. 12 : 3, in which Moses

is renowned as being very great in the land of Egypt, and as being meek above all the men upon the face of the earth, and Deut. 34 : 10, compared with Numb. 12 : 8, "And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom Jehovah knew face to face," we must ascribe to the Jehovist, his disciple, and perhaps his friend. Both of them, the priestly Elohist and the prophetic Jehovist, are, each in his own way, but the echo and the copy of the great Lawgiver, their teacher and prototype. As after the ascension of Jesus, the evangelists wrote His Gospel in His Spirit, so did these two, after the removal of Moses, write his Law and the history that contains it. The note-worthy passage—Ezra 9 : 10–12—where a commandment of the Thora, given during the wandering in the wilderness, is cited as the word of the servants of Jehovah, the prophets, is due to the consciousness that the Thora had been written in this way.

We have now followed our author till we have reached his view as to the authorship of the Pentateuch, and of Genesis as a part of it. To enable us to understand the relation which his theory bears to the others which have from time to time been adopted, it may be useful to give, somewhat after his own manner, the history of the various opinions which have been ventilated by ingenious, but not always reverential scholars, as to the same point. We find Vitringa, in his *Observationes Sacrae*, chap. 4, pp. 3–6, *et seq.*, offering his own conjectures as to the origin particularly of the first book, Genesis. He supposes that the first Fathers of the Church held frequent assemblies long before the Mosaic age, in which they frequently and mutually discoursed concerning the origin of the world, the fall of man, the promise of grace, which was often repeated, and the revelations made to themselves or their ancestors, and that this was necessary for the strengthening of their faith, the sustaining of their hope, and the conviction of those ungodly Cainites by whom they were surrounded; and that these

men wrote down, for the use of their children after them, those truths made known to them by divine revelation, or the testimony of others. This was specially done as the human race multiplied, and faith in the divine promises was threatened and tried by the increasing wickedness of the race. Those parchments and portfolios (*scrinia*) of the Fathers, he supposes Moses to have collated, digested, set in order, and supplemented, and from them to have composed the book of Genesis. If Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or even antediluvian patriarchs, left any fragments of Scripture, they were equally inspired with other holy men of old, but of a later date, who were moved by the Holy Ghost. Moses also enjoyed the Spirit's aid while perfecting this work, no less than Luke, who composed his Gospel from the narratives and annotations of those who from the beginning were *αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου*, eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. This harmless hypothesis, as propounded by Vitringa, was set forth by others in a different vein. In 1753 appeared, at Brussels, a treatise from the pen of Astruc, entitled, Conjectures respecting the Original Memoirs which it appears Moses used in composing Genesis,* in which he sought to show, from the interchange of the names of God, that Moses compiled the book of Genesis from two principal documents, availing himself also of ten others. This hypothesis, which is called *the Document Hypothesis*, was advocated by Eichorn and Herder, and was modified and perfected by Ilgen and Gramberg. By the side of this was introduced, first by Vater, the *Fragment Hypothesis*, which regards the Pentateuch as a mosaic, composed of fragments of various authors. Both these attempts to account for the origin of the Pentateuch, Delitzsch says, have had their day. The mechanical method they contemplate is inconsistent with that living unity which these

* Conjectures sur les Mémoires originaux, dont il paroît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de Genèse.

writings exhibit. In the place of both these, the *Supplementary Hypothesis* is now the prevailing one among the critics of the German school, according to which, the author of the Pentateuch, the Jehovist, had before him an older account—that of the Elohist—extending from the creation to the death of Joshua, and wrought it over and enlarged it. This hypothesis is, after the precedent labors upon it of De Wette, Ewald, Bleek, Von Bohlen and Stähelin, carried out, with the most subtle and careful thoroughness, by Tuch, in his Commentary on Genesis. There is no better name for the hypothesis advocated by Ewald in his History of the People of Israel, than the *Crystallization Hypothesis*. He divides the Pentateuch in four non-contemporaneous parts, which have received their last form from the author of Deuteronomy, who is, also, the last author of the book of Joshua, which belongs likewise to the Pentateuch. Of these, the book of the Covenant is the oldest portion, and was written in the times of Sampson. The next is the *Liber Originum*, תּוֹלְדוֹת to which are assigned the chief portion of the Elohistic fragments, a work throughout of a religio-historical and legislative object, written by a Levite of the last third of Solomon's reign. There is further to be distinguished a first prophetic narrator of the primitive history, a citizen of the kingdom of Israel in the age of Elijah and Joel, and a second prophetic narrator of the times between 800 and 750 B. C., who, like the author of the book of the Covenant, calls God by the name Jehovah, rarely by the name Elohim. He had the works of the three others before him, and is the author of the Pentateuch and Joshua in their present form. Kurtz represents Ewald as pointing out no less than ten different writers, including these four, as being concerned in the production of the Pentateuch, and sarcastically remarks that "Ewald is able not only to assign to each of these ten authors his own part in the great work, even to single verses and words, but generally, also, to distinguish and to characterize the sources

from which each of them had, again, drawn his original materials!"* Such is the wonderful sagacity or effrontery of modern unbelieving criticism.

There remains the one theory which the Church, both Jewish and Christian, have held for ages, that the Pentateuch has but one real author, and that author, Moses, which belief is not impugned by the few additions by a later hand, the most obvious of which is the last chapter of Deuteronomy. The usual arguments for this are: 1. The regular plan and unity of purpose displayed in the entire five-fold book, pointing, it is believed, to one author. This unity and regular progressive plan Delitzsch admits and pleads for, and strives to represent as consistent with his theory. But it is far more consistent with the ordinary belief.

2. The fact that the book is the basis of all Jewish history, civil and ecclesiastical, and, so far as history goes, the beginning of its literature; that it exhibits throughout, manifold traces of the Mosaic age, and evidently belongs to that period. This, too, is argued by Delitzsch, and in this respect his modification of the *supplemental hypothesis* is not open to the objections of others who have advocated it, and who have located its composition at various points in the post-Mosaic centuries.

3. A third argument has been adduced from the passages in the Pentateuch itself in which Moses is represented as having written the Law and delivered it unto the priests, and ordered them to deposit it in the side, or by the side, of the Ark. In the book, too, he was directed to write the conflict with the Amalekites. He is said to have written all the words of the Lord; to have taken the book and read in the audience of the people; to have written in the book the journeyings of the children of Israel. The book of the Law is referred to, and throughout the sacred writings is called *the Law of Moses*. Not conclusive is the protest of

* Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Cov't*, 1, p. 61.—Note.

Delitzsch, that the Pentateuch could be called the Law of Moses, with far greater right than the Book of Psalms could be called the Psalms of David, without being in all its parts immediately Mosaic. The Pentateuch is one continuous book, with a regular plan; the Psalms are a collection of detached compositions, probably receiving increment from time to time. The earliest portion of the collection consisted of the Psalms of David, and these gave the style or title of the whole when referred to in popular speech. The same reason could not be given for the ascription of the Pentateuch to Moses. We are persuaded that the common reader would take these expressions to point out Moses as the author of the book, and that there is far more reason for affirming it than for maintaining that Julius Cæsar wrote the Gallic War, in which the same indirect way of speaking of himself occurs.

But the entire argument for the genuineness of the Pentateuch as a writing of Moses is cumulative, embracing a multiplicity of details. These may be found fully handled in the apologetic writings of Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Drechsler, Ranke, Welte, and Kurtz, but can not be brought forward by us now, after these protracted remarks.

In reference to the peculiar theory of Delitzsch, that the Pentateuch was written partly by the hand of Moses, and the rest by two like-minded men, one of the priestly, the other more of the prophetic order, which subsequently arose, we see no advantage it has over the opinion that Moses either wrote the whole himself, or was assisted in some portions by others, over whom he exercised his superintendence. So that he was, under the divine inspiration, the human author, the Holy Spirit being the Divine Author of the book. This does not exclude the hypothesis that there may have been writings of the patriarchal age, authentic and inspired, which Moses used in the primeval history that preceded his own times. The difference of phraseology, which has been presented as characterizing the

Elohistic, as compared with the Jehovistic portions, may thus be accounted for as to the book of Genesis; and for this difference, so far as it appears in the four remaining books, the consideration that an author's own style as to favorite expressions alters with the circumstances and times in which he writes, may furnish a sufficient solution. He who has heard the same speaker, or read the productions of the same living writer, through the lapse of years, must have observed this fact. The same thing occurs in the writings of Paul, Peter, and John, in the New Testament, and has given rise to various theories of a different author, among the critics of Germany, of books and portions of books through all past ages ascribed to them.

Numbers 12: 3, which speaks of Moses as meek above all the men upon the face of the earth, and other similar passages where the Jewish Lawgiver is mentioned in terms of praise, admit of several explanations well known to scholars, more probable than the theory of Delitzsch, and which neither require nor justify his view as to their author. The last chapter in Deuteronomy, which speaks of the death of Moses, and a few other expressions, could have proceeded from a later, but authorized hand. Much more accordant is this view with the traditionary opinion, which certainly goes back beyond the New Testament times, for Christ and the apostles acknowledged the Law not only as given, but written, by Moses. "Had ye believed Moses," says our Saviour, "ye would have believed me, for he *wrote* of me. But if you believe not his *writings*, how shall ye believe my words."

Delitzsch's view does, indeed, place the last writer of the Pentateuch in the age next succeeding Moses, making him contemporary with Joshua, and, probably, through a part of his life, contemporary with Moses himself, and in this respect is not to be confounded with that of De Wette, who locates the Elohist in the time of Samuel or Saul, 1120 or 1050

B. C., or 400 years after Moses, and the Jehovist in the time of Solomon, 1015-975, B. C.

And yet, while Delitzsch speaks nobly and truly in defence of the Pentateuch, and especially against the charge that it repeats itself without reason, we are sorry that he should have said that inspiration does not altogether exclude unconscious historical errors. If it does not, then the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures must be given up. But, in our view, the Holy Spirit never left these holy men whom He moved to write, at any moment when thus employed on these documents of our faith. However freely their minds may have moved, and however each one may have shown forth the mental peculiarities which distinguished each, He never withdrew His influence till the record was completely finished. This record, therefore, must have been infallible truth, as it flowed from the pen of him who was moved by the Holy Ghost.

Yet, with much force does Delitzsch charge upon the modern criticism of his own times and country, that it is unfree, *i. e.*, that it is a bond-slave. For when innumerable external and internal reasons make the Mosaic origin of the Thora evident, it must hold its contents as a web of intermingled history and myth, of times not contemporaneous. For it is held bound, by its dogmatic prejudices, to maintain that there is no preternatural revelation, no miraculous agency of God in nature and human life, no prophecy proceeding from inspiration. Modern criticism is driven to the three following foregone conclusions: 1. The Pentateuch represents itself as the history of a supernatural divine revelation, of an actual commerce of God with our first parents, with the patriarchs, with Israel. Therefore, it is neither strictly historical nor Mosaic. DeWette can not allow the causes and consequences of events, as related in the Pentateuch, to be true; and thus the Pentateuch is regarded by him as the theocratic epos of the Hebrews, and the Jehovah of the Pentateuch, so far as He steps forth

acting in history, is to him the product of legend—in the same category with the Homeric gods. So Ewald designates the fact, that the Godhead appears acting and visible in history, as the peculiarity of the Hebrew Mythos. It avails nothing to deny, says he, that the Hebrew tradition approaches the heathen mythology in this. With such presumptions to the contrary, it is impossible to hold to the historicalness and contemporaneousness of the Thora, were both ever so well attested. 2. The second is of the following import: the Pentateuch is full of miraculous occurrences, which, as DeWette expresses it, are beyond the thought of the thinking mind, at least are doubtful, and so it is and must be post-Mosaic, for its stories of miracles are an ideal poetic robe, which was first thrown around the genuine historical tradition at a date subsequent to the events. 3. The Pentateuch contains prophetic discourses, which bespeak a knowledge of the events of times subsequent to Moses. Such a knowledge is not conceivable. These prophecies are, therefore, *vaticinia post eventum*—prophecies after the event—or they at least came into existence in those times when these events could be surely foreseen. De Wette characterizes the prophecies of the Pentateuch as invented, with the remark, “Such prophecies have the Indian Puranas put into the mouth of their old heroes.” From this predetermined denial of all true prophecy, there results a peculiar procedure for determining the date of the composition of the Pentateuch. The *vaticinia post eventum* serve as marks for determining the date. Because, according to the Elohist, it was promised the patriarchs that kings should descend from them, the Elohist could not have written before the elevation of Saul to the throne of Israel. Because Isaac announces to Esau his independence of Jacob, and Balaam predicts the subjugation of Amalek, Edom, and Moab, the Jehovist could not have written till after the victory of Saul over the Amalekites, and David over the Moabites and Edom-

ites. But Isaac speaks—27 : 40—of the attempt of Edom to free himself from the yoke of Israel, which removes the time of the Jehovist to the reign of Solomon, towards the end of which Edom rose in revolt. This procedure, which turns the head of prophecy, looking to the future, backwards, is one of Ewald's sources of proof. The oldest portion of the Pentateuch is, according to Ewald, the so-called Book of the Covenant. The author lived in the times of Sampson. How does Ewald know this? Because—Gen. 49 : 17, "Dan shall be a serpent by the way"—he refers to the times of the Danite, Sampson, as a *vaticinium post eventum*. To the fourth narrator (of his theory) is ascribed the assumed prophecy of Balaam, in which is predicted the coming of ships from the coast of Chittim, and the affliction of Asshur. This, also, is a *vaticinium post eventum*, and the fourth narrator wrote near the time of the victory of the Tyrian king Eluläos over the piratical fleet of the Phenician Cypriots. Menander, compared with Josephus, must determine the time in which the fourth supplementer lived, which, in addition, will be settled by the prophetic words of Isaac concerning Esau—chap. 27 : 39. Is this criticism, asks Delitzsch, not forced, and devoid of all true freedom and independence? True criticism presupposes the Pentateuch neither as Mosaic nor post-Mosaic, but decides from external and internal grounds. But this criticism is forced to hold it as post-Mosaic, in spite of all external and internal arguments, because it contains words and theophanies of God, miracles and prophecies; and yet, in the Mosaic times, all must have gone on quite naturally as now! But every thing of this present day moves, according to the laws of nature, only to those who have never heard that God speak within them, who gave His fiery Law on Sinai, who have no realization that they have been translated from the kingdom of nature into that of the Spirit, and have tasted the powers of the world to come, to whom the eye of faith is not yet

opened to see the majesty of God revealing itself marvelously, ever and anon. The possibility of miracle and prophecy is agreeable to the experience of the believer; and the miracle of the new birth, and the Spirit's influences, are his security for the same. For this reason, he stands free in reference to the miracles and prophecies of Scripture, without being forced credulously to admit them, or incredulously to deny them beforehand. Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. There also is true and unslavish criticism; a criticism which neither is doomed to affirm *a priori*, nor *a priori* to deny, but is placed in a position to form an unbiassed judgment, as the state of facts, in the present or past, may demand.

Thus we approach, says Delitzsch, the historical contents of Genesis with confidence. The following two considerations will strengthen us against the mistrust of unbelief. This history of the primitive times, which Genesis gives, *can* be authentic. The source whence it is borrowed is the oral tradition, transmitted in the family of the patriarchs, by which, according to the divine command—Gen. 18: 19—the remembrance of the divine revelations was handed down during the lifetime of the Fathers, which could be the more easily done, the longer their lives, the more simple their mode of living, and more secluded from foreign influences they were. Over this tradition they certainly watched with the greatest care. It was to the chosen race the foundation of its existence, the bond of its union, the mirror of its duties, the security of its future, and so its most precious inheritance. The credibility of the historical contents of Genesis might, with certainty, be expected. For, as the true religion, the religion of redemption, declared in the Scriptures, rests upon the facts of revelation, it is by the true tradition of these that its own security is effected; and to this end religious feeling and a regard for historical truth converge. Not only the universally conceded character of the people of Israel, but the

work and testimony of Christ, as given in the New Testament, presuppose, and so establish, the truth of the historical contents of Genesis, and of the history of the Old Testament. Should we compare the Old Testament literature with that of the pagan East, it has not its like in sobriety, in child-like objectivity, in pure morality, in its universal aspect, and its interest in mankind at large. One will thus acknowledge the prevalence here of another power than that power of nature heathenism exhibits. The literature of Israel is a miracle of grace. It is the literature of redemption from the jurisdiction of the principle of nature; the literature of the spirit which has laid hold again on God as that power which is above nature; the literature of the regeneration of the old heathen East by the grace of the one everlasting God. It is, for this reason, not so gorgeous to the senses, not so dazzling in speculation, not so imposing in the eyes of men, as, for example, the literature of India. The Orient, in the Old Testament literature, has become a child, that it may enter into the kingdom of God. There rests upon it a tranquil peace, whose rainbow arches over the deepest excitement. It has found every thing in the one personal God, who is in history and over history, its safe measure and its firm boundary. As Hellenism brought back, at a later period, the gigantic, and, in great part, distorted forms of the East, to the measure of human beauty, thus, in Israel, divine truth lifts itself out of the chaos of the mythic, fantastic nature-life of the Orient, quiet and chaste, without noise and pomp.

These things are beautifully and nobly said.

We have thus given our readers an outline of the introduction to this commentary on Genesis. To a very large extent, and far beyond what we at first purposed, we have allowed the author to present his own views, merely exchanging the German for an English dress. It was our purpose to have commented upon the expository part of the

work, especially his explanation of the cosmogony contained in the first chapter, which, he says, lies not outside, but within the orbit of the history of salvation, which begins its course from eternity, and circles back to eternity again. For God had, in creating the world, the earth for His aim; and on the earth, man; and among men, Israel; and in this redeemed nation, His redeemed Church; and in the Church of the redeemed, the consummation of all created things. These words are refreshing, and though there are defects in the treatment, and views from which we must express our dissent, and there are illustrations from the traditions of other nations, perhaps more than is meet, and a less elaborate and ample handling of the latter part of the book, where the foundations of the Church are represented as laid in the institutions of the patriarchal age, there is much in this volume to commend, and much that places it far beyond those cold and unevangelic commentaries which have proceeded from the German school in this our age.



ARTICLE II.

SUPERIORITY OF THE GREEKS IN LITERATURE AND THE FINE ARTS.

The superiority of the ancient Greeks in literature and the fine arts, has often been a theme of wonder and admiration; and many causes have been proposed to account for so striking a phenomenon. There is one, however, which has not received the notice it deserves, to which we desire briefly to call attention. We mean the intense spirit of emulation, the panting desire to excel, which distinguished that people beyond those of any other age or coun-

try. The origin of this passion, it is not our purpose to trace, or to investigate the causes which made the bosoms of the ancient Greeks burn with such an intense enthusiasm of competition, such an absorbing spirit of rivalry, in every pursuit. Certain it is, that for more than a century, this was the very soul of Greece; and Plato said that the national spirit of the Lacedemonians, the passion for victory, was rooted in their breasts; all their habits tended to inflame it. Cicero says that Greece always claimed the palm of victory, though they were fonder of contention than of truth; Horace remarks that the Greeks, animated alone by ambition, have excelled in letters; and the Athenian historian, Thucydides, tells us they aimed at a *perpetual possession*, and not at mere temporary success. The great Athenian orator expressed the feelings of every one of his countrymen, when he said that Athens had wasted more blood and treasure merely to stand foremost and take the lead in Greece, than other nations had expended to defend their dearest rights.

Almost at the dawn of existence, even in the days of childhood, in his sports and amusements, to excel his companions was the principle inculcated into the mind of every Greek. And as they advanced in life, emulation entered into every thing in which they engaged, and became the ruling principle of their souls.

In the education of their youth, there was no retired study, no isolated, independent effort; their minds were formed by an incessant struggle with each other, and not cast in one regular mould. As they strove with the grasp of desperation in the palæstra, so mind was perpetually grasping with mind; ever active, contention and dispute were their delight; mental superiority their only object of ambition; *præter laudem nullius avari*, greedy of nothing but praise.

This emulation to excel was cherished and exalted into a religious principle by the public games, and especially by

those of Olympia, which exerted an influence unparalleled in any other country. Here the mightiest energies, both of mind and body, were called forth. Here the combatants were to contend, not before the people of their own town or village, but the immense population of Greece, assembled in one vast concourse to witness their victory or defeat. No wonder that parents expired in the arms of their sons with joy, as they saw them crowned with the wreath of victory. No wonder that the desire to excel, thus cherished, infused an almost superhuman energy into the genius of Greece. Says Kitto: "These games, taken in connexion with the early training by which they were preceded, and of which they were the natural result and reward, were a *grand educational system*, bearing primarily, indeed, in favor of the physical developement, but also tending directly and powerfully to advance the highest intellectual and moral culture. The exercises through which the child, the youth, and the man, were stage by stage conducted, each in succession, becoming more difficult and complex, as the bodily powers came into play and acquired vigor, were admirably adapted to give that union of strength and beauty in which physical perfection consists, and in which the Greek nations probably surpassed every other known people. But the vigor and energy which ensued imply health and hilarity: hence arise humane, kind, and generous dispositions; so that a good state of the body, promoting moral soundness, combined with bodily vigor, guaranteed intellectual activity and mental power. The existence of these exercises and these games in each separate state, secured the developement and activity of those feelings which made his own country to each one most dear and venerable; while a narrow and selfish patriotism was greatly prevented, and emotions which embraced the whole Hellenic race were enkindled and fostered by those general meetings, which from time to time called together, especially at Olympia, all who were not alien from the Greek

commonwealth, marked out by the use of that noble instrument of speech, the Greek tongue."

Frederick Schlegel remarks: "The gymnastic struggles—the peculiar object of the public games, and where the human frame attained a beautiful form and expansion, by every species of exercise—the gymnastic struggles had a very close connexion with, and may be said to have formed the basis for the imitative arts, especially sculpture, which, without that habitual contemplation of the most exquisite forms afforded by these games, could never have acquired so bold, free, and animated a representation of the human body."

Nor was this all; this energy of genius, if brought into action in other circumstances, might have been wild and extravagant; but the peculiar circumstances of Greece called it forth in the strictest conformity with the dictates of nature and a refined taste.

One of these circumstances was the form of their government, which, while it opened a boundless field for competition, gave a native business cast to all their mental efforts. Emphatically the government of the people, by whom all measures were decided, that "fierce democratic," as Milton calls it, had but little of the security and firmness of the constitutional states of modern times. In addition to this, the rich and the poor, jealous of each other, were constantly endeavoring to gain the ascendancy. "The governments of Greece," says one, "so far as the arts were concerned, operated most powerfully. Hence statues, paintings, etc., were for the people; and it is well known that the plaudits of an enraptured multitude are much more intoxicating than those of an autocrat. Again, specimens of art in Greece were for the public places, where they constantly met the public gaze; *e. g.*, Minerva of the Parthenon, which would not only spread the reputation of Phidas through Athens, but was the object of adoration to thousands of strangers who thronged the city; and his Jupiter at

Olympia was visited quadrennially by thousands, who came from the four quarters of the world to the Olympic festival. In Greece, too, unity of people was linked with the arts. Their tombs, temples, altars, and consecrated places, their shields, helmets, breast-plates, etc., were all made by the artists' skill to perpetuate the memory of their fathers."

Thus a spirit of competition acted on the minds of the Greeks in every period and condition of life.

As to their most important interests, they were a nation of men brought into an incessant contest of intellect and feelings. In respect to poetry and the fine arts, this passion to excel was developed under circumstances the most favorable that we can imagine; not in a country exposed to the withering influences of a torrid clime; not where the eye rested on arid plains and joyless deserts, tending only to enervate the mind, and blunt the edge of genius; not under the cold and inclement skies of the north, where they saw nothing but snow and ice, or were enveloped in mist and fog, chilling the finer feelings of the soul and blasting the buddings of genius; but in a country whose broken surface, ever varied in beauty, was clad with the eternal verdure of spring; with a climate more soft and delicious than any other on the globe; with a sky of the purest azure, and of so intense clearness that by his silent gaze the Greek seemed to penetrate the very heavens. The noblest scenery of our earth was spread out around him. He looked upon the bold and lofty steeps of Olympus, whose summits were bathed in the blue vault of heaven; he trod the vale of Tempe, plucked flowers on the banks of the Ilissus, and drank from the fountains of Castalia and Helicon. From the Acropolis at Athens, he looked towards the Ægean sea, studded with its hundred isles; on the one hand were the plains of Platæa and Marathon, and on the other, the Straits of Salamis, the scenes of his country's glory, and associated with the holiest recollections. Every thing around him and within him urged him on to tread the path of glory and

excellence. Under such circumstances, the effusions of the poet came forth from a glowing imagination, imbued with the noblest spirit—a spirit which still lives and breathes, in “thoughts that breathe and words that burn,” and renders them immortal.

Says Professor Wines: “Literature, philosophy, and the fine arts spread rapidly over Greece, and were cultivated with an ardor unknown in any other age or country. There did the Greek, possessing the finest genius, and blessed with the most delicious climate and picturesque scenery, produce those immortal works in poetry, eloquence, history, and philosophy, which have embalmed their memory; which have become universal models of taste and composition, and which have constituted the solace and delight of cultivated minds in every age and nation of the world.” The Greeks wrote, they labored, they painted, they sung for immortality; and they have attained the end of their wishes.

The love of excelling acted on the mind of the orator in the land of freedom, the orator's natal soil, and where alone eloquence can flourish. The popular governments of Greece gave an opportunity for the highest talent to exert its utmost influence. How much better adapted to create the highest eloquence were the circumstances of Greece when struggling for existence, liberty, and power, as we ourselves now are, than those of Rome in the days of Cicero, her proudest orator? It was no idle contest for party strife and ascendancy, or for ornament and display, that the Greeks employed the all-prevailing influence of their eloquence; but in cases of real interest, of momentous importance—where national liberty and independence were at stake, where the fate of the nation depended on the decision of the hour. It was employed to rouse the slumbering energies of the people against a domestic or a foreign foe. But, on the other hand, some of the most admired specimens of Roman eloquence are

on topics of minor importance, exhibiting mere art and ingenuity. No subject of great national interest, if the conspiracy of Catiline be excepted, ever called forth the eloquence of Cicero. Rome, proud mistress of the world, enjoying universal dominion, was in no danger from a foreign foe.

With all this emulation, thus directed, is it wonderful that the orators of Greece reached a point of perfection never since surpassed? Acting under such impulses, is it wonderful that Greek literature has been so eminently distinguished for simplicity, force, and beauty—that it presents us so perfect a picture of nature?

Under these circumstances, poetry and eloquence acted on minds not yet dulled by custom, or stupefied by indolence, or trammelled by rules; they spoke from the genuine impulses of nature, and they spoke to nature beaming from the breast of every Greek; thus situated, they could not fail of consummate excellence. In the eyes of such men; noisy declamation or affected sentiment would appear ridiculous and contemptible.

The genius of Greece, like her own proud Parthenon, stood forth to the world in majestic simplicity and grandeur, the admiration and model of all succeeding ages.

ARTICLE III.

THE RELATIONS OF LANGUAGE.

The first form of knowledge to which we are systematically introduced, is that of words. We are taught to pronounce them, to spell them, to read them, and to understand their signification, in our childhood. This is following the order of nature; for we can not express our own ideas, or receive those of others, except through the medium of language. Indeed, so intimate is the relation between thought and language, that it is impossible to conceive how man could reason without it. Pure thought, abstracted from all those signs that represent it, is a mystery to us. By the various combinations of words, all the thoughts of men are represented; and the whole domain of knowledge is laid off as a map, by which the track of each explorer can be followed; a region which otherwise would be dim, and peopled with shadowy forms, now becomes distinct and firm.

Most children who enjoy the privilege of a few years at school, remember so well the form of the many thousand words that compose a cultivated language, that they can call them at sight, or reproduce them by spelling or writing when not seen. This must be regarded as a very wonderful achievement of the memory, and shows what any faculty, even of ordinary minds, by attention and perseverance can accomplish. If the formidable nature of the undertaking had been comprehended at the outset, but few would have entered on it; but unconscious of its magnitude, they have performed what is not unlike the act of that military chieftain who could call by name all the soldiers of his large army.

Although, in the most general sense, language is the expression of ideas by signs; and in this sense is possessed

by the unfortunate mute, and even by the inferior animals, to each class of which Providence has given a few peculiar notes that they can not increase, yet is there a radical difference between such a language and the distinct utterance of articulate words, connected together in sentences, with emphasis and tones corresponding to the sense. The capacity to make those varied sounds which form a spoken language, and to combine those visible signs which constitute a written one, is peculiar to man; nor can the imperfect imitation of human speech by some birds be regarded an exception, with more reason than the transient effort of a trained dog to walk on two feet is to that other characteristic of man, that he alone walks upon the earth erect.

The prominent position which language, as the representative of thought, confers on man, is manifest, when we examine the refined and intelligent conversation of human beings, whether instructing each other with lessons of experience, or pleasing each other with sentences of genial humor, or sustaining and comforting each other under the trials and vicissitudes of this life: or on observing the assembly of divines, philosophers, or statesmen, where the important themes of religion, science, or government, are eloquently discussed in the presence of thoughtful hearers; or those more popular assemblies where, under the influence of words, an impulse is given to those vast improvements that are producing such a change in the aspect and condition of the world; or where those pious feelings are animated, which are the connecting links between the earthly and the heavenly. When we contrast such associations of men with those of the brutes, merely for the purpose of eating grass together in the meadow, or mutely ruminating under the shady tree, is it not evident that language is no mean element in that combination which enables man to retain the sovereignty with which God originally endowed him—a sovereignty that, from its very nature, imposes the necessity of unity on the nature that

possesses it. Nor was inferior honor conferred on language by Him who "spake as never man spake," when He trained and sent forth His ambassadors to preach, and gave them the gift of tongues, that they might "stand in the temple and speak to the people all the words of this life."

As the different degrees of human civilization depend on the different degrees of developement in the common reason and feeling, and as language is the representative of these, it follows that the language of a people will be an indication of their social position. In a rude state, man's ideas are few and simple, and so will be his words; but as the range of thought enlarges, as new regions of science are explored, as nicer distinctions in philosophy are perceived, as more refinement of sentiment is cultivated, as inventions of new methods to supply his wants, or gratify his taste, or promote his comfort, are increased, to the same extent must appropriate language be added to the scanty vocabulary of rude periods. But we do not refer to the number of words merely, but to the number and variety of the volumes in which these combinations of words, as expressing various important and elevated ideas, are contained. Tried by this standard, the modern civilization must be admitted to be in advance of the ancient. All the departments of nature, from the strata of the earth to the stars, have been classified, we may say, recently. The telescope, the microscope, the compass, and the numerous other mechanical ~~and~~ ^{which} man, in modern times, is able to employ, have opened new worlds of investigation, developed rich mines of information, which the art of printing has extensively diffused; so that far more is known now, and by a greater number, than in the ancient world. While antiquarian researches have brought to light some interesting specimens of ancient art, yet it has never discovered a printing-press, or a steam-engine, or a compass, or a chronometer. It is not to be denied, that in

literary taste, and in some of the fine arts, the ancients have left models which will be the admiration of coming generations; but it must be remembered, that where the range of thought and effort is not extensive, on that very account the few things to which the attention is directed will exhibit proof of superior excellence. Besides, we presume the most enthusiastic admirer of the ancient civilization will not deny that in poetry and eloquence, sculpture and architecture, the moderns are much nearer on a level with the ancients than they are with the moderns in astronomy, geography, geology, chemistry, philosophy, and medicine, and the many arts which have followed the advance of these sciences. But after all, it is possible for a community to be eminent in knowledge, and yet savage in feeling, as has been proved by the history of many nations, and was proved in France during the latter part of the last century. Now, the moral and religious sentiments of the civilized world of modern times are more elevated than those of Assyria, Egypt, Greece, or Rome. It is not, then, the mere structure of a language, or the number of its words, that must determine the social position of a people, so much as the range of thought and elevation of sentiment generally expressed. If all languages had a common origin, then it is possible that a barbarous race might speak a language that is admirable in its structure. Or, it is possible, in the long history of a community, for an individual now and then to arise, who should leave behind him the evidence of superior wisdom and excellence, but this is not decisive in reference to the nation, unless we know to what extent such views and sentiments were entertained.

In the opinion of many, the origin of language is involved in great obscurity. Now, although the Sacred Scriptures do not directly assert that language was given to man by his Creator, yet we think this is the only reasonable inference from the facts that are recorded in them.

Man conversed with God, and with his wife, and named the animals, before his fall. He seems to have had the power of speech from the beginning of his existence. There is no mention of a period when he was dumb. He was evidently created not only with the vocal organs, but with the power and disposition to use those organs for the purpose intended. This view is in harmony with nature; for who is there that doubts that in the act of creation God determined and made it necessary that the eagle should scream, that the dog should bark, and the lion roar, as surely as that the first should fly in the air, and that the last should roam the forest? Now, why should any who regard these notes of the inferior animals as analogous to speech in man, be reluctant to trace it to the same source; or to believe that man began to speak as soon after his creation, and with as little difficulty, as the other animals to utter those voices peculiar to them?

If any should object, that man was endowed with reason and the power of invention, which the inferior animals have not, and therefore what was necessary for God to do in the one case, was not in the other, let him consider that man is taught many things by instinct, as well as the animals below him. The difference between the two is not, that to the one God gave reason alone, and to the other instinct alone; but to both He gave certain powers, in which the range of the one was very limited, and that of the other very extended; giving to both similar talents; to one no capacity to increase it, and to the other the power to improve it greatly. The faculty of invention was not given to create or originate, but to improve, to advance from a starting point at which man has been placed. Although in time reason might have discovered that certain things placed in the mouth and chewed and swallowed would appease hunger, and nourish the body, yet it was not in this way that man learned this necessary art; but God said unto him, "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."

If God made such communications as these to man, it is evident that the knowledge of language was before that of the food that was necessary to preserve life. Those characteristics that are universal and constant, and distinguish one order of creatures from another, must be original endowments conferred in the act of creation. It might as well be supposed that man was created a crawling animal, but with a capacity to discover the mode of walking erect, as that he was created dumb, but with the power to teach himself to speak. If, however, it should be supposed that the instinctive sounds made by the inferior animals are not analogous to human speech, then an important question suggests itself. In what condition was man created? Was he created as an infant, or with his powers and faculties fully developed? If it should be supposed that he, together with all the other members of the animal kingdom, were created in the feebleness and dependence of infancy, let it be considered what daily miracles were necessary, for many years, in bringing them up from such a condition to one in which they were able to take care of themselves. Had those venerable records, which give us the earliest history of man, represented this to have been his primitive condition, what incessant objections to the authenticity of such a narrative would have been urged by those who are so jealous of any divine interference. We presume that those who admit a creation at all, will accept the account of it in this particular as natural and reasonable. There were mature trees laden with mature fruits. There were mature animals, so that the eagle, fully fledged and grown, was soaring in the air, the horse was prancing on the plain, and the great whale was throwing the sparkling brine, like a fountain, above his head. Man was mature. His stature was complete. His senses and his mind were fully devel-

oped. Why were they thus created mature? The natural answer to this inquiry is, that they might at once exercise these faculties in their appropriate functions. Man's limbs were created strong that he might immediately walk, and his senses and intellectual powers were mature, that he might instantly exercise them. Because of the mature condition in which he was formed, Adam was able to walk, to eat, to observe, to remember, to reason, from the moment that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Now, the organs of speech were as fully developed as his other powers, and for the same reason. He spoke as naturally as he ran or reasoned. He was able to express his thoughts and his emotions in articulate words, as naturally as to quench his thirst with water, or appease hunger with appropriate food. There is no reason for making an exception to this universal principle in the case of the vocal powers; there is no reason to suppose that, when the lowest powers of motion and eating, and the highest powers of reason and affection were active, that the vocal organs were dumb. Let not, then, the fact that the child is born dumb, and that he slowly learns to speak, be any obstacle in coming to the conclusion that language is of divine origin, for it was to anticipate this state of pupilage that man was created mature, and with all his powers in exercise.

It is possible that some may admit that man was created with mature faculties; but not for the reason that we have supposed. They may imagine that it was not that they might immediately exercise themselves in their appropriate functions, but that there might be no constitutional impediment to this exercise, when he should have discovered the proper method of doing so. This will certainly not apply to those functions which are involuntary. The lungs, for example, did not wait until man had discovered how they were to be used before they began to respire. But, in addition to this, we are persuaded that common experience will attest, that man never learns the use of any faculty or

power of nature by examining it merely in repose ; but by observing it in exercise. The hand, for example, was not palsied until man, by examining its structure and reasoning on it, should discover its use. But there was a natural and instinctive use of it from the beginning. Indeed, the supposition of the objector is absurd, for many of man's faculties are not under his direct observation ; and if all were, the faculties of perception and reason, which are themselves necessary to discover the uses of things, according to the supposition, must first learn, *a priori*, the purposes for which they were designed, before they can exercise their powers. No progress, therefore, was possible on this theory. The true conclusion, doubtless, is, that man was created with all his powers mature, and they were created mature that he might immediately employ them in the manner, and for the purpose intended in their creation.

Not to speak of those who have entertained the opinion that man has reached his present position by a process of gradual developement from the brutes, it has been a favorite theory with more respectable philosophers, that the primitive condition of man was exceedingly humble, if not savage, and that he has slowly raised himself to the different elevations which he occupies along the line of improvement. If man's moral nature was pure when it came from the Creator, it is not possible that he should have been so degraded. The two things are incompatible. And to suppose that God created him with a corrupt moral nature, shocks the soul that has been accustomed to cherish exalted views of His purity. Besides, there is no evidence that the human race has made any progress outside of the influence of revealed religion. There is no community of Mohammedans or Pagans now that are equal to the ancient Babylonians, Persians, Grecians, or Romans ; nor is there any example of a barbarous community elevating itself without foreign aid. Language is the most ancient record that we have of many barbarous tribes, and the

philosophical structure of many of these languages forbids the supposition that they were invented by men of such degraded powers of mind as to remove them but a little above the brutes.

There is another position from which we may take a view of the origin of language. If we observe the organization of man, we shall discover a correspondence between certain organs and faculties, and certain other elements, very distinct from these, but without which these would be useless. For example, there is such an adaptation between the eyes and light, that the eye can not see any thing but light, and nothing else but the eye can see the light. There is also a similar adaptation between the air and the lungs, between the organs of digestion and the food, between reason and the properties and relations of things. Now, in all these cases, not only the organ, but the element suited to it, and without which it would have been useless, was the gift of the Creator. But is there not as perfect an adaptation between the vocal organs and those other arrangements necessary to produce articulate sounds, as between any other organ and that which the wise Creator has made for it, that it might exercise its peculiar functions? Did He create light for the eye, and air for the lungs, and food for the digestive organs, and did He not make for the vocal organs those arrangements that are necessary to form words? As we sometimes find the elements of nature having different relations, and having several uses, so language sustains so close a relation to reason that that faculty would be of but little more use without it, either in conducting its peculiar processes or in communicating them, than the eye without light. The principal design of the ear was to receive these intelligible sounds, because these are the sounds that it hears with most interest, and the air serves almost as valuable a purpose in transmitting these sounds as in affording vital breath for the lungs. These varied and beautiful adjustments evince too much of

the divine skill to permit us to deny His direct agency. Speaking is the proper function of the vocal organs, and we believe it was made necessary and natural by the arrangements of God, in the act of creation, so that man spake without any more difficulty than any other organ performed its proper function. The analogies of nature warrant the belief, on natural principles, that intelligible words were addressed by God to man just created, which his perfect constitution enabled him to understand and answer.

It may not be justly objected to this analogy, that there is a difference between those external material elements which, concurring with the human organ, enables it to perform its functions, and that more complicated arrangement by which the vocal organs voluntarily perform their function. We think this makes no difference. Some of these elements, in other cases, are material, as air; others are immaterial, as light. In some cases the arrangement is simple, as in feeling; in others more complicated, as in seeing and hearing. In some they are voluntary, as in walking or eating; in others involuntary, as in breathing and digesting. We think the principle we lay down is a solid one, that wherever a natural organ or organs exist, that all the arrangements for the discharge of their appropriate functions were made by the Creator, so as to necessitate the result without a toilsome effort on the part of His mature and perfectly organized creature.

Neither is the objection a valid one, that God supplied every thing that was absolutely necessary for man's existence, but as it was not necessary that he should speak, the plan was such the speech should be acquired by the invention of man. We think God was more bountiful than the objection supposes; that man was not limited to those things that were barely sufficient to keep him alive. The variety and richness of nature—many things combining beauty, fragrance, and sweetness—forbid us to suppose that

the penurious principle brought out in the objection was that according to which God acted in the creation of man. Man would rather have dispensed with many of these beautiful sights, and fragrant odors, and sweet tastes, than to have been denied the power immediately to understand and utter intelligible words; for the loss of this ability now he deems well-nigh irreparable. It was not more necessary that man should taste and smell, than that he should speak. There would also, doubtless, be quite a difference of opinion as to the relative importance of speech, as the medium of divine communications on the one hand, and of worship on the other, and the actual necessities of life. Those who, like Job, esteem the words of His mouth more than their necessary food, would differ from those who are disposed to say, Depart from us, for we desire not a knowledge of thy ways, as to its value and necessity.

We shall reach the same conclusion in reference to the origin of language, if we follow another line of argument. Men learn to speak by imitation, and they speak that language, and that alone, which they hear. There is an analogy between the vocal organs, in this respect, and the hand with a pencil in it; the one imitates sounds, and the other imitates visible things. Models are necessary in each case. As man can not conceive or represent any thing with the pencil, but according to forms of nature which he has seen, so neither could his vocal organs imitate sounds of which nature afforded no examples. He may combine different parts of primitive forms, according to his fancy, but his invention is restricted to this sphere. The inventive power only combines existing materials into useful forms, in harmony with some law or principle of nature, which has first been discovered. We can conceive that there may be other properties of matter than those with which we are acquainted; but who can imagine what they are? It is possible that there may be other senses than those with which man is endowed; but who can imagine what the sixth can possibly

be? If man had never heard an articulate sound, what could have given him the idea that such a sound was possible? There have been, from the earliest period of the world, unfortunate members of the human family, who have been born deaf. And although they have had the opportunity of seeing persons engaged in conversation, and although they may be capable of reading words, and although their organs of speech may be perfect, yet they have never uttered an articulate sound, and they never seem to make the effort, because they can not form a conception of that which to them has no existence. But perhaps it may be asked whether, by imitating those sounds with which nature abounds, man might not at length invent articulate sounds and words. The analogy between these sounds and those words which are the signs of ideas, does not seem to be sufficiently close to warrant an affirmative answer. Persons partially deaf, who could hear many of these sounds, have never learned to articulate; and it is a well-known fact that persons who become deaf after they have learned to speak, lose the power of speaking intelligibly afterwards. If, then, man can not continue the imitation of articulate sounds after having acquired them, unless he can constantly hear them, we infer that it is unreasonable to expect him to invent them, never having heard them, and continue to repeat them when he can hear them from no other source. We conclude that man was created with the ability to speak intelligible words, so that when his Creator first addressed him in such words, he understood them, and without effort was able to reply.

It is not probable that this primitive language was as complete and copious as would be necessary for all the future wants of man, but only the present. As the design of language is to express his ideas, it was not desirable that man should have a greater variety of words than was necessary for this purpose. The nature of man, though mature, was progressive; maturity was the point from which it be-

gan to advance, as the feebleness of infancy is the point from which man begins to progress since. As the reason of the first man did not anticipate the ideas and discoveries which the combined reason of all mankind should afterwards develope, it would have been burdensome to him to have had a large store of words imposed upon his memory, which were without meaning to him. His language was sufficient for all the purposes of speech, and capable of improvement as he advanced in knowledge.

As there was originally, then, but one language, and as there are now quite a variety, the origin of these numerous tongues is a subject of interesting inquiry. It might, perhaps, be imagined that after man had learned the use of his vocal organs, that different forms of language would spring up, as natural offshoots from the parent stock. That there would, in the progress of time, be changes, especially by the addition of new words, can admit of no doubt. But changes as great as those that exist, and as various, and at as early a period in the history of the world as we know them to have existed, can not be satisfactorily accounted for in this way. The diversity in languages consists not only in one having more words than another, all formed after a similar rule, but also in pronunciation and grammatical structure. Upon the supposition of one universal language, those causes that now operate to produce changes, as conquest, commerce, and social intercourse, would have had no such effects, so that any change at first must have been voluntary. Even exposed to the influence of these causes now, when each nation has its own peculiar tongue, what nation has voluntarily changed the once established structure of its language? To be sure, the Chinese have been less exposed to these influences than other nations, but the writings of Confucius, which are two thousand five hundred years old, exhibit the same language that is written now. The Iberians, who are not a numerous people, inhabiting the south-western part of France and north-

eastern part of Spain, although so closely pressed by large communities speaking different languages, have retained their own language from time immemorial. The languages of barbarous tribes undergo but little change, and although the languages of cultivated races are gradually changing, yet what probability is there that in any period of time the English people would voluntarily change the peculiar modes of inflection in their language for that of the Greek or Latin? The philosophical structure of many languages spoken by barbarous tribes, forbids us to suppose that such a language was the invention of a people as uncivilized as those who now speak it. As there are about four thousand languages and dialects spoken on the earth, and as the race of man has been here only about six thousand years, there must, by the natural process, have been on an average one new language formed in less than two years; or, as the deluge took place about four thousand years ago, there must have been one new language invented and established every year. We have no faith in any such natural increase of languages.

Some naturalists account for the diversity of language in a different way. They argue that all men did not have the same origin, but were created in different geographical districts; that the same race, even, did not spring from one common source, but that "men must have originated in nations, as the bees in swarms;" that each of these communities would have its own peculiar language. This theory is based on an analogy, it is affirmed, between the plants, the inferior animals, and man.

We believe there is nothing in the Mosaic account of the creation to contradict this supposed plan of the creation and distribution of, at least, such plants and animals as are adapted by their constitution to a certain temperature. Indeed, the inspired history represents the earth at the creative word as bringing forth the plants and animals adapted to it, and the waters as producing the animals

sued to it; so that to this extent it favors the supposition that plants and animals peculiar to one geographical area were created there. Nor are we at all disposed to object to its application to man. We will not say that he is an exception. But, with all deference to the distinguished naturalist who is the ablest expounder of this theory, we think he does not give the law in those exact terms which science authorizes, and which would prevent confusion. The law is simply this, that plants and animals were created in those geographical districts in which they are found, provided the same species be never assigned to more than one district. If we could have seen the world immediately after the creation, every thing would have stood in the place in which it was formed, and we could have said of this, it was created here, and of that, it was formed there. But great changes have taken place since, and many plants and animals are found at immense distances from the place in which they originated. It may be they are found in every geographical district; it may be they flourish better in a place to which they have been removed than in that in which they originated. It is impossible, without a knowledge of the history of these, to assign them to their own province. There are other plants and animals whose nature will not so readily adapt itself to different climates, and hence they remain where they originated, and their birth-place can be more surely pointed out. But nothing is better established than that God did not create the same species in two different districts. Not an exception to this rule has been found. On this subject, we refer to the Principles of Zoölogy, by Agassiz and Gould, p. 186, where it is said, "No animal, excepting man, inhabits every part of the surface of the earth. Each great geographical or climatal region, is occupied by *some species not found elsewhere;*" and on p. 209, "We shall find, by the study of the different groups in detail, *that certain species, though very nearly alike, are nevertheless very distinct in two different faunas.*" "Neither the distribution of

animals, therefore, any more than their organization, can be the effect of external influences. We must, on the contrary, see in it the realization of a plan wisely designed, the work of a Supreme Intelligence, who created, at the beginning, *each species of animal at the place and for the place which it inhabits*. To each species has been assigned a limit which it has no disposition to overstep, so long as it remains in a wild state." This being the law, it follows as a necessary consequence that man was either created at different places and of different species, or at one place and of the same species; or else that he is so unique that there is not sufficient analogy between him and the subordinate creation to enable us to reason from one to the other. At one time, Professor Agassiz adopted this last supposition; for he says, "Whilst animals are of distinct species, in the different zoölogical provinces to which they belong, man, notwithstanding the diversity of his races, constitutes a single identical species over the whole surface of the globe. In this respect, as in so many others, man appears to us an exceptional being in this creation, of which he is at once the object and the end." But it does not seem to us at all necessary to place man, as an animal, thus beyond the pale of those analogies that are universal. We are satisfied that science should apply such tests to him. There must have been good scientific reasons constraining the mind of the learned professor, to say that all the races of men are of a single species. Why, then, did he not permit science to conduct him to the conclusion that it was impossible that man should have been created at but one place? This would have been consistent. This would have exhibited him as a docile child of nature. This would have saved him from that maze into which he so unfortunately entered, and in his efforts to extricate himself has hidden himself, so that no one can tell precisely where he is. But it is flattering to him to know that so many are anxiously search-

ing for him, and listening to every sound which will enable them to discover him.

The discovery of the law that the same species was not created in two different natural provinces, may assist the naturalist in his classifications, but no one would be content with the mere fact of finding an animal in this or that place in determining his species. For example, the mere fact of finding a drove of horses on the prairies of the west, would not itself prove that the horse was created both here and in Asia, or that there are two distinct species. Neither, if he found a race of negroes in the West Indies, would he, from this mere circumstance, conclude that it was a different species from the negroes of Africa. But knowing the means that man has of removal from one place to another, and the various motives or accidents that may cause such removals, he would attribute to this cause rather than suppose a violation of the law. It is too late in the day, from an observation of this kind on man, in conjunction with the present place of his residence, to determine that he was created there, and has always lived there. The various migrations and changes of mankind should induce caution in any conclusion on this subject. In such cases, the naturalist avails himself of history, if within his reach. Now, we have a history the most authentic, which says that the red man was not created in America, nor the white man in Europe, nor the black man in Africa, but all were created in Asia, and gives a history of the dispersion.

But it is said this history is perhaps authentic, but it confines itself to one race, and that the white race. But this interpretation can not stand; for, leaving out of view the disputed points as to origin, the rest of the history is as true of the other races as of the Caucasian. They were all created by God; they have immortal spirits; they are fallen; they die; they bring forth children with pain; they eat their bread in the sweat of their brow; their an-

cestors were swept away by a flood; and they speak as many languages as the white race. But besides this, we are told by a distinguished naturalist, who at the same time asserts that Moses wrote the history of the white race, that men originated in nations, as the bees in swarms. We can not reconcile these statements, unless we suppose that the Caucasian race descended from one father and mother, and that the other races came into existence by nations. Unnatural as this exposition of his opinion may be, we hope it may be the true one, rather than that he should mean to say that the Mosaic account of the origin of the white race is not true, because all races originated in nations, and each race was created in a different zoölogical province. In the history of man there are examples of those who, either from vanity or some such weakness, have imagined that it was only necessary to affix their names to spurious notes on nature to give them circulation. This is unfortunate, both on account of those who have yielded to such a temptation, and of those who hold the counterfeit papers as genuine.

It is generally admitted that man is a cosmopolite—that he can live in any habitable part of the globe. He was created with this nature, and it might be interesting to inquire why he was thus created? Evidently, that he might roam over or inhabit any part of his extensive domain, and thus avail himself of the benefits to be derived from every part of it. Every portion of it was capable of being made tributary to him. Now, had God created each race in a particular place, and for that particular place, would He not, probably, have limited them to that region by a nature or constitution similar to that which he has given to tropical plants and animals, for example, which will not bear transportation to a different latitude? Does not this pliability of his nature, by which he can adapt himself to sea or land, to warm or cold latitudes, to low or elevated

regions, show that man was not created in different places, as being exclusively suited to those places?

But it may be asked, if there is not a marked adaptation between certain races and the climates they inhabit? There certainly is. This very pliability of the constitution that enables man to go every where over the globe, accommodates itself to the peculiarities of the climate where he dwells, so as to enable him to thrive in it better than one who has been accustomed to dwell in a very different climate. You will do violence to nature if you conclude, for example, that the negro was created in Africa, because he thrives there, for it sometimes happens, with reference to plants and animals, especially those having this cosmopolitan nature, that they flourish better in regions to which they have been transported, than in those where they originated. The Irish potato, Carolina rice, the Newfoundland dog, are familiar examples.

It is not man alone that is cosmopolitan in his nature, but there are certain plants and animals the most useful to him that are similarly constituted. Now, when we find these dispersed over the earth, and flourishing in this or that region, we are not to infer that they were created there. There is a relation between the fauna and flora of a country, and a wise Providence created them together; but as man is able to carry those plants along with him on which he feeds, God, instead of creating one race in one place, with plants and animals suited to it, and another race elsewhere, with a class of vegetables and animals more appropriate for it, created man with a nature that can adapt itself to all climates, and certain plants and animals most useful to him, with the same nature, that he may carry them into all the lands whither he himself may go. Those plants and animals that have this nature were, most of them, created in the warm part of the temperate zone in Asia, as best suited for the race in its infancy, and that

in the dispersion they might approach both extremes of heat and cold gradually.

But some of these naturalists hold the opinion that these races of men are not only of diverse origin, but of different species. What is necessary in this case is, for these naturalists to agree as to the number of these distinct species, accompanied by a description of their invariable peculiarities. This they confess they are unable to do, because they say the races are so intermingled that a perfectly pure race can not be found. And yet they do not see in this very state of confusion the most satisfactory evidence that their theory is not in harmony with nature. Where does such an anomalous condition exist, among the other species of animals? The world might exist for ever before that great law which keeps the different species of animals distinct would be so overthrown as they say it is in the different species of men. In any other department of knowledge, similar opinions would be condemned as crude, and they are not entitled to any more indulgence in this, the most important of them all.

The difference in color is that which is chiefly considered by these writers; and yet there is not a living naturalist who would not disregard the nonsense of one who should object to the classification that includes a black sheep and a white one, or a black horse and a white one, in the same species, although such varieties are inexplicable. These varieties in the human species bring it into admirable harmony with other species of animals, and the cause is as unaccountable in the one case as in the other. Indeed, had the human species not exhibited these varieties in analogy with the other species of animals, these same men, doubtless, would have wondered what it was in man that made him an exception to the influence of a law so general in the departments of domestic plants and animals. There is a disingenuousness unbecoming philosophers in the appeals to popular prejudice on this subject. It betrays

a consciousness of weakness, as it does in the guilty man arraigned at the tribunal of justice, who selects the most ignorant and corrupt men for his jury.

Now, the diversities of language can not be truly accounted for by such theories as these. Agassiz supposes each race to have their vocal organs so modified as to necessitate different languages. But as he supposes there are but eight distinct races, the number of languages is entirely too great to sustain the theory. Anatomy has discovered no such difference in the vocal organs of the different races. There is as much difference in the languages spoken by one of these races, as there is often between the languages of two different races.

It seems very natural that the same reasons that influenced the wise Creator to make different species of animals apart, would lead Him to ordain such constitutional barriers as would keep them distinct; and if we find that there is no such barrier between them now, we may justly conclude that there never has been. One of these barriers is, the incapacity of one species to imitate the vocal sounds of another. There is no art by which you can teach the horse to bray. This does not result from any want of opportunity, for different species of the same genus are often together, but the difficulty is constitutional. But it is different with men. They learn to speak each other's language. Men of the white race speak the languages of the black and red races, and so they speak his. Indeed, if you take a child of one race before it has learned to speak its native tongue, and place it in the midst of other races, it will learn their languages with as much facility as it would have learned that of its parents. From which it appears that the different languages are not the voices of different species, but varieties of one common tongue.

The diversity of language can not be satisfactorily accounted for on the false theories of diverse species, or a diverse origin of the human races. Neither can we see any

motive sufficient to prompt human ingenuity voluntarily to invent these different languages, and to induce others to adopt them. Neither could they be accidental, unless God implanted some constitutional bias or tendency, which in this way developed itself. This confusion of tongues took place through the interposition of God, so that the race of man, which had existed about two thousand years, all speaking the same language, now began to speak differently, and so suddenly, that the very same men who had been accustomed to labor together were unable to associate with each other any longer. The same God who, in the former times, produced such a great change in the voices of men, did, at the beginning of this dispensation, bestow the gift of tongues on His servants, that men of all nations might hear them speak the wonderful works of God.

Great changes took place in the human constitution about the time of the deluge. Causes which had not so operated before, now shortened the duration of human life; so that the average age of the nine descendants of Noah was three hundred and forty-three years, whereas the average age of Noah and his eight progenitors was nine hundred and twelve years. The suddenness of the decline is evident from a comparison of Noah's age, which was nine hundred and fifty years, with that of Shem, which was six hundred years; a difference of three hundred and fifty years.

From the name Ham, it is not improbable that the black variety of the human species then originated, which, at the dispersion, determined the course of his migrations toward the sun. And then came this confusion of tongues, which dispersed the different colonies in different directions, the name Babel commemorating the one, and the name Peleg the other. It was the design of God that the earth should be more rapidly peopled, and the resources of different parts more rapidly developed, than by the gradual

advance of the race of population from a single centre. There were immense advantages to be derived from the organization of distinct nations, each prosecuting its distinct mission. All these important results were involved in this confusion of language and consequent dispersion.

In effecting this confusion of tongues, or causing this diversity of language, God may either have obliterated all traces of the primitive language, and introduced a new tongue altogether; or He may have permitted one community to retain the original language, and may have evolved out of this, as a germ, a great number of dialects, differing from it in a greater or less degree. We think this latter method accords best with His usual plan. He uses existing materials as far as they will answer the purpose. As at the deluge He did not destroy the whole race, and then bring in a new one; so in the confusion of tongues, He did not destroy the old language, but incorporated its elements into the new languages in different proportions. We think that usually the works and acts of God are so performed as to leave behind them traces of His plan of procedure. His works are historical. In harmony with this view, although all the languages of the world have not been compared, yet the examination thus far has convinced the most eminent philologists that all tongues have so many common elements as to indicate that they are different branches from the same trunk. Alexander von Humboldt says: "However insulated certain languages may at first appear, however singular their caprices and their idiom, all have an analogy among them, and their numerous relations will be more perceived in proportion as the philosophical history of nations and the study of languages shall be brought to perfection." And again: "The comparative study of languages shows us that races now separated by vast tracts of land are allied together, and have migrated from one common primitive seat; it indicates the course and direction of all migrations, and in

tracing the leading epoch of developements it recognizes, by means of the more or less changed structure of the language, in the permanence of certain forms, or in the more or less advanced distinction of the formative system, which race has retained most nearly the language common to all who had migrated from the general seat of origin." "The largest field for such investigations into the ancient condition of language, and consequently into the period when the whole family of mankind was, in the strict sense of the word, to be regarded as one living whole, presents itself in the long chain of Indo-Germanic languages, extending from the Ganges to the Iberian extremity of Europe, and from Sicily to the North Cape." "From these considerations, and the examples by which they have been illustrated, the comparative study of languages appears an important rational means of assistance by which scientific and genuinely philological investigation may lead to a generalization of views regarding the affinity of races, and their conjectural extension in various directions from one common point of radiation." Not less explicit is the testimony of Julius Klaproth, whom no one will accuse of any partiality for inspired statements. He says: "The universal affinity of language is placed in so strong a light that it must be considered by all as completely demonstrated. This does not appear explicable on any other hypothesis than that of admitting fragments of a primary language yet to exist through the languages of the old and new world." From such testimony of these eminent philologists, and others that might be quoted, it is evident that the condition of language throughout the world could not be expected to harmonize better with inspired history than it does. They are so closely related as to satisfy even the sceptical philologist that they all emanated from a common root; and they are sufficiently diverse to interrupt social intercourse, and to disperse colonies in different directions. There is a gratifying conformity between the most thorough

and impartial researches of the most eminent comparative philologists, and the scriptural account of the original uniformity of language and the violent divergence from that original form into many varieties. If we consider that it is only among highly cultivated nations that language undergoes any changes, and that among these the changes are not so much in the structure as in the increase and pronunciation of words; and if we consider, too, that there have not been many such highly cultivated nations, we shall be at a loss to account for the existence of nearly four thousand languages in about as many years, from one, by those causes merely which are operating at present. It will not be satisfactory, on the one hand, to attempt to account for the general resemblance of languages by the influence which one nation at a former period may have exerted over another; for it is not the similarity between two, or even a few languages, that we speak of, but that which appears among them all, and especially in those words which are the names of the most familiar objects. Neither, on the other hand, can the diversity be accounted for by the supposition that skilful men designedly invented new languages, and persuaded their fellow-men to discard the old familiar language for the new; for we doubt whether the most ingenious man living could invent a language as distinct in structure and vocabulary from all existing languages, as many of them are from each other; much less, when so invented, that he could induce any large community of mankind to adopt it.

ARTICLE IV.

The Puritans: or The Church, Court, and Parliament of England, during the reigns of Edward the Sixth and Queen Elizabeth. By SAMUEL HOPKINS. In three volumes. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1859.

Since its first appearance, Neal's History of the Puritans has been accepted as the standard work on that subject; nor is it likely to be very soon superseded. The author seems to have been peculiarly qualified for the task to which, with filial piety akin to that of Old Mortality, he devoted the best energies of his nature and the best years of his life. An Independent minister, of unfeigned piety, of orthodox sentiments, of highly respectable talents and attainments, with a profound veneration for Puritan institutions, ideas, and character, with some peculiar personal facilities in the possession of important papers relating to the men and times to be treated of, and in perfect sympathy with the freedom and glory of his country, he was unquestionably well fitted for his important undertaking. His style is uniformly clear, unaffected, and manly. It can not, of course, be compared, for a moment, with the style of our great classic historians; in vigor, in vivacity, in pungency, or in narrative tact, with that of Hume; in variety, in grace, in pictorial art, and in graphic force, with that of Macaulay; in pomp and magnificence with that of Gibbon, the procession of whose stately sentences is measured and majestic as was that of those Roman legions he so delighted to honor; but it is a style, nevertheless, which we can always read with satisfaction.

Of the author of the portly and ponderous volumes before us, we know absolutely nothing, save what may be easily inferred from the work itself. We were, therefore, wholly unprejudiced, of course, and we took up the work

with high hope; but we laid it down with disgust, not unmixed with indignation. It may be proper to say that only two of the three volumes announced have reached us. What could possibly have induced the author to write so long and laborious a work on such a subject, we can not divine. He evidently has no proper understanding of the Puritan character; and, of course, no intelligent sympathy with it. Judging from the materials before us, we should take him to be an unworthy scion of the old Puritan stock, ambitious and wrong-headed, without refinement of literary taste or thoroughness of literary culture, determined to do for himself what a good man, in the extremity of his anguish, imprecated on his enemy, as the sum and climax of every earthly evil—*write a book!* With this foregone conclusion arrived at, “in spite of nature and his stars,” he cast about for a subject, and, as John Bunyan says of himself, “as he walked through the wilderness of this world, lighted” on the unhappy Puritans.

The style of the work is peculiar and provoking, if not piquant or picturesque. The first volume opens like one of James’s novels—any one taken a trandom—but, instead of the inevitable “solitary horseman,” lo! we have a couple of horsemen, who turn out to be Edward the Sixth and the Lord Protector, Somerset. Then follows an “imaginary conversation,” not exactly in the style of the best of Walter Savage Landor’s.

Now, we protest, *in limine*, against writing history after this fashion. A novel may be a good thing in its place, and after its kind. If a man can and will write a novel, such as has been written, and probably will be written again, which shall “hold the mirror up to nature;” shall abound with pure sentiment, with elegant and exact description, with delicate touches of human nature; which shall cause the purest and profoundest waters of the fountain within us to gush forth, as if at “the touch of the enchanter’s wand;” the affections of this human heart, “by which

we live," to flow forth in streams of tenderness, of admiration, and of delight; if, in a word, he can and will give us a new Vicar of Wakefield, or a new Heart of Midlothian—we, for one, at least, shall be sincerely thankful. All we contend for is, that a novel is one thing, and a history is another; and that when a man professes to write a history, he should not so far confound things that differ as to give us a novel under the title of a history; or, as this unscrupulous writer has done, for bread give us a stone, and for a fish, a serpent. A woman may be a very good woman, and a man may be a very good man, still we do not like to see them resemble each other too closely in dress and demeanor; and must confess that we have always felt some sympathy with the honest Welshman, when he exclaimed, "I like not when a 'oman has a great peard: I spy a great peard under her muffler."

Never before, in the annals of literature, was there so little harmony between subject and style; the downright, determined, straight-forward, and energetic character of the men to be portrayed, and the tricky, gaudy, jaunty, affectedly picturesque and really burlesque manner in which they are presented. Even their worst enemies must admit of the Puritans that, whatever their faults, whatever their short-comings, whatever their errors of taste, of opinion, of principle, or of policy, they were not light, trifling, finical, but plain, serious, resolute, earnest, and able men.

The spirit of the book we hesitate not to characterize as grossly and offensively irreligious. What would those grave and godly divines, Cartwright and Travers, Baxter and Owen, have thought of a writer who could so lightly profane the awful name of the Most High, as does this irreverent scribbler on the 267th page of volume 1: "Good God! what a question;" or, on only the third page after, 269th, "By Jesu! sith thou dost provoke me;" and, "Jesu! saith she," etc., page 297; "Odds! my life, sir!" page 37, volume 1; etc., etc.

We have transcribed these profane expressions with ineffable disgust, and only because we supposed that without the exhibition of some specimens, at least, the grave charges alleged might be deemed undeserved or exaggerated. It must be perfectly evident that, whatever else he may be able to do, or fit to do, such a man is morally and intellectually incapable of writing the history of the Puritans.

The matter is not a whit better than the style and spirit of the work. It is astonishing how little these two large volumes tell us, not that was previously unknown, not that could not be readily found in a score of printed and by no means rare works—in Neal's History of the Puritans, in Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation, in Jeremy Collier's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, in the Zurich Letters, in Mather's Magnalia, in McCrie's Life of Knox, in the Life and Writings of Thomas Cartwright, taken in connexion with the Life and Writings of Richard Hooker—but that they tell us so little that was worth knowing at all, not to say that even this little might there be obtained upon much more moderate terms than wading through the deep morass of this "perilous stuff."

The ancient historians, Greek and Latin—Herodotus and Thucydides, Livy and Sallust—were comparatively disdainful of minute accuracy. They rarely condescend to refer to dates and authorities. *Ὡς λέγουσι*, seems to have been regarded by the father of history as a sufficient voucher for his most marvellous statements. The design of these writers was not so much to convey exact information, as to amuse or amaze the reader. They were more solicitous, therefore, to make a vivid and deep, than a just and adequate impression. Truth, indeed, they sought, they attained, they announced; but it was not so much literal historic verity, as ethical or dramatic truth, such truth as we find in Hamlet or in the Iliad. It was rather the truth of nature than the truth of history that they aimed at. A critical and philosophical history, like Grote's History of

Greece, or like Niebuhr's History of Rome, was unknown to the literature of classical antiquity. Hence it is a capital rule with the ancient historians, never to spoil a good story by fanatical scruples or ill-timed scepticism. Hence, they have not the slightest hesitation in putting speeches into the mouths of their historical characters, such as they deemed appropriate to the occasion. Still, Herodotus and Thucydides never ventured on the dramatic liberties in the formation and structure of their narratives, which the writer before us so boldly and blindly assumes.

We now take leave of Mr. Samuel Hopkins, not altogether pleased, it may be, but "more in sorrow than in anger;" a sorrow occasioned by the terrible remembrance of two mighty and mortal volumes, not to speak of the appalling announcement of a third of equal diameter and dulness, from which, thus far, we have been mercifully preserved by a benevolent blockade. No intelligent person can fail to have perceived, no evangelical believer can fail to have deplored, the indiscriminating censure and scorn with which the Puritans have been stigmatized of late, and in which every party, in any way or on any ground associated with them, justly or unjustly, intelligently or ignorantly, has been compelled to bear a part. It is to be feared that, under the hated name of Puritan, not only will good men be unjustly aspersed, but great principles fall into temporary discredit. So easy is it for those who dislike the polity and principles of the Presbyterian church, under cover of an assault on the Puritans, to assail the principles and disparage the men we hold most dear, that we think it not merely a service to the cause of historic truth, but a necessary act of self-defence, to enter on the inquiry, how far the Puritans are liable to the charge of being pragmatic disturbers of the peace of society, and fanatical despisers of the decency of divine worship; and what relation they rightfully bear to us, even if the charges brought against them be sustained and admitted.

In regard to this latter point, we wish it distinctly understood in the outset that we acknowledge no responsibility for the acts and principles of the Puritans, save so far as we were historically united in a common and heroic resistance to civil and ecclesiastical oppression under Queen Elizabeth and the Stuarts, and received in common certain great principles of divine revelation and canons of Scripture interpretation. That there is not merely misapprehension, but malice, in the tone now adopted when speaking of the Puritans, is evident from the fact that, in its bitterness and boldness, at least, it is quite recent. Even David Hume, sceptic and tory as he was, the champion of abuses and the apologist of tyranny, admits "that the precious spark of liberty had been kindled and was preserved by the Puritans alone; and it was to this sect, whose principles appear so frivolous, and habits so ridiculous, that the English owe the whole freedom of their Constitution."* The testimony of the historian of the United States to the same point, is uniform and emphatic: "The Commons of England resolutely favored the sect which was their natural ally in the struggle against despotism."† From the time of the appearance of Macaulay's *Essay on Milton*, in the forty-fourth volume of the *Edinburgh Review*, to the appearance of Carlyle's *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, we had imagined that a change, favorable to the estimate of the Puritan cause and character, had been going on in the public mind of Europe and America.

Since the commencement of the revolution through which our country is now passing, however, we have been pained to see a disposition on the part of many conductors of the public press and leaders of public sentiment in the South, to identify the insane and inhuman crusade now instituted against the people of the Confederate States

* Hume's *History*, Vol. IV., p. 141, Harper's edition.

† Bancroft's *History of the United States*, Vol. I., p. 298, and throughout the work.

with the creed and character of the Puritans; and to represent the shameless atrocities of the present war as the legitimate fruits of their teaching and example: not remembering that we are contending this day for the very truths and doctrines, in the political sphere, at least, for which the Puritans contended in Great Britain, and for which they were content to suffer the forfeiture of their estates, the mutilation of their limbs, imprisonment, exile, and death; that the war now carried on against us is the act, not of a sect, or of a portion, but of a "*united North*;" that if a Spring, a Breckinridge, and a Hodge, are to be found among its Presbyterian abettors, a Cheever and a Beecher among the Independents; Doctor Tyng, Bishop Clarke, Bishop McIlvaine, Bishop Whittingham, and Bishop Smith, are found as representing the Prelatic element of Northern society, and Archbishop Hughes and his satellites the Romish; that while, as Sallust tells us, worthy ancestors are a reproach to degenerate descendants, no one has ever been so wild as to imagine that the unworthiness of a remote posterity was just ground of reproach to a noble ancestry; that the most excellent things are the basest and most pernicious, when they grow degenerate and corrupt. The prince of darkness was once the son of the Morning, and Adam, who, by his transgression, "brought death into the world, and all our woe," was, in his creation, the son of God. The choice seed which Jehovah planted in Canaan, the noble vine was not more unlike the degenerate plant of a strange vine, which it afterward became; the godly generation which took possession of the promised land, under the leadership of the heroic Joshua, was not more unlike succeeding generations, who offered incense to the queen of heaven, and bowed down to Baal and to Ashtaroth, than were the original settlers of New England, the followers of Bradford, of Winslow, of Winthrop, and of Endicott, to their corrupt and degenerate descendants of the present day.

Certain it is, that no body of men in the South have sustained the cause of Southern independence with more unanimity, intelligence, zeal, and efficiency, than the ministers and members of the Presbyterian church. In the war inaugurated against the rights, the interests, the institutions, and the very existence of Southern society, in defiance not merely of the dictates of humanity, but in violation of solemn constitutional compacts and the most sacred pledges of public faith, it is known that several of our best ministers have been in the fore-front of the hottest battle; that no more precious life-blood has bedewed the altar of our country's freedom than that which has streamed from the brave hearts of Presbyterian ministers on Southern soil. And while our church or our country shall survive; while freedom, or religion, or learning, the noblest gifts of nature, or the brightest instincts of personal or hereditary worth, shall be treasured among men, never will the name and the memory of the Rev. Dabney Carr Harrison be forgotten—a gentleman, a scholar, a Christian, a minister, a martyr to his conscientious conviction of public duty and uncalculating devotion to his country. Among the illustrious worthies of ancient story, among the deified heroes of ancient song, in the golden records of Grecian fame, in the glowing chronicles of mediæval knighthood, in the ranks of war, in the halls of learning, in the temples of religion, a nobler name is not registered than his, nor a nobler spirit mourned. And among the glorious leaders whom God has raised up for our country, in this the hour of her deadly peril, none can be found whose names shine with a purer lustre than those of Daniel H. Hill and Stonewall Jackson, who yet esteem it their brightest glory, not that they have received the grateful plaudits of their admiring countrymen, not that they have received the respectful recognition of the friends of freedom throughout the world; but that they have been counted

worthy to be members and officers of the Presbyterian church.

It is, however, a gross historical anachronism to identify or confound the Presbyterian church with the Puritans. Puritanism arose in the Church of England. That church, and that church alone, is responsible for its existence. Puritanism was the protest of the Christian conscience of the more evangelical portion of the Established Church, against the errors and abuses of popery, to which not the superior clergy of that church alone, but the princes as well, from Elizabeth to James the Second, clung with such perverse and pernicious tenacity. The Presbyterian church was in existence, not in decrepitude, not in decay, but in unimpaired vigor, in uncorrupted integrity, before Henry the Eighth had renounced the supremacy of the pope; before Calvin had given his matchless Institutes to the world, or Luther had translated the word of God into the German tongue; before the southern provinces of France had been stained with the blood of the martyred Albigeois; before the morning star of the Reformation had arisen on England; before Charlemagne had restored the empire of the West; before Constantine had enthroned and enslaved the Christian Church. In the times and writings of the apostles of our Lord, not merely were the inspired articles of our belief and teaching set forth, not merely were the great foundation stones laid, on which the grand and beautiful temple of our harmonious system reposes, but not less the principles on which her ecclesiastical government is constituted and administered.

How grateful should we be to the great benefactors of our race; the men who have rescued from contempt or forgetfulness noble and needful truths; have taught them, with courage and constancy, in spite of opposition, obloquy, and loss; those high and gifted souls who have thrown out, as from a sunny fountain, imperishable streams of truth and rays of light; who have bravely fought the grand in-

tellektual and spirital battles of our race; battles for freedom, civil and religious; for intellektual enfranchisement and the sacred heritage of a divinely inspired revelation; the Apostles, the Reformers, the Puritans! The fundamental principle of the Reformation, common and dear alike to Luther, to Calvin, to Zwingli, and to Knox, was the supreme authority of the word of the living God, in opposition to all the figments of the human imagination, and all the decrees of earthly councils. The earliest and purest of the Reformers of the Church of England, as Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Jewel, adopted the same great principle; although, from the peculiar circumstances of the kingdom, they were not able to carry it out with perfect consistency to its legitimate results. That they considered the Reformation in England incomplete and unsatisfactory on this ground, and for this reason, we have their own recorded testimony.* Adopting this simple and fruitful principle of the paramount authority of the Scriptures, together with the related principle of the personal responsibility of each individual to God for his belief and practice, the Puritans were not merely in sympathy and correspondence with the continental Reformers, but were the heirs and expositors of their doctrinal system, and of their views in regard to the constitution and government of the Church, considered as a visible and organized body. With this grand and generative principle of the supreme authority of the word of God in the entire sphere of conscience and duty, their subordinate principles were logically inevitable, and collision with the government of their country a fatal necessity. The inquiry of the apostles, whether we should obey God rather than man, is at once a clue to their perplexities and a key to their extrication. In the time and person of Henry the Eighth, the supremacy of the pope was merely transferred to the sovereign. The great body of popish errors,

* See authorities cited in Note R, p. 78, of McCrie's *Life of Knox*.

of popish abuses, and of popish corruptions, was retained by the bloated and beastly wretch who rejoiced in the title of Defender of the Faith, and who illustrated his claim to the title by passing sentence of death on the Romanist who denied his supremacy, and the Protestant who denied transubstantiation. In the time of Edward the Sixth, the Reformation in England made wonderful progress in a short period; when, for the sins of the people, it was arrested by the premature death of their wise and saintly king. In the time of Mary, the best of the English clergy were compelled to take refuge in Germany and Switzerland, to avoid the wrath of a bloody woman, hounded on by a bigoted priesthood. It was in her reign, and at Frankfort, that the Puritans, as a party and under that name, first appear in history.* The great Puritan controversy, however, first raged in England under the imperious and intractable Elizabeth. Her own personal tastes and religious convictions were with the Church of Rome, but her interests attached her to the cause of the Reformation. Had she professed herself a Romanist, she must have proclaimed herself illegitimate, and forfeited her title to the throne. She was, then, a Protestant, not by conviction, but, as the grammarians say, *by position*. But toward every thing distinctive of Protestantism, toward every thing characteristic of Protestantism, she was inveterately averse. She did not believe in the marriage of the clergy. She did not favor the general preaching of the Gospel. She kept a crucifix, with wax candles burning before it, in her private chapel. She gloried in a gorgeous ceremonial, and abhorred a simple and scriptural worship. The same absurd taste for finery which induced her to bedizen her plain person in gaudy clothing and splendid jewelry, inclined her to the purple pomp of the Romish religion. Her antipathy to the Puritans was far more intense and vindictive than her dislike to the papists. The papists

* Neal's History, Vol. I., p. 68.

were incessantly plotting against her throne and her life. The Puritans acknowledged her title, and were loyal to her person. Poor Stubbs, brother-in-law of Cartwright, after his right hand had been cut off by order of the Queen, pulled off his hat with his left and cried out, "God save the Queen."* But she hated them for their religion, and for those principles of civil liberty with which it was identified. "They fasted and prayed for the Queen and the Church, though they were rebuked for it, and punished by civil and ecclesiastical officers. They were suspended and deprived of their ministry, and their livings sequestered to others; and many of them were committed to prison, where some were chained with *irons*, and continued in durance a long time. The bishops tendered to suspected persons the oath, *ex officio*, to answer all interrogatories put to them, though it were to accuse themselves, and when they obtained a confession, they proceeded upon it to punish them with all rigor, contrary to the laws of God and the land. The grounds of these troubles were not impiety, immorality, or want of learning, or diligence in their ministry; but their not being satisfied in the use of certain ceremonies and orders derived from the Church of Rome, and not being able to declare 'that every thing in the Book of Common Prayer was according to the word of God.'"[†]

It is an affecting illustration of the divine wisdom and love, that God should have so bound together His best gifts and the highest interests and treasures of the soul, that we can not part with one without imperilling all. We can not

* Memoir of Cartwright, p. 95.

† Memoir of Thomas Cartwright, pp. 329, 330. See Swift's account of brother Martin's method of dealing with the fringe on his coat, in the incomparable Tale of a Tub. "But when he had gone thus far, he demurred a while; he knew very well there yet remained a great deal more to be done; however, the first heat being over, he began to cool, and he resolved to proceed more moderately in the rest of the work." Brother Martin represents the Lutheran and English churches, as Peter the Romish, and Jack the Reformed.

contend for one without gaining the others also. Thus, while battling primarily for religious freedom, the Puritans secured civil and intellectual as well. In like manner, the champions of intellectual freedom, as Erasmus, undesignedly overthrew or undermined the towers and ramparts, not only of intellectual, but of religious despotism.

What the natural sun is to the material universe, the Scriptures are to the intellectual and spiritual. In contending for the rightful supremacy of the word of God, in opposition to the mandates of kings and the decrees of councils, the Puritans conferred a priceless boon on the human race. They affirmed a principle, they established a right, which, in its power and compass, is alike immeasurable and inestimable. It gives to God what properly belongs to Him, and thereby secures to Cæsar what rightfully pertains to him, by a higher than a human tenure, even a divine obligation. Thus the doctrine of civil obedience, within the appropriate sphere of the civil magistrate, is not, as rulers are apt to imagine, enfeebled by the prevalence of evangelical principles, but entrenched and fortified, making our obedience to government a part of our obedience to God. His Bible is the weapon of Heaven, which strikes with resistless force against every speculative error and every practical evil. It is not less the storehouse of Heaven, which contains and confers every good and every perfect gift.

The apostolic history, as recorded in the Acts, is the type of the history of the Church in post-apostolic times and in all after ages. It is commonly said that history repeats itself; but here there is not an occasional, an apparent, or a fortuitous repetition, or partial resemblance, but a prophetic rehearsal—an inspired *resumé*—on a small scale and narrow theatre, of what should afterwards be enacted through all the circling ages, and over all the boundless globe. The dispersion of the Church in the first great per-

secution,* by which the seeds of eternal life were sown broadcast throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, may be regarded as a typical illustration of the method by which, bringing good out of evil, and making the wrath of man to praise Him, God propagates the Gospel over countries and continents which otherwise it would never have reached, or only after a long lapse of years. It may, especially, be taken as an illustration of His adorable providence, in making the persecution of the Puritans in England the occasion of evangelizing other lands. It may seem a reverse, and not less marvellous process, for the attainment of the same general end, that the Marian persecution should have driven so many Protestants from England to the Continent, to receive more perfect instruction in the faith, with gracious reference to the needs of their own countrymen; as Apollos, though an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, was thankful to Aquila and Priscilla for expounding to him the way of God more perfectly.† Thus, in the case of the Puritan refugees, we see how divine providence prepared the way for the diffusion of the true religion in England and Scotland in its utmost purity. He who, by a simultaneous, or nearly simultaneous operation on the mind of the Roman centurion and the Hebrew apostle,‡ so wrought that the error of the one should be corrected, and the other be instructed in righteousness and have the seal of baptism, caused the English and Scottish Reformers to enjoy the tuition of Calvin and other wise and godly men, so that they might be qualified in their turn to teach others also.

Among the early English Reformers there was no diversity of sentiment in regard to doctrinal theology. Whitgift, "the Pope of Lambeth," and persecutor of Cartwright, was quite as Calvinistic as Calvin himself, as is manifest from the Lambeth Articles, drawn up under his super-

* Acts, 8 : 1.

† *Ibid.*, 18 : 25, 26.‡ *Ib.*, ch. 10.

vision, and issued under his sanction. Until the time of Sancroft, the Calvinistic theology was universally embraced and acknowledged in England as the doctrine of the Established Church. The great practical point of divergence and controversy between the Puritans and their opponents, turned upon the power of the civil ruler—not to impose articles of belief, but to decree rites and ceremonies, to determine the government of the church, to evacuate its discipline, and to dictate its worship. This was what the Crown claimed, what the court-party conceded, and what the Puritans contended against. All the particular points of difference—as, that no one ought to be admitted to the ministry who was unable to preach; that those only who ministered the word ought to pray publicly in the church, or administer the sacraments; that popish ordinations were not valid; that only canonical Scripture ought to be read publicly in the church; that the public liturgy ought to be so framed that there might be no private praying or reading in the church, but that all the people should attend to the prayer of the ministers; that equal reverence was due to all canonical Scripture, and to all the names of God; that it was as lawful to sit at the Lord's table as to kneel or stand; that the sign of the cross in baptism was superstitious; that it was reasonable and proper that the parent should offer his own child to baptism, making confession of that faith in which he intended to educate it, without being obliged to answer in the child's name, "I will," "I believe," etc.; nor ought women or persons under age to be sponsors, etc.*—the determination of these and the like subordinate questions, depends ultimately on the great principle contended for by the Puritans, and before them by the primitive Reformers

* Memoir of Rev. Thomas Cartwright, by Rev. R. B. Brook. London: John Snow, 35 Paternoster Row. The propositions signalized above are, of course, alleged as specimens, not as an exhaustive summary of the points in dispute.

of the Continent and Great Britain, that in reforming the Church it was necessary to reduce all things to the apostolic institution. Travers, Cartwright, and after them Milton, adhered to this principle with not less tenacity, and enforced it with not less eloquence, than Calvin. "But I trust they for whom God hath reserved the honor of reforming His Church will easily perceive their adversaries' drift in thus calling for antiquity; they fear the plain field of the Scriptures, the chase is too hot; they seek the dark, the bushy, the tangled forest, they would imbosk; they feel themselves strook in the transparent streams of divine truth; they would plunge, and tumble, and think to lie hid in the foul weeds and muddy waters, where no plummet can reach the bottom."* This was the great principle, in the reception and affirmance of which all the various parties among the Puritans and Presbyterians agreed; and in the rejection and denial of which, all who were opposed to the Puritans were not less unanimous. To the discussion of this principle, we shall now briefly address ourselves.

In such a posture of parties it is a presumptive argument that those who contended for the authority of the Scriptures, conceived that their peculiar views were sustained by the sacred umpire whose decision they invoked. They would hardly have appealed so confidently to the Scriptures, if they had not felt assured that they could make that appeal with safety. Their opponents, on the other hand, not merely declined the authoritative arbitrament of the Scriptures in regard to the leading questions at issue, but expressly referred them to a different and inferior court of judicature. They advocated their adoption, on the ground of conformity to the will of the sovereign and the laws of the realm; on the ground of decency, propriety, and good taste; and grounded their use, so far

* Milton's noble treatise of Reformation in England.

as related to divine authority, not on the positive prescription, but simply on the silence of the Scriptures—a most “expressive” silence, surely, if it authorized the English hierarchy, culminating in the Archbishop of Canterbury and the headship of the reigning prince; the portentous additions to the public worship of God, wholly unknown to the New Testament; and the retention of rites and ceremonies which, if not in themselves idolatrous, were associated with idolatry; and confessedly retained, not in spite of such association, *but because of it*, and in order to propitiate and attract the adherents of Rome. That the opponents and oppressors of the Puritans did not pretend to rest their cause upon the positive authority of the word of God, express or implied, is evident, from the fact that they denied the necessity for such authority, and is conceded by their own apologists. Professor Keble, in his elaborate introduction to his edition of Hooker’s works, endeavors to account for the fact that the great writer, whose works he was about to offer to the public, had assumed ground so low, for claims and conclusions so grave and high. His special difficulty is not that Hooker made so little of the Bible argument, but that he made so little of what is denominated Church principles. He attributes the particular line of argument pursued by Hooker to the circumstance of his early education among the Puritans; to his unwillingness to insist upon claims offensive to the foreign Protestants; and to a desire to sustain the authority of the Queen’s government, and the consequent temptation to rest his plea on the obedience due to the appointment of the sovereign. The third book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* is taken up in controverting the proposition maintained by the Puritans, “that in Scripture there must be of necessity contained a form of Church polity, the laws whereof may in no wise be altered.”

The doctrine held by Cranmer, by Whitgift, and by Hooker—a man incomparably superior to either in grasp

of mind, and in learning deep and various—was a modified Erastianism. It is, indeed, the only ground on which the church, of which he was the boast and bulwark, can be maintained; with the historical claims of popery on the one side, resting exclusively on prescription, on authority, and on tradition; and the Presbyterian church on the other, resting primarily on the eternal rock of the divine word, and sustained by the authentic testimony of the noblest confessors and witnesses for the truth of the divine word, from the apostolic age to the present day.

The Presbyterian church has ever held, in common with the Puritans of England, that ecclesiastical authority is not lordly, but ministerial; that nothing can be lawfully imposed upon the conscience for which the authority of God can not be alleged; that the draught of the constitution of the Church is given us in the Scriptures, not left to our own conjecture or choice; and that, therefore, it should be sought, not in the writings or practice of the Fathers, but in the infallible records of divine inspiration. And this draught they have held to be plainly, pointedly, and perfectly Presbyterian; the distinctive ecclesiastical offices and functions recognized in the Presbyterian church to be, not merely agreeable to the word of God, but ordained therein; to have not merely the divine permission, but the divine precept; that the principles which control our ecclesiastical organization and action are not merely “regulative, but constitutive,” to employ a distinction so clearly drawn and so impregably established in the pages of this journal;* and that the constitution of the Church should not positively

* See Article x., January, 1861, in which the lamented author, Dr. Thornwell, replies to the Princeton Review, Article vi., July, 1860. The death of this renowned and admirable man, just at this crisis, and in the fulness of his powers, his usefulness, and his fame, can be regarded in no other light than that of a national affliction, a disaster to every cause of God and every interest of man; but the blow falls with peculiar severity on our own branch of the Church, of which he was so distinguished an ornament and pillar.

contravene the scriptural order is not enough; but that not going beyond the Scripture or adding to it must be rigidly conformed and confined to it.

That this is not a novel interpretation or peculiar theory, as affirmed, but the true ancient and accepted doctrine of the Presbyterian church, inwrought into her standards, proclaimed by her most honored and trusted leaders, and familiar to her most intelligent and zealous members, a single citation, not from a Presbyterian, but from a Prelatist and a High Churchman, may suffice to show. "Whatever is not against the word of God is for it, thought the founders of the Church of England. Whatever is not in the word of God is a word of man, thought the founders of the Church of Scotland and Geneva. The one proposed to themselves to be reformers of the Latin church, that is, to bring it back to the form which it had during the first four centuries; the latter, to be the renovators of the Christian religion, as it was preached and instituted by the apostles and immediate followers of Christ, thereunto specially inspired. Where the premises are so different, who can wonder at the difference in the conclusions."*

It was contended by the Puritans that, in refusing subjection to the decrees enforced upon them, they were not resisting the authority of the Church, for that they were not imposed by any ecclesiastical or religious authority. They did not, indeed, recognize the authority of the Church itself, when clearly expressed, to bind any thing on the conscience which the Bible had not made binding; but they conceived that the things sought to be imposed on them could, by no definition of what constitutes a church, and by no construction of church authority, be reckoned ecclesiastical. It was, on their part, simply a resistance to civil tyranny seeking to obtrude itself within the ecclesiastical sphere. During several reigns the religion of England was made dependent

* Coleridge's Works, Vol. V., p. 149, Prof. Shedd's edition.

on the personal sentiments of the sovereign, and was actually conformed to them, so far as legal enactments and apparent acquiescence on the part of a majority of the English people might be regarded as constituting such conformity. Thus the noted Vicar of Bray was, during several reigns, a representative character. During the reigns of Henry the Eighth, of Edward the Sixth, of the bloody Mary, and of Elizabeth, it was held to be the duty of the people to conform to the religion of the crown. If this view of the duty of the subject to the sovereign, and the relation of religion to the state, were correct, religion itself, instead of being the worship of the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning—instead of being the loyal and loving subjection of the soul to Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever—would be of all things the most variable, both in its essence and in its manifestations; in the doctrine which it affirmed; in the duties which it inculcated; and in the worship which it prescribed. The headship of the pope of Rome, unscriptural, absurd, injurious, and hateful though it be, is still less offensive to the conscience than the relation which the monarch of England seems, at this period, to have sustained to the religion of his country; for the successive popes might be expected to adhere to the same general system of religion; the supremacy of the pope would be willingly recognized by every sincere papist. But the worship of the king of England, during this period of national and religious change, was the headship of one who, whatever his creed, must enforce what was offensive to a large number of his subjects. If he were a papist, he must, in the name of the pope, persecute his Protestant subjects for non-conformity to papal edicts, and opposition to papal interests. If he were a Protestant, he must persecute the papists for the denial of his ecclesiastical authority, and the neglect of his religious requirements. So that the death of one king, and the succession of another, would be the signal for the revolution

of the faith and worship of a kingdom. So far as the constitution of the realm was concerned, Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, were equally heads of the Church, and defenders of the faith. One thing is unquestionable, that they were not heads of the same church, nor defenders of the same faith. The church which Edward loved, Mary detested. The faith which Edward defended, Mary destroyed. What more monstrous; what more unnatural among ancient fables—the mermaid, half woman and half fish; the centaur, half man and half horse—than to set up one who might be a papist, like Mary; or a Protestant, like Edward; or half infidel and half papist, like Charles the Second, but altogether profane and licentious; as head of the Church, supposed to be a congregation of faithful men? The atrocious crime of repudiating and resisting the authority of the sovereign, therefore, in matters pertaining to religion, is not peculiar to the Puritans, but common to them and to every other body of men in England, whoever might be the reigning sovereign, and whatever the religion of the state. To persecute men for refusing subjection to what is confessedly not of divine obligation, but of human appointment, and which the objects of persecution reject, not in defiance or contempt of human authority, but in supposed obedience to the will of God—what appalling wickedness! And for brethren to persecute brethren for such a consideration—how unspeakably offensive to God and discreditable to the Christian religion! Any one who will study the Acts of the Apostles, with the Puritan controversy in his mind, will be surprised to see what correspondence there is in the spirit, the tone, and even the terms, in which the blinded Jews reviled the apostles and primitive believers, and the prelatial charges, and the spirit which dictated them, against Cartwright, Snape, Proudlowe, and Travers. Our sense of the peculiar injustice of the bitter persecution to which these excellent men were subjected, is heightened when we reflect that the very doctrines for which they

suffered were the doctrines of the primitive English Reformers; of Cranmer, of Jewel, and of King Edward himself. They all believed that the reformation of religion in England had not gone far enough.

We are, of course, aware that it is possible to attribute a disproportionate importance to a particular structure of church government, as compared with the doctrinal system revealed in the Bible; and that the hierarchical excesses of prelacy are due, in no small measure, to this very error. But this is an extreme not more perilous than the opposite, of an Erastian indifference to all forms; and it is an extreme to which the Presbyterian church in this country seems by no means prone. There is, undoubtedly, an intimate connexion, historical and moral, between systems of doctrine and forms of government. Unless, therefore, doctrine itself be a thing which may change and bend with times and with the humors of men, we see not how church government can be safely regarded as a matter of slight importance. The mind is a unit, and a loose and latitudinarian habit will infect all its exercises, and can no more be confined to one department of speculation, especially in the sphere of commanded duties, than we can say to the unchartered winds that they shall blow only in one direction, or with a certain degree of violence.

“Uná Eurusque Notusque ruunt, creberque procellis
Africus, et vastos volvunt ad litora fluctus.”

As a matter of fact, we know, assuredly, that certain types of doctrine have been historically associated with certain principles of ecclesiastical regimen. The type of doctrine prevalent in the Romish obedience, as Palmer happily terms that corrupt communion, is as definite as notorious, and as characteristic as her hierarchical system. At certain times, but wholly without success, or with only very partial success, the attempt has been made to engraft an evangelical theology on the hierarchical system. But they

have been felt to be incongruous elements, and have refused to coalesce, like oil and water. The doctrine of Augustine, who has been honored as a saint, has always been felt to be alien to the spirit of popery, and allied to that of Protestantism. Of all the Fathers, he is known to have been the favorite of the Reformers, as he is of Protestant theologians now, on account of his vigorous assertion of the prerogatives of God and the doctrines of grace. In like manner, the Jansenists, who embraced and inculcated his system, have always been regarded as tintured with heresy. Pascal, Nicole, Arnauld, eminent for genius and piety, and withal devoted adherents of the Romish body, could not escape the ecclesiastical ban, because of the earnest sympathy and eloquent support which they gave the hated doctrines of Augustine. So in the Church of England, from the days of Archbishop Laud to the days of Dr. Pusey, that party which has receded farthest from the spirit and doctrine of the Reformation, and approached nearest to the Romish communion in its views concerning the constitution and authority of the Church, has evinced most sympathy with the doctrinal tenets of that apostate tyranny. The vessel is naturally, we may say divinely, adapted, in material and make, to the liquid which it is to contain. We may expect, therefore, that the golden cup of sorcery, which is to intoxicate the nations, shall be unlike to the cup of blessing, which shall present a healing draught from the pure river of the water of life. Our Lord himself has warned us against putting old wine in new bottles; how, then, can we safely commit the old wine of Gospel truth to new bottles of popish or prelatiçal device? We can not but look upon any departure from the scheme of government sketched in the Scriptures, therefore, or any unauthorized addition to it, with only less grief and dread than we should feel in a voluntary renunciation of the faith once delivered to the saints.

The plea on which papists and prelatists have rested their gratuitous additions to the offices and worship prescribed by the apostles, and prevalent in the churches which they planted, is a profane reflection on the wisdom and goodness of the Church's glorious Head. Forgetting that the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God stronger than men, they would engraft their imaginary improvements on a pattern divinely given, and dishonor the chaste bride of Christ with the gaudy robes of the Babylonish harlot. The hands of man were never given to make a Church. The Sovereign Architect of heaven needs not the help of human builders, nor will He accept their unsolicited additions to His glorious work. As well might man seek by his gaudy fire-works to out-shine the lustre of the stars of heaven, or the beauty of the beaded grass, or to rear a temple which shall compete with "this majestic roof, fretted with golden fire," as by the devices of his fleshly mind to add to the efficiency of the ecclesiastical regimen revealed in the New Testament, or to the spiritual beauty of the worship it prescribes.

"Compared with this, how poor religion's pride,
 In all the pomp of method and of art.
 When men display to congregations wide
 Devotion's every grace except the heart!
 The power incensed, the pageant will desert,
 The pompous strain, the sacerdotal stole;
 But haply, in some cottage far apart
 May hear, well pleased, the language of the soul,
 And in His book of Life the inmates poor enroll."

If it had been our design to enter upon an extended vindication of the Puritans, it would have been proper to inquire why they should have been for so long a time the objects alike of courtly disdain and of popular odium; why the gay jesters, from the author of *Hudibras* to the author of *Pickwick*; why the grave historians, from *Clarendon* to *Hume*; should have made them the subjects of their scurrilous merriment and malignant sarcasm. We

should have brought, at least, into rapid review their majestic and precious contributions to scientific freedom and practical religion. We should have referred to that goodly and magnificent procession of divines and preachers who, teaching the apostolic doctrine in the apostolic spirit, are the genuine successors of the apostles, and the glory of the Christian Church—the elegant Bates, the heart-searching Flavel, the learned Owen, the penetrating Charnock, the philosophic Howe, and the saintly Baxter. We should not have forgotten their sympathy with the great cause of common school education in Europe and America. We should have spoken of the heroic fortitude with which they endured the utmost violence of persecuting rage, and the heroic energy with which they discharged the most perilous duties of pastors to the forsaken victims of a devouring pestilence. We should have pointed to the proud and peerless majesty of England, under the Puritan sway of Cromwell, when her force was felt, and her wrath was feared, throughout all Christendom. And we should have compared her then with the feebleness and degradation to which she so soon descended, under his most sacred Majesty, Charles the Second. We should have gratefully and reverently pointed to Cromwell's Latin secretary, the poet of Puritanism,

“Whose soul was like a star, and dwelt apart;”

a Puritan in training, a Puritan in temper, of Puritan associations, and of Puritan sympathies; the man who embodied in himself every thing pure, and serious, and high, and noble, in the traits of the Puritan nature, and the tendencies of the Puritan time. Let it never be forgotten, when wittlings and foplings sneer at Puritanism and the Puritans, that the greatest statesman who ever wielded the sceptre of empire in England was a Puritan leader; and that the purest and most sublime poet who has ever written in “the tome of our land's tongue,” was of Puritan growth, with soul deep and harmonious as those organ-tones he loved so well,

clear and capacious as the cloudless sky ; that this grandest of uninspired bards, this most Hebrew in spirit and in genius of all the sons of Gentile birth, was essentially and historically a Puritan.

“But we can now no more ; the parting sun
Beyond the earth’s green cape and verdant isles
Hesperian sets ; our signal to depart.”

ARTICLE V.

LIFE, CHARACTER, AND GENIUS OF THE LATE
REV. JAMES H. THORNWELL, D. D., LL. D.*

“We all of us reverence, and must ever reverence, great men :” for, adds Mr. Carlyle, in his terse, epigrammatic way, “the history of what man has accomplished in this world is at bottom the history of the great men who have worked here ;” “in every epoch, the great event, parent of all others, is it not the arrival of a thinker who teaches other men *his* way of thought, and spreads the shadow of his own likeness over sections of the history of the world ?” What remains have we of the hoary past, save a few monumental works, and a few names linked to those in eternal memory ? All beside is buried in the forgetfulness of history, from which there is no resurrection. And when this busy time of ours shall retreat before the coming age that crowds it back, how few that now write, and plot, and work, will flit

* The following article is a Discourse commemorating the life and labors of the late Rev. Dr. Thornwell, delivered in the Presbyterian church, Columbia, South Carolina, on the evening of September 17, 1862, at the request of the officers of the church, and in the presence of members of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary.

among the shades, and be known as the men without whom history could not have been? The world's great masters must needs be few. As from the earth's undulating surface only here and there a mountain peak lifts its solemn front in solitary grandeur, wrapping the grey clouds around its head, so only at intervals does a true thinker lift himself above the mean level upon which other men more humbly tread. The integration of society demands this gradation in mind, this relation between teacher and taught, between the leader and the led; and no such democracy will ever be established, in which the many do not bow with the instinct of loyalty before the imperial supremacy of those whom God has given to be princes in intellect among them.

Christian fathers and brethren, such a thinker has passed from the midst of us; and we sit together this day under the shadow of a bitter bereavement, doing homage to one of earth's best heroes—it is assembled Greece placing the laurel wreath upon the brow of one who wrestled nobly in the Olympic game of life. A bright and beautiful vision has vanished from us for ever: a man gifted with the highest genius,—not that fatal gift of genius which, without guidance, so often blasts its possessor, its baleful gleam blighting every thing pure and true on earth,—but genius disciplined by the severest culture, and harnessing itself to the practical duties of life, until it wrought a work full of blessing and comfort to mankind; a mind which ranged through the broad fields of human knowledge, gathered up the fruits of almost universal learning, and wove garlands of beauty around discussions the most thorny and abstruse; an intellect steeped in philosophy, which soared upon its eagle wings into the highest regions of speculative thought, then stooped with meek docility and worshipped in childlike faith at the cross of Christ; a man who held communion with all of every age that had eternal thoughts, and then brought the treasures hoarded in the literature of the past, and sanctified them to the uses of practical religion. Yet,

a man not coldly great, but who could stoop from lofty contemplation to sport and toy with the loving ones around his hearthstone; with a heart warm with the instincts of friendship, so brave, so generous and true, that admiration of his genius was lost in affection for the man, and the breath of envy never withered a single leaf of all the honors with which a grateful generation crowned him. Alas! that death should have power to crush out such a life! Our Chrysostom is no more! The "golden mouth" is sealed up in silence for ever!

"The chord, the harp's full chord, is hushed;
The voice hath died away;
Whence music, like sweet waters, gushed
But yesterday."

"The glory of man is as the flower of grass;" "our fathers, where are they: and the prophets, do they live for ever?" The men who with their heroic deeds make history to-day, become its theme and song to-morrow!

This rude outline, dashed upon the canvass, it is the privilege of one who loved him well to fill up now with cautious touches; and if the affection of the artist should impart a warmth of coloring to the picture, the truthfulness of the portraiture will yet, we trust, vindicate itself to those who knew the original.

Dr. James H. Thornwell was born of poor but honorable parentage, December 9, 1812, in the District of Chesterfield, South Carolina; but as his parents removed, in the second month of his infancy, into Marlborough, he always hailed from the latter District, where he simply escaped being born, and with which the associations of his boyhood were identified. By the early death of his father, a young family was thrown, in straitened circumstances, upon the guidance of a widowed mother, who proved, as is so often the case, equal to her high trust. She is described by those who knew her, as a woman possessing a vigorous understanding, great strength of will, firmness of purpose, and a boundless am-

bition for the advancement of her sons, in whom she traced indications of more than ordinary mental endowments. We are thus furnished with another illustration of a popular theory, that in the transmission of natural qualities from parent to child, intellectual traits come predominantly from the maternal side, while perhaps the moral qualities descend more conspicuously from the paternal. It may well be questioned if history reveals a single instance of a truly great man who had a fool for his mother. It is still more important to observe, in this case, the fulfilment of His promise, who has said: "Leave thy fatherless children, I will preserve them alive, and let thy widows trust in me." Who has not been compelled to notice the blessing of God upon these broken households, in which a feeble and desolate woman has lifted up her soul to God for strength to bear the burdens of her own sex, increased by those which should have devolved upon her stricken fellow; amidst weakness and pain, poverty and sorrow, toiling to support her fatherless ones, and reaping, in the lapse of years, the pious widow's reward, in seeing her orphan children emerge from obscurity and want to the highest distinctions in society? The full recompense of her toil and tears was meted out to this widowed mother; she lived to see her prophetic hopes realized, as her son, clothed with all the honors of the academician, sat among the senators and nobles of the land, the noblest patrician of them all, the pride of his native State, the joy and ornament of the Church, and, with a fame spread over two continents, the peerless man of his time. At length, in a satisfied old age, she lay down to her long rest beneath his roof; and now the lasting marble speaks the reverence he felt through life for her to whose firm guidance the waywardness of his youth was so much a debtor.

The education of young Thornwell was commenced in one of those log-cabin schools which have not yet entirely disappeared from the country. But the first teacher whose

name deserves to be linked with his in grateful remembrance was a Mr. McIntyre, from North Carolina, who taught in his mother's neighborhood one of those mixed schools, partly supported by the free-school policy of the State and partly by the fees of more affluent scholars. Upon removing to a different portion of the District, Mr. McIntyre determined upon taking with him a pupil in whose rare promise he had become so deeply interested, and effected an arrangement by which he was gratuitously boarded in the family of Mr. Pegues, while he imparted an equally gratuitous instruction. A sentiment of delicacy would prompt the historian to pass over these more private facts, if they did not form the links in the chain of opportunities furnished by a gracious Providence, and without which this youth might have shared the fate of those hapless sons of genius deplored by Gray :

“ Whose hands the rod of empire might have swayed,
Or waked to ecstasy the living lyre.

“ But knowledge to their eyes her ample page,
Rich with the spoils of time, did ne'er unroll;
Chill penury repressed their noble rage,
And froze the genial current of the soul.”

Another hand was now stretched forth to pluck from obscurity our “muted, inglorious Milton.” A physician, Dr. Graves, whom professional attendance at the house of Mr. Pegues brought occasionally into contact with the subject of our story, was so impressed with his precocious talents as to make him the burden of frequent, and of what seemed then, extravagant panegyric. Amongst others, he expatiated before General Samuel W. Gillespie upon the youthful prodigy he had discovered, as one who might become, with the advantages of education, the future President of the country. This hyperbole, so illustrative of our democratic way of thinking, is quoted here only to show the profound impression which his unquestioned genius made from earliest youth upon all with whom he was associated.

Upon the strength of such representations, General Gillespie, with his brother, James Gillespie, and Mr. Robbins, at that time a legal practitioner in Cheraw, resolved conjointly to secure his education. Pale and sickly in appearance, and of extremely diminutive stature, his personal presence seemed a burlesque of the hopes entertained on his behalf, and provoked many a quiet jest at the expense of those who had ventured such lofty predictions of his future eminence. But these forgot the apothegm of Watts, "the mind is the measure of the man;" and never did a frail body enshrine a spirit of nobler mould, a soul more allied to the God who gave it. His removal, in 1825, to Cheraw, consequent upon these new relations, brought him under the immediate superintendence of his patron, Mr. Robbins; with whom he lived, and who undertook his private instruction, evincing from the beginning his appreciation of his ward, by lifting him at once into the confidence and intimacy of an equal. He was soon, however, transferred from the private preceptorship of Mr. Robbins to the more systematic discipline of the Cheraw Academy, where he remained until prepared for admission into college. It is instructive to pause at every stage in such a history and trace the influences by which a capacious intellect was trained for unparalleled usefulness and honor. It can not be doubted that a familiar association of five years with an improved and mature mind, stimulated a most rapid and vigorous development of mind and character. Few laid aside at so early an age the things of a child, and assumed so early the attitude and proportions of a man. Possessing, according to his own testimony, the ambition to become all that was possible—with a burning thirst for knowledge which no acquisitions could quench, he had daily before his eyes, in his patron and friend, what seemed to him the personification of knowledge; and whose fuller stores poured forth in hourly converse the aliment upon which a growing mind would delight to feed. Under the

promptings of such a noble ambition, with a lofty ideal ever beckoning him forward, he laid in these early years the foundation of those habits of intense application which never deserted him to the close of life; and here, too, was laid the basis of that accurate scholarship which only needed the enlargement of after years and fuller opportunities to render him the wonder he became in the eyes of scholars like himself. Perhaps the most remarkable feature of this history is, the happy training by which he was disciplined from the opening of his career. Not only did he study while other boys gambolled and sported; not only did he dig into the intricacies of obsolete languages through the long watches of the night, whilst other boys slept; but he always studied the right things, in the right time, and in the right way. Whether by the instinct of his own genius, or whether by the wise direction of his superiors, or whether by the mysterious guidance of an unseen providence, which men call accident, or whether by all these combined, he read the best books, and precisely at the time to secure their determining influence upon himself. The light works written for amusement, and which at most but embellish the taste and enrich the fancy, had no charms even to his boyish mind. Like the Hercules of ancient story, he rose from his cradle to giant labors; and so became the Hercules of whom to tell all the truth would seem to many to convert him into a myth. An incident may be recorded here, not only because it falls within the chronology of this period, but as a striking illustration of the foregoing observations. Being detected once by his friend, Mr. Robbins, with Mr. Locke's *Essay* in his hands, he was playfully bantered upon the hardihood of undertaking a work so far beyond his years and the developement of his intellect. Piqued, as he himself testifies, by this implied disparagement of his powers, he resolved at once to master the book; and master it he did, completely and for all coming time. Shortly after, chancing to light upon Stewart's *Elements* of

the Philosophy of the Human Mind, he devoured this also with avidity. Dr. Doddridge tells us a dream which he once had in sleep: that having passed through death into the world of spirits, he first found himself in a spacious chamber whose walls were covered with strange hieroglyphs. Upon close inspection, these resolved themselves into a perfect map of his own life, with all its intersections and connexions, and every influence which had contributed to shape his destiny. It scarcely needs a revelation from another world to determine the effect of this incident in giving its final direction to a mind which was, perhaps, the only mind on this continent which could be classed without peril with that of Sir William Hamilton. It gave him a bias to philosophy from which he never swerved, and was the pivot upon which the whole intellectual history of the man afterwards turned.

In December, 1829, he matriculated in the South Carolina College, and from the hour of his entrance within its classic walls, the superiority of his genius was universally acknowledged. Coupling the fervor of an American student with the assiduity of the German, he devoted fourteen hours a day to severe study. It does not, therefore, surprise us that he bore off, in 1831, the highest honors from rivals, some of whom have since achieved eminence in civil and political life. Either he intuitively penetrated the character of the age in which he lived, and pierced the fallacy which supposes that genius can win permanent success without learning, as the material upon which, and the instrument by which, it must work; or else he was led blindly on by an avaricious love of knowledge, rendering the toil with which it is gathered itself a delight; but certain it is, he turned away with the severity of an anchorite from the blandishments of society; and like an athlete of old, with continuous and cruel rigor trained every muscle and every limb for the Olympic race and the Olympic prize before him in life. During his college career, he omitted no opportunity

of discipline, neglected no part of the prescribed curriculum, wasted no hour in dissipation or indolence; but with elaborate care prepared himself for every public exercise. In the literary society of which he was a member, the same assiduity availed itself of every privilege. Despising the baldness of mere extemporaneous harangues, he armed himself for the conflict of debate; and few were they who could withstand his vigor of argument, or parry his trenchant criticism, when he chose to indulge his power of sarcasm and invective. This example, with its attendant and grand results, stands up in scorching rebuke of the egotism and folly which would exalt the triumphs of genius by disparaging the discipline through which its energies are directed. As iron sharpeneth iron, so the mind confesses its obligation to any influence by which it has insensibly been toned. Dr. Thornwell, in later years, gratefully acknowledged the benefit he derived in college from contact with the classical taste and attainments of Dr. Henry, the Professor of Philosophy at the time; the enjoyment of whose friendship he recognized as one of the felicities of his college course, and by whom he was both stimulated and directed in the acquisition of classic and philosophical lore.

This devotion to study does not, however, appear at this period to have been sanctified by the love or the fear of God. His religious character was totally unformed. It was a noble idolatry, indeed; but still, as an idolater, he worshipped only at the shrine of learning, and offered the sacrifice of his devotion to ambition as his only God. As regards religion, in the language of another, "He had no catechism but the creation, employed no study but reflection, and read no book but the volume of the world." Yet the analogy of Providence forbids the supposition that so select an instrument of the divine glory should not, during this critical and forming period, have been unconsciously trained for his future work in the Church of God. It would be strange if some religious element were not secretly in-

troduced into the solution from which such a crystal must shortly be formed; reflecting, as it afterwards did, from every angle the glory of the Redeemer—the prism through which so many rays of divine truth were transmitted, and lent their hue to other minds. The lapse of thirty years will often sink into the repose of death the passions which once agitated society to its depths. The opinions and actions of one generation are calmly reviewed by the next, and history pronounces her impartial and irreversible verdict. It is simply a matter of history that, at the period of which we are now treating, the college was the seat of infidelity. Its President, Dr. Cooper, in the language of the college historian,* “had drunk deep at the fountain of infidelity; he had sympathized with the sneering savans of Paris, and sat at the feet of the most sceptical philosophers of England;” “the strongest feeling of his nature was the feeling of opposition to the Christian religion, which he believed to be a fraud and imposture.” It was not wonderful that the Christian people of the State rose up to defend “the altars which he proposed to subvert,” and to protect their sons “against the influence of a false and soul-destroying philosophy, a species of Pyrrhonism, a refined and subtle dialectics which removed all the foundations of belief, and spread over the mind the dark and chilling cloud of doubt and uncertainty.” The issue was slowly but stubbornly joined between the religious faith of the masses, on the one hand; and a cold, bloodless deism on the other, which had throned itself upon the high places of intelligence and power, and was poisoning the very fountains of knowledge in the State. It was scarcely credible that such a conflict should fail to arrest the attention of our pale and patient student; whose dialectic ability would cause him, with almost the love of romantic adventure, to seek truth in the wild clash of opposing opinions. We find him, accordingly,

* Dr. Laborde's *History of the South Carolina College*, pp. 175-7.

bending the vigor of his intellect to an examination of the claims of deism; and rising, after a careful perusal of its ablest apologists, with an intelligent conviction of the necessity of a divine revelation. He next turned to the investigation of Socinianism, towards which he confessed an early bias, and of whose truth he ardently desired to be convinced. With the knowledge we have of his whole character, as developed in later years, it would greatly interest us to trace the mental conflict through which he must now have passed; and did we not know the result, we might tremble for the decision which is to be rendered. On the one hand, it was a system peculiarly attractive to a mind so speculative as his. Its destructive criticism strips Christianity of all that is supernatural, and drags its sublimest mysteries before the bar of human reason. It degrades "the signs and wonders" of the Bible into the legends of a fabulous age; or converts them into myth and allegory, the mere symbols of philosophy, masking its teaching under the guise of fancy; or construes them into the jugglery of nature, beneath which we are to detect the working only of her secret and invariable laws. Shall our student be dazzled with the boldness of a system which

"Soars untrodden heights, and seems at home
Where angels bashful look;"

which professes to subdue things divine under the dominion of reason; and, offering to compass all truth, puffs up the soul with vanity; which intoxicates the mind by its promise of unbridled liberty of thought? Or, on the other hand, shall his earnest spirit, longing for the positive and the real, turn away from its endless negations; from a system which only offers a destructive criticism in lieu of a constructive faith; and which substitutes the abstractions of reason in the place of a substantive testimony? Before the fervor of his gaze will not these airy speculations, woven of the mist and the sunlight, melt away like the de-

ceitful mirage upon the distant horizon? Still more, shall not his warm and loving heart find itself chilled in the frozen atmosphere of a system which offers nothing to the embrace of the affections? Can such a nature as his be content to dwell in the beautiful snow houses of this polar latitude, shining, indeed, with crystalline splendor, but beneath a sun which neither cheers nor warms? The decision trembles not long upon the balance: he turns away from Socinianism with the indignant sarcasm of Mr. Randolph: "What a Christless Christianity is this!" He would not have "the play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out." Thus far, a purely intellectual examination had conducted him to an intellectual recognition of the Scriptures as the revelation of God, and of Christianity as the scheme it unfolds. Upon the interpretation of this book he had framed no hypothesis, and had formed no system of doctrinal belief. He was not, however, to rest here. Stumbling, during an evening stroll, into the bookstore of the town, his eye rested upon a small volume, entitled "Confession of Faith." He had never before heard of its existence: he only saw that it contained an articulate statement and exposition of Christian doctrine. He purchased and read it through; and for the first time felt that he had met with a system which held together with the strictest logical connexion. He could not pronounce it true without a careful comparison of the text with the scriptural proofs at the foot of each page. But he was powerfully arrested by the consistency and rigor of its logic: granting its fundamental postulates, all the conclusions must follow by necessary sequence. This book determined him as a Calvinist and a Presbyterian; although he had never been thrown into any connexion with this branch of the Church of Christ, and had never been, except in one instance, within any of their sanctuaries of worship. The circumstance, however, of most interest in the whole series, is the fact that the chapter which most impressed him in this "Confession"

was the chapter on Justification—that doctrine which is the key to the whole Gospel; as Luther styles it, “*articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ.*” How parallel with the history of Luther himself, and of the great Reformers of the sixteenth century! who by this clue extricated themselves from the labyrinth of popery, and who built Protestant Christianity upon it, as the keystone of the arch by which the whole superstructure was supported. Those who recall the fierce conflict which raged in the Presbyterian church at the very time our friend was introduced into its ministry, and who remember the distinguished part he was called to bear in defence of the very doctrines of the Reformation, which are only the doctrines of grace, can not fail to recognize here the wonderful method by which he was unconsciously trained for a similar work of reform. None can fail to see that those who are raised up to be the champions of truth in an age of defection and strife, and those who are destined to shape the theology of their age, must drink the truth from no secondary streams, but fresh from the oracles of God, and from those symbolical books in which the faith of the universal Church is sacredly enshrined. But if these researches led him within the temple of Christian truth, it was only to wonder, and not to worship. He stood beneath its majestic dome, and mused along its cathedral aisles, as before he had wandered through the groves of the academy, or paused beneath the porch of the stoic. The Gospel was nothing more than a sublime philosophy: and if it secured the homage of his intellect, it failed as yet to control the affections of his heart. If he seemed to sit with reverence at the feet of the great Teacher, it was only as a teacher,—something greater than Socrates, and more divine than Plato. The seed must lie dead for a time. How soon it was to germinate, and what fruit to bear, we shall shortly trace.

Upon his graduation, in December, 1831, he left the halls of his *Alma mater*, followed by universal predictions of his

future greatness. In whatever quarter of the heavens he should chance to rise, and in whatever constellation to shine, all expected in him a star of the first magnitude. But a few years elapsed when, by the path of these same predictions, he returned to the college, to be as distinguished among its teachers as he had before been among its pupils. In the opening of his twentieth year, he entered, as student of law, the office of his patron, Mr. Robbins; but did not long remain. His spirit of manly independence could not brook longer to be a pensioner upon the bounty of those who had befriended him thus far; he must, also, stretch the hand of help to those of his own blood who desired likewise to climb the steep ascent of knowledge. He accordingly devoted the two years of 1832 and 1833 to teaching, first in Sumterville, and then at Cheraw, the scene of his early academic toils. During the first of these years, the seed of religious truth, which had been secretly swelling in the soul, burst through the parted crust, in the tender blade. In the spring of 1832, he united, by open profession of his faith, with the Concord Presbyterian church, near Sumterville. Thus did the sovereign spirit of God, who chooses His own avenue of approach, come to him through the convictions of the intellect and by the logic of the understanding. But He who had previously so illuminated the mind, now quickened the affections and subdued the will; and with "every thought brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ," our friend bowed, with all his powers united, before the cross. Thwarting the instincts of his own ambition and the fond hopes of political preferment cherished by his admirers, he forthwith resolved upon devoting himself to the "ministry of reconciliation." This resolution was formed and kept under the pressure of a tremendous conviction. Three years later, at the period of his licensure, whether through a conscientious apprehension of the sacredness of the office, or whether through an earthly ambition not wholly subdued, he cherished the

secret hope of being rejected by the Presbytery, upon whom would devolve the responsibility of releasing him from the pressure of the Apostle's woe. It is a fearful struggle when, once for all, a noble spirit brings its longing after fame and lays it down a perpetual sacrifice to conscience and to God. For though the pulpit has its honors and rewards, woe! woe! to the man who enters it under this temptation—

“To gaze at his own splendor, and exalt,
Absurdly, not his office, but himself.”

The shadow of a fearful curse falls upon him who “does this work of the Lord deceitfully,” who can not with a purged eye look beyond the meed of human applause to the benediction of the great Master as his final crown. During these two years of retired and scholastic improvement, he prosecuted with diligence the study of divinity; and in 1834, went to the University of Cambridge, where, through several months, he perfected his knowledge of Hebrew. In the autumn of the same year, he was licensed as a probationer by the Presbytery of Harmony, and soon after commenced his ministerial labors in the District of Lancaster. In the spring of 1835, he was ordained by the Presbytery of Bethel to the full office of the Christian ministry, and was installed pastor of the associated churches of Waxhaw, Six Mile Creek, and Lancasterville. In the following December he formed a matrimonial alliance with a daughter of Colonel James H. Witherspoon, of Lancaster; the bonds of which were only dissolved, after the lapse of twenty-seven years, by his decease, leaving his widow and children to embitter their grief by the constant memory of his own exceeding goodness. In this pastoral charge he remained three years, from the commencement of 1835 to the close of 1837; and the brilliancy of his pulpit efforts, with the powerful impression produced upon his hearers, remains among the traditions of that region to this day, uneffaced by the labors of succeeding ministers. Indeed, in the

opinion of some, for popular effect those early discourses were never exceeded by the riper productions of his later years. Though his learning became more various, and his discussions more profound, yet the first impressions of his oratory were never transcended. Perhaps, however, this is due to a severer taste and a deeper Christian experience, which learned to disregard those mere graces of rhetoric by which a popular assembly is so often dazzled. We shall have occasion hereafter to describe him more fully as a preacher; and will discover that his eloquence dug for itself a deeper channel than in his earlier years, and poured itself in a much broader flood, rather overwhelming by its majesty than simply charming by its grace.

We now follow him to a different sphere. The chair of Logic and Criticism in the South Carolina College being made vacant by the death of the lamented Nott, the remembrance of his brilliant scholastic career, and the splendid fame he had acquired through the northern portion of the State, brought him before the electors as the man for the place. He was accordingly chosen to the vacant chair in December, 1837, which he soon occupied, the department being shortly after enlarged by the addition of Metaphysics. He entered with characteristic zeal upon the office of instruction, in studies so peculiarly adapted to his acute and analytical mind. Metaphysical science he speedily vindicated from the charge of inutility, showing the application of its principles to the practical business of life, and as implicitly involved in the whole current of human intercourse. His lucid exposition dispelled the haze of uncertainty and doubt hanging around themes so abstract and difficult of research. The warmth of his enthusiasm quickened into life and clothed with flesh the marrowless bones of what was regarded only as a dead philosophy. The re-animated form, instinct with the beauty which his glowing fancy diffused, invested with the drapery which his varied learning supplied, and speaking in the magnificent diction

which his matchless eloquence inspired, no longer repelled the embrace of ardent scholars, as when she lay a ghastly skeleton, covered with the dust of centuries of barren speculation. During his long connexion with the college she sat enthroned among the sciences, and far be the day when she shall be deposed from this queenly ascendancy! But congenial as were these pursuits to the young professor, his conscience began to be disturbed with scruples which robbed his repose. We have already seen with what unusual solemnity and depth of conviction he assumed the office of the holy ministry. His ordination vow presses hard upon him. He had covenanted to make the proclamation of God's grace to sinners the business of his life. Did this comport with a life spent in teaching others only the endless see-saw of the syllogism, or even the sublimer mysteries of the human mind? The opportunities afforded for the occasional ministration of the Word, how frequent so ever, did not seem to fill up the measure of obligation he had contracted by "the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." He must preach, with constancy and system, as a man plying his vocation: "the word of the Lord was in his heart, as a burning fire shut up in his bones, and he was weary with forbearing." Under this pressure of conscience, he proffered his resignation to the Board of Trustees in May, 1839, with a view to accept the pastorate of the Presbyterian church in Columbia, South Carolina. The transfer was effected at the close of the year, and on January 1, 1840, he was installed by the Presbytery of Charleston in this new relation. His services, however, to the college were too invaluable to induce general acquiescence in the change. An opportunity was soon presented for his recall. The election of the Rev. Dr. Elliott as Bishop of the Diocese of Georgia, left the college pulpit without an occupant. The chaplaincy was at once tendered him, in connexion with the Professorship of Sacred Literature and the Evidences of Christianity. The conscientious scru-

ples which had withdrawn him from the chair of Philosophy did not embarrass his acceptance of a new position, where he would be intrusted with the care of souls, and those of a most important class in society. At the opening of the year 1841, he entered upon his duties in the college amidst the lamentation and tears of his deserted charge, who during one year had drunk the Gospel at his lips as never before. In this renewed connexion he remained through ten years, with almost unbroken repose; except that in the first of these years he was seriously threatened with a pulmonary affection, which interrupted his labors, and necessitated a visit of several months to Europe. During this time, he not only reëstablished his health, but came into acquaintance with many of the leading minds in England and Scotland; which, leading to a call for his published writings as fast as they afterward appeared, secured him a reputation in Europe as enviable, though not so wide, as that he enjoyed in America. Upon his return, his studies were resumed with redoubled vigor, rendered all the more valuable to himself from the necessity of daily imparting his knowledge to others: for true it is, in the language of the poet,

“ No man is the lord of any thing,
 Though in and of him there be much consisting,
 Till he communicate his parts to others—
 Nor doth he of himself know them for aught,
 Till he behold them formed in the applause
 Where they're extended; which, like an arch, reverberates
 The voice again; or, like a gate of steel,
 Fronting the sun, receives and renders back
 His figure and his heat.”

The chair which he now held combined in its embrace the mysteries both of philosophy and revelation. Studies so lofty, and yet so comprehensive, pursued through ten years under the stimulus and in the daily reflection of his own teaching, deepened incredibly the bed of his mind, and laid up in its chambers stores of knowledge which made him rich for eternity. The prestige of his genius and his facility

of exposition rendered him the idol of his pupils: the tact he displayed in discipline, and the practical wisdom of all his suggestions on the subject of education, won more and more the admiration and confidence of the State; while the sanctification of all his powers to the glory of the Redeemer and the salvation of souls, knit to him the affections of the Church of God. The results of his long ministry in the college chapel will be known only at the judgment. Many received here their first saving impressions of divine truth, which, in after years, and under other ministrations, ripened in a sound conversion; and not a few seals to his fidelity were more immediately gathered into his crown. In that day of revelation, when all the issues of time shall be gathered into a single view, he will be greeted as a spiritual father by many sons whom he has begotten in the Gospel. Nor, in framing an estimate of the labors of this period, should we overlook the influence of his scientific and elaborate defences of the Christian faith, uttered in the class-room; by which many were saved from the delusions of infidelity, and rooted in at least a speculative belief in the word of God. Let us pause here and adore the mystery of that providence which worketh not after the pattern of human expectation. Who, that ten years before mourned over the college as the seat of infidelity, and sending out its reproach against God through all the land, dreamed that then she was nourishing in her bosom a champion for the truth, who should take up the gage and bear off the prize upon his triumphant lance! Who, that ten years before saw a half-grown youth sitting at the feet of the great apostle of deism, and drinking in his counsels as the inspirations of an oracle, foresaw the advocate for Christianity standing for its defence upon the very platform of its evidences, and undoing the work of his own oracle and guide! Who could then have foretold that an infidel philosophy was whetting the dialectics which should unravel its own sophisms, and feathering the arrow

by which its own life should be pierced: that deism itself should train the giant strength by which its own castle should be demolished, and the spell of its own foul enchantment be dissolved! Ah, it is the young Saxon monk, climbing Pilate's stair-case upon his knees, who now shakes the gates of papal Rome! It is the young man bearing the garments of the first martyr and consenting to his death, who now fills the world with the faith he destroyed!

In May, 1851, he was released from the college, and removed to the city of Charleston, on the acceptance of a call from the Glebe Street church. But before these arrangements were consummated, he was unexpectedly remanded to his old relations. The resignation of the presidency of the college by the Hon. William C. Preston turned the eyes of the whole State to the only man who was deemed worthy to be his successor; and now, the third time, the State became a suitor for his services; and a third time, by the unanimous voice of her whole constituency, he was borne into the academic halls with which his whole life had been so strangely identified. It was no small tribute paid to his merit, that he should be summoned to fill a station which, from the foundation of the college, had been graced by the most illustrious names. The unanimity of the summons was but a mark of appreciation which his great genius might justly claim as its due. For the office itself he had a surpassing fitness. His long experience in the government of young men; the exquisite tact he had so frequently displayed in times of emergency; the freshness of his sympathies, which bound him to them by cords whose tenderness was only equal to their strength; the complete ascendancy he had acquired over them, not less by the force of his character than by the brilliancy of his intellect; the confidence in his integrity inspired by the transparent honesty of his heart; the affectionate reverence in which he was held by his colleagues in the faculty; and the cordial support he might expect to receive from a confiding public,

who trusted him with an unbounded faith: all gave the presage of a most successful administration. In January, 1852, he put on the mantle once worn by a Maxcy, a Barnwell, and a Preston; by a redistribution of the chairs, resuming his position as Chaplain and as Professor of the Evidences and of Moral Philosophy. We do not care to interrupt the continuity of his personal history with dissertations upon the several aspects of his character which these several relations reveal to us. Reserving these to another place, let us trace the thread of his life until it is broken at the grave. From the hints already given, the presidency of Dr. Thornwell would not probably be marked by much that is external. The college would be expected rather to move forward upon its wheels through its daily routine, without those jars and discords which, like revolutions in the State, denote something out of joint, through the unskilfulness of rulers. The same clear expositions of divine truth, and the same passionate appeals to the conscience, were heard, as before, every Sabbath, in the chapel; the same powerful vindication of the Christian faith, and the same luminous tracing of analogies between the natural and the moral government of God, were heard in the class-room, as before. But what large plans that fertile brain was maturing, to draw up the whole education of the land to a higher summit level; what modifications of the curriculum of study to secure greater mental discipline, and yet to enlarge the culture and extend the area of knowledge—all this, which might have wrought itself out in the history of the institution which he loved, was arrested by a movement which plucked him from his seat, and terminated for ever his connexion with the college.

In the zenith of his fame, in the height of his influence, with statesmen and judges clustering around him, with a large retinue of admiring pupils, himself the pivot upon which turned the educational interests of his native State—covered with academic titles, and clothed with the highest

academic office in his country's gift—is there yet a nobler reward, a richer meed of praise, to be lavished upon this favored son of learning? There remains but one, and that must come from the Church of God. As intimated by her Founder and Head, “the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation;” and her rewards may seem paltry to the eye of sense, when hung in contrast with the splendid prizes of earthly distinction. Yet the call upon this man by the Redeemer's Church, to turn from these academic titles and train her sons for the ministry of reconciliation, was the crowning glory of a life bright with applause from its beginning. Through eighteen years the Church, holding in her hands his pledge of allegiance, had lent him to the State; through eighteen years he had devoted himself to its most vital interest, with an assiduity of which only an earnest soul was capable. Now, in the noon of his life, in the ripeness of his intellect, and in the richness of his learning, the Church saw fit to reclaim him to herself; she would pass those rare gifts under the baptism of a renewed consecration to her service. It was thought by some a waste to fritter the energies of such a mind in the mere police requisite for the government of undergraduates, or in the details of an executive office, however honorable. It was feared by others that his frail constitution would succumb beneath the anxiety and care continually exacting upon a frame already taxed to its utmost endurance by the habits of a student. It was felt by all that if the Church of this generation must swell the wisdom of the past by a contribution of its own, this was the representative of her choice, whose immortal writings should teach to children's children the piety and faith of their fathers. Dr. Thornwell had evinced singular aptitude in repelling the false philosophy of the day in its covert assaults upon the word of God. Holding in his grasp the entire history of philosophy, from the times of Plato and Aristotle to those of Fichte and of Kant; possessing a logic that could detect and tear off the dis-

guises of error; and withal, imbued with profoundest reverence for the dogmatic authority of Scripture: such a man could, of all others, unmask the hypocritical rationalism which seeks by craft to undermine our faith in an objective revelation, and borrows the very dialect of the Gospel to travestie its holiest and most vital truths. Such a man, it was hoped, might not only tone the rising ministry of the Church, and fashion them in part upon his own majestic mould; but would reproduce the fixed theology of the past in its new relations to the present. For, as the mountain which leans its ragged head against the sky, itself the same for ever, is differently seen through the shifting atmosphere which surrounds it; so the theology of the Bible, eternal as the being and government of God, is affected by the shifting hues of the philosophic medium through which it is seen and interpreted. It was the highest mark of the Church's favor to Dr. Thornwell, that he was chosen for the momentous task: and that he might have leisure for its accomplishment, the Church withdrew him from the garish splendor of the world within her own tranquil shades, and hoped and prayed to her great Head to spare him till the work was done. Three things the Church expected at his hands, and then she would freely yield him to the enjoyment of his reward on high: a system of theology from his own point of view, exhibiting the nexus between all its parts, and blending these in a perfect unity; a rediscussion of the Christian Evidences, with reference to the subtle, rationalistic philosophy by which they have been impugned; and a book on morals, in which the foundation of the true philosophy of human obligation should be laid bare. The materials for all three were abundantly treasured in the store-house of his thought: nothing remained but to draw them forth and commit them to the record! Alas! death came too soon for the Church to realize the rich legacy her heart was coveting. Only a part of the first in this triplet was permitted to be

done: all else has gone down into the silence of his tomb, from which comes no response to our wail of sorrow.

In December, 1855, he pronounced his fourth and last baccalaureate; and, obedient to the call of the two synods of South Carolina and Georgia, turned his back upon the halls in which he had so long taught the sons of the State, and entered the school of the prophets, hard by, to train the sons of the Church for their mission of love to a dying world. Dr. Thornwell, with all his various learning, eminently illustrated the adage, "Beware of the man of one book." In his own search after truth, whilst he read in a good degree discursively, he *studied* a few great masters. Plato and Aristotle among the ancients—Milton, Locke, and Bacon among the moderns, he read and re-read; until he not only digested their contents, but was saturated with their spirit, and stood prepared to grapple independently with the highest problems of human existence. The same policy marked his course as a teacher. The text-book by which he disciplined his college pupils into habits of severe thinking, was the celebrated Analogy of Bishop Butler, which, undisfigured by the pedantry of foot-notes, shows in the text itself a perfect mastery of the entire literature of the subject. But whatever text-book was chosen by Dr. Thornwell, it served only as a thread upon which to string the pearls of knowledge he had himself collected. A college student once remarked to the speaker: "Dr. Thornwell is the only teacher for whose recitation I can never say I am fully prepared; I study Butler until I can repeat every word, and fancy that I can answer every possible question, and in three minutes I stand before him a perfect fool, and feel that I know nothing at all. He has, sir, the happiest knack of drawing out of Butler what was never there, except as he put it in." The teacher knew—the pupil did not—how deep those simple and suggestive sentences of the author actually drew: only an equal mind could take the soundings of such a work. The selection of a text-

book in theology was typical of the man ; it was the Institutes of John Calvin. Wonderful association of names ! drawn together by an electric affinity so close that, with the men transposed, the Calvin three centuries back might have been the Thornwell of to-day, and our Thornwell might equally have been the Calvin of the Reformation. The same profoundness of learning, evincing itself rather in the results it achieves than in the idle display of the apparatus with which it works ; the same logical acumen, which resolved the most intricate problems and laid bare the secret principles wrapped within their folds ; the same massive intellect, which imbedded these in pregnant utterances capable of endless exposition ; the same candor in the investigation of truth, and the same passionate love which made them worshippers at her shrine ; the same Herculean industry, which sported with labor and found refreshment in toils by which others were exhausted ; the same practical judgment, whose counsels were almost akin to prophecy, and seldom led astray those who asked advice ; the same versatility of genius, which made the ecclesiastic an able counsellor of State ; the same simplicity of character, which preserved the freshness of childhood in the maturity of age ; the same fearlessness of soul, which shrank neither from reproach nor peril in the pursuit of right ; the same guileless sincerity, which never understood *finesse* nor worked by indirection : all these and other traits run the parallel so close between the two that, standing three centuries apart, they seem to be born twins. The resemblance is preserved even in things we would call accidental. The same early maturity of mind, which enabled the one, at the age of twenty-five, to dedicate his Institutes to the French king, and which placed the other, at the same age, in the chair of Philosophy ; the possession by both of a frail body, which scarcely contained the indwelling spirit, beating against its sides with every movement of its own activity, and threatening each day to batter down the walls

of its feeble prison; and finally, the coincidence in their death at nearly the same age, the one in his fifty-fifth, and the other in his fiftieth year, both closing a long life while it was yet high noon with both; these are points of resemblance which, though accidental, we can not but pause to admire. Nor is it strange that the theologian of the nineteenth century should go back to the theologian of the sixteenth, to find a master for his pupils. He who had dug the truth for himself from the quarry of the Scriptures, and from the symbols of the Church, would naturally carry his pupils up the stream of theological tradition to the very spot where it broke out afresh from the earth. Like the fabled river of Africa, systematic theology had for ages buried its channel beneath the superstitions and errors of popery; and, as from the foot of a great mountain, it emerged anew at the period of the Reformation. Precisely here the waters would be found the purest, except as he might carry his pupils higher still, to the original fountain, and cause them to drink from the oracles of God. But when it became necessary to employ human aid in constructing an articulate system of doctrine, he found no master equal to the great theologian of the Reformation. John Calvin stands in the same relation to Protestant theology as Francis Bacon to modern philosophy; each being a constructor in his own sphere, and each putting the stamp of his own thought upon the science of after times. Nay, if it be not irreverent thus to couple inspired with uninspired names, John Calvin stands in the college of the Reformers somewhat as Paul in the college of the Apostles, the penman and logician of his day. After the lapse of three centuries, he finds an expositor worthy of himself—the Plato after Socrates. Happy master, to find such a commentator! Happy expositor, to find such a master! Happy pupils, to sit under the combined light of two such kindred intellects!

Dr. Thornwell's method of instruction was the Socratic. He examined his class upon the text of the author, so

shaping his interrogatories as to evolve the truth from the mind of the student itself. Recitation by rote was an impossibility; the repetition of the text did not answer the requisitions of the class-room. Interrogation was poured upon the pupil's head like a shower of hail, until he was driven back through all the steps of the most rigorous analysis; then he must frame precise statements of the doctrine, while a critical logic stood by to cut and pare until it was revealed before the eye with the utmost sharpness of profile. Finally, the student was put upon his defence, against every form of assault to which the champion for the truth might be exposed. If the line of defence was unskilful, the pupil found himself in the toils of an adversary who wound tightly about him the meshes in which he was involved. Not till then came the hour of extrication. But at last there would follow lucid exposition, searching analysis, and resistless logic, disentangling the web and probing every difficulty to its core. The class-room was thus not like the studio of the statuary, who chips away upon the senseless block until he "moulds every joint and member into an immortal feature of loveliness and perfection;" but it was the gymnasium, where the living mind was taught to unfold itself according to its own law of developement, and work itself out into the consciousness of knowledge which is yet a part of its own texture. He is a benefactor who communicates to me one new and grand thought; but he is twice a benefactor who helps me to think that thought myself. Under this double weight of gratitude Dr. Thornwell brought his pupils; no wonder that they loved him as a child its father! Bereaved school of the prophets, well may thy walls be draped in mourning! During the life of this generation, thy sons will mourn the loss of instruction which can not be reproduced; but which a faithful tradition will hand down, so long as one shall live that ever saw the kindling of his expressive eye.

Besides his labors as a theological professor, he discharged once more the duties of a pastor in the Columbia church; over which he was a second time installed, in conjunction with a younger brother, one of his own pupils, upon whom the sole pastorship was finally devolved. During the past two years, his constitution, naturally frail, manifested symptoms of sure but gradual decay. Severe application to study such as his, protracted through so many years, must tell upon the physical frame, so soon as its recuperative energies begin to be impaired. His nervous system commenced now giving way, and he experienced that prostration of strength more distressing than even acute suffering. Coupled with this, the fears of pulmonary disease, which had been excited in his earlier life, were now renewed. In consequence of this two-fold affection, he made, in 1860, a second trip across the Atlantic, and returned improved, but not, as before, renovated. Unquestionably, too, the intense excitement of the present war wore upon his shattered and nervous body, beyond its power either to sustain or resist. The love of country burned always in his breast at a white heat. In former years none gloried more than he in the spreading power of the old Republic, and his sanguine hope painted her future splendor in colors absolutely gorgeous. The speaker well remembers, three years ago, the spontaneous burst of applause in the General Assembly, so unusual in an ecclesiastical council, produced by one of his sudden outbreaks of patriotic fervor. He was describing his emotions while surveying in the Tower of London the various trophies of British prowess; and how he drew himself up to his highest stature, and proudly said to his attendants, "Your country has waged two long wars against mine, but I see here no trophies of successful valor wrested from American hands." But those were days when America had not learned to bow the supple knee before a vulgar despotism of her own creation; the slime of the serpent's trail had not then been seen winding

around the steep ascent to the presidential chair. From the moment a sectional party obtained the supreme control, his clear judgment saw at a glance the momentous issue that must be joined. His heart turned at once to his beloved South, as all the country that was left to him, in whose entire independence rested the last hope of republican freedom. His patriotism burst forth into a consuming passion, and his cultivated moral sense looked upon his country's wrongs with a resentment which was holy. From the pulpit and the platform he poured forth his fiery eloquence, in words scarcely less massive than those hurled by Demosthenes against the Macedonian Philip. In elaborate essays, he unfolded, with a statesman's power, the mighty principles of religious and political liberty which were implicated in the struggle; and through the newspaper press his prophetic words were borne upon the wind, like the leaves of the Sybil, through the whole Confederacy. These writings will be gathered into the portfolio of the statesman, as among the ablest documents of the time. They reveal the order of statesmanship he would have attained, if he had chosen to walk in the paths of political preferment; and those who may have regretted his turning aside from these, may take comfort in the thought that even thus, when life was flickering in its socket, he fulfilled a statesman's task, and left behind him a statesman's fame; for at this moment South Carolina weeps at his grave such tears as she learned to shed around the bier of her immortal Calhoun.

As usual, Dr. Thornwell spent his last vacation in the vain effort to recruit his health, visiting for this purpose Wilson's springs, in North Carolina. But experiencing no benefit from their waters, he came down to Charlotte, to meet his wife and son; the latter of whom, after recovering from severe wounds received in battle, was on his way to the theatre of war in Virginia. Here his disease, a chronic dysentery, returned upon him with redoubled violence; and

after a short conflict with the powers of nature, overthrew its victim, and bore him to the tomb. Through this last sickness he was not permitted to speak much. Apart from his characteristic reserve, which shrunk from every thing approaching a scene, the nature of his malady was such as to becloud his mind. He lay, for the most part, in stupor; easily aroused, indeed, to the recognition of those about his bed, but speedily sinking back into lethargy. His troubled and incoherent utterances revealed the habit of his life: lifting his finger, as if addressing an imaginary class, he would say, "Well, you have stated your position, now prove it;" and then, as if musing upon the qualities of the human mind, he would articulate: "The attributes—first, the moral, then the intellectual, and thirdly, the religious or spiritual;" reminding us of the good Neander, who, in like manner, would lift himself from his dying couch and say, "To-morrow, young gentlemen, we will resume our exertations upon the sixth chapter of John." It is our loss that we can not treasure the last sayings of such a master, for

"The tongues of dying men
Enforce attention, like deep harmony;
The setting sun, and music at the close,
As the last taste of sweets, is sweetest last,
Writ in remembrance more than things long past."

Yet they are not needed; our brother's whole life was a continued song: and memory, with her faithful chord, like an Æolian harp, will prolong its music till we, too, sleep. On the first day of August, 1862, he entered gently into the rest of God. Six years ago, the last time but one it was the speaker's privilege to hear him from the pulpit, in one of those outbursts of strong emotion which we all remember, he exclaimed: "I am often very weary—weary with work, as the feeble body reels beneath its accumulated toils; weary in struggling with my own distrustful and unbelieving heart; weary with the wickedness of men, and with

the effort to put a bridle upon human passions, and I often sigh to be at rest"! Brother! thou hast entered into rest, and we are the more weary for loss of thee!

The thread is broken which has conducted us from the cradle to the grave: in what manner it has been gathered up by unseen hands, and woven into a broader and brighter web beyond the skies, it is not for us yet to know. The foregoing sketch presents only the connexions of his earthly history, and the facts which afford a key to the consummate excellence he achieved. A complete memoir would swell this discourse into the proportions of a book, and it is reserved, we trust, for some future day and for some abler hand. It only now remains to consider the relations in which he stood to society, and to analyze the powers which in their combination produced the genius we have so long admired.

Every attribute of his mind, natural and acquired, fitted him to be the EDUCATOR OF YOUTH, in which relation he stood so long prominently before the public eye. The range of his learning was immense. Though he studied severely certain great masters, his reading was discursive and large: and such was his power of concentration, that he seemed to take up knowledge by absorption. It was playfully said of the learned Murdock, the American Commentator of Mosheim, that he never could have amassed such intellectual stores unless his two great eyes read both pages of a book at once. The secret lay in that rare discipline by which the attention was riveted, and knowledge was immediately assimilated. Dr. Thornwell possessed this faculty in the highest degree. His mind was under such control that, when closeted with an author, the door was locked against all intrusive thoughts, and he digested as soon as he devoured. His retentive memory, also, never relaxed its hold of what was once read. We have heard him recite consecutive pages of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, as

though the whole poem was daguerreotyped upon the tablet of his memory; and, more wonderful still, entire odes of Horace, when it was certain the original had not been opened for years. Without the aid of an index, or any artificial digest, he could refer to volume and page of any author he had once perused. His memory could not only reproduce the logical contents of a book, but the precise language of many extended passages which most impressed him. Besides the studies which he had made his specialty, he excelled in other branches of universal knowledge. He was a ripe classical scholar: Latin he could write correctly and with ease, and in Greek he was singularly proficient. The works of Aristotle lay always upon his table, and he revelled in the philosophy and poetry of Plato. The group of scholars who would sometimes with him pour over the pages of the *Phædo*, knew not which most to admire, the exquisite finish of his translation, or his philosophic commentary on the text. The study of Hebrew he had never carried to any remarkable extent, but his knowledge was sufficient for the purposes of a careful exegesis. French and German he had mastered so far as to put him in living communion with the literature of both languages, and only required larger practice to render them the medium of conversational intercourse. To the study of mathematics he had no original bias, and probably never pushed his knowledge beyond the point to which a liberal college curriculum conducted him. He certainly sympathized in the views of Sir William Hamilton upon their precise value as a method of intellectual discipline, and the place they should occupy in a course of general education. In *belles-lettres* he was far from being deficient. He had read the beautiful classics of his own and other tongues, and was by no means insensible to the charms of poetry and song. But his severer order of mind led him through more thorny paths; and his ardent search after absolute and unadorned truth left him little leisure to cull the beauties which grow

in the flower-beds of the Muses. But when it pleased him, he could select a beautiful bouquet from the garden of English literature, and his own affluent diction was tinged with its inimitable sweetness and grace. Indeed, the exquisiteness of his literary taste was a serious impediment with him to authorship. Fastidious as to style, he conceived disgust for his own writings as soon as he departed from that region of argumentative and didactic philosophy where he was so completely at home; and upon this ground resisted the importunities of friends who were continually urging him to write. He lived to overcome and to regret this fastidiousness, but too late for the world to recover what it has thus lost for ever. In history, both ancient and modern, of the Church and of the State, he was extensively and accurately read; and could enforce argument by many an apposite appeal to the recorded experience of mankind; and no one generalized more safely the practical conclusions which should be drawn from its universal teachings. In natural science he had never carried his researches through the many departments in which it is now subdivided. His information was not, therefore, minute: but his general knowledge was accurate and full, and he sometimes adorned his discourse with beautiful illustrations drawn from the analogies of the material world. He has been accused of disparaging the natural sciences as a part of liberal education, in which we suppose there is a slight misapprehension of his true position. He certainly did not estimate them highly as instruments of mental discipline, and thus assigned them a small place in that scheme of education which is intended to discipline and train the mind. But he would give them ample verge in that broader scheme, which takes the disciplined mind and adorns it with various knowledge: he simply shifted their position from the gymnasium to the university, and would rejoice in their cultivation as the furniture, rather than as the diet, of the mind.

The accuracy of his knowledge was even more wonderful than its extent. We say deliberately, and exactly what the words imply, that we have never known a man who made his knowledge so peculiarly his own. It was not learning codified in common-place books, nor locked up in pigeon-holes nicely labelled and tied up with red tape, to be drawn forth from dust and brown paper when wanted, but it was part and parcel of his own mental substance. Whenever reproduced, it came fresh from his own mint, stamped with the coinage of his own thought. It did not simply strain through his memory, like water through a sieve, but it entered into the bone, and flesh, and blood of his own thinking. Hence, he was never overborne by it, as too many are, nor did it impair the individuality and freshness of his mind. When he wrote and spoke, the stream flowed forth with an evenfulness, under the pressure of its own abundance. All this entered into his merit as an instructor. The variety and depth of his learning invested him with the highest authority; while his perfect command over it, enabled him to present truth under any form level to the student's apprehension. He had the most remarkable facility of explanation; his thoughts ran in no stereotyped phrases, but could be cast into a hundred moulds, suited to a hundred different minds. The strongest sympathy, too, was established between the teacher and his pupils. He never wrapped himself up in an artificial dignity, but won all who approached him by the genial kindness of his temper, and by the childlike simplicity of his address. Even under the severe inquisitions of the class-room, the pupil felt that his teacher was his friend, and would be his helper in the painful search for knowledge; while in private, the great man let himself down into the playfulness of a child, and chased timidity away by the unceasing flow of humor and sportive wit. Thoroughly digesting his own knowledge, he became, as we have seen, a perfect master of the Socratic method of

instruction, so difficult except in the hands of a master. Teaching his pupils to search for ultimate principles, he taught them the happy art of generalization, which is, after all, the true secret of large mental acquisitions; for these ascertained principles not only afford the nucleus around which the most diffuse reading may collect itself, but give the key by which the secret stores may be unlocked and brought into use. He could not, therefore, but excel as an instructor in those branches which he particularly taught.

For similar reasons, he was equally fitted to represent and conduct the general interests of education through the State at large. Upon this entire subject his views were strongly defined. He properly considered the discipline of the mind to be the first object of education; to elicit its dormant powers, and to train these for vigorous self-action; while the mere acquisition of knowledge he regarded as secondary in time and importance. He therefore disapproved the attempt made in our American colleges, to cover the whole area of science, and to compass within a four years' course, peculiar and professional studies. His favorite idea was to restrict undergraduates to studies by which the mind may be systematically developed, and to engraft upon the college, at the close of a prescribed and compulsory curriculum, the main features of the university system, with its large and varied apparatus for the fuller communication of knowledge. He was a warm advocate for common school education among the masses; yet firmly held to the idea that knowledge, after all, is diffused by its own law of descent from above, below; percolating through society from the surface to the lowest bed beneath. Hence he labored with all his energy to promote the highest education among the few, as the surest way to quicken and enlighten the less favored masses. Thoroughly imbued with the Aristotelian maxim, *Πολις γινομένη μεν του ζην ενεκεν, ουσα δε του ευ, ζην*, he reckoned it amongst the highest obligations of the State to provide for the education of her sons. Upon this ground, and to

prevent collision between the two jurisdictions, he resisted through life the doctrine which places secular education among the positive duties of the Church. In her organized capacity, according to his strict construction of her charter, her duty terminates with the religious training of mankind—the sanctuary, her class-room; the pulpit, her chair; and the Gospel of Jesus, her discipline. It is not the historian's province to arbitrate in such a controversy; but only to represent opinions firmly held by the subject of his story. He found able critics upon either hand—those who upheld in this matter the prerogative of the Church; and those who as stoutly denied his postulate touching the duty of the State. It is hard to swim against the current of the age. His grand ideal of an institution which should unite the advantages of the gymnasium with those of the university, was never realized; and he has left the great problem of education yet to be solved—how to adjust the wide diffusion of knowledge with that breadth and depth of learning which it was the object of his life to secure. But, whoever may have differed from him on these points, none ever questioned the sincerity of his convictions, doubted the purity of his motives, or denied the impulse which the cause of education received at his hands—an impulse chiefly due to the personal influence which has given tone to so many yet living, through whom it will be perpetuated to generations yet to come.

We shall be pardoned for combining next the PHILOSOPHER and the THEOLOGIAN; not only because of the natural affinity between the two, but because of their actual conjunction in the history and labors of Dr. Thornwell. In them we have the ripest fruits of his genius, and upon these two pillars the whole of his future fame must rest. We have seen that his mind was early biased towards philosophy—it would probably have been determined in this direction by its inherent proclivity. The culture through which it subsequently passed, places him without

a peer in this department. After the splendid eulogium which he has pronounced upon Sir William Hamilton—"in depth and acuteness of mind a rival of Aristotle, in immensity of learning a match for Leibnitz, in comprehensiveness of thought an equal to Bacon"—it may seem a perilous connexion to mention the name of the impassioned panegyrist himself. But truth demands the utterance of the conviction that, after Hamilton, no mind was more thoroughly imbued with the spirit of philosophy than his. It is unfortunate that, aside from the aroma which breathes through all his writings, the evidence of his splendid acquisitions can be gathered only from monographs; and those upon topics which rather implicate philosophy than lie wholly within its domain. He was unquestionably master of its history, from its dawn amidst the schools of Greece, through the mid-day slumbers in which it dozed with the Schoolmen, to the frenzied and fantastic dreams of our modern transcendentalists. Passing through all the schools into which her followers have been divided, and acquainted with every shade of opinion by which they are distinguished, the fan of his own criticism winnowed the chaff from the wheat; and whatever contribution each school or age may have made to her common stores, he safely gathered into the chambers of his memory.

The traits which specially characterized his own speculations were, modesty and earnestness in the discovery of positive truth. His first effort was to mark the boundaries of reason; within whose limits he thought with all the vigor and self-reliance characteristic of a mind conscious of its own great powers, and beyond which he never permitted himself to pass. He was thus protected from that presumptuous rationalism which so much disfigures the thinking of modern Germany; and uttered his frequent and solemn protests against the profaneness of those "rampant ontologists," who attempt to "unfold the grounds of universal being from the principles of pure reason." His mind was

too positive in its tone to rest on theories, however splendid, unless he could discover a solid basis upon which to build them. It was not content simply with beating the air with its wings, however high it might soar; nor did he ever mistake the fantastic scenery of the clouds for the mountain landscape of which he was in search. Taking his departure from the English and Scotch schools, that all our knowledge begins in experience, he concurred with these in the doctrine of fundamental beliefs as essential to experience, and by which alone it is made available. He struck thus a middle course between the doctrine which makes the mind only a passive recipient of impressions, working up the materials it gathers from without, and the antagonist view which finds in the mind itself the data of all knowledge, "of which universal and all-comprehensive principles the reason is held to be the complement." He was able thus to steer safely between the Scylla and Charibdis of philosophy; between the Atheistic materialism of the French Encyclopedists on the one hand, and the pantheistic audacity of the German rationalists upon the other. His consistent and intelligible doctrine held that, while knowledge begins in experience, yet "experience must include conditions in the subject which make it capable of intelligence." "There must be," he says, "a *constitution* of mind adapted to that specific activity by which it believes and judges." The mind is, therefore, "subjected to laws of belief under which it must necessarily act"—"certain primary truths involved in its very structure." As "undeveloped in experience, these do not exist in the form of propositions or general conceptions, but of irresistible *tendencies* to certain manners of belief, when the proper occasions shall be afforded." But "when developed in experience, and generalized into abstract statements, they are original and elementary cognitions, the foundation and criterion of all knowledge." While, however, "the laws of belief qualify the subject to know, they can not give the things to be known. These are fur-

nished in experience, which thus not only affords the occasions on which our primitive cognitions are developed, but also the objects about which our faculties are conversant." Starting from these principles, it is easy to see that the same reform is carried into mental philosophy, which long since has been achieved in the natural or physical. The knowledge acquired is substantive and real; because it is a knowledge only of attributes and properties, level to our apprehension, capable of being gathered by observation, and of being generalized by induction. The mind, instead of being lost in speculations which transcend its limits, settles with confidence upon those positive truths which it is able continually to verify. But it would be idle to map out, in this connexion, the whole scheme of philosophy wrought out by Dr. Thornwell through the studies of a long life. Thus much has been said to indicate the position which he occupied, searching only for the positive and the real in all his researches. His mind, from its modesty and earnestness united, speculated safely. Feeling the ground beneath his feet at every step, with fixed principles for his guidance, he wrought within this broad field of observation and induction, in the language of one who has described him, with "an acuteness of mind that was marvellous, with a quickness of apprehension and rapidity of thought never surpassed, and with a power of analysis which, as if by the touch of the magician, resolved the most complex objects into its simple elements."

Dr. Thornwell's studies in philosophy were not lost upon him as a theologian: if he sought diligently to ascertain the bounds of reason in the one, he was not likely to transcend them in the other. Penetrated with the conviction that God can be known only so far as He has been pleased to reveal Himself, he bowed with perfect docility before the dogmatic authority of the Scriptures. In this he equalized at once the modesty of the philosopher and the humility of the Christian. He brought all his speculations to this touch-

stone; and wherever he found a "thus saith the Lord," he ceased to reason and began to worship. He first sought, by a most careful exegesis, to ascertain the meaning of God's word; then to collate and classify, until he built up a systematic theology. As the inductive philosopher ranges through nature, collects his facts, and builds up his science; so the theologian ranges up and down the inspired record, collects its doctrines as they are strewn in magnificent profusion through the histories, narratives, poems, epistles, and predictions of the Bible, and in the same spirit of caution constructs his scheme of divinity. The system deduced by our brother from this venerable and authoritative testimony, was precisely that articulately set forth in the Westminster Confession. It was, in his view, the only complete system of truth which a thorough and candid exposition could extract from the Bible. By many, doubtless, he has been regarded as extreme in some of his theological views; a prejudice founded, perhaps, upon the positive tone with which his convictions, like those of all earnest men, were announced, and the fervid zeal with which they were cherished and defended. Never was a prejudice more unfounded. His examination was too cautious, and his knowledge too exact, to allow extravagance in any single direction. His theology was uncommonly symmetrical in its proportions. He knew the limitations upon every single doctrine, and the relations of all in a common system, by which they are checked and qualified. There could be no overlapping; for every part was so sharply cut and defined, and the articulations were so close, that to a mind severely logical the whole must stand or fall together. We think it doubtful if a single instance can be produced, in all his writings or in his extemporaneous addresses, of that extravagance, even in language, which so shocks a pious ear, and by which the forcible ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~able~~ amongst us often attempt to make the truth intense. Always earnest indeed, he was remarkably exact and logical in his statements of doctrine; cautious not to go

beyond the clear testimony of the written word, and careful never to disturb the harmony subsisting between the truths themselves, as constituent members of one entire system; and always relying upon the simple majesty of the truth to carry its own convictions to a loyal understanding. His discussions were exhaustive and profound, bringing all the light of philosophy to elucidate the principles of religion; which, as to their substance, could only be derived by a direct revelation from Jehovah himself.

We next turn to view Dr. Thornwell in THE PULPIT, an ambassador of God to sinful men. And here may be repeated of him what was said with so much emphasis of Ebenezer Erskine, that "he who never heard him, never heard the Gospel in its majesty." From all that has been said of his logical proclivity and scholastic training, it may be rightly inferred that his preaching was addressed predominantly to the understanding: we do not mean, of course, to the exclusion of the heart, as we shall presently see. But, looking upon man as a being of intelligence, and upon the truth as the instrument of sanctification, he caused that truth to knock at the gates of the understanding until she was admitted and entertained. He had a sublime faith in the majesty and power of truth, and in God's ordained method of reaching the affections through the proclamation of His word. Eschewing all efforts to work upon the superficial emotions, or to play upon natural sympathies, he addressed himself in earnest to present the whole truth of God, and to discuss its fundamental principles before men. His analytic power was richly displayed in the pulpit. The clear statement of a case is often one-half of an argument. Stripping his subject at once of all that was adventitious or collateral, he laid bare to the eye some single principle upon which it turned—so single and so bare, that the most untrained hearer was compelled to see precisely what was to be elucidated. Then followed a course of argument, close, logical, profound, and clear, bending forward

to one conclusion; towards which the hearer was carried, with his will or against it, led captive in chains of logic that could no where be broken. When the truth had won its way to the most acknowledged conviction, and the mind was broken down into a state of complete submission, the argument would be gathered up in its weighty and practical conclusions, and hurled upon the conscience; compelling either the confession of guilt upon the one hand, or the most complete stultification of reason on the other. These appeals to the heart were often fearful in their solemnity; and all the more, as being based upon the conviction of the understanding, previously gained. They were not simple exhortation; but a judicial finding in the court of the hearer's own conscience. The preacher stood there as an attorney from heaven, to indict and prosecute the sinner; the pleading has been heard, and the argument for his conviction is concluded; and the sinner hears only the sentence of conscience, from its throne of judgment, echoing through all the chambers of the soul. It was upon this plan most of the discourses of this matchless preacher were formed. It mattered little whether the exposition was of moral law or of Gospel grace; there was the same statement and enforcement of eternal and immutable principles, and the same judicial finding of guilt and shame, whether the form of offence was against the one or the other. We have described Dr. Thornwell as being predominantly argumentative. He was not, however, polemic. Indeed, the current of his argument was too rapid and vehement to pause and deal with impugners and their small objections. It was the rushing down of the Nile, swollen with its mountain tributaries, and bursting through the sedge which impedes its flow. He rightly judged that to build up truth in its positive form was the better way to remove difficulties, which in its light soon come to appear as mere impertinences.

Nor were his public efforts always thus exclusively argumentative. He excelled in the exposition of Scripture; and had he not chosen to be the first of logicians, he might have been the first of commentators. His analytical talent was brought richly into play. It dealt little in dry, verbal criticism; but, after a sufficient elucidation of the text, it seized the great principles which were involved, and marshalled them in their proper order—a species of commentary of which, with all his dogmatism, we have an excellent example in Haldane; and a form of exposition particularly useful to the general reader, as presenting the Scriptures in their logical connexion before the mind. His relations, moreover, for so long a time as preacher to young men, led him into much practical discourse upon the common duties of life; characterized still by the same clear exhibition of final principles which, either as determining the nature of morality or as affording specific rules for the conduct, revealed the strong thinker and the practical moralist.

But the feature most remarkable in this prince of pulpit orators was, the rare union of rigorous logic with strong emotion. He reasoned always, but never coldly. Most logicians present truth only in what Bacon calls “the dry light of the understanding;” clear indeed, but without the heat which warms and fructifies. The sun shines upon the polar iceberg, and its sheen glances from the polished surface as though it were the splendor of heaven; yet the brightness sickens the beholder, from the cheerless desolation which it every where reveals. Dr. Thornwell wove his argument in fire. His mind warmed with the friction of its own thoughts, and glowed under the rapidity of its own motion; and the speaker was borne along in what seemed to others a chariot of flame. One must have listened to him to form an adequate conception of what we mean. Penetrated with the sublimity of his theme, and feeling in the depths of his soul its transcendent importance, he could not preach the Gospel of the grace of God

with the freezing coldness of a philosopher. As the flood of his discourse set in, one could perceive the ground-swell from beneath, the heaving tide of passionate emotion which rolled it on. Kindling with a secret inspiration as he proceeded, his manner lost its slight constraint; all angularity of gesture and ungracefulness of posture suddenly disappeared; the spasmodic shaking of the head entirely ceased; his slender form dilated; his deep black eye lost its drooping expression; the soul came and looked forth, lighting it up with a strange, unearthly brilliancy; his frail body rocked and trembled as under a divine afflatus, as though the impatient soul would rend its tabernacle and fly forth to God and heaven upon the wings of his impassioned words; until his fiery eloquence, rising with the greatness of his conceptions, would burst upon the hearer in some grand climax, overwhelming in its majesty and resistless in its effect. In all this, as may be conceived, there was no declamation, no "histrionic mummery," no straining for effect, nothing approaching to rant. All was natural, the simple product of thought and feeling wonderfully combined. We saw the whirlwind as it rose and gathered up the waters of the sea; we saw it in its headlong course, and in the bursting of its power. However vehement his passion, it was justified by the massive thought which engendered it; and in all the storm of his eloquence, the genius of logic could be seen presiding over its elements, and guiding its course. The hearer had just that sense of power, which power gives when seen under a measure of restraint. The speaker's fulness was not exhausted; language only failed to convey what was left behind.

But this picture would be incomplete, if we failed to speak of the magnificent diction which formed the vesture of his noble thoughts. "It is," says one, "the plumage of the royal bird which bears him upward to the sun;" and Dr. Thornwell was far from being insensible to the power of language. In his early life, it was with him an affec-

tionate study; and in later years, it was his habit before any great public effort to tone his style by reading a few pages from some master in composition—sometimes it was a passage from Robert Hall, sometimes of Edward Gibbon, sometimes of Edmund Burke, sometimes of glorious old Milton; but oftener yet he drank from that old well of eloquence, Demosthenes for the Crown. His spoken style was unquestionably, however, the general result of his life's study. His habits of close thinking exacted a choice of words. We think in language, however unconscious we may be of the process. It is the only embodiment of thought, without which we can not represent it to ourselves. Style, therefore, is not so much cut and fitted to the thought by an artificial and secondary labor, as it is woven by the thought in the course of its own developement. Hence the precision which uniformly characterized Dr. Thornwell's style. He was, above other men, a close thinker; a thinker who had daily to think his thoughts aloud in the hearing of his pupils. The utmost exactness in language was required by the studies of his department. The subtle spirit of philosophy could only be held, as it was caught and imprisoned in the precise word which fitted it; and so his whole career as a teacher was a training for himself as a master in style. The classical studies which he pursued so diligently when young, and which were never remitted even to the close of his life, were a continued exposition of language; so that, in a thousand cases, you shall not find a ripe scholar who is not equally a finished writer. In addition to all, his copious reading opened to him the whole vocabulary of his native tongue. "Reading," says Lord Bacon, "makes a full man; writing, an exact man; and speaking, a ready man." Dr. Thornwell was all three, habitually, and through a long life. He read abundantly, and in all directions, and acquired insensibly that copiousness of language which formed one of the attributes of his style. But it was the union of precision with fulness which distinguished his

utterances. In the most rapid flow of his speech, his style was beyond impeachment. It was always the right word for the thought, and the whole vocabulary of language could not have furnished a substitute; while, in the amplification of his thought, his mind, like a kaleidoscope, presented an infinite variety of terms, and the same combination never palled by repetition. To this precision and copiousness was added a certain richness of expression, a courtliness of style; which can only be explained by the majesty of his thought, which disdained to appear in the dress of the clown.

To understand Dr. Thornwell's power in the pulpit, these several elements must be combined—his powerful logic, his passionate emotion, his majestic style—of which it may be said, as of Lord Brougham's, that "he wielded the club of Hercules entwined with roses." This generation will never look upon his like again; a single century can not afford to produce his equal. We shall listen to much lucid exposition, much close and powerful reasoning, much tender and earnest appeal, much beautiful and varied imagery. But never again from the lips of one man shall our souls be stirred by vigor of argument fused by a seraph's glow, and pouring itself forth in strains which linger around the memory like the chant of angels. Since his death, we have heard the regret expressed that his unwritten sermons had not been preserved through the labors of a reporter. It is well the attempt was never made. Dr. Thornwell could not have been reported. The spell of his eloquence would have paralyzed the skill of the most accomplished stenographer. But if not, what invented symbols could convey that kindling eye, those trembling and varied tones, the expressive attitude, the foreshadowing and typical gesture, the whole quivering frame, which made up in him the complement of the finished orator? It were as vain to sketch the thunder's roar or the lightning's flash—to paint the fleecy cloud or the white crest of the ocean wave. No!

the orator must live through tradition: and to make that tradition these feeble words are uttered by me to-night.

We transfer Dr. Thornwell, and view him next in **THE CHURCH COURTS**, the ecclesiastical statesman. Were we not addressing those perfectly conversant with the fact, we should fear to present this man of the closet as the wisest of practical counsellors. Yet the combination, though rare, is not unexampled. Paul, the writer and logician among the apostles, was, above them all, the man of action. He had upon him the care of all the churches, and was not inferior to the practical James in executive direction. Calvin, the great writer and expositor of the Reformation, bore upon his shoulders the weight of the Genevan state. So solid was his judgment, that all portions of the Reformed Church turned to him for advice; and the burden of his correspondence alone would have overwhelmed any ordinary man. So with him whose memory we cherish this day. In every sphere in which he moved—whether as a professor in the college faculty, or as a trustee in its board of administration, or in the broader area of an ecclesiastical council—he was remarked for his practical good sense, and became a leader among equals. One secret of this is found in the fact that his principles of action were all settled. They were not left to be gathered up in the hurry of an emergency, amid the dust and strife of debate; but were antecedently determined, and no temptation could induce him to swerve from their maintenance. No man was ever less under the guidance of mere expediency than he, whether the question related to the private intercourse of man with man, or ranged upon a higher scale in matters of public policy. None saw more clearly that so shifting a rule as that of expediency could never prescribe an even or consistent course. He fixed, therefore, for himself, finally and for ever, the great principles of private and of public morality, and these were his guides through every labyrinth of doubt. In this is found the capital distinction between

a ripe statesman and the stock-jobbing politician: the one starts out with catholic and fundamental principles, which determine his entire course; the other floats upon the current of events, is borne off into every eddy, and reflects little else but the changefulness of popular opinion. There is, indeed, with the former, continual danger of mistake in the application of his canons to particular cases. But an honest and clear mind, guarding itself against prejudice and passion, will not often trip; but will preserve, for the most part, a manly and beautiful consistency through all the shiftings of a public career.

Another element of Dr. Thornwell's influence in council lay in the caution with which all his particular judgments were formed—waiting for a full rendering of facts, and suspending his opinion until the case had been considered on every side. Even in the intimacy of private life, this cautiousness marked his utterances. An innate sense of justice and rare integrity of heart seemed to check a premature expression. Thus he was seldom constrained to retract his judgments. He was preserved, on the one hand, from the weakness of vacillation, and on the other, from the criminal obstinacy of adhering to opinions which ought to yield under the pressure of convincing reasons. Public confidence was continually challenged by this prudence of reserve, which had its springs alike in the dictates of wisdom and of moral propriety. He found an advantage, too, in the rapidity of his mental operations sweeping him on to his conclusions, far in advance of others. His wonderful power of analysis resolved complexities in which others were entangled; and whilst they were searching for the clue by which to extricate themselves, he had already seized the ultimate principle which unravelled all difficulties and settled every doubt. Nor should we omit, in this enumeration of his practical qualities, a certain positiveness of mind, which lifted him above the danger of indecision, and, as if by a sort of internal necessity, compelled him to

frame a positive judgment upon every issue. It is the infirmity of some minds to be always trembling upon the balance, incapable of deciding whether to descend upon this side or upon that of every question. These are the unfortunate incapables who swell the list of non-liquets on the records of our Church courts; or who, in their desperation, leap blindly upon a vote, as a man would leap from a railway train, not knowing whether he will land upon a bed of sand or in a brake of thorns. On the contrary, every deliberative body reveals examples of men who, by their greater positiveness of mind and character, lead those far superior to them in ability and general attainments—men in whom strength of will and decision of character stand in the stead of intellectual power. In a body of counsellors, the ready always lead the unready. From the imbecility here rebuked, Dr. Thornwell was perfectly free. In every situation he could not but think—if difficulties embarrassed any question, he only thought with more intensity—but he always thought to a conclusion. If he was cautious not to speak till his convictions were matured, yet he always came to time, and so always led.

But the moral quality which secured him unbounded influence as a counsellor was, the transparent honesty of his heart. He was no intriguer, had no by-ends to accomplish, never worked by indirection. His heart was in his hand, and every man could read it. When he rose in debate, the motto seemed to be engraved upon his forehead: "I believed, therefore have I spoken;" and he was believed. None doubted the sincerity of his utterance, or suspected a trap to catch the feet of the unwary. Straightforward himself, he dealt honestly with his colleagues: and if he could not carry his point by fair argument, he was content to fail. Winning confidence thus by his manly and truthful bearing, the cogency of his reasoning met with little resistance either of resentment or prejudice, and seldom succumbed under defeat.

For all the duties of a churchman, Dr. Thornwell was perfectly equipped. He had sifted the controversies which, through eighteen centuries, have been waged touching the organization of the Church, and had deduced from the writings of the apostles the principles which are fundamental to her existence through all coming time. He had studied with care the constitution of his own church, from those great principles which underlie her whole polity, to the minutest rule of order for her internal management; and no man ever surpassed him as an expounder of her laws. He was also versed in those parliamentary rules by which deliberative assemblies are usually governed; and thus, upon every hand, was fitted to be a leader in our ecclesiastical councils. Over the entire church he wielded the influence, though not clothed with the jurisdiction, of an acknowledged primate. The church signalized her appreciation of his abilities, not only by conferring upon him the highest honor in her gift, that of once presiding over her highest court, but also by calling him to the most responsible and difficult duties in all her assemblies. Both before and since the rupture of our national and ecclesiastical bonds, the delicate task of revising her code of discipline was twice placed mainly in his hands. Great as her loss may be, when she mourns over the greatest of her theologians and preachers, it will be felt heaviest, in this day of general reconstruction, now that her wisest statesman is removed from her councils. Never was there an hour, according to human view, when she could have spared him less; now, in the infancy of her new national existence, when her public policy needs to be drafted, and the principles clearly announced upon which her great enterprises are to be conducted, he that had the ear and the heart of the whole country is taken away, and the bereaved church covers her head with a mantle, and sits a mourner beside his grave. May it not be that he who is supremely jealous of His own honor has, for a purpose, smitten our

trust in a human arm, and challenges a sublime faith in His own power and grace to lead us through all perils? If this be the lesson of His providence, may His Spirit seal it with sanctifying virtue upon the heart of the nation and of the Church!

Our survey will be complete when he have viewed Dr. Thornwell, in the last place, as A CHRISTIAN AND A MAN. Of an exceedingly spare habit, his medium stature diminished by a slight stoop; with a forehead well developed, but not ample; the features of his face small; with a carriage of the body rather marked by negligence than grace; his personal presence can not be described as commanding. Yet he would be singled out from a convention of men even by a careless observer. His hair rivalling the raven in its blackness, and, above all, his redeeming eye, deep set and black, and capable of the utmost intensity of expression, and a certain air of abstraction upon his countenance, denoted a man who was to be separated from others. The retirement of scholastic life, and the boundless resources he had within himself, withdrew him in a large measure from general intercourse with society. While his official relations sometimes forced him from seclusion, and his valuable counsels were invoked by many, he did not ordinarily put himself forth to seek communion with the bustling world around him. Though by no means an ascetic, and while his warm sympathies took hold of life upon every side, he was rather to be sought than to be himself a seeker. Whoever desired, might readily approach him; no man ever found himself repelled either by the coldness or the indifference of his manner. In general society, for which he had a confessed aversion, he was rather thoughtful and silent than communicative. But in the circle of his chosen friends, and in the bosom of his family, he poured forth the contents of his soul. It was then the entire nature of the man was revealed. Endowed with rare conversational powers, he emptied his stores of learning, and discussed his favorite themes of philosophy; or dived into the deeper

mysteries of religion, and uttered the experiences of his own heart; or else, descending from these graver topics, he sported with the glee of childhood itself in banter and jest, abounding with repartee, and diffusing the glow of his genial humor. Full of anecdote, and fond of badinage, his lighter conversation sparkled with wit; carried sometimes to excess, if one did not recognize it as the recreation of a mind that needed thus to unbend itself, and found its refreshment only in the easier play of its own powers. His affections were warm and enduring, often leading him to overestimate those in whom he confided. Lifted by his own greatness above the temptation of jealousy, he rejoiced, without the slightest infusion of envy, in the advancement of others. Generous in all his instincts, there was no sacrifice he would not make for his friends. Indulgent to his own household, he passed through its petty cares without permitting himself or them to be corroded by the anxieties of earth; but, smoothing over disappointments, he made life's path less rugged to their feet. Cherishing in his own heart the utmost loyalty to truth, he was never soured when thwarted in his projects; but waited with sublime confidence for truth and right to vindicate their own majesty. In this way, the dew of his youth was never exhaled; he remained elastic and fresh to the last, no generous sentiment or instinct of his nature being withered by age. With such attributes, he possessed the power of all truly great men, of magnetizing those brought under his influence; and it must have been a very strong or a very feeble nature that did not yield to his attraction. His friends are bound to him by cords of affection which even death will prove unequal to break.

"He was one
The truest manner'd; such a holy witch
That he enchants societies unto him:
Half all men's hearts were his."

As a Christian, it will suffice to say that the type of his theology was the type of his experience. He was not the

man to divorce the understanding from the heart. He concurred fully with all the Reformers in their definition of true faith, which, as Calvin says, is "not formed by the addition of pious affection as an accessory to assent, but the assent itself consists in pious affection." In his own language, "the form of Christian knowledge is love; it is a higher energy than bare speculation; it blends into indissoluble unity intelligence and emotion; knows by loving, and loves by knowing." Those, therefore, entirely misconceived him who supposed the form of his religious experience to be even predominantly intellectual; a religion of stern principle alone, separated from the affections of the heart. On the contrary, in his own beautiful exposition, "the mind sees not only the reality of truth, but its beauty and glory; it so sees as to make it feel; the perceptions are analogous to those of the right and beautiful, in which feeling exactly expresses the intellectual energy." His inner life practically illustrated this happy union of the mind and heart, and revealed the "faith which worketh by love." The same strong views which the theologian held upon the nature of sin, bowed the Christian in penitential grief before the Redeemer's cross; the same clear exposition given by the one of man's helplessness in a state of nature, cast the other upon the infinite power and riches of divine grace; the same clear discovery of the completeness and sufficiency of the atonement which made this the centre from which the preacher's discourses all radiate, led the believer to throw the arms of his affection around the Saviour with rapturous delight; the same conviction of the necessity for a divine revelation which led the Christian apologist to stand most stoutly in defence of its inspiration, bowed also his reason into the docility of faith before the teachings of Scripture; the same recognition of God's rightful supremacy which in the class-room placed the crown of dominion upon the King of kings, sustained the afflicted saint in the hour of bereavement, and filled his soul with solemn awe as he passed beneath the rod; the same intelligent reason

which owned the majesty and eternity of divine law, brought the will into the subjection of constant obedience to its commands; the same clear view of the resistless operations of the Holy Spirit, invoked His aid in the whole work of his own personal sanctification; and the same sense he entertained of the nature and functions of the Church of God, engaged him with his whole heart in her sublime efforts to evangelize the world. In short, a most beautiful harmony obtained between his secret exercises and his public utterances. There was no conflict between his preaching and his prayers. It was not one man in the class-room with his pupils, and another man in the closet with his God; but a delightful consistency ran through his character, both as a teacher and Christian.

We only state the great law of the Christian life, when we speak of growth—first the tender blade, and then the full corn in the ear. Dr. Thornwell ripened in holiness to the very hour of his translation. His humility became more profound, his faith more abiding, his love more glowing, his will chastened into deeper submission. He did not escape the discipline of sorrow by which the Lord refines His people. The cup of bereavement, with its bitterest ingredients, was once and again put to his lips. A delightful softness was diffused over his Christian character. The sharper and sterner features were worn down into more perfect symmetry and grace. He became more gentle in his censures, more catholic in his love. His views of the Divine holiness and of the Redeemer's glory, were always grand; they now became more sublime and adoring. He rose above the speculations of reason, and approached more nearly the ecstasy and rapture of a seraph. Upon his dying bed, the Holy Spirit placed His last seal upon his brow. Lying apparently unconscious for hours, most delightful smiles played over his countenance, like the flashings of a summer evening's cloud. His last broken words, upon which the departing soul was borne into the bosom of God, were ejaculations of wonder and of praise. "Wonderful!

beautiful! nothing but space! expanse, expanse, expanse!" and so he passed upward and stood before the Throne.

Christian fathers and brethren, it is idle to utter words of grief over the irreparable loss we have sustained.

"Our size of sorrow,
Proportioned to its cause, must be as great
As that which makes it."

There are no words in which it may be embalmed and brought forth into public view. Rather let us, in the depth of our own sadness, bow in thanksgiving before that Infinite Goodness which lent him to us so long. We may, too, lawfully enter into his joy. With our hearts' love twining around him, we follow him in his sublime ascension, and heaven is brought nearer than before. Think of his first half-hour in heaven! standing within the gates of pearl, and looking with open gaze upon the transporting glories of the scene! Behold him in personal communion with those worthies of the Church militant with whom on earth he once held refreshing converse through their precious writings; sitting beside Owen, and Howe, and Charnock, and Flavel, and Baxter, and Erskine; joining in immortal discourse with Luther, and Beza, and Melancthon, and Zwingle, and Calvin; holding fellowship, face to face, with Peter, and with John, and with the beloved Paul, whose sacred words had so often inspired his holiest eloquence on earth; and passing up through the shining hierarchy, until his fresh crown is cast before the Lamb, while the arches of the grand Temple ring with the acclaim of ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands, swelling anew the triumphant anthem of redeeming grace.

"How glorious now, with vision purified
At the Essential Truth, entirely free
From error, he, investigating still,
From world to world at pleasure roves, on wing
Of golden ray upborne; or, at the feet
Of heaven's most ancient sages sitting, hears
New wonders of the wondrous works of God."

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—NO. 3.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXIII.

ARTICLE I.

ON THE NATURE AND USES OF ART.

By the intelligent people, and even by many highly cultivated men, Fine Art is looked upon as essentially a mere pleasant illusion—as some thing entirely unreal and unsubstantial, or else as only a shadowy and imperfect imitation of nature. In its effects upon the mind, its uses in a scheme of human culture, it is looked upon as at best of doubtful import; as at best a pleasant recreation and relaxation from the sterner duties of conflict with nature; an amusement of an essentially low order; a purely sensuous enjoyment, which, though it may relax and rest our strength, can not in any sense be said to exercise and cultivate our higher faculties; but on the contrary, is almost certain to dissipate our strength, to paralyze our energies, to relax and effeminate our whole nature; or, still worse, to cultivate and strengthen the senses at the expense of the intellect, and thus degrade and brutify the nature. Plausibility is given to this view of art, by reference to the present condition of southern nations which have excelled in art, especially the Greeks and Italians. It would carry us too far

VOL. XV., NO. III.—40

to show the falseness of this view of the cause of the decline of Greek and Italian civilization. Every profound thinker knows that the cause lay much deeper than this; that art itself rose, culminated, and declined, along with civilization in every other department. Instead of growing and batten- ing, fungus-like, upon the decaying tree of civilization, it was itself the flower and fruit of that tree in its highest perfection.

The view of art spoken of above, at least as a popular view, is essentially modern. Such a view would have been utterly unintelligible to an ancient Greek. It originated, in its extreme form, with the Puritans of the seventeenth century, and was in thorough keeping with the whole Puritan philosophy; a philosophy which despised nature, external and internal, and which, therefore, despised both science and art; a philosophy which looked upon human culture and improvement as the total extirpation of nature within; the total eradication of natural appetites, impulses, and emotions of the heart, as either weak or essentially wicked and devilish. In a word, the Puritan spirit was *asceticism*, and the Puritan view of art was the view which ascetics, in all ages and countries, Christian and heathen, have taken. Now, the Puritan spirit was evidently a healthy, natural, and necessary reaction against the abuses of the times; an indignant uprising of the spirit of man and the assertion of its dignity against the miserable sensuousness and frivolities of the age. The Puritan view of art, too, was therefore a healthy reaction against the gross abuses of art. But, like all reactions, it has gone much beyond the line of truth and the limits of reason. It is really astonishing to observe the impress which the Puritans have left upon all subsequent ages, even to the present time; an impress far greater than most of us are willing to admit. The dress, the manners, the philosophy, social, religious, and political, most prevalent at the present day, are essentially Puritan. So, also, the Puritan view of art is still prevalent, in a mod-

ified form, among the people, and even among the most intelligent men, at least in this country. We are even now only recovering from the immense impulse given to society in one direction by the Puritan movement. We have just now begun to reflect how much of this direction is onward, and how much is to one side. We are only just now beginning to do real justice to the Puritan character and the Puritan movement. We are only now exchanging blind admiration, or equally blind hatred and prejudice, for rational and just estimate. Every just estimate, while admitting that no movement since the Reformation has conferred such lasting benefit upon society—has so signally advanced the cause of humanity—must, also, admit that much narrowness of view, prejudice, and serious error, was mingled with the benefit; that the line of impulse diverged sadly from the right line of truth and reason. The dawn of a more comprehensive and rational philosophy in the present age has rendered this divergence evident, and the evil effects patent to all but blind admirers.

Now, as Puritan morality was a necessary reaction against the corruptions of the age, so the Puritan view of art was also a necessary reaction against an extreme opposite view universally entertained by the gay, frivolous, and thoughtless cavaliers of the period. This was that art is essentially, and under all circumstances, cultivating and refining, and therefore to be used freely and without discrimination; that all that is said against art is mere puritanic cant, the contempt of which should rather lead to the other extreme. Thus, society on this subject was divided into two classes, occupying extreme positions, and all the more extreme by virtue of their mutual hatred. In the one were the indiscriminate despisers of art, as tending to weakness and effeminacy, and thus eventually to sensuality and vice; in the other, the equally indiscriminate, and, therefore, irrational worshippers of art. Both views were, in part, genuine and

earnest; and both, in part, through antagonism, degenerated into cant and affectation. Both views still exist at the present day. The first class consists mostly of religious, thoughtful, earnest men; the second, mostly of the gay, the thoughtless, frivolous, and irreligious. Between these extremes there has been steadily growing a third class, in intelligent communities the largest of all, which may be considered as entertaining the prevailing view of art at the present time, viz.: that it is mere pleasant, and, in moderation, innocent amusement; mere sensuous enjoyment; mere pleasant illusion; which does well enough to while away an idle moment, and stand in place of grosser and more dangerous pleasures, but entirely useless as a means of cultivating our higher faculties, or fitting us in any way for the practical duties of life; that it is essentially an illusory and fictitious world, entirely disconnected with, or at least but a shadowy imitation of the world of reality; a world of *fiction*, *falsehood*, and pleasant deceit, in contrast with the world of *truth* and *fact*. Now, our object in the present article is, if possible, to show in how far these views are right and in how far they are wrong; in short, to define the *true nature of art*, and to point out its *true uses*, and its *abuses*.

We remember once having heard it objected to Dr. McGuffey, the distinguished professor of moral philosophy in the University of Virginia, (a man whose suggestiveness of mind will be conceded by all who have ever listened to his conversation or his lectures,) that he was much too fond of fanciful paradoxes. As an instance, it was stated that in a popular lecture he had actually startled his audience out of their propriety, by asserting that *a steam engine was not a fact, but a fiction*. We know not the solution of the apparent paradox given by the Doctor himself, but we are much indebted to it for the suggestion of many trains of productive thought.

What is *fact*? and what is *fiction*? The answer to this question involves one of two conclusions: either that all art and all products of art are *fiction*, or else that no genuine art is *fiction*. Perhaps the only philosophic distinction between fact and fiction is, that a *fact* is a work of nature, existing irrespective of man, and perhaps even opposed to him; a *fiction*, from *fin*go, is a thing having no existence in nature, but purely the creation of man, the *contrivance* of his brain, and the work of his *fingers*. In this sense, all works of art, mechanical as well as fine art, are fictions, and the more so, as they have no analogies in nature. Now, can any thing be more a pure creation of man's brain, can any thing be more diverse from a natural product, than a steam engine? In this sense, all the so-called great facts of the age, such as the steam engine, the electric telegraph, etc., are fictions. But there is another and more popular sense in which the word fiction is used. With the change of opinion which has taken place in modern times with regard to the nature and use of fine art, there has been, also, apparently, a gradual change in the definition of the word *fiction*. It has gradually changed from the natural signification indicated by its derivation. It has come to mean a cheat, a delusion, a deception, a mere clever trick, a juggle. And the pleasure we take in fiction is accounted for on the principle contained in the well-known lines of Hudibras:

"Doubtless, the pleasure is as great,
Of being cheated as to cheat."

Now, in this sense, it is true, the products of mechanical art are at once excluded from the domain of fiction, and fall into the domain of fact. Surely, there is nothing delusive, deceptive, or imitative in these. These are *real* products of man's mind. They imitate nothing, and therefore can not deceive or cheat. But are there not departments of fine art, too, which are pure products of the human mind, and unlike any thing in nature—which are essentially

non-imitative, and, therefore, non-deceptive and *real*? Are not Music, Poetry and Architecture, pure products of the human mind? Is there any thing in nature at all similar to these. "Music! Poetry! Ah, but these," answers the objector, "belong to the unreal and delusive world of the imagination." Think you, then, that no imagination, no genius, was required in the original creation of the steam engine? "But music and poetry are intangible, immaterial, unpractical; the steam engine is solid, practical, useful matter." Alas! yes, here is the true difference. It all amounts, then, to this: *whatever belongs to this world, whatever is solid matter, whatever subserves the purposes of our purely material nature, is real, and belongs to the domain of fact; and whatever belongs to the spiritual world, the world of feeling and sentiment, and subserves the purposes of our spiritual nature, is unreal and fictitious.* Then, indeed, art has no reason to complain of the word fiction. For then love and honor, faith and religion, in short, all that is worth living for, are fictions. "But," again answers the objector, "the products of mechanical art are practical and useful, they produce visible results in the amazing impulse given by them to human civilization, while no such results are visible as the effect of music or poetry." We will not attempt to answer this objection now, but hope to show in the sequel that the culture of the human mind, and the progress of civilization, is at least as closely connected with fine art as with so-called useful art.

But there are other departments of fine art which are called *imitative*. Are not these essentially deceptive in their nature? Let us examine this subject a little more closely.

Art, in its widest sense, as the sensible product of the human mind, is divided into two great divisions, the so-called *useful arts*, and *fine art*. Useful art is the human embodiment of the laws of the *forces* of nature; fine art, the human embodiment of the laws of *form* and of *harmonic relations* in nature. The former is the product principally of the human *understanding*, since the laws of force

are mainly apprehended by the understanding; the latter is mainly the product of *imagination* and *feeling*, since it is through these faculties that the laws of form and of harmonic relations are apprehended. Hence, the one may be called the embodiment of *the laws of the human understanding*, or mechanics; the other, of *the laws of human feeling*, or æsthetics. Fine art is again divided into the *non-imitative*, which are purely original embodiments of laws of æsthetics, without any analogies in nature; and the so-called *imitative*, which are equally embodiments of æsthetic laws, but less purely original, since a product of nature forms the basis and suggests the idea upon which the work of art is made. In the one case, the mind acts under its own inspiration; in the other, under the inspiration of external nature. To the first class belong Music, Poetry, Architecture; to the second belong Sculpture, Painting, and also the Drama and the Novel. Now, these latter are usually looked upon as purely imitative, and nothing more. Mechanic arts are acknowledged to be purely human and original; the non-imitative fine arts must also be acknowledged to be purely original and human. But the imitative branches of fine art are apt to be looked upon as purely imitative, as a simple copy of nature; and the work is supposed perfect in proportion as the copy is accurate. Now, the very fact that these are branches of fine art—the very fact that these exercise the same faculties of the mind, both in the appreciation and the execution, as the other departments acknowledged to be non-imitative, is sufficient to prove to the reflective mind that they are not the product of the imitative faculty. Pure imitative art is mechanic art, and that, too, of the lowest kind. It requires neither sense of beauty nor imagination, but only accurate measurement. It exercises neither imagination nor feeling, but only the understanding. The copyist of nature bears the same relation to the true artist, which the ordinary manu-

facturer of the steam engine does to its great inventor and creator, James Watt.

The common view of art, as we have already said, is that it is essentially deceptive and cheating. The highest object of art is supposed to be, to render this delusion of the senses—this cheating of the soul through the senses or through the emotions, as perfect as possible. This cheating may be accomplished in two ways, either by exact *imitation* merely, as in *landscape* and *portrait* painting; or else by exciting the senses, the appetites and emotions, to such a degree as to overpower the intellect and the higher sentiments, as in music, poetry, the drama, the novel, the dance, etc.; in a single word, by *intoxicating*; for all excitement of the lower appetites and emotions beyond the control of the higher faculties and the will, is truly intoxication. Thus, then, the power to *deceive* by exact imitation, or else to *intoxicate* by undue excitement of sense and emotion, is considered the highest function of art. Thus, a perfect landscape is supposed to be one which completely deceives us into a belief of reality; one in which, taking the frame for a window, we seem to look out upon an actual view of nature, as in the “cosmorama views” once so celebrated in this country. A perfect drama or novel is supposed to be one in which the audience is completely spell-bound, deceived into complete belief of reality, and intoxicated by emotion. This idea is embodied in the well-known story of trial of skill between Zeuxis and Parrhasius, in which the painted grapes of the former were pecked at by birds, while the painted curtain of the latter deceived even the experienced Zeuxis himself; again, in the story of the Helen of Zeuxis, which was imitated from the several beauties of many women. Now, we do not hesitate to assert that the common idea of the function of art, so finely embodied in these stories of Zeuxis, is radically erroneous, and not only erroneous, but extremely degrading to art and hurtful to society. The contest between Zeuxis and Parrhasius was, indeed, a

trial of skill, but not of genius. Whatever was the theory of art among the Greeks, it is certain that the instincts of Greek genius were far different from this. No artists have been so little imitative as the Greeks. No artists have cared so little for, or relied so little upon, sensuous deception for success—have been so purely ideal—as the Greeks. This is particularly true of their drama, which was exhibited without scenic effect, in the open air and open daylight, and apparently even avoiding deception, as unbecoming the true artist, by means of the cothurnus and the mask. If, then, art is not a pleasant delusion, what is its true nature? We will attempt to show.

Nature is *infinite* in every way; in extent, in greatness, and in minuteness, in multiplicity of detail, and in unity of thought. Art, on the contrary, is *finite* in every way. Nature is divine; art is human. Again: nature is not only infinite, but *perfect*. Man is not only finite, but *fallen*. and depraved.

But observe, next, in what this depravity consists. The simple primary faculties of our nature can not properly be classed as *good* and *bad*, (since all were possessed by Adam and even by Christ himself,) but rather as *high* and *low*. There is a gradation in the faculties of the mind; and their proper position as to authority and subordination is determined by their rank. The human soul may be compared to an organized society. In the perfect, unfallen man, all the faculties and powers take their natural position, and Reason, counselled by Faith, holds the reins. In the fallen man, on the contrary, the subjects have revolted, and the governor is overthrown and manacled. Reason, not heeding the counsels of Faith, has been overborne by the rebellious impulses, passions, and appetites, which now hold the reins of government, and all is discord, anarchy, and confusion. Thus, in our present fallen condition, it happens that the faculties of the soul are naturally *strong in proportion to their lowness*, and are *weak in proportion to their dignity*.

The whole object, then, of every thing noble in this world, of religion, of science, of art, of culture and training of all sorts, of all our strivings and ceaseless internal conflicts, is, or should be, to restore again the pristine harmony of the soul. How can this be accomplished, except by subduing the lower, or by strengthening the higher faculties, or by both? This, then, must be the object of a *true art*. How is this to be done?

Nature, as we have already said, is infinite. It addresses every faculty of the human soul. To the unfallen man it is a complete revelation of Deity. It combines the highest and noblest, through infinite gradations, with the lowest and most commonplace. It addresses the senses, the emotions, the sentiments, the reason. But, on account of the fallen, depraved condition of man, the low and commonplace in nature are seen by all men, and even by animals, since they are apprehended by the senses; while the high and noble—the appeals to the higher sentiments, to the imagination and to the reason—are felt only by the noble and imaginative, and by these only in favored moments. Thus, the higher faculties are overborne by the strength and multiplicity of the sensuous impressions. Thus, in viewing a landscape, the multiplicity of detail interferes with perception of harmonious relation—the sensuous impression overbears the imaginative and æsthetic faculty. Thus, too, in science, the infinite detail of *facts* interferes with the perception of *law*. But we will have illustrations enough of this before we are done.

But again: nature not only thus strongly impresses our senses and overpowers the mind through the infinite multiplicity of its detail, but also awakens our appetites, passions, and emotions, and thus in a still more lamentable way overpowers the mind and degrades the soul. In the first sense, nature is too great for us—we are stupefied; in the second, nature is too strong for us—we are overthrown and enslaved. What can we do? We can only bow down

before nature, external and internal, in stupid, abject worship. Thus arises the lowest form of religion, viz.: fetichism. Now, we are all to some extent the enslaved worshippers of nature. It is the function of art, as well as of religion and science, to release us from this bondage. We should say to art: "Come between us and this nature, and interpret for us, for she is too strong and too great for us. Be thou the priestess to this divinity." In art we view nature through the mind of the artist, and thus see more that is great and noble in nature than we otherwise could. Nature is infinite. In her totality, therefore, she is beyond all human comprehension. Men differ in the amount and kind of what they see. The great artist sees all that is seen by common men, and much beside. Now, it is this *much beside* which must be revealed by the artist. The common man does not, or rather ought not to, care to see a mere imperfect imitation, a duplicate, of what he already sees much better in nature. He ought rather to have revealed to him, whether he wishes it or no, what he does not see in nature. Here, then, is the true difference between high and low art. The true artist, from the sum of all that he sees in nature, purposely selects some parts and rejects others, and makes this selection in such manner as to *subdue somewhat the sensuous impression, and strengthen the impression upon the higher faculties*; by means of his selection he diminishes the multiplicity of incomprehensible detail, or subdues somewhat the sensuous and emotional impression, thus freeing the mind from the bondage of sense and passion, and then takes advantage of this freedom to suggest noble thoughts. On the contrary, the low artist either sees not, or wilfully rejects, what is noblest and highest for a mere clever deceptive imitation of the *sensuous impression*. Thus, he is either in soul no artist at all, or else he prostitutes his art by pandering to a low taste in the multitude; he sells his divine birth-right for a mess of pottage.

Thus, nature is certainly greater than art; but, through our fallen condition, art—a true art—becomes a better teacher of man than nature. Nature was intended for the unfallen man, to cultivate every faculty of his soul. It was intended that the divine truth should stream in from nature through every window of the human soul, brightening ever the image of God already impressed there. But alas! through man's fall, nature no longer elevates, but often degrades the human soul; the windows open only into the outer court, the inner sanctuary remains dark. Through man's fall the higher faculties are in humiliating bondage to the lower. The true mission of art, like religion, is, by subduing somewhat the sensuous and emotional, and strengthening the higher faculties—the imagination, the sense of beauty, etc.—to set these latter free; to pluck the soul from the miry clay, that it may take its upward flight. The state of mind, then, which it is the object of high art to produce, is one in which the senses, passions, or emotions are powerfully impressed, but the intellect equally or still more so; and these two thus standing in violent conflict, but the latter predominant, are, as it were, fused into one by the fervid glow of the imagination, and brought into perfect harmony by the sense of beauty; and the man stands all glowing, but not melted; all afire, but no wise consuming; but rather elevated, purified, strengthened. This we will call the æsthetic condition of mind. It is a sort of serenity of mind; not mere passive serenity, but the serenity of strong, vigorous, but harmonious activity. In fact, the stronger the emotion and passion—the more fiery the glow—the nobler the condition, if only harmony and self-mastery still prevail.

We can render these principles plainer by no longer dwelling upon abstract generalities, but by illustrations drawn from every department of art, or even from departments more or less remotely connected with art. Our first

illustrations may seem trivial, but we hope as we multiply them the principle will become clearer.

1. The pleasures of anticipation, particularly in persons of vivid imagination, are often greater and purer than those of fruition; because the absence of the *real* gives place to the *ideal*; the absence of the sensuous impression gives free play to the imagination. In the actual fruition we ought to have all the anticipated pleasure we had before, and the pleasure of sense besides; or rather, both of these should become only more intense by nearer approach; but alas! the sensuous impression too often interferes with and overpowers the higher pleasures, and we are disappointed.

2. Absence from loved ones, in persons of very strong imagination, or in whom imagination and a love of the ideal predominates over true heart affection, produces similar effects. Love takes the æsthetic form, under the transforming power of the imagination. Presence—sensuous impression—too often breaks the charm.

3. " 'Tis distance lends enchantment to the view," and for the same reason. Near at hand the strength of the sensuous impression interferes with the higher faculties; the multiplicity of detail overpowers the perception of relation; the strong sensuous impression of the parts overpowers the general æsthetic perception of the whole. Distance, by softening the sensuous impression, by decreasing the multiplicity and the distinctness of the parts, sets the intellect free. A great battle, or a great waterfall, at a distance is a noble subject of contemplation, and produces that exalted serenity of mind in which excitement is united with calmness, which we have called the æsthetic condition. But amid the roar of cannon, or the din of the waterfall, passion, emotion, and violent sensuous impression, swallows up and drowns every other faculty of the mind.

4. Time, like space, by softening the sensuous or emotional impression or both, brings the mind into the æsthetic condition. A strong, noble man, full of keen sensibilities and

powerful emotion, has been struck down by the hand of Providence; a great affliction has fallen upon him—the loss of a beloved wife or an only child. In the first agony of emotion, he simply falls prostrate and grovelling in the dust; the strong man is unmanned, every faculty of the mind subdued, overwhelmed, and crushed by grief; he expresses his anguish only in incoherent exclamations and ejaculations. Such an one is an object of pity, but surely not an object of admiration. But time passes on—a week, a month, a year of terrible, victorious conflict. Now behold him again; his form is again erect, his face again calm, but its expression elevated, purified, ennobled. He is still under strong feeling, but reason and faith predominate. He is still assaulted by strong emotion, but master of himself. Now he is no longer an object to be pitied, but to be admired and revered. Now, if he be a man of fervid imagination and strong sense of beauty, his emotions are no longer expressed in exclamations and unmeaning ejaculations, but take the form of art, and break forth in poetry or in song. No true art is possible until the condition of mind described is attained; and it is the object of all true art to bring about this very condition—calm, but glowing; moved, but strong—this pure, elevated, ecstatic condition of noble emotion in the minds of others. Art produced in any other condition of the mind, or before this condition is entirely attained, is always morbid, false, intoxicating, and therefore debasing.

5. Mrs. Jameson illustrates the “Characteristics of Women,” not by examples taken from history, nor yet from women of her own acquaintance, nor indeed at all from the world of fact, but from the world of fiction—from the women of Shakspeare. She very properly justifies this choice on the ground that we know and understand the characters of Shakspeare much better than we do historical characters, or even our best friends; in fact, often much better than we do ourselves. This is an admirable illustration of the manner in which art reveals nature

to us. In our loved friends, and still more in ourselves, the multiplicity of daily, hourly impressions, capable of different construction; the infinite mixing and mingling of many motives and feelings in every action of life; the deceptions of self-love or of affection, or of every other passion and emotion of our nature, is so great that a thoroughly just estimate of the character is impossible; the complexity of the problem is so infinite, that without assistance we must despair of its solution. Now, the object of the artist is to reduce this complex problem to its simplest terms; to remove one complication after another, until the fundamental idea of the character is left bare and simple. For this purpose, first the sensuous impression is removed; we hear and see the characters only through the imagination; next, all personal interest, with all the involved selfish feelings which so distort our vision and deceive our minds, are also removed; then, among the infinite actions and speeches which appertain by nature to every individual, only such are selected as really throw light upon the character; all other actions and speeches as are of no significance, or are of significance contrary to the real character, or of which the significance would, at least, be not apparent to human eyes, are excluded as merely overloading the picture and distracting the mind. A character thus drawn is understood with comparative ease, and in its turn becomes the key to the more difficult study of human nature as exemplified in the actual world, or in our own hearts. If we bring our eyes very near the human face, we see with the utmost distinctness not only every feature, but even every pimple and pore and texture of the skin; but we catch not the general expression, we see not the soul which shines through the face. We may approach a building until every brick, and even every grain of sand composing each brick, may be distinctly visible, but the noble thought expressed in the building is not thus seen. So, also, we may bring our eyes so near the

human heart, we may examine our own so closely with the microscope of introspection, that we shall know every wrinkle, and pore, and pimple, and blemish, and yet see not the divine image which still remains, though blurred. In all these instances, the strength and the multiplicity of the sensuous impression overpowers the general intellectual impression. Art, by removing us to a distance, until insignificant details are no longer visible; by removing the senseless rubbish which has accumulated through carelessness and want of definite purpose; exhibits the character in its grand outlines. Thus, by removing the sensuous and subduing the emotional, the higher faculties of the mind and soul are set free.

It is curious to observe the difference between Milton's Eve and Shakspeare's female characters, in this respect; a difference which characterizes dramatic and epic poetry. Milton is elaborately descriptive of the personal appearance and loveliness of Eve; Shakspeare never describes the persons of his females. It seems to us that the very want of any distinct conception of the *persons* in the latter case, makes possible a clearer and distincter conception of the *characters*.

6. Sculpture. We know no finer illustration of the true nature and use of art than can be drawn from representations of the human form. The nude human form, in its best examples, is of course more perfect, more beautiful, and, therefore, in itself more fitted to touch and cultivate the highest faculties of the mind, than any representation in marble; and yet who can doubt that the latter is actually more cultivating? And why? Because, in the contemplation of the natural nude figure, the mind of the spectator is not free, but enslaved by the strength of the sensuous impression. All that is beautiful in the higher sense, all that is graceful in form and noble in expression, is lost sight of, is, in fact, overpowered and drowned in the lower feelings. But subdue this sensuous impression; let the life, the

warmth, the softness and flesh-tint of nature be replaced by the purity, the coldness, the hardness, and the whiteness of marble; the mind is set free, and may now receive impressions of the noblest kind; now the mind is open to receive a true æsthetic impression. The sensuous is not, indeed, eradicated, but subdued to its proper rank of subordination to the higher faculties; in which position, so far from interfering with, it is a necessary element in the highest æsthetic impression. But now paint this statue again to the life; in other words, *imitate nature* as perfectly as possible; do we not feel at once that it is ruined as a work of high art? Can any thing show more plainly that art is not a mere imitation of nature, perfect in proportion to the accuracy of the imitation; but that it essentially differs from nature, and that this difference is not a mere inferiority, the result of the imperfection of the artist, but is voluntary and with a purpose, which purpose is immediately connected with our fallen nature? Can any thing show more plainly that, though abstractly—from the divine standpoint—art is infinitely inferior to nature, yet, to fallen man it is far superior?

7. It is generally supposed that the Drama is but a deceptive imitation of nature, which is perfect in proportion to the completeness of the deception. It is generally supposed, even by intelligent and cultivated men, that a really great tragedy is one in which, when well acted, the whole audience is overwhelmed and unmanned, not only dissolved in tears, but completely crushed; in which the deception is so complete, and the emotion so great, that perhaps twenty men leap from the pit upon the stage to stop the murder and rescue the victim; in which the excitement is so overpowering, that a farce is absolutely necessary to restore the mind to its healthy tone, otherwise the audience return home low-spirited and melancholy, retire to bed only to have the night-mare, and rise in the morning exhausted, the nervous system unstrung, and the mind relaxed and unfit

for business. Alas! is such, then, the highest triumph of art? If such intoxication be the end of art, then surely all the objections ever brought against it by the most ultra Puritan only fall short of the truth. If such excitement be the end of art, then much better go to see actual murders and hangings, for here the excitement is still more intense; then Roman gladiator shows are to be preferred to the representations of Greek drama. This, in fact, is precisely the view of the rude and brutal Roman, but how different from that of the cultivated and refined Greek. But no! this is not the triumph, but the degradation, of art. It is the triumph of low imitative art, but high art delights not in such effects.

Let us examine this subject a little more closely. Suppose we are actually present when Othello murders Desdemona, and every thing occurs exactly as represented by Shakspeare; the same noble language, the same glowing imagery, the same profound moral reflections: Is it probable that we would heed this noble language, that our imagination would be kindled by the glowing imagery, that the moral reflections would take root in our breasts? On the contrary, the storm of passionate emotion would sweep like a tornado over our souls, ravaging all its beauty, and scattering to the winds all its fairest flowers. The æsthetic impression of the whole would be utterly lost in the violence of the sensuous and emotional impression. But wait now a week or a month, until time shall have subdued somewhat the emotion; and then, if memory still retains it, the whole scene will take the form of art; then the mind is set free, and is open to receive whatever noble lesson may be drawn from the scene; in other words, the mind is now in what we have called the æsthetic condition: that is, under strong emotion, but the intellect still predominant, and the imagination and the sense of beauty fusing the whole into a perfect unit, in which the separate impressions are undistinguishable—a state of exalted but glowing serenity.

Now, exactly this state, which has been brought about by time acting through memory on a highly endowed mind; exactly this state it is the end of art to produce; and it does so in a somewhat similar manner. The artist subdues the sensuous and emotional by removing reality; he still further removes the scene into the ideal world, by the employment of *verse*, which would otherwise have no significance. He then selects only such actions and speeches as to the susceptible and yet reflective mind, would suggest noble thoughts and high emotions; he then, by the imagination and the sense of harmony, moulds these, in his hands plastic materials, into a true unit—a work of art which shall also kindle the imagination, and touch the æsthetic sense in the susceptible listener.

What, then, is the true ideal of acting? Evidently the perfect carrying out of the conception and the purpose of the ideal artist. The purpose of art is to teach, to purify, to ennoble, to elevate, and strengthen. Let no man dare to undertake to act, who can not carry out this purpose. The true actor must be a noble man in soul; his form and tread must be expressive of real dignity, and not the miserable and ridiculous stage strut, which conventionally stands for dignity; his passion must be noble, and therefore nobly, and, to a certain extent, calmly expressed; his imagination must be vivid, and his sense of beauty fine, and all this must be expressed visibly, though naturally. In a word, he must be a true lover of high art, and strive to carry out its purpose. Judged by this standard, how much of the drama, and how much of acting, is true art? The actor studies only to make a *strong* impression, careless as to the nature of that impression. But, as it is our lower feelings which are strongest, and most easily excited, he generally addresses himself to these; and by noise and rant, by violent excitement and over-acting of every kind, all that is finest in thought, or most delicate in beauty, is entirely drowned and lost. Whatever dramatic exhibitions may have been

at one time, there can be no doubt that they have degenerated, both as to the character of the plays and the manner of acting, to such an extent—they pander to such a degree to a low taste for mere excitement—that they are now seldom or never improving in any way. We believe we speak the feelings of the most cultivated and genuine lovers of high art, when we say that dramatic representations are sadly disappointing; that a really great work of art, like one of Shakspeare's masterpieces, is dreadfully marred in the acting; that the stage is no longer the representative of the most refined taste in art; but, on the contrary, that a conventional taste has been perpetuated from time immemorial upon the stage, which is thoroughly disgusting to the man of true culture. It is for this reason that, while the reading and the appreciation of Shakspeare's plays have constantly increased, the representation of them on the stage has constantly diminished. This change we do not believe to be temporary, but will be permanent; since it has its ground not in religious prejudice, as imagined by many, but in a sound philosophy of art. There can be no doubt that the impression produced upon the mind by the appreciative *reading* of one of Shakspeare's dramas is higher, purer, more truly æsthetic, than can be produced by *acting*. The impression produced by acting is stronger, but at the same time lower. The pleasure in the former case is weaker, but higher; in the latter, more intense, but coarser. There can be no doubt that, even in the best acting, and still more in all but the best, the sensuous and emotional interferes too much with the higher faculties for the freest activity of the latter; that the finest flights of fancy, the subtlest touches of character, the most delicate aroma of Poetry, must be sacrificed. It is the keener appreciation of these in modern times which, among many other reasons, has caused the decline of the stage.

These principles, if correct, form a standard by which to judge the relative merits of the drama of various periods

and nations. If, for instance, we compare the tragedies of Shakspeare with the later tragedy, we will at once see the vast superiority of the former. Let it be remembered, that nature and art address both our lower and our higher nature—both our sensuous and emotional nature, on the one side, and our æsthetic nature on the other—but with this difference, that nature impresses our lower faculties—our senses and emotions—too powerfully, and thus overbears, and in all but the highest minds, destroys the higher impression; while it is the object of art to readjust the relative position of these two. Thus, we might briefly say that there are in all art, as well as in nature, two elements: the sensuous, or emotional, and the æsthetic. The first is some times called expression, life, power, passion, naturalness; the second, beauty, grace, unity, ideality. Now, in a high art the latter is always predominant; in a low art, the former is always predominant. Still, in a true art, particularly the drama, the emotional element must not be wanting. On the contrary, the stronger the emotion, the higher the work, provided always the mental balance is not overthrown. The more power, passion, energy, expression, pathos, can be put into a work, the better, and the nobler the work, provided the æsthetic impression still predominate; provided the intellectual harmony is still preserved. In the highest work of art, both of these elements must be strong, the stronger the better; but their relative strength must be maintained. If the æsthetic element is too weak, the mental harmony is overthrown, the work is morbid; if the emotional element is too weak, the work is cold and lifeless. But, since nature impresses most strongly and easily our lower faculties, it is evident that a deceptive imitation of nature, can only be achieved in art by addressing these lower faculties. Thus, a deceptive imitation of nature is always an index of low art. It is not that such art contains *more truth* of nature than high ideal art, but only that it contains more *obvious truth*. It is not that such art is

really more like nature, but only more like nature as seen by common eyes, and apprehended by common minds.

Now, the whole effort of the later tragedy has been to satisfy the false view of art so common in modern times. There is no doubt of the fact that the empowering emotional effect of such plays as the "Stranger," or "the Gambler's Wife," is far greater than that of any of Shakspeare's dramas, for the simple reason that the dramas first spoken of address only the emotional nature, while in Shakspeare's dramas, strong as the emotional impression is, the impression on our higher nature is still stronger. Thus, while the former intoxicates, unnerves, unmans; the latter purifies, invigorates, and strengthens our manhood. But, on account of the prevalence of depraved taste in art—on account of the *love of intoxication*—Shakspeare's plays can hardly maintain their footing on the stage.

In comparing the Greek drama with the modern, (of which we take Shakspeare as the type,) the former would seem more perfect and complete, and more purely ideal, than the latter. The Greek seems more perfect, because more simple; the modern more imperfect, because more complex, varied, and difficult. As we have expressed it elsewhere,* the Greek belongs to a simpler, lower type of art, but more completely developed; the modern, to a higher and more complex type, but more imperfectly developed. The difference between sculpture and painting represents well, though not perfectly, the characteristic difference between ancient and modern art generally, and especially the difference between ancient and modern drama. In sculpture we have only the antagonism between the simplest sensuous impression, and the purest æsthetic impression of ideal beauty of form. In painting we have not only form, but color; not only beauty of form, but harmony of color; not only sense, but also emotion. The variety of impression is far more difficult to

* Southern Pres. Rev., Vol. XII., p. 111.

adjust into harmonious unity. The Greek drama, in fact all Greek art, in comparison with modern, is like sculpture. It stands out in more complete unity, in more definite outline and relief. Its composition, or rather organization, is more simple. We have only the antagonism between the simplest and commonest emotions, and the purest and highest æsthetic ideal. In Shakspeare, on the contrary, this wide chasm is filled up by an infinite variety of impressions, addressing every faculty of the mind. We have the greatest variety of characters, individualized with the utmost subtlety; the greatest variety of emotions, thoughts, feelings, distinguished with the utmost delicacy; the greatest variety of incidents, occurring in various places and at different times; (for Shakspeare acknowledges no unity but the unity of action;) the profoundest philosophical reflection, the sublimest analysis of character and thought, the most daring flights of strong imagination, and the gentlest play of delicate fancy; all these and much more combined in a single play. Is it to be wondered at, that the harmonious coördination of so much diversity should be imperfect; that the perfect oneness of impression characteristic of a work of art, is incomplete? And yet we believe this incompleteness is rather apparent than real. In proportion as we rise to the more and more complete comprehension of Shakspeare's dramas, in the same proportion does the unity, the true æsthetic impression, of the whole become more complete also. We must rise to the stand-point of the artist, before the complete unity of his work is seen. We must rise to the stand-point of Deity, before the perfect unity of nature, as a work of art, is comprehended. We must rise to the stand-point of Shakspeare, before the perfect unity of his dramas is seen. Below that point, we are attracted by minor beauties of scenes and passages and delineations of character, as is the case with most of the criticisms of Shakspeare, rather than the general æsthetic effect. In fact, we ought to appreciate the

general effect of the whole, without thereby losing sight of the effect of the parts.

Thus, then, the stand-point of the highest modern art is higher than the ancient. The task which is proposed—the mission of modern art—is more difficult to fulfil. For that very reason, most artists in modern times, through weakness, or indolence, or cowardice, prove recreant to their mission; for that very reason, false art is more common in modern times; for that very reason, also, modern art is more corrupting than ancient, particularly to the young, and therefore a *solid basis of pure, healthy taste in art must always be laid in the study of the antique*. We see, also, at once, the *importance of the study of Scripture in forming a healthy taste*.

In a similar manner, we might point out the characteristics of the German and French drama; but the principle once clearly understood, there will, we think, be no difficulty in applying it to individual cases.

We have spoken, thus far, only of the *tragic* drama. *Comedy* may be reduced to the same principles, though, perhaps, with more difficulty. For the purposes which we have in view, all comedy may be divided into three distinct classes or schools, viz.: the Greek, the Elizabethan, and the French; or, as they have been otherwise called, the ancient, the romantic, and the modern. The first is represented by Aristophanes, the second by Shakspeare, and the third by the French and English comedy since the time of Charles the Second. Comparing broadly these with one another, the first is the embodiment of *fun*; the second, of *humor*; the third, of *wit and satire*: the first is the “inextinguishable laughter of the gods;” the second, the *kindly smile* of sympathy with human weakness; the third, the bitter *laugh of contempt*, the *heartless sneer*, or the sardonic *grin* of concealed hatred. In the ancient, the animal nature is predominant, and it is, therefore, intoxicating; in the French, the intellect predominates, and it is, therefore, cold; it excites laughter, but does not warm the heart. The ancient comedy

subordinates the intellect to sense; the French comedy subordinates kindly emotion and human sympathy to cold, dissecting, anatomizing intellect. The ancient is the joyous reign of animal nature; the French, the reign of scepticism and disbelief in human virtue. The one is the natural revulsion from the earnestness of tragedy; the other, from the earnestness of Puritanism.

Now Shakspeare, in every respect, stands between these extremes, and is, therefore, the embodiment of true art. The best of Shakspeare's comedies, such as "the Tempest," "the Merchant of Venice," "As You Like It," and several others, are the work of a playful imagination, but kindly nature, full of the deepest sympathy with human weakness and human error. They are rather romances, than what most people (because educated in the French school) would call pure comedy—romances in which the varied and shifting scenes of human life, with its "mingled yarn" of joy and sorrow, of comic and serious, are exhibited as we find them in nature, only that the low and comic is always subordinate to the noble and serious.

A few words upon the state of society which gave rise to these different schools of art, will, perhaps, throw further light upon their peculiarities, as well as upon the nature of art in general. The Greek comedy finds its sufficient explanation in the free joyousness and exuberant animal spirits of this remarkable people, as otherwise exhibited in their Olympic games, and in their extravagant and, to us, almost childish bacchanalian sports. The Elizabethan and French comedy deserve a little more thorough comparison. During the Elizabethan age, society and public opinion had not yet acquired sufficient power and authority to compel any thing like uniformity in manners. Each man acted out his natural character, without hindrance, and, in a great measure, without shame. The body was clothed, but the spirit went almost naked; the whole character, both good and bad, was exposed. Hence there was wanting that

morbid sensitiveness concerning mental and moral peculiarities, concerning vice or weakness or spiritual deformity, which necessarily comes of concealment. In such a condition of society, it is easy to understand how every one, being fully conscious that his own peculiarities are freely exposed to the gaze of his fellows, would naturally join in the laughter which they excite, and the laughter would thus become good-humored and kindly. Thus, in Shakspeare, we find the nature, both good and bad, fully exposed; the peculiarities, the follies, the weaknesses, the mental and moral obliquities in each character, displayed in the most amusing light, but mingled with some redeeming traits. We laugh, but it is a kindly, good-humored laugh, in which the characters themselves seem to join. The effect of the whole is not only to agitate the diaphragm, but to warm the heart; not only to create amusement, but to cultivate charity for the foibles, the weaknesses, and even the vices of our fellow-men. In the course of the next two centuries, however, society becomes more and more artificial, manners and opinions less and less free and unrestrained. Every man now clothes, and strives to conceal the nakedness, not only of his person, but of his character. Every weakness is carefully concealed; vice walks in the garb of virtue; hypocrisy, charlatanism, and deceit of every kind abound. According to Carlyle, the whole eighteenth century was hollow and false, *an age of splendid shams*. In such a condition of society, comedy becomes satirical. Its function is now to tear off the mask from society, and expose its deformity. At such exposure, we laugh; but it is no longer the kindly smile, but the bitter laugh of contempt, and perhaps even of hatred. Now the most essential condition of a true and noble art is its *perfect freedom*. Art must be itself its own supreme object; it must be subordinate to no object or end but its own beauty and perfection. Hence Schiller very appropriately calls the impulse under which a work of art is created "*play impulse*;" thus indicating

the perfect freedom and harmonious action—the play—of the human spirit in art, in contrast with its more or less constrained action—work—in other departments of human pursuit. Now Shakspeare, in his comedies, has no other object in view but the presentation of a varied and beautiful picture of society; but the French comedy has some other supreme object in view, either the gratification of spleen, or the reform of society. In either case, the freedom of art is necessarily trammelled, and its beauty impaired. Again, for the full developement of art, particularly dramatic art, there must be a certain degree of freedom in *society*. Not only must the play of the human spirit be free, but the material upon which it operates must be plastic. As loose and imperfect clothing is necessary to the free action and symmetrical developement of the body, so a certain freedom of manners and opinions—not license, but a sense of freedom from constraint—is necessary to the developement of the human spirit into forms of the greatest beauty. Public opinion, law, religious conscience; in a word, *a sense of sin and fear of its consequences*; binds and oppresses the human spirit. Hence, freedom from this oppressive sense and dreadful fear is absolutely necessary to the highest developement of art. But this freedom may be the result of two causes, viz., unconsciousness of sin, and deliverance from sin. Thus, a certain childlike unconsciousness of sin is favorable to art; asceticism, or the oppressive sense of sin and human depravity, is unfavorable, but pure Christianity is, again, favorable. The spirit of asceticism is the spirit of bondage, the spirit of Christianity is the spirit of freedom. Thus the almost complete unconsciousness of sin, and the absence of any oppressive fear of the gods, among the Greeks, gave rise to a free joyousness of nature, and symmetrical developement of spirit, and these, in their turn, to that wonderful art which has ever since formed the object of emulation and the model of imitation. The Romans, on the contrary, were oppressed by a sense of sin and reli-

gious obligation—by a slavish fear of the gods unknown to the Greeks; and the Roman civilization was thus a fitting preparation for the coming of Christ, who was to give deliverance. The Romans, therefore, never produced any great native art. Art again flourished in Catholic Europe, from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century, and from the same cause, viz., an imperfect sense of bondage of sin. The Puritans again brought back the distressing consciousness of sin, and with it the decline of art. With the advance and spread of a true and liberal Christianity, however, the human spirit will again be released from bondage, into the glorious freedom of Christ, and a great art, a true Christian art, will again spring up and flourish. “I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died;” but, blessed be God, we are again made alive and free through Christ.

8. “*The novel*” is in many respects like “the drama.” Both are intended as a picture of human life; natural, and, at the same time, more or less ideal. The ideal element, however, would seem to predominate in the drama. The drama is farther removed from ordinary life than the novel; as, in fact, indicated by its very form, the language being in the form of poetry, instead of prose. The very fact of action bringing out the sensuous and emotional element more vividly, renders a strong infusion of the æsthetic, or ideal, element absolutely necessary to constitute it a true work of art. The novel is, therefore, lower in its position, as a form of art, than is the drama; but, at the same time, it has a wider range of usefulness. It may be used as the vehicle for the conveyance of knowledge, for the inculcation of philosophic views, or the institution of reforms in morals and politics. Thus the novel has a range of usefulness outside of art proper. It is only as a work of art, however, that we shall treat of it here. As already stated, every species of subordination of art to other purposes, whether philosophic, moral, or political, cramps the freedom of art,

and necessarily impairs its beauty. Perfect freedom is an essential condition of art; and, therefore, whoever executes a work of art for any distinct purpose, to him higher than art itself—from any motive stronger than the love of beauty—must be content to sacrifice a portion of its intrinsic excellence as a work of art. A work of art, to be really great, must be executed for itself alone. It may contain profound philosophic and moral reflections; it may contain much religious truth; but it must not be executed for these purposes. It must exhibit these things to the reflective mind, as nature does, unobtrusively; the appreciative, thoughtful mind will receive the lesson all the more willingly for having, as he supposes, *found it himself*; the inappreciative and thoughtless sees nothing—his peace is not disturbed by having what he does not understand or care for thrust upon him “against the stomach of his sense.” As soon as art becomes didactic, it not only loses much of its value as art, but even much of its power of teaching the truly appreciative mind, although it may become thereby more efficient as a teacher of the popular masses. Now, much of the novel-writing of the present day has been thus subordinated to purposes of moral or social reform. It is for this reason that Mr. Dickens’s later novels, as works of art, are inferior to his earlier ones. In his “Bleak House,” for instance, his object is to expose the abuses of law processes, particularly in chancery suits, together with other subordinate objects, such as the exposure of the cant of that philanthropy and charity which has its seat in the head, and not in the heart. In his “Little Dorritt,” his main object is to expose the abuses of Government, and the horrors of Debtors’ prison. Of course, as there is a distinct purpose to be subserved, caricature takes the place of true delineation of life and character. No one can blame Mr. Dickens for this; for to him social reform is a worthier field of activity, or a field for which he is better qualified, than high art. All we wish to say is, that in every such work, true art is

in a measure sacrificed. Now, it is only of *the novel as a work of art* that we wish here to speak.

To most readers, the charm of the novel is the complete absorption of every faculty of the mind in the interest of the narrative. The novel is supposed to be successful, when we are hurried along in a state of breathless suspense, the excitement increasing at every step, until we reach the conclusion; when the intricacy of the plot is so great, and the interest of the incident is so intense, that, with a sort of ravenous appetite, and an eagerness bordering on fierceness, we actually devour the story; when the glowing descriptions, and the delirium of passion, shall steal away the senses, and, "in a sweet madness, rob the mind of itself," and like the ravishing song of Circe, "take the prisoned soul and lap it in Elysium." Can the bowl of Comus be a more intoxicating draught than this? Can this be the object of the "novel?" Far from it. On the contrary, in every such case the novel has entirely failed of its true object; it depraves and prostrates, instead of purifying and invigorating. It is characteristic of a true work of art, that the use of it *bears repetition ad infinitum*. No work of art is worth contemplating at all, unless it can stand this test, and even improve under it. No piece of music is worth hearing at all, unless it is worth hearing many times. No painting is worth seeing at all, unless worth seeing many times, and with increasing interest. No drama or novel is worth reading at all, unless worth reading many times. We mean, of course, as a work of art. A novel may contain good history, or good science, and may be worth reading once on that account; but, as a work of art, it must not only be worth reading the second, but even the tenth or twentieth time, and always with increasing pleasure. We say, with deliberation, *increasing* pleasure; for, even in the best novels, the excitement of the mere story, on first reading, is somewhat too great for the perfect freedom of the mind. It is only in memory, or on repeated readings, that the true

æsthetic impression is complete. Every appreciative reader knows that the pleasure derived from Shakspeare's dramas and Walter Scott's novels rises in purity and in dignity with every reading, and just in proportion as we become more familiar with the incidents of the story, and the lower pleasures of curiosity and excitement become less. The pleasure may become *less and less intense*, but certainly higher and purer. Alas! is it not a law of our nature that those pleasures which are most intense are also the lowest, and those which are highest and purest are also weakest?

We see, then, that in the novel, as in the drama, and in fact in all art, our whole nature must be impressed; but in such manner that the mental harmony is insured—the æsthetic condition is produced. This, then, becomes a test of the perfection of a novel as a work of art. In this respect, we find the German and the French novel are complete extremes. In the French novel, the intense, passionate interest of the story, and the extreme ingenuity in the construction and the disentanglement of an intricate plot, are the *sine qua non* of art. In the best German novel, on the contrary, the plot is so simple, and the incidents so commonplace, as to be unbearably tiresome to the mere ordinary novel-reader; the whole genius of the writer is shown in bringing out the noble and the ideal, even in this common picture; in introducing in the most natural manner, thoughts and sentiments which touch the highest faculties of the mind and soul. In the French novel, the true end of art is lost sight of in the attempt at emotional effect; in the German, the highest end of art is recognized, indeed, but the best means of attaining that end is not understood. The former is intoxicating; the latter, tame, cold, and repulsive to a large class, whom they might benefit. In Walter Scott these extremes are more perfectly united than in any other novel-writer. His novels, therefore, we conceive to be the best type of this species of art which we have in any language.

It becomes now easy, too, to judge how much of truth there is in the criticism on various schools of novel-writing, and of art generally. Madame De Stael, in her admirable work on Germany, though she bestows the highest encomiums on German character, German Philosophy, German Poetry and Music, can not do justice to German Drama and Novels, particularly the latter. The reason is quite evident. Her criticism is really acute and fine. Every word is true from her point of view; but her point of view is essentially different from that of the German. It is essentially French. She looks upon the intense interest of the story—the passionate and emotional effect—as the most essential element in the novel, without which it fails of its object, since it must fail of getting readers. It may be so to the giddy and volatile French, but not to the patient and thoughtful German. Her criticism, as addressed to the French, and having for its purpose the opening of German literature to her own people, may be good; but as philosophic criticism of art, it is superficial.

Again, Dickens has been held up, in his best novels, by some, as the type of the novel-writer. In illustrating this subject, we shall not scruple to compare the drama and the novel, since they are so similar. In comparing, then, Dickens with Shakspeare, while both are admitted to have depicted nature with wonderful accuracy, yet they are, in some respects, the very antipodes of one another. Dickens, in his best novels, depicts nature with an accuracy so minute, that it may well be called a daguerreotype. But the very fact of the imitation being thus minute—the very fact of its being a daguerreotype—is an index that it is only *common nature*, *i. e.*, nature as seen by common eyes, and addressing the lower faculties—the very nature which every one may see around him every day. Shakspeare, on the contrary, less prolix and minute, is even more true to nature; but it is no longer nature as seen by common eyes, but high, ideal nature—nature as seen by the highest genius, and

teaching the noblest lessons. This high, pure, truly wonderful ideality of Shakspeare, is best seen in his female characters. These are, at the same time, perfectly natural, and attaining an otherwise inconceivable ideal. Dickens is, therefore, the extreme of simple naturalness, in the common acceptation of the term—Shakspeare, of the highest conceivable ideality combined with perfect naturalness. Again, the very manner in which the characters are constructed, in each case, is equally characteristic, and suggestive of the essential difference in the genius of the two. The process is, as it were, *inductive* in the former case, and *deductive* in the latter. Dickens commences *ab externo*, with the minutest details, and proceeds step by step until every detail is exhausted; and then only is the character, in its true nature, seen and understood. Shakspeare, on the contrary, commences, as it were, *ab interno*—with the *living principle*. The very first words spoken by any character, reveals the true nature of that character to the appreciative, reflective mind; and all that comes after is but the more perfect developement of that character under various circumstances. In the former, the character is built up, stone by stone, *like an edifice*—in the latter, we are introduced at once into the innermost sanctuary of nature, and shown the *living germ*, and then permitted to watch this germ while it gradually expands and clothes itself in forms of beauty. What is this but true *creative genius*?

Now, in every respect, Walter Scott stands between Shakspeare and Dickens. He is more *ideal*, as well as more truly *creative*, than Dickens—though in both respects inferior to Shakspeare. We have already said, however, that there is an essential difference in this respect between the Drama and the Novel. It is not improbable, therefore, that Walter Scott, in his novels, has attained the highest position possible in this department of art. He, therefore, is for us the type of the novelist.

9. If any department of art is purely imitative, surely it is "*Portrait-Painting*:" and yet we know none which illustrates the principles previously laid down better than this. It is generally supposed that the portrait-painter is successful in proportion as he reproduces, with mathematical accuracy, the outline and color of every feature; so that the man himself, exactly as we usually see him, lives before us. If so, then portrait-painting has become an entirely useless art; for the daguerreotype is infinitely superior in every thing but color. If so, then Genius has become an useless faculty; for it is far outstripped by sunlight. The art of Photography is an absolutely perfect imitative art. Even microscopic details are reproduced with almost inconceivable accuracy. Yet who does not feel that the pleasure taken in photographic pictures is essentially of a low kind, compared with the pleasure we take in a work of real fine art. Now, what is the reason of this? It evidently is not owing to the absence of color, for this may be very successfully added to the photograph. We explain it thus:

Our nature is a strange mixture of the high and the low—of the divine and the bestial—of the heavenly and the earthy—well expressed in the beautiful outlines of Retzsch, by the Sphynx, with its animal body buried in the dust, and its divinely-human head encircled with clouds. The whole of this mixed nature is expressed in the human face; the several elements in various proportions, according to our original individual character or degree of culture, but in all, under ordinary circumstances, the lower and sensuous too strong—the higher and the divine too weak. In too many, alas! the divine is so obscured by the animal—so eclipsed by the sensuous—that it seems gone for ever. It exists, however, even though invisible to us, otherwise the face would no longer be human. There is not a human face, however revolting, there is not a human character, however degraded, but has something in it worthy of *love*,

yea, even of reverence. If we can not see it, it is our own fault. God sees it, and compassionates its fallen condition. It is the business of genius, amid all the infinite obscurations of inherited depravity—amid the still sadder obscurations of individual vice and passion, to detect, bring out, and embody it in art—to disentangle and separate the gem from its dross, and exhibit it in its true brilliancy. In a state of repose, or mental vacuity, only the low, the sensuous, and the animal is visible. The eye must be kindled, the whole face lighted up by noble emotion—by sublime thoughts and high and holy purposes—ere the divine is visible. Now, it is impossible that photography should take the human face except in repose—not the noble repose of conscious strength, but of mere mental vacuity. Any attempt at expression becomes an affectation, and, therefore, worse than mere vacuity. Thus the photograph is impotent to express all that is highest in our spiritual nature. The highest ambition of the imitative artist, like the photographer, is to daguerreotype the face—to make an exact copy of all that a clown might see, or a mechanic, with a rule and compass, might execute. The great artist, on the other hand, may be less minutely accurate in the exact flesh-tint—in reproducing every wrinkle and pimple of the skin, or every fold of the cravat; but he will catch the divine expression—the seal of the spirit. Whatever is low, base, sensual, animal, he will even soften; and whatever is noble, he will make nobler. He does not violate nature, but only *carries out what nature intended*. It is we ourselves who violate nature, through sin, and then call by that sacred name the monster which thus results. The true, but unattainable ideal of portrait-painting, then, is the clear vision by the artist, and the complete expression on canvass, of an individual human character, not exactly as it is, but as it should be—as God intended it to be, and as it would have been if it had not been marred and deformed by sin. A spark of Divinity assumes individual

character, and takes up its abode in human form. Untrammelled, it moulds that form into a perfect image of its own essential nature—but alas! sin has defaced and obscured the divine image. It is the duty of art to restore the image in its completeness, without affecting, in the slightest degree, the perfect and distinctive individuality. What a teacher would such a portrait-painter be!—to see ourselves such as God intended we should be, and such as we might have been, and such as through much conflict we may still hope to be; and then to see ourselves such as we are, through sin. “To look on this picture, and then on that!!”

This is the ideal, but, as we have already said, the unattainable ideal of art. All that we can expect is some distant approach to this ideal; all that we can hope is that the artist shall watch his opportunity, shall skillfully draw out from its deep sleep within the inmost recesses of the soul, whatever is noble and divine, so that it may for a moment flash upon and enlighten the features; and then embody this upon canvass—in other words, shall paint the face when under the influence of noble emotion, when it expresses the highest conditions of the soul. This is the best idealism which we find in portrait-painting. But even this is very rare, for much of what is called idealism is utterly false and worthless; and not only so, but infinitely hurtful, through the discredit which it throws upon true idealism. It sees not, and therefore can not embody, the divine; but it only sees, or imagines it sees, something which it mistakes for the divine, but which has no existence except in its own imagination, and this miserable shadow it strives to embody. The difference between the two is perfectly clear. The false is full of affectation, vanity, and conceit, for it is occupied only with its own vain imaginings; the true is full of reverence, awe, and self-forgetfulness, for it is in the presence of the divine. The former, in its execution, is dim, shadowy, and uncertain; a mere patch-work, without central unity, a mere piece of deliberate *composition*; the latter em-

bodies only what actually exists, and what it clearly sees, and is therefore firm and certain—a work of art possessing unity, because embodying a distinct idea.

There are, therefore, three classes of portrait-painters. The first honestly, faithfully, and accurately sets down all that he sees, but he sees only the low and commonplace. The second equally honestly and faithfully sets down all that he sees; but he sees also the noble, the divine—sets down honestly all that he sees, only varying their relative strength; here softening, there strengthening, until all is brought into divine harmony; not in the spirit of dishonesty and deceit, but as a faithful and loving teacher. The third, despising the first class, and not able to attain to the second; leaving the firm basis of mechanical execution, and not able to attain to the divine conception; losing his firm grasp of the *actual* and material, and not able to take hold of the *ideal*, merely floats about in a cloud-land of vain imaginations and foolish conceits. The first is low art; the second, high art; but both genuine, and therefore useful; but the third is simply false, and therefore hurtful. The second, *i. e.*, high art in portrait-painting, in its purity, is so exceedingly rare, that most of us would, probably, prefer an error on the side of mechanical accuracy in representation of the commonplace, rather than on the side of imperfect and somewhat false idealism. The tendency to false idealism is so strong in the present age; it is so difficult for the artist to be convinced that he should set down nothing but what he distinctly sees—it is so easy to mistake his own imaginings for the divine ideal—the danger is so great that, if he relaxes his grasp upon the common, he will only catch at a shadow—that really we had much better be satisfied with the accurate representation of our friends in their common, every-day faces. Love is closely allied to genius. Love, like genius, enjoys the privilege of seeing the noble, the Godlike, in the human face, however obscured by the veil of material clothing, and darkened and defaced by sin.

Thus the faces of our loved ones become indissolubly connected in our minds with what is noblest in their character. Thus, if we only have a faithful copy, even of what is most commonplace; if we get a faithful copy of the *material abode, even in ruins*, and, therefore, no longer an accurate image of the divine; yet we have so often associated together in our minds the beautiful spirit with the ruined abode, that the latter becomes at once the index and sign of the former, and love does for us exactly what art strives often in vain to accomplish—transfigures the human face into the image of the divine.

Thus we may, with justice, prefer a pure imitative art, such as photography, in the representation of *our friends*, but this is because we are ourselves, through love, in the position of the high artist; because, in this department of art, our perceptions are so acute that it would require almost superhuman genius to satisfy them, and therefore we prefer that imitative art should furnish only the material upon which *we* may exercise our own *creative power*.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

ARTICLE II.

THE PEOPLE AND LANGUAGES OF WESTERN AFRICA.

Western Africa, in the modern and general acceptation of the term, embraces all that portion of this great continent lying between the Atlantic ocean on the west, and the Kong and Sierra del Crystal mountains on the east, and extending from the southern borders of the Great Desert, in the sixteenth degree of north latitude, to the Portuguese colony of Benguela, in the same degree of south latitude. The whole length of this region, following the line of the sea-coast, is about three thousand five hundred miles, whilst its breadth is no where, except in the northern portion of it, more than three hundred and fifty miles. It embraces more than one million square miles, and has a population, it is supposed, of at least twenty-five millions. Extending over so many degrees of latitude, it necessarily embraces a great variety of climate, soil, natural products, etc., which it is not consistent with the design of this article to consider at length.

This region of country is usually described under the three well-known divisions of Senegambia, Northern or Upper Guinea, and Lower or Southern Guinea, a distinction that is founded not more on the geographical outlines of the country than upon the peculiar character of the people by whom these different districts are inhabited. Senegambia extends from the southern borders of the Great Desert to Cape Verga, in the tenth degree of north latitude, and interiorwards to the distance of six or seven hundred miles. It is watered by the two great rivers Senegal and Gambia, from the combination of the names of which it derives its peculiar denomination. Northern Guinea extends

from Cape Verga, on the north, to the Kamerun mountains on the Gulf of Benin, and is separated from Northern Central Africa by the Kong range of mountains.* It is intersected, in the southern portion of it, by the great Quorra or Niger river. Southern Guinea extends from the Kamerun mountains to the sixteenth degree of south latitude, and is separated from the unexplored regions of Central Southern Africa by the Sierra del Crystal range of mountains. It is divided into two nearly equal halves by the Kongo river, the third great river of the continent of Africa.

At various points along the sea-coast there are a number of English, French, Dutch, Portuguese, and American settlements, none of which, however, except Liberia and the British colony of Sierra Leone, are any thing more than trading establishments, or naval and military stations. Liberia, as is well known, is made up of free colored persons, or emancipated slaves, sent from this country. This population does not, at the present time, amount to more than ten or twelve thousand, scarcely as many as the whole number sent there from this country in the last forty years. Sierra Leone is composed almost wholly of recaptives, and taken, as they have been, from all parts both of the eastern and western coast, the present population is a sort of medley or amalgamation of all the various tribes and families of the whole country. The European inhabitants at these different settlements compose but an insignificant portion of the population of the country, but they are brought into commercial intercourse with the representatives of almost every tribe residing between the sea-coast and the mountains.

* The term Guinea, according to Barbot, is derived from Genadida, the name of a district to the north of the Senegal, where the early Portuguese navigators first met with the negro race, and they consequently applied this name to all the country southward, being inhabited exclusively by this race. The term was afterwards restricted to the Gold Coast, which was, for a time, the chief seat of the slave trade.

The inhabitants of Western Africa, though usually included under the general name of negroes or Africans, are, nevertheless, widely different from each other in almost every national characteristic, and, as we propose to show, have had entirely different origins.

The inhabitants of Senegambia are made up mainly of three well known tribes, viz., the Jalofs, the Mandingoes, and the Fulahs. All of these are Mohammedans, in distinction from the inhabitants of both the Guineas, who are pagans. One of these tribes, the Fulahs, claim to be the descendants of Phut, the third son of Ham. Whether they can trace up their genealogy to this remote source or not, it is an interesting fact that they have always prefixed that term to the name of every district they have ever occupied in Western and Central Africa: as, Fut-a-Jallon, Fut-a-Bondo, Fut-a-Torro, etc. The inhabitants of Upper Guinea are usually denominated the *Nigritian* stock, and are so characterized from their supposed descent from the negro races who have inhabited the valley of the Niger from the remotest periods of antiquity. The inhabitants of Southern Guinea have been denominated by all modern writers on Africa, the *Ethiopian* or Nilotic family, from their obvious relationship to the ancient families of the Nile. This family, or race, have spread themselves over the whole of the southern half of the continent, including the Pongo and Kongo families, on the west, the Kafirs and the Zulus, near the Cape of Good Hope, and the Swahere and other tribes, on the coast of Zanzibar. The only exceptions are the Hottentots, the Namakwas, and the Bushmen, near the Cape, who belong to an entirely different race, and a small number of Arabs, recently colonized along the eastern shores.

It is not denied that these different races have many physical characteristics in common. Black skins, woolly hair, protruding lips, and most of the distinctive features of the negro, belong to all of them, but under great modifications.

The Jalofs, for example, are intensely black, but their features are more European than African. The complexion of the Fulahs and Mandingoes is much lighter than that of the Jalofs, whilst their features are equally regular, if not more so. The mountain inhabitants, both of Northern and Southern Guinea, are nearly as light as true mulattoes, whilst they have the thick lip, the distended nostril, and the retreating forehead of the full negro. But it is in the close study of their habits, customs, traditions, superstitions, religious creeds, and especially the structure and character of their languages, that the difference in their national characteristics and origin will become more obvious.

It has already been mentioned that the population of Senegambia is made up mainly of the Jalofs, the Fulahs, and the Mandingoes. The Jalofs are found only on the sea-coast, and along the banks of the Senegal and the Gambia, to the distance of a hundred miles from the sea-coast. They are an agricultural people, and depend almost entirely upon the products of the soil for the means of subsistence. The Mandingoes are mechanics and itinerant merchants. They are to be found in all parts of Senegambia, but extend their trading excursions as far down the coast as Monrovia, and in the interior, perhaps, to a still greater distance. In their peregrinations, they establish temporary colonies, where they ply their various arts, so long as there is any demand for the products of their skill. They establish potteries, tan leather, manufacture cotton cloths, and fabricate implements of war and agriculture. One of their most lucrative employments is the manufacture of amulets, (small leathern bags in which scraps of Arabic are ingeniously sewed up,) which they sell to the pagan negroes at high prices. Most of the Mandingoes read and write the Arabic with tolerable ease, and wherever they go among the pagan tribes, they establish schools for the purpose of propagating their faith. In the absence of slates and other writing materials, they teach their pupils to make the Arabic characters in the sand,

or on smooth green leaves. Sometimes they use green leaves for the purpose of transmitting written communications from one place to another. The Fulahs have made greater attainments in general civilization than either the Jalofs or the Mandingoes, but they are an essentially restless, warlike race. They have gradually extended their conquests, until they have made themselves masters of a large portion of central Northern Africa. They are now known to be the same people whom Clapperton and Denham found on the banks of the Niger, and whom they described under the name of Fellatahs. If their conquests be pushed forward as rapidly the next half century, as they have been since the days of these distinguished travellers, they will have acquired the control of every considerable district between the southern borders of the Great Desert and the Mountains of the Moon, and will give an entirely new social aspect to this vast region. Their great object, no doubt, is to extend their faith. What the Mandingoes are trying to effect through the peaceful agency of schools, they are accomplishing by the sword; and, if we may judge from the actual results, much more successfully. None of either of these families, with a few exceptional cases, have ever been brought to this country as slaves. They are restricted by the precepts of their religion from selling their own people into bondage, but are under no restraint whatever from trafficking in their pagan countrymen. The few of them that have by some means or other been brought to this country, have always shown themselves much superior to the common negro. There is one notable case, in the person of Father Moro, as he is familiarly called, who is still living in Wilmington, North Carolina. He is a Fulah, reads his Arabic Bible with ease, and no one can have any extended intercourse with him without feeling that he is much above the level of the ordinary negro. But our object in the present article is mainly with the people

and languages of the two Guineas, and the remainder of our remarks will have exclusive reference to them.

The inhabitants of Northern and Southern Guinea, though constituting two distinct families or races, as will be seen in the progress of this article, have, nevertheless, many national characteristics in common. They are not to be ranked, as is generally supposed, among the lowest grades of the human race. Nor are they to be judged, in all respects, by the condition of their countrymen when first brought to this country, or even by the character of their descendants at the present day. It is an undeniable fact, that the great body of our present slaves came from a poor stock. There are in Africa, as there were at one time among the Indian tribes of this continent, a large number of weak and feeble tribes interspersed among the more powerful, who have always been made the victims of the slave trade. It is not easy to account for the origin of these weaker tribes; but they may be met with in all parts of Western Africa, even at the present day, and are generally found along the marshy banks of creeks, and in other unhealthy localities. Individuals, too, belonging to the more powerful families, who have not the mental or physical energy to render themselves valuable members of society, are often sold into foreign servitude on the charge of witchcraft, or on some other frivolous pretext. Furthermore, when a gang of slaves, taken in indiscriminate warfare, has been brought from the far interior, the native factors on the sea-coast, through whose hands this traffic must pass, are always in the habit of singling out the healthier and better looking women for their own wives. By this process of elimination on the one hand, and of incorporation on the other, the sea-coast stock has been constantly improved, whilst the refuse only has been sent abroad. Occasionally, a turbulent man has been sent away from the better classes, because he could not be managed at home; and this, no doubt, accounts for the fact, well known to the older members of society among

us, that among the native Africans brought to this country in the early part of the present century, there was occasionally an individual who could never be brought into complete subjection; and, no doubt, if the pedigree of those negroes among us, who occasionally evince more than ordinary energy of mind and character, could be traced out, it would be seen that they derived their origin from some such source.

The negroes of Western Africa, compared with the blacks among us of the present day, have much less civilization, and they show little of that benignity and kindness of character, that has been effected in the latter by the influence of Christianity. But they possess more energy of character, more sprightliness and vivacity of disposition, and are by no means chargeable with that proverbial improvidence which belongs to the blacks here, and which ought to be ascribed mainly to their circumstances. On all parts of the coast, the natives have fixed habitations, cultivate the soil as the chief means of their subsistence, have herds of domestic animals, have made considerable proficiency in many of the mechanic arts, especially in the manufacture of gold and brass ornaments, and in the fabrication of implements of war and agriculture, and show not only a disposition, but a decided aptitude, for carrying on trade with the foreigners who visit their country. On some parts of the coast of Southern Guinea, they construct neat and well finished schooner-boats of twelve or fifteen tons' burthen, in which they perform voyages along the sea-coast, to the distance of two or three hundred miles, and with which they might safely pass over to South America, if they understood the art of navigation.

They have no knowledge of the science of government, as that term is understood among civilized men. Nor are there any extended political organizations any where in these regions, with the exception of the kingdoms of Ashantee and Dahomey; and these, there is reason to believe,

are gradually undergoing a process of disintegration. As a general thing, the people live in independent communities, varying in population from four or five to twenty-five or thirty thousand. In some of these, the patriarchal type of government prevails; in others, the despotic; but in the great majority, the democratic form predominates, in which cases the male population, almost *en masse*, enact, judge, and execute all the laws of the realm. Their laws, so far as they have any, have little or no force, except so far as they are sustained by that wise and universal law of Providence, which sets one man's selfishness over against that of another.

It is not easy to give an idea of the religious systems of pagan Africa, or to render them intelligible to the ordinary reader in a single paragraph. The belief in one great Supreme Being, the Maker and Upholder of all things, is perhaps universal. But they have no correct ideas of His glorious character, and never invoke His name, except in a few rare cases of extreme distress. The belief in a future state of existence is equally prevalent, but of course they have no correct ideas of the nature or conditions of that existence. In some communities, a separate burial-place is assigned to malefactors, showing an impression that there is to be some kind of separation between the good and the bad in the world to come. The belief in the existence of evil spirits, is not only universal, but is deeply inwrought into the mental constitution of the African. The only religious worship he ever offers, is directed to these spirits, the object of which is to conciliate their favor, or ward off their displeasure. They divide them into two distinct classes. One of these are the spirits of dead men, and no doubt are the *δαίμονες* of the New Testament. In relation to the other, they pretend to no knowledge of their origin, but they are held in great fear and detestation, and are probably the *διάβολοι* of the Scriptures. They offer sacrifices to the former class, and have as much to do

with them, almost, as with the living. But they never hear the names of the other class mentioned without feelings of uneasiness and distress. The inhabitants of Southern Guinea worship the spirits of their ancestors, and not unfrequently have wooden images to represent them, to which they present stated offerings. The belief in witchcraft, and the resort to *fetiches* (charms, or amulets) as a means of defence against it, pervades almost every community on the continent of Africa. Almost every tribe has some kind of ordeal by which persons suspected of this crime are tried, the most common of which is the *red-wood* ordeal.

The natives have no knowledge of letters whatever in either of the Guineas; and until missionaries went among them, it never occurred to them that their languages could be reduced to writing. This will appear very remarkable, when we come to consider the wonderful structure of some of their dialects, where it would seem almost impossible to observe all the nice grammatical changes without a knowledge of letters. Whilst they have no written literature, they have immense stores of what might be called unwritten lore, in the form of traditionary stories, proverbial sayings, fictitious narratives, and fables in endless number, and of the most striking and forcible character. It is one of their most cherished pastimes to have these stories and fables recited on stated occasions, and it is no mean ambition among them to acquire the reputation of a successful rehearser.

Having presented some of the characteristics common to both of these races of men, we might now dwell much more fully upon the numerous points of dissimilarity between them, but this would extend our article to an undue length; and we must, therefore, restrict ourselves to the consideration of their languages alone, which, however, will be sufficient to show that the two must have had entirely different origins.

In both of these sections, the number of dialects is very great, but in either case it can easily be shown that they all belong to one family; that in Upper Guinea being known as the the *Nigritian* family, and the one in Lower Guinea as the *Ethiopian*. In both cases, the different members of the same family diverge very widely from each other; but there are certain family resemblances which can not easily be mistaken, and always show to what family they belong. The easiest and most satisfactory way of exhibiting the contrast between these two languages, is to single out one dialect from each, and make them the subject of comparison; and for this purpose, we select the Grebo dialect, spoken at Cape Palmas, in Upper Guinea, and the Pongo, or Mpongwe, spoken at the Gaboon, in Lower Guinea. These two points are more than twelve hundred miles apart, and the people, respectively, have no knowledge of each other or of their languages.

The Grebo dialect, regarded in a general point of view, is just such a language as one might naturally expect to find among a rude and uncultivated people. It is harsh in sound, abrupt and indistinct in enunciation, abounds in inarticulate nasal and guttural sounds, has but a limited vocabulary of words, admits of but few grammatical inflections, and is capable of expressing only the simplest and most rudimental ideas. The great majority of its words are monosyllables, and are distinguished from each other, in a great many cases, simply by intonation. Some of its words are so purely nasal, that they can not properly be represented by any combination of letters whatever. The word for five, for example, is represented by *hmu*, but this is a mere arbitrary representation. In common conversation, three or four words are jumbled together, as if they were but one, and in such cases, it is almost impossible for a foreigner to repeat it so as to be understood. The phrase, *hani na nyene ne*, "what is your name?" belongs to this class; and very few foreigners have ever been able to ask this

question so as to be understood by the people themselves. Many monosyllabic words, while having very different meanings, are sounded so much alike that it is almost impossible for a foreign ear to discern the difference. In the monosyllabic character of its words, and the use of intonations to distinguish between them, the Grebo is much like the Chinese; but this resemblance, no doubt, is purely accidental. It is possible that, in comparison with the other dialects of the same family, it may have this feature in excess. As has been mentioned above, the Grebo admits of very few grammatical inflections. In the great majority of cases, the plural form of the noun is scarcely distinguishable from the singular; and when any change at all takes place, it is simply in the final vowel; thus, *blli*, cow; plural, *bllë*, cows; *hyah*, child; plural, *hyëh*, children; *blablë*, a sheep; plural, *blable*, sheep; etc. The Grebo has very few adjectives, and those few have neither number, declension, nor degrees of comparison. The want of an adjective is constantly supplied by circumlocution; thus, instead of saying, he is hungry, or is a hungry man, they say, *kanu ni nã*, i. e., "hunger works him." The Grebo verb has but very few inflections, except to indicate a number of specific periods, both past and future. It has one form for what has occurred to-day, another for what occurred yesterday, and a third for what occurred at any period anterior to yesterday; and so in relation to the future. As a general thing, it relies upon the use of auxiliary particles to express the completeness or incompleteness of an action. The ground form of the verb itself admits of very few changes. All the changes that take place, either in the verb or the noun, are on the final syllable, and never on the incipient. This fact should be distinctly borne in mind, for this, more than any thing else, determines its relationship to other languages. The Mpongwe language, as will be seen presently, makes its changes mainly, though not entirely, on the incipient syllable.

But if the Grebo is just such a language as we might reasonably expect to find among a rude and uncultivated people, the Mpongwe, judged by its own intrinsic merits, would indicate that it was spoken by a people only of the highest culture; which, however, is not the case. In every essential feature, it is the exact antipode of all the dialects of Northern Guinea, and, in many respects, is one of the most wonderful languages that have ever been brought to the knowledge of the civilized world. It is spoken along the banks of the Gaboon river, which empties into the Atlantic ocean just under the equator; along the sea-coast south of the equator, to the distance of two hundred miles, and, perhaps, to the same distance in the interior; and, with some dialectic modifications, across the whole breadth of the continent. The inhabitants of the Gaboon, by whom this particular dialect is spoken, rank higher in civilization than the generality of the people of Northern Guinea, but they can not, nevertheless, be regarded in any other light than as a semi-civilized community. Whilst they have adopted many of the usages and customs of civilized men, they have retained more of what properly belongs to heathenism. The greater part of the men are shrewd and expert traders, and, from long intercourse with English, French, Dutch, and Portuguese traders, have acquired an extensive, if not very accurate, knowledge of these languages.

Their native tongue is remarkable for its beauty and elegance, its clear and distinct enunciations, its complete classifications, its systematic and philosophical arrangements, its wonderful combinations and inflections, and its almost unlimited power of expansion. It is only by a close examination of the structure of the language, and the analysis of its various parts, that we can form any just idea of its wonderful character. We select, therefore, for more particular consideration, the noun, the adjective, the pronoun, and the verb. These will be sufficient to exhibit its more remarkable and striking characteristics.

THE MPONGWE NOUNS.

These, though having nothing to correspond with what is known as declension in Latin and Greek, have, nevertheless, a certain classification, founded upon the manner in which the plural is derived from the singular, which gives them as marked a character as those of either of the other languages.

There are five different modes of deriving the plural from the singular; and, for the sake of convenience, these will be denominated *declensions*, though this term is not strictly appropriate. The first declension includes all those nouns which derive the plural from the singular, by simply prefixing *i* or *si*;* thus, *nago*, house; plural, *inago* or *sinago*, houses; *nyare*, a cow; plural, *inyare* or *sinyare*, cows. The second declension includes those nouns which form the plural from the singular by simply dropping the initial *e*; thus, *egara*, a chest; plural, *jara*, chests. If the first consonant should be *z*, in forming the plural the *e* is not only dropped, but the *z* is changed into *y*; thus, *ezâma*, a thing; plural, *yâma*, things; *ezango*, a book; plural, *yango*, books. The third declension embraces all those nouns which have *i* for their initial letter, and form the plural by changing *i* into *a*; thus, *idâmbe*, a sheep; plural, *adâmbe*, sheep. If the first consonant is *v*, in forming the plural, it is changed into *mp*, as, *ivanga*, law; plural, *ampanga*, laws. The fourth declension embraces all those nouns which have *o* for their initial letter, and change it into *i* to form the plural; thus, *olamba*, a cloth; plural, *ilamba*, cloths; *omamba*, a snake; plural, *imamba*, snakes. The fifth declension embraces those nouns which have *a* for their initial letter, and are the same in both numbers; thus, *aningo*, water; *alugu*, rum; which are the same in both numbers. There are not as

* In all Mpongwe words we use the Continental sounds of the vowels.

many as a half-dozen words in all, included in this last declension. All of the nouns in the Mpongwe language are included in the above declensions, and there are no exceptions or variations, except those mentioned. The following table will exhibit all these classes or declensions, at a single view :

First Declension.

Singular,	Plural,
<i>nago</i> , house ;	<i>inago</i> , or <i>sinago</i> , houses ;
<i>nyare</i> , cow ;	<i>inyare</i> , or <i>sinzare</i> , cows.

Second Declension.

<i>egara</i> , chest ;	<i>gara</i> , chests ;
(irreg.) <i>ezâma</i> , thing ;	<i>yâma</i> , things.

Third Declension.

<i>idâmbe</i> , sheep ;	<i>adâmbe</i> , sheep ;
<i>ikândâ</i> , plantains ;	<i>akândâ</i> , plantains.

Fourth Declension.

<i>olamba</i> , a cloth ;	<i>ilamba</i> , cloths ;
<i>omamba</i> , a snake ;	<i>imamba</i> , snakes.

Fifth Declension.

<i>angingo</i> , water, etc. ;	<i>alugu</i> , rum, etc.
--------------------------------	--------------------------

These changes, so far as is known, are founded upon no principles of euphony, but are the fixed, original laws of the language. These laws are never violated in conversation—a most remarkable fact, when we remember that the natives have no knowledge of the visible representatives of these nice changes of grammar.

ADJECTIVES AND PRONOUNS.

These two parts of speech are included under one head, because both follow the same laws of inflection. Like nouns, they have number, but no case. Adjectives have regular degrees of comparison, and in this respect they differ entirely from all the dialects of Northern Guinea. The comparative degree is made by suffixing *kwě* to the positive, and the superlative by *mě*; thus, *nda*, long; *ndakwě*, longer; *ndamě*, the longest. Whilst adjectives have no case, they have another species of inflection, unknown to any other language of which we have any knowledge, by which they accommodate themselves to any class of nouns to which they may belong. In other words, they have one form for nouns of the first declension, another for the second, etc. This will be better understood by the following table:

First Declension.

Singular.	Plural.
<i>nyare yam</i> , my cow;	<i>inyare sam</i> , my cows.

Second Declension.

<i>egara zam</i> , my chest;	<i>gara yam</i> , my chests.
------------------------------	------------------------------

Third Declension.

<i>idâmbe nyam</i> , my sheep;	<i>adâmbe mam</i> , my sheep.
--------------------------------	-------------------------------

Fourth Declension.

<i>omamba wam</i> , my snake;	<i>imamba yam</i> , my snakes;
-------------------------------	--------------------------------

Fifth Declension.

<i>alugu mam</i> , my rum, etc.

Here are five different forms, in the singular number alone, for the adjective pronoun, viz., *yam*, *zam*, *nyam*, *mam*, and

wam. In English phraseology, when an adjective goes before two or more nouns, it is not always possible to determine to which it belongs, or whether it qualifies all or only one of them. But in the Mpongwe, the form of the adjective determines the particular noun to which it belongs, with unerring certainty. The personal and demonstrative pronouns follow the same law of inflection; as, *yi, zi, nyi, wi, mi*, in the singular; and in the plural, *si, yi, mi, wi*, etc. In English, when the personal or demonstrative pronoun is used, it is not always possible to determine its antecedent; but in the Mpongwe, the particular form of the pronoun determines its antecedent, however widely it may be separated from it. In this respect, it will be perceived that the Mpongwe has an exactness and precision of expression that can be rivalled by no known language whatever.

MPONGWE VERB.

The most remarkable feature about the Mpongwe language, however, is the systematic structure and almost interminable inflections of its verb. As a matter of literary curiosity alone, it is worthy of the closest attention of every inquiring mind. The Greek verb is the most flexible known to the literary world. From a single root, (making no account of changes that merely indicate the number of the person,) between sixty and seventy oblique forms can be derived. But from an Mpongwe verb, more than four hundred distinct, independent forms can be derived from one root, every one of which shall have a well-defined shade of meaning of its own; and is, at the same time, so regular and systematic in all its inflections, that a practiced philologist, after a few hours' study, would be able to trace up any branch of it whatever to the original root. We are sorry that we can not spread out a full paradigm of one of its verbs on the pages of this Review. We will endeavor, however, to give such a view of it as will enable our readers

to form some idea of its peculiar structure, and its amazing flexibility.

All the verbs in the language, except the verb of existence, are perfectly regular in their inflections, and must commence with one of the following consonants,* viz., *b*, *d*, *f* or *fw*, *j*, *k*, *n* or *nl*, *p*, *s* or *sh*, and *t*, each of which has its corresponding or reciprocal letter, into which it is invariably changed in the progress of its inflections; thus, *b* is always changed into *w*, *d* into *l*, *f* into *v* or *vw*, *j* into *y*, *k* into *g*, *n* into *nl*, *p* into *v*, *s* into *z*, *t* into *r*, *sh* into *zy*. The imperative mood is, in all cases, derived from the present of the the indicative, by simply changing the initial consonant into its reciprocal letter; thus, *mi denda*, I do it; *lenda*, do thou it; *mi kamba*, I speak; *gamba*, speak thou; etc.

The Mpongwe verb has all the moods, tenses, and voices that are common to the verbs of most other languages, but it is not necessary to the understanding of the verb that these be developed to their full extent. It has an active and passive voice affirmative, and an active and passive voice negative, also. The active voice, whether affirmative or negative, may be rendered passive in any mood or tense whatever, by simply changing *a* final, into *o*. The negative form, whether active or passive, is distinguished from the affirmative by a certain prolonged intonation on the first syllable, which it has been found convenient to indicate in writing by the use of an Italic vowel when the other letters of the word are in Roman, or by a Roman letter when the other parts of the word are Italics. The following table will illustrate these distinctions, at a single view:

Affirmative,	{ Active— <i>mi tonda</i> , I love.
	{ Passive— <i>mi tondo</i> , I am loved.
Negative,	{ Active— <i>mi tonda</i> , I do not love.
	{ Passive— <i>mi tondo</i> , I am not loved.

* The present tense of the indicative mood is properly the radical form of the verb.

The intonation which distinguishes the negative from the affirmative forms is slight, and at first not very perceptible to a foreign ear; but after attention is directed to it, it can easily be acquired. These four forms should be kept distinctly in mind, if we would acquire a satisfactory view of the full inflection of the verbs.

Having given these general outlines, we may now proceed to the consideration of a still more important feature of the verb. We refer to its *conjugations*, and use this term in the sense in which it is used in Hebrew grammars. Every regular verb has as many as six simple, and at least as many as twelve compound conjugations. The simple conjugations are: first, the radical; as, *mi kamba*, I speak. Second, the causative, which is derived from the radical by changing *a* final, into *iza*; as, *mi kamba*, I speak; *mi kambiza*, I cause to speak. Third, the frequentative or habitual, which is derived from the radical by suffixing *ga*; as, *mi kamba*, I speak; *mi kambaga*, I speak frequently, or habitually. Fourth, the relative is derived from the radical by changing *a* final into *ina*; as, *mi kamba*, I speak; *mi kambina*, I speak to some one higher than myself; to the Deity, etc. Fifth, the reciprocal, which is formed from the radical by suffixing *na*; thus, *mi kamba*, I speak; *mi kambana*, I speak with others; as in conversation, or interlocutory speaking. Sixth, the indefinite, which is formed by the reduplication of the radical, (the initial consonant being changed into its reciprocal consonant, at the commencement of the reduplicated form;) thus, *mi kamba*, I speak; *mi kambagamba*, I speak much without point, at random, gabble, etc. Now, by combining two or more of the simple conjugations, we derive as many as twelve compound conjugations, each of which combines in itself all the shades of meaning of the separate conjugations. Thus, by combining the causative and the frequentative, we get the form, *kambazaga*, which means, to cause some one to speak habitually. By combining the frequentative and the relative, we get *kambinaga*,

which means, to address the Deity habitually. The following table will exhibit all these conjugations at one view :

Simple Conjugations.

- Radical—*mi kamba*, I speak ;
 Frequentative—*mi kambaga*, I speak frequently, habitually ;
 Causative—*mi kambiza*, I cause some one to speak ;
 Relative—*mi kambina*, to speak to God in prayer ;
 Reciprocal—*mi kambana*, to speak to others in conversation,
 or interlocutory speaking ;
 Indefinite—*mi kambagamba*, to prattle, speak at random, etc.

Compound Conjugations.

- Frequentative and indefinite—*kambagambaga*, habitual speaking at random ;
 Frequentative and causative—*kambizaga*, to cause some one to speak frequently ;
 Relative and causative—*kambinaza*, to cause some one to speak to the Deity, lead in prayer ;
 Indefinite and causative—*kambagambiza*, to cause some one to speak at random ;
 Reciprocal and causative—*kambanaza*, to lead in conversation ;
 Frequentative and relative—*kambinaga*, to address the Deity frequently, to be in the habit of prayer ;
 Frequentative and reciprocal—*kambanaga*, to be in the habit of conversational speaking ; much speaking in society ;
 Indefinite and reciprocal—*kambagambana*, very much gabbling in society ;
 Indefinite and relative—*kambagambina*, much rambling speaking to the Deity ;
 Relative, causative, and frequentative—*kambinazaga*, to cause some one to speak to the Deity frequently ; to be habitually a leader in prayer ;

Indefinite, causative, and frequentative—*kambagambizaga*, to cause some one to speak at random frequently ;
 Indefinite, relative, and causative—*kambagambinaza*, to cause some one to address the Deity in random language.

In the above, it will be seen that there are six simple, and twelve compound conjugations, making eighteen separate forms, each of which has a distinct shade of meaning of its own. Now, when we remember that each one of these has a separate form for the active and passive voices affirmative, and active and passive voices negative, we then have as many as seventy-two separate forms, each of which can be inflected through all the moods and tenses belonging to every regular verb. It can easily be seen, therefore, how more than four hundred different forms can be derived from the same root; and how easy it is, also, after a little study, to trace up the remotest branch of this extended ramification to the original stock.

It is not pretended that every verb is used, or could be used, in all these varied ramifications; but there is not one of them that is not more or less frequently used by one verb or another; and no matter what one of them may be called into use, its precise shade of meaning will be caught by the native ear, though that particular form may never have been heard before.

The power of combining varied and extended meaning in the same word, as illustrated in the conjugations just presented, must strike every one as some thing very remarkable. The Cherokee and some other Indian dialects, show great power in combining the pronoun and other parts of speech with the verb, so as to vary and extend the meaning of a single word. But the Mpongwe verb varies and enlarges its meaning, by simply unfolding itself according to well-established laws. What can be expressed in English only by a phrase of five or six words, can be expressed by the Mpongwe in a single word. The phrase, “use not vain

repetitions in prayer," is fully expressed in the single word, *agambambina*. Again, the phrase "they held an interlocutory meeting," is expressed by the single word *kambana*. "To lead an assembly in prayer," is expressed by the single word, *kambinaza*.

The Mpongwe language, as might be inferred from what has already been said, is capable of almost unlimited expansion. The vocabulary of words in actual use is not very extensive, which could scarcely be expected of a people of so little mental culture and general civilization. But it has the capacity of very great expansion, as may be seen in connexion with the missionary labors carried on among them in the last twenty years.

At the time just mentioned, the people had no knowledge of the Christian religion, and, of course, had no words corresponding to its technical terms. They had no words, for example, for Saviour, salvation, Redeemer, redemption, faith, etc. But the missionaries, after acquiring an insight into the genius of the language, found no difficulty in pressing into their service words that would express these ideas, and which would be perfectly intelligible to the people, though they had never heard them used before. From the word *sunga*, to save a thing on the point of being lost or destroyed, comes the word *ozunge*, the person who saves it, and *insunginla*, the derivative noun for salvation. So, *danduna* means, to pay a price for the deliverance of a man who has been imprisoned or held in stocks. From this comes the word *olandune*, the Redeemer, and *ilanduna*, redemption. In like manner *iyivira*, faith, comes from the singular, *jivira*, to believe, to confide in, etc. In these various ways, and simply by carrying out the well-known principles of their grammar, the vocabulary of words, in the course of a very few years, has been more than quintupled. It is, and probably always will be, a great mystery to the adult natives of the country, how the missionaries ever acquired such mastery over their language, or how

they have drawn out its amazing capabilities; whereas, it has been done simply by carrying out the principles and laws of the language to their legitimate results.

Where this language originated, or how it has been maintained in all its beauty and purity, by an uncultivated people, for so long a time, are questions that can not easily be solved. We have aimed, in the foregoing pages, merely to furnish the facts connected with its present condition, leaving it for ethnologists to account for its origin, and assign it its proper place in the great family of human languages. We would venture the single suggestion, that the family to which it belongs may have a very remote origin. The people by whom it is spoken have all the physical characteristics now that they had in the days of Herodotus, showing that those characteristics can not be ascribed exclusively, or even mainly, to climate or other external causes. Had they been the results of these alone, there would have been an increasing exaggeration of every peculiar feature; which has not been the case. No doubt the peculiar characteristics of the leading branches of the human family were impressed upon them by a divine hand, at the time of their dispersion. And why may we not suppose that languages of equally diverse character may have been given to them at the same time? It is a fact well known to students of comparative philology, that uncultivated people retain the grammatical forms of their language with much more tenacity than civilized communities. This is owing to the fact that uncultivated men, having no written symbols to aid them, hold on to the original elements of their language with so much tenacity, that they become interwoven with the very warp and woof of their mental constitution; whilst the languages of civilized communities are constantly undergoing changes, for the purpose of accommodating themselves to the demands of a progressive state of society. If this theory be correct,

and it no doubt is so, the language we have under consideration may claim a very remote origin.

But whatever may have been the origin and subsequent history of this language, it is a remarkable providence that both it and the people by whom it is spoken have been preserved for so long a period. If there has ever been a people, of whom it might be truthfully said that they have been *peeled* and *scattered*, it is the African race. They have been carried as slaves into almost every civilized nation, and, from the earliest periods of antiquity, petty wars and internal feuds make up the sum and substance of their whole history. And notwithstanding all this, they have increased and multiplied on their own soil, until, at the present day, they are the largest single family of men, with the exception of the Chinese, to be found any where in the world. When we couple with this the preservation of so remarkable a language—one so well adapted to convey the truths of the Gospel—must it not appear more than probable that God has purposes of mercy towards them that must soon be made manifest to the eyes of the world? Ought not the energies of the Church, and especially of the Southern Church, to be put forth at once, to impart to them the blessings of the Christian religion? Where can a more promising field be found, or where could she expect to reap a richer harvest?

ARTICLE III.

LETTER TO DR. BRECKINRIDGE.

TO THE REV. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D.:

These pages are addressed to you, Sir, for several reasons. You had some thing to say, in almost every phase of political affairs, during the time when the old Union was drifting to its dissolution. And we have heard from you several times, even through the thick ribs of the blockade, since the dissolution. You are the accredited author of various utterances on political affairs: a famous debate with George Thompson, the English Abolitionist, I think, at the city of Glasgow, in Scotland; a powerful letter to the "Patriot" newspaper, (I believe that was the name of the paper,) at the same place—both more than a quarter of a century ago; a letter to Charles Sumner, the Abolitionist Senator from Massachusetts, published in the Baltimore "Critic," which I did see; and a letter to William H. Seward, as I understood, which I did not see; and, also, a communication on Know-Nothing Americanism, very strenuously advocating the purposes of that association, in the same religious journal; a powerful letter published in the "National Intelligencer," though not, probably, addressed originally to that paper, in the summer of 1860, in relation to the Presidential election, and the then approaching dissolution of the Union; and the act of the Northern Presbyterian General Assembly, at Columbus, in May, 1862, describing and denouncing the great and guilty sin of the Southern Churches in withdrawing, very schismatically, you thought, from ecclesiastical communion with men busily engaged in preaching the crusade of war upon us. A speech of yours has, also, been seen in "Secesh," delivered in Cincinnati, in the early summer of 1862, in which you are reported to

have said that "it would be better for the South and the North to go back to Jamestown and Plymouth, than peaceably dissolve the old Union." We have never heard it denied or questioned that you are, also, the author of the sentiment, universally attributed to you in the newspapers, as having been uttered at an early stage of the present war, that "it was no matter how much of the blood of rebels, their wives and children, it might cost to restore the Union, the Government was worth it all." For this sentiment, you said, you might be considered a fanatic; and you accepted the probability that it was so. "Perhaps I am a fanatic," you are reported to have said; and you then gave reasons looking to the justification of your strong feelings on the subject, without expressing any apprehension of danger from the guilt of fanaticism, or any repentance for that sin, or any wish or prayer to be delivered from it, if you were guilty of it.

You may wish to know some thing of the antecedents of one who addresses you, as is now undertaken to be done, in this article. I am a Southron, a Virginian, a Presbyterian Minister of the Gospel; a man with, I suppose, about the ordinary sensibilities, sympathies, emotions, and intellect of a man. Of antecedents, in the sense of past honors, to boast of, I have none worth naming; and should feel quite awkwardly employed in boasting of them, if I had any. I have some times, for brief periods, in other days, had the pleasure of your attractive and fascinating personal society; some times the pleasure of hearing from your own lips utterances which bespeak the richest natural gifts of God to mortal man—a masterly intellect, right grandly and royally conversing with the truth of God, and with men and things, and richly enlightening other men by that converse; and still oftener have had the pleasure, and some times the amazement, of reading from your brilliant and trenchant pen what you have seen fit to produce for the public eye. I was a subscriber for the magazine which you

published in Baltimore, the "Literary and Religious Magazine;" a great admirer of your bearing while combating the Abolitionists in Great Britain, and of your letter to Sumner; and have defended quite as much as, on deliberate reflection, my conscience will justify, your two rich and grand, but very crude, undigested, rhapsodical, and dithyrambic books, "The Knowledge of God Objectively Considered," and "The Knowledge of God Subjectively Considered." This is enough to say of myself for the importance, or even for the self-importance, of the subject. I have been so much an admirer of yours in days past, as to be forced, even by the most velvet-footed and unthorough of Southern patriots around me, and by my own conscience, also, to reconsider and rejudge much of the veneration which I delighted to feel in other days for your honored name. Would that you had not compelled it to be so!

When you say that the Government of the old United States is worth any amount of the blood of men, women, and children, and say this in view of, and during the progress of, the present war for Southern Independence, if you have properly weighed the words which you employ, you must mean that any amount of bloodshed is preferable to a peaceable separation of the old Union into two federal Unions, each of respectable size and power; each, as has been proven so far, able to maintain itself against any power which may be brought into the field against it; and each having institutions homogeneous in themselves, but differing from those of the other. And you must be presumed, in all candor, to have believed, while uttering these words, that the Government of which you spoke, that of Mr. Lincoln, answered the purpose for which the Constitution was established: "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The value of a Government, certainly, consists in its answering these and similar purposes, and not in the

names of its founders, or in the pretended attachment to it of those who deliberately defy it for a long series of years, when it would restrain their own partisan lusts, and love it only when it becomes the instrument of the oppression and ruin of their adversaries. And yet it seems hardly possible to suppose, in all candor, and in all charity to boot, that any man who has not been as completely lethean, during the last quarter of a century, as one of the seven sleepers of Ephesus themselves, can now believe that the Government of the United States either establishes justice, insures domestic tranquillity, or secures the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. When we read, in the clause describing the purposes of the Government, the words, *to establish justice*, a long and chequered series of events rises to view: the resistance of the Yankee States to the admission of the State of Missouri into the Union, because her institutions were Southern; the constant struggle of those States to lay heavy duties upon the imports of the Southern States, to build up Northern manufactures; the appropriation of nearly all the territories acquired in the Mexican war, chiefly by the valor and the blood of the South, to Northern use and benefit; the appropriation, after that, by the election of Mr. Lincoln, and the triumph of the Chicago platform, of *all* the territories of the Union to Northern institutions; the open infraction, by nearly all the Yankee States, of a clear and distinct provision of the Constitution of the United States, for the return of fugitives from labor; a social war on Southern institutions for thirty years; the election of a sectional President, by a sectional vote, and on a sectional platform; the usurpation of the power to call out a military force, and to increase the regular army, without authority of law; measures of confiscation, surpassing in barbarity what have been known in Europe among the most barbarous nations since the most barbarous ages; and, at last, the New Year's gift, which is

destined for us at the beginning of the approaching new year.

There, Dr. Breckinridge, is just a glance at the manner in which the Government of the United States has *established justice*, for over a quarter of a century last past. You and I both remember most of these things. Your letter to Mr. Sumner, in 1855, proves you to have been then a deeply apprehensive spectator of the gathering storm. Yourself, Sir, and all others under whose eyes these pages may pass, are respectfully requested to reperuse, if it can be conveniently referred to, that eloquent letter of yours, in which, though it is here quoted from memory, it seems to me that you made a very powerful argument to prove to the Jacobin Massachusetts Senator the probable military equality, and perhaps superiority, of the Southern armies over the Northern, in consequence of superior Southern generalship. Of course, you have not forgotten the personal liberty laws of the Yankee States; or the underground railroads; or the violent seizures of the servants of Southern families in Northern cities; or the constant thefts of Southern servants on the borders; or the Abolition riots in the North; or the grand phillipics of your correspondent, Sumner; or the great book of Hinton Rowan Helper; or the sublime raid of John Brown to Harper's Ferry; or the pathetic appeal of Thaddeus Hyatt and the Concord schoolmaster, Sandford, for the honors of martyrdom, because the United States Senate wanted to make them tell what they knew, as witnesses, concerning the John Brown conspiracy. It is solemnly believed that no such series of mingled injury and insult was ever before so long submitted to by a brave and free people, without revolution. And this is the Government, and it is union with such a people as those, the preservation of which you, Sir, a Minister of the Prince of Peace, think is worth all our blood, and that of our wives and children.

One almost shudders at the logical enormity, in turning to another clause of the preamble to the Constitution, and inquiring: Does that Government insure domestic tranquillity, as it was designed to do? The chief magistrate, for the preservation of whose authority you devote such measureless blood, and who has actually taken a very solemn oath, on the Holy Gospel of God, to support that Constitution, has, without shadow of authority elsewhere in the instrument, save in this preambulatory clause, requiring domestic tranquillity to be insured, issued an edict from Washington inviting the slaves of the South to scenes which, if they should occur, according to the will and design of that magistrate, would make the situation of Corcyra, in its great historic sedition; or that of Paris, in the reign of terror; or that of a Northern city during the former Abolition riots, in opposition to the United States Marshal; or that of any other country of which we have read, in its worst times of public tumult, as good or better than ours. And we, and those dearer to us than our own souls, ought to die for the maintenance of a Government which thus observes its oath to "insure domestic tranquillity"!

You will scarcely allege that the question, under your valued Government, whether the Federal power has the right to make war upon the States, is an unimportant one in its connexion with the insurance of domestic tranquillity; or that the question was so clearly settled under your Government, that the ablest and the purest men might not honestly differ in their views of it. The ablest and the purest men of the North, if they still have able and pure men in political life, appear to think the right of the Federal Government to regard itself as the instrument of one part of the States, to wage war on the other part of the States, a clear and unquestionable right; as, also, the right of any particular faction, having temporary possession of the Federal Government, to call itself the Union, and to wage war upon all the rights of the people, North and South.

But the wisest and purest men of the South regard both claims as manifest usurpations, the success of which can leave no chartered liberties either in the South or the North. And in confirmation of the Southern view of the subject, the refusal, in the Convention which framed the Constitution, to accede to the proposition there made, to give the Federal Government power to coerce the States, seems entirely conclusive. Clearly, the Federal Government was never the Union, but a mere temporary representation of it. And yet this question of the right of that part of the old Union whose sectional party might have temporary possession of the offices of the Government, to style themselves the Union, and make war upon the other States, can be esteemed an unimportant one, in view of the insurance of domestic tranquillity, by no sane man any where. It appears to be a question, in the decision of which is involved the decision of the whole question concerning the value of such a Government as our old Union. If the States had the right to arrest the progress of Federal despotism, and either shield their people from it, or place them out of its reach, then it was a Government which might have had some claim to the power to insure domestic tranquillity; and, also, to fulfil another clause of the preamble to the Constitution, "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." But in that Government which you prize at so much blood, you are perfectly aware that it has become one of the highest of crimes to think on this question exactly as the framers of the Constitution thought, that the Federal Government has not the right to let loose that part of the States who adhere to them upon those who do not: and in the sacred name of Union! And if the States had no such right as this, under that Government, to arrest the progress of despotism, to shield their people from it, or to place them beyond its reach, then it is, with all its boast of liberty and republicanism, by the illusory and juggling perversion of words for the deception of man-

kind, among the worst Governments upon which the Omniscient eye looks, as the earth revolves beneath it; and the greatest enemy to true liberty which it has encountered in all the series of its struggles upon the earth. If the old Constitution provided at all for the prevention of despotism, then the North have overthrown it, in its forms, as well as in its spirit; and the South have maintained it, both in its spirit and its forms. But if it made no such provision, then it was the worst engine of despotism ever set at work among men, though tinselled on the outside, and as much glorified by blind or interested praise as the silver shrine of the Ephesian Diana; and ought to have been overthrown—the sooner the better for the real progress of human liberty. I commend to you this dilemma, between the prongs of which the perfectly obvious facts of the case compel you to enter.

Do you affirm that we had no right to change our form of general government, or confederation? There stand those words in the Declaration of Independence, on account of which it was, as is supposed among us, that the Yankees did not read the instrument to much extent in public companies last July, notwithstanding the unequivocally false interpretation which they have put upon the equality of all men announced in it: “that to secure these rights,” (of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,) “governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; and that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.” There may, perhaps, be some escape from the definite and conclusive force of these words, in some minds, produced by being plausibly told that the Constitution could not cease to be “sacredly obligatory upon all, until it was

changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people." This is a part of the language of Washington's Farewell Address, pressed into service after the usual Black Republican manner, of seizing the shallow and superficial sound of some phrase to which a great name is attached, and whirling it about for an argument, until the smallest amount of calm and fair reason, which it never professed, indeed, to be able to endure, at once dissolves it into its true nothingness. By their interpretation, the right of revolution is denied, by the pen of the most illustrious of revolutionists, and liberty is made impossible, by one who intended to make it secure. A Federal Government elected and supported by one section of States, banded together, and having peculiar interests, engaged in the most gross and avowed oppression of another section, having common and peculiar interests, would, of course, never consent to any change of their form of government, by or for the oppressed. And the more flagrant and avowed the oppression of one section by the other, the more definitely certain that no redress could ever arise from "an explicit and authentic act of the whole people," in the sense of the people of the oppressing section, as well as the oppressed. That sense was probably never intended in the words by the illustrious author; but they have interpreted it as they did the word of God, and the Constitution of the United States, and all other chartered and covenanted truth which stood in their way. Could "an explicit and authentic act" of Great Britain ever have been obtained, to change the form of government of the thirteen American colonies? Could an explicit and authentic act of "all the Russias" ever be obtained, that Poland should change her present form of government, to one which should receive the consent of the Polish people? Or could an explicit and authentic act of the Austrian Empire be now obtained, consenting that the kingdom of Hungary shall live under its own laws? As well might we expect the explicit and authentic consent

of the hawk to leave the chickens secure; or of the wolf to give the sheep a free constitution; or of the avaricious man to give chartered immunity to the gold which he desires more than life; or of the highway robber to give guarantees of respect for the rights of property.

You may, no doubt, believe, with devout sincerity, that there is power in the Government of the United States to secure the blessings of liberty to yourselves and your posterity. We entertain, very deeply, and very sincerely, a very different opinion. Let us, then, calmly reason together.

It can scarcely have escaped your memory, that a Force Bill failed to pass the Congress of the United States in the spring of 1861. That one was attempted to be passed, proves that it was deemed necessary by even the party then coming into power. But that want of lawful authority did not restrain the present chief magistrate of that country, either from his famous call for seventy-five thousand volunteers, or from an increase of the regular army by executive edict. It is true that the new Congress was perfectly subservient to the President; or rather, they were more fanatical than Mr. Lincoln himself. They registered his edicts at once; and passed an act of indemnity for his usurpations. They were too busy in preparing for the destruction of the South, to care for their own liberties. They threw them, *en masse*, at the despot's feet. But, suppose the Congress had been worthy of the name of an American Congress; suppose they had desired ever so much to check the power of usurpation at that initial and decisive point; and suppose they had considered that a gross usurpation, as no statesman would have failed to do, in times when reason was on the throne; what power would they have had to do so? The streets of Washington were thronged with fanatical soldiers, making daily arrests of the best and noblest citizens, on the slightest grounds. The venerable chief justice of the United States pronounced that one of them—an arrest in Baltimore, it was—was among the most

flagrant acts of despotism in history. What of all that? The despot had seized the sword. Free legislation became thenceforward impossible. The plea of necessity was urged—the usual plea of despots. Simple letters from the Executive, for the arrest of individuals, (*lettres de cachet*), which have met with such universal condemnation in Europe, became perfectly common in that Government, and have been to this day. Printing-presses were demolished, and editors imprisoned; all liberty became a farce, even when they were boasting of liberty, and declaring, like drunken sailors, that they were preserving the “mildest Government on the face of the earth.” When a written constitution becomes powerless, precedent is a great thing. That act of usurpation is upon the statute-books of the United States. All the waters of Lethe can not take it away. Not only has the despot’s plea of necessity been accepted, but the claim of the despot himself, to judge when that necessity arises, has been allowed, and held good. Now, what is your prospect, under that Government, to secure the blessings of liberty to yourselves and your posterity? Other despots may, some day, suppose themselves under the same necessity as the present despots. They may imprison the Republicans at will, according to the precedents which the Republicans have set them. What a howl for *habeas corpus*, and “free speech,” and “free press,” that would produce among the Lincolns, and Seward, and Sumners, and Wades, and Hales, and Trumbulls! They love despotism when the other party feel it. They do not erect themselves to so lofty a height of principle, as to see that it is always criminal, even when they themselves get the benefit. They will, of course, think it very horrible when they feel its edge. But if Marius may proscribe the followers of Sylla, then Sylla may in turn proscribe the followers of Marius. If Pompey may proscribe the followers of Cæsar, then Cæsar may just as well proscribe the followers of Pompey. Faction will rise against faction,

and urge the plea of necessity, which has already been accepted, to set aside all liberty. No man can foresee the end. It really seems a mere jest to talk of such a Government as the means of establishing justice, of insuring domestic tranquillity, or of securing the blessings of liberty to yourselves and your posterity.

It is not easy to see what that is, on account of which you prize your Government above so much blood, guilty and innocent. You freely call us *rebels*. So does Mr. Lincoln; so do all the newspapers of the North, which are permitted to exist. For, under your "best Government in the world," as in Austria and Russia, a man may yet speak freely, provided he will pronounce the Shibboleth exactly to suit the Government.

We will not speak now any more of the sovereignty of the States, and of the right inherent in them to withdraw from a tyrannical Government. We will say no more about the principle asserted in the Declaration of Independence, that the just powers of a government depend on the consent of the governed; nor about the right of a free people to alter or abolish their government when it ceases to answer the ends of its creation. You have gotten beyond all those sweet and sacred things of other days, the days of real liberty and prosperity. But you can not have forgotten how the Southern States kept the bond with unsullied faith, while they acknowledged it to be their bond; how it was chiefly their blood which won the honors of that old flag, in wars against foreign powers. Nor can you have forgotten, that by their personal liberty laws, and their under-ground railroads, the Northern States were *perpetual rebels* against that Constitution, while they very specially claimed the benefits which it conferred upon them. They gave very little assistance in the Mexican war, you will remember; but when the question of dividing the spoils acquired therein came up,

“Hark, answering to the ignoble call,
How rises each bold bacchanal.”

There appear to be two senses of the word *rebel*; the one, describing those who claim the benefits, and reap the advantages of the government under which they live, but refuse to make the required sacrifices, and to discharge the correlative duties. In this, the really odious sense of the word, we feel that we are in no danger of the reproach. We were loyal till we were almost lost. We appeal to an enlightened world, and to God, the judge of all, for our loyalty, while loyalty to that Government was not treason to the cause of lawful free government itself. The other sense of the word is, one who resists a despot's usurped authority. In this sense of the word, we feel a just pride in being what our would-be oppressors style *rebels*. In this sense of the word, it is common to us with Washington, and Henry, and Jefferson, and with Hampden, and Sidney, and Russell, and with the patriots, the world over, who have won the purest and the loftiest fame among men. We are willing to have it inscribed on whatever monument may chance to appear to mark to future generations the places where our ashes may repose in the earth, that we are of those rebels who, laying their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor upon the altar of their country, resolve to resist tyranny and lawless oppression, until that last resting-place shall receive us. Until lately, the names of such rebels were held in reverence among you. Until lately, the Declaration of Independence, which is the very apotheosis of exactly such rebellion, was reverently read among you every year on the fourth day of July, especially when it was supposed that it would bear the Abolitionist sense of negro equality. But your people seem now to condemn rebellion so strongly, that one would think that, since the election of Mr. Lincoln, they had some how received some new light on the subject, which not only convinced them that the legal withdrawal of our Southern States from their

usurped and despotic Government was a great crime—the very greatest of crimes, indeed—but that John Hampden's rebellion against Charles the First was a very great crime; and that George Washington's rebellion against George the Third was a very great crime; and, in short, that any rebellion, even a rebellion against the god of this world, the prince of the power of the air, the great spiritual liar, and father of lies, would be a very great crime, and loyalty to him a very great virtue.

But perhaps it is because you think a large nation has so much better chance for reputation abroad, and for respect among the nations of the earth, that you set such a bloody valuation upon the Government of Mr. Lincoln. This was one prominent reason given by your present Secretary of State for being opposed to the separation of the South and the North. But it was in the rude days of old that men were honored for their bodily size and sinew, and a bruiser was of more estimation than a philosopher. It is certainly not the case at this day, that nations are respected for either their territorial size or the denseness of their population. If it were so, the Chinese would surely be a far more respectable people among other nations than the French; and the Russians, than the English: neither of which will be pretended. Nor does it seem to us that the Yankee States, from which we have withdrawn, can be greatly suffering, in their own view of themselves, from diminished territorial limits, or dwindled military and naval power. They have, you will remember, with great sanctity, appropriated to themselves and their posterity all the vast territories which belonged in common to the people of the late United States. That must, in time, greatly swell their territorial dimensions.

Moreover, they have several times recently, during the prevalence of rumors of foreign intervention, declared their thorough ability and determined purpose, not only very speedily to crush "the Southern rebellion," but to contend,

by land and water, with any or all the nations of Europe who might desire to interfere to stop the effusion of blood in the present war. That does not look as if they felt themselves to be suffering seriously from territorial emaciation, or exhaustion of resources. Excuse the remark, Sir, but that does not look as if a Christian Minister ought to be willing to shed measureless blood, which he believes to be guilty blood, and, in addition, measureless blood besides, which he admits to be innocent blood, to extend the territorial limits, or to add to the military resources of such a giant people.

But you can hardly be supposed to think that the respect which a nation commands abroad depends altogether, or even chiefly, upon its size, and not at all upon its character. Most of the giants of the mediæval romance were coarse, ignorant, truculent fellows, good for little else than to devour stray children whom they caught, and of whom a dozen were not worth one good Aquinas, or Abelard, or Roger Bacon. Already one minister of the British Crown has denounced the unparalleled atrocity with which your Government has waged this war; and another minister of the British Crown has thought it necessary to warn the friends of constitutional liberty in Europe against the adverse influence of your present example upon that cause abroad. The nations of the earth are hardly so blind as to look altogether to size or resources, in estimating your influence. They are hardly so blind as not to see that, under the old republican forms, you have, like the Romans under the Cæsars, accepted one of the completest of despotisms, not only affecting to claim for itself rightful power over us guilty rebels of the South, our property, our liberty, and our lives; but claiming that thoroughly despotic power in the so-called loyal States of the North themselves, and having the claim largely conceded to them. It is impossible to foresee how the sentiment will be received by so zealous an adherent of the Lincoln Government as yourself—per-

haps in rage, perhaps with a smile of contempt—but it is coming to be believed to be true by many of the wise at the North; and is most clearly perceived as truth by every thinker at the South, whose thoughts there are any means of knowing by the public, that the existence of any legal liberty on this continent, either in the North or in the South, depends on the success of the Southern revolution. You may also see unmistakable signs of the spread of the same conviction in European public sentiment.

Is it on account of the pure and upright moral character evinced by Mr. Lincoln's Government, and by the people who support it, that you think its preservation worth so much of our blood? It may be a mistake, but it can hardly be so, for it was so said in the newspapers, and corroborated universally by the testimony of those in attendance at the Presbyterian General Assembly, and never denied by yourself, as is believed, but rather gloried in, that, in a debate on the subject of missions, on the floor of that body, a few years ago, your own trenchant and influential voice uttered the sentiment, that great efforts ought to be made to send missionaries to New England; that you did not know any country, pretending to be enlightened, where there was so great a lack as in New England of the full, thorough, outspoken deliverance of the Gospel of Christ to the people from the pulpit. You were not then, certainly, fallen very deeply into *Yankeecomania*. And that good witness, it is greatly to be feared, is true.

It has been your high privilege, Dr. Breckinridge, in other and better days, to render eminent services to the cause of pure truth and a sound Gospel, which we can never forget. And even now, we are sad that you have given good ground against yourself, to those who will occupy it with more pleasure, on account of the scenes and events of other days, and the part which you were called to bear in those scenes and events. But in those services, you were not more remarkable and justly eminent for the noble powers of intel-

lect bestowed on you by a munificent Creator, than for a certain moral honesty which scorned concealment and equivocation, a certain "Kentuckyesque" chivalry of mental habit, which no one, who at all knew you, expected to see ever stoop to any sort of meanness or deception. And you have, in your day, had occasion to see and to know a good deal of the Jesuit priests, and of the wily and cunning arts with which they weigh and balance words and actions, to mean one thing or another, as the exigencies of their cause may demand. You have, no doubt, read the letters of Mr. Lincoln's premier, Seward, to Messrs. Adams and Dayton, published a year ago; and the recent circular of that great Northern statesman to the foreign ministers of the United States abroad, not to mention the frequent and influential speeches of the premier on political questions in former days, on account of which he has attained his present eminent position. Have you ever met in your reading, or your experience of Jesuit morality, with a more thoroughly disingenuous mind, on any and every subject, than that of Mr. Seward? Have you ever seen the art of deceiving men with words practised more thoroughly, more skilfully, or more boldly, than by Mr. Seward? It is not believed that you can or will say that you ever have. Your conjunction of excessive admiration with such a man, looks as if Old Honest had made a partnership with Hate-Good; as if Lofty and Low had met together; and Truth and Deception had kissed each other. That conjunction has seriously injured you, without doing Mr. Seward any good. The act which you carried through at Columbus, accusing us of making an ecclesiastical schism, because we did not remain in connexion with a religious body which was fiercely hounding on the civil Government in making war upon us, and because we established a separate Church in the Confederate States, believing that we had, both of right and in fact, a separate civil Government there, had a twang of peculiar Sewardish innocence about it. Our country had

ceased to be free, and belonged to you! The Presbyterians of the South, though unrepresented in your body, had ceased to be the Lord's freemen, but belonged to you! If they withdrew from you, you would disregard their Church organizations, and establish others on the same ground! You would give up none of *your country*—not you! There was far more of Seward than of Breckinridge in that act. Such voluntary blindness to things perfectly visible; such persistent manufacture of coverings thinner than fig-leaves out of human language, to conceal facts, or cause them to glimmer with dimness to men's view, is probably a sign of the sore impending judgments of God upon your people. The faith of man in the words of God, is the means of man's salvation. That faith is among the highest acts of worship which man offers to his God. To realize that facts accord with those words of God, and thus to receive the words as the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen, is about the highest elevation of the spirit of man while in our present bodily condition. Veracity between man and man, is one of the ten commandments given from heaven to earth. The practice of veracity is the basis of moral honesty, and moral courage; some say, of almost all good character. You yourself have taken the distinction, in the titles of your two massive volumes, between subjective truth, or what a man thinks, and objective truth, or that which exists independently of all human opinion. You have, probably, observed how the Northern mind often tries to think a fact out of existence; to shut their eyes to it, whether it be a principle of Scripture, a clause of the Constitution, or a maxim of common good faith and good behavior; to ignore it, to deny totally any acquaintance with it, as Peter did with his Master; and look you calmly in the face, in all apparent good conscience, as if the fact itself had been annihilated by their refusal to recognize it. You have probably observed, and if so, it must have been with alarm, the prevalent opinion among

that people, that there is no difference between objective and subjective truth; that whatever a man chooses to believe to be truth, is truth for him. You must have observed the suppression of printing-presses for speaking unwelcome truths, which it is intended to expel from God's universe, and cause them to cease to be truths, by ignoring them. You must notice how every fact connected with thirty years' social war of the North upon our institutions, is now diligently concealed from the Northern people; and how the most orderly, lawful, and proper revolution in all history, provoked by a train of insult and injury such as no other people ever submitted to for so long a time, is styled "the most causeless rebellion that ever was, against the best Government on earth." This disingenuousness is a very deep and cancerous species of depravity, when it becomes so wide-spread. With all your strong bias in its favor, yet with your natural stout honesty of mind, you must some times see this deep depravity of the Northern mind, or, at least, have startling glimpses of it. It has shown itself as clearly among your military leaders, as in your Secretary of State. General Pope's dispatch from near Corinth, last summer, that he had captured ten thousand Confederate prisoners, and a million of dollars' worth of army stores, from General Beauregard, in the retreat of that general, has never been denied by any Northern paper that we have seen, although it was a total falsehood. It may not be amiss to put on record here a few other things of the same description, for the eyes of those who come after us, as memoirs to serve for the history of the mystery of the iniquity of mendacity. When Jackson drove Banks and his army from the Valley of Virginia, last June, in one of the most affrighted and perfect routs on record, capturing his immense stores at Winchester, Banks's official report contained these words: "My command has not suffered an attack and rout. It accomplished a *premeditated retreat* of sixty miles, in face of the enemy, defeating his plans, and

giving him battle wherever found. Our loss is, thirty-eight killed, one hundred and fifty-five wounded, and seven hundred and eleven missing." At the very time when this report was published, there were to be counted in Virginia three thousand prisoners, captured from Banks's army on its "premeditated retreat." The defeat of McClellan's army in its entrenchments around Richmond, last June and July, was, as events have since shown, one of the most thorough and crushing defeats on record. The following appeared in the "New Orleans Delta," of the 10th of July: "Great battle fought! Richmond taken! Fifty thousand rebel prisoners taken! The last ditch captured! The Tennessee has arrived from below Vicksburg, bringing the following important intelligence: On the sixth instant, General Halleck sent a despatch to Commodore Davis, commanding the American fleet above, announcing that he had just received a telegram from General Grant, stating that a great battle had been fought at Richmond, with immense loss of life on both sides. Richmond had been captured, after a desperate struggle, and fifty thousand Confederate prisoners taken, with a vast quantity of stores, ammunition, guns, etc. We have no reason to doubt the authenticity of this great news, as it comes through a semi-official channel of a most reliable character. Three cheers for McClellan and the army of the Union!" The capital of the Confederacy may be taken hereafter, for all we know, if God so will, and even before these sheets go through the press; but it certainly was not captured by McClellan last July. Here is another incident, of the same period, involving the veracity of General McClellan himself, and taken from a trustworthy authority: "At Cold Harbor, after the fight was over, a wounded Yankee called to one of our officers, and besought him to tell him what devils had been fighting them, as he had 'never seen such a fight before.' The officer satisfied his curiosity, and, among other forces, mentioned those of Jackson. 'Was that devil *here*?' re-

plied the Yankee. 'Why, yesterday, *McClellan had an order read to the army*, saying that he had been cut to pieces in the Valley.'" (The Italics are ours.) Such is General McClellan's idea of the virtue of veracity. His own address to his army, on the fourth day of July, from Harrison's Landing, from which he soon afterwards made an inglorious escape, will further illustrate that virtue of this distinguished character. It commences: "Soldiers of the army of the Potomac, your achievements of the past ten days have illustrated the valor and endurance of the American soldiers. Attacked by superior forces, and without hopes of reinforcements, you have succeeded in changing your base of operations by a flank movement, always regarded as the most hazardous of military operations. You have saved all your guns except a few lost in battle, taking in return guns and colors from the enemy. Upon your march you have been assailed, day after day, with desperate fury, by men of the same race *and nation*, skilfully massed and led. Under every disadvantage of number, and necessarily of position also, you have in every conflict beaten back your foes with enormous slaughter. Your conduct ranks you among the most celebrated armies in history. None will now question that each of you may always, with pride, say, 'I belonged to the army of the Potomac.' You have reached this new base, complete in organization and unimpaired in spirit. The enemy may at any time attack you. We are prepared to meet them. I have personally established your lines. Let them come, and we will convert their repulse into a final defeat."

These specimens appear to be sufficient. We have no space for the vulgar mendacity of your hero, John Pope. It is equally gross and notorious. We spread these things here, Dr. Breckinridge, under the all-seeing eye of our God and Judge, and ask if this is not the most shameless perversion of truth with which you have ever met any where? They say that these men are required by their Government

to make these mendacious reports. It is vain to say, it is a part of the strategy of war to practise these arts. There is nothing whatever of the sort among the Confederates; nothing! That charge, if made, is as true as these despatches and addresses: not more so, that we know of. And this is the moral character of the Government, and of the cause, for love of which an aged and venerable minister of *God's truth* cares not how much of the blood of rebels, their wives and children, is shed. Oh, Sir, you have, some how, fearfully erred!

It is a grand and solemn fact, that neither a man, nor a party, nor a whole generation of men, can MURDER TRUTH, any more than they can murder God Himself. That discovery will have to be made, some time or other, by your Government and your people, if it is not made already. The giant Enceladus, lying under Mount *Ætna*, often threatens to arise and shake off the mighty mass of the superincumbent mountain. And some day he will probably arise, although the fabled giant is but the volcanic force of subterranean Sicilian fires, and not a giant of mind and soul. But there can be no conceivable mass of superincumbent falsehood, piled upon the bosom of truth, from under which she can not rise, when God shall so please, as readily as the Hebrew giant from the fetters of the seven green withes, which he broke "as a thread of tow is broken when it toucheth the fire." For God is the life and soul of truth. It is His breath, as immortal as His being, as unconquerable as His right arm. "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth mischief by a law?"

Your Government seems, at length, to have fully set up the claim of right to confiscate the property, emancipate and ruin the slaves, and subjugate the people, of the Southern States. Have you ever seriously asked yourself, as in the presence of the Judge of all the earth, from whence have they derived such right? Was there ever

such a grant of our soil to your people, by express divine authority, as there was of the soil of old Canaan to the Hebrews, under Joshua? And if not, do you think that the invasion of Canaan by Joshua, and the subjugation and extermination of the people, would have been justifiable without the express divine command under which it was accomplished, and that it is a proper model for wars of subjugation and conquest in every age and country? Do you never *feel with* our great ancestors of the first Revolution, while Great Britain was attempting to subdue them? or with Holland, in her heroic story, while the haughty Spaniards were endeavoring to wrest from her her political and religious rights? Have you learned to *feel with the despots*, in all the great struggles for the rights of self-government and unfettered conscience, with which the annals of the human race are bespangled?

Do you profess to derive that right of confiscation, emancipation, and subjugation, from the Constitution of the old United States? The fact that the Union was a union of States clearly appearing before our eyes in the Senate, where great States and small are equal; and that the Constitution was adopted by States; and that the President is elected by States, and not by a majority of the whole people; and that almost every political function, except those which involve foreign nations, was transacted by States; ought to have satisfied the calm reason of every man that the instrument of the union of the States could never have contemplated the subjugation of one part of the States by another part; and the consequent destruction of those powers of voluntary sovereignty on which the Union depended. Logically, the claim to rule by coercion in this country, is a claim to *force* men to a *voluntary* action—one which must be voluntary, in the nature of the case, or else it can not be at all. It is said to be a war-making power. But certain powers are granted to the Executive, for times of war, by the Constitution, and these are not among them.

And all powers granted to the Executive, for all times, are restrained by the positive mandate that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; and that in all criminal proceedings, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law.

Much is built upon the *insurrection* of the States against the Federal Government. This is a thorough perversion of the meaning of the word *insurrection*, as employed in the Constitution, as almost any publicist of the old and un-fanatical school of any party of the politicians would have admitted. But suppose the present claim to be well founded. Suppose that war removes from the Executive Government the restrictions of the Constitution in regard to the life, liberty, and property of the citizens of States in *insurrection*, as they choose to call it; then it would really seem as if the obligation of the Southern States to support that Constitution was dissolved also, by the act of your own Executive, in setting aside the instrument as the regulating authority of the war; even if the repeated infractions of the instrument by the Abolition States had not broken the covenant on all sides, by breaking it on their side; and even if our own solemn and legal act of secession and withdrawal had not released us from the moral obligation to support that Government. These considerations throw a lurid light upon the moral character of the war which you are waging upon us. Moreover, if a state of war releases your Executive from the constitutional restraints in relation to life, liberty, and property of the citizens of the States, then, clearly, you only need a state of war, at any time, to constitute your President the completest despot of the world. Surely, men who thus construe a written instrument under oath, are not the men through whom you can hope to secure the blessings of liberty for yourselves and your posterity; or for whom

it is either Christianity or worldly wisdom to spill much blood, guilty or innocent. They are such men as no people can elevate to power without fearful danger, to say the least.

Do you derive the right to subjugate and destroy us from natural justice, equity, or from any law of nature? This you will hardly pretend. The Abolitionists have long contended that the Declaration of Independence gave the negro the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, after the cruel fashion of their States. But even they have not yet advanced theoretically, although they have practically, to the splendid humanitarian conclusion, that natural equity gives those rights to the negro of the South, but takes them away from the white man.

A good deal is said at the present time about the great battle of Armageddon, the pouring of the seventh vial into the air, the division of the great city into three parts, and the dreadful apocalyptic hail. And a blessing certainly is pronounced upon those who wisely read, and hear, and keep the words and things of that prophecy. But there is another much plainer prophecy than those of the apocalyptic seer—a prophecy from the lips of the Lord Jesus Himself—one of those clear foreshowings of the moral destinies of this life, which He frequently threw upon the world—which, taken in connexion with its fulfilments, appears to me to be among the grandest of all prophecies of worldly affairs. It is this: "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." The moral government of God in human affairs, His unwearied and unceasing special providence, and His eternal justice, appear together there in unequivocal form. What a prophecy that is for your beloved Government, to be fulfilled under the just eye and in the due measures of God! And what solemn days are before them, when they shall be receiving full and fair compensation, from Him before whom all truth lies in sharp objective shape, independently of all human attempts to think it down, or to outface it, for their social war of thirty

years against the South, under the stolen guise of humanity; and for their selfish and sectional presidential election; and for their total overthrow of the liberties of the people of the North, and, as far as they could, of the South also; for their intrigue of the Continent into this war; for the oppression, rapine, and murder, which have been committed; for Butler's deeds in New Orleans, for Andrew Johnson's in Nashville, and for Sherman's in Memphis; for all that the cells of Fort Warren, Fort LaFayette, Fort Delaware, and Fort McHenry have to utter in the unerring and retentive ears of the holy, impartial, and almighty God. Your Government may take comfort to itself, that there is little prospect that any earthly power will be able soon to be the instrument of administering the divine justice to them. Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the hearts of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil. Yet, remember that

“The mills of God grind very slow, but they grind exceeding small;
And though He may forbearing be, with exactness grinds He all.”

God is patient, because he is eternal.* His means of administering justice are as ample as His government is universal. He can and does do, in these days, without miracle, all that He did in former days by miracle. The New Testament dispensation is not one in which the order and plans of His government produce any diminution of the displays of His power in human affairs. The same power attends Him now as when the Red Sea closed on the chariots of Pharaoh, or when the destroying angel paid a visit by night to the hosts of Sennacherib. “Nemesis has always been represented as seeming to tarry, but making her appearance most opportunely at last. When man's passion is strong, and bent upon indulgence, avenging justice may seem as if it was standing aside, and inattentive; but it is only that it may seize him with a more powerful grasp, in

* St. Augustine.

the state of exhaustion that follows. When the plots of cunning and deceit are successful, it may look as if God did not observe human affairs; but when the dishonest man is caught at last, he finds it to be in toils which have for years been weaving for him. Napoleon, on his march to Moscow, concluded that he could command his destiny; but when the nations of Europe, alarmed at his ambition, shut him up in St. Helena, every one saw that his destiny had, instead, been all the time carrying him along, as the stream bears upon its surface the bubbles which its waters had formed. It not unfrequently happens, that every opposing power, which the wicked thinks he has crushed, rises up to pursue and punish him, when the tide of fortune is turning against him. Every drop of that cup of bitter elements which he has been filling for others, he must drink himself, when he has filled up the measure of his iniquities. The fagots which he has been collecting for the destruction of others, all go to augment the flame of his own funeral pile. The drunkard is not more certainly haunted by the frightful apparitions called up by the disease which follows excess, than crime is pursued by its avenging spirits. There is, if we may so speak, a gathering and closing in at the death, and that to behold his agonies and humiliation, of all the powers which have been in scattered scent and pursuit of him, throughout the whole hunting-ground of his career. It is affirmed of the drowning man, that in the brief space of time that precedes unconsciousness, every event of his past life passes in rapid review before his eyes; and there is certainly some thing of this hurrying in the avenging events, all having a connexion with his past life, which God crowds on one another, to make the ambitious, the proud, and the malignant, discover that He has all along been ruling their destiny."*

* McCosh on the Divine Government, Chap. II., sec. 3.

These eloquent sentences, written years ago, in the tranquillity of Scotland, sound as if they were written for the present times on this continent. Do not think, however, that we are unmindful of our own sins. Far from it. We know that divine justice owes us, and we feel that we are being paid heavily, for pride, covetousness, sensuality, worldliness, ungodliness. We trust that we are, in some measure, humbling ourselves, and coming to repentance for those great sins. But of the dreadful political and social sins, of faithlessness to compacts, and to oaths, and to constitutions, and to Holy Scripture; of falsehood and deception; of inhuman malice and barbarity; we do not greatly dread the inquisition of our Divine Judge. We loved and defended the Government of the United States, until the whole spirit of the bond was perverted by malignant enemies into an instrument for our oppression. While we professed to live under it, we did so with unsullied honor. Our sages made it. Our statesmen administered it. Our patriots freely gave their blood for the honor of its flag, while the flag was an emblem of justice. We bore with the insult and wrong of the Northern States with all patience, until hostility to us became the high road to popular favor among them; and until our patience received their sneers, and was construed into a confession of weakness, and a purpose of submission to the most lawless and fanatical of their meditated schemes of oppression. And we solemnly believe that one of the greatest obstacles to peace is the favorable record for us which truth would make of our great struggle and its causes, if the war should speedily close. We are, both parties of us, in the hands of God. We cheerfully leave our cause in His hands. Your beloved Government will one day fall into His mighty hands, whether you will or not.

When you say that your Government is worth any amount of the blood of rebels, their wives and children, how do you estimate the value of that part of the blood thus devoted

to be shed, which even you will admit to be innocent blood? The shedding of innocent blood is the crime to which, of all others, the severest penalties are annexed in the divine law, and put into execution in the divine government. It is forbidden from Mount Sinai, and in the inspired Jewish civil law, and in the laws of all countries. And the penalty which we see to come directly from the hand of God, into the conscience of the guilty man, is the most tremendous in nature. Time does not wear it away, but leaves it plainly exhibiting a nature and a power as eternal as the spirit itself in which it inheres. On the first occasion on which we know of innocent blood having been shed on earth, the voice of that blood was loud enough to be heard from earth to heaven. It cried unto God from the ground. And the earth which opened her mouth to receive that blood, opened it also to curse the murderer. He was denied the bountiful gifts of the earth, and made a fugitive and a vagabond upon her surface. One night a treacherous Jew sold the blood of an innocent man to the chief priests of his nation, for thirty shekels of silver. But before the hour of noon on the next day, the thirty silver shekels were hurled out of his hand as if they burned it; and the bare memory that he had had a part in exposing that innocent blood to be shed, had such fearful power in his mind as to extinguish his ruling passion of avarice, and blot out his hopes of the future, and crush the instinct of the love of life itself, and send his soul into eternity, reeking with the blood of the innocent Redeemer, and with his own blood besides. That same innocent blood, laid upon the souls of the children of God, as the sprinkling of the atonement, is of sufficient value to save unnumbered millions of souls through eternity. Laid upon the guilty heads of those Jews who, upon the day of the crucifixion, invoked it upon their heads, and those of their children, it has burned and withered them, and is now burning and withering them, until, in point of perfect loss of all existence as a people, they are sunk lower than

any other people on the face of the earth. If you really believe that this world is a part of the dominion of God, that His holy, and powerful, and infallible government and providence extends over it, and that might does not make right, and that delay of judgment is no sign that the sentence is either repealed or forgotten, then, indeed, you would better have a care of being found guilty before God of the shedding of innocent blood. Such men as old king Pharaoh, of Egypt, in the days of Moses, and king Herod, of Judea, in the days of the birth of Jesus, and Richard the Third of England, and perhaps a few of the Roman Catholic Inquisitors, have dealt in the blood of children. You are the first Christian Minister in all history known to us to be enrolled in that list, the distinctly and deliberately expressed atrocity of whose sentiments renders any defence of him impossible. We consider our own blood, when shed by our invaders, as innocent blood. And so do you, and so do all men of any thought in Mr. Lincoln's dominions, consider the blood of all other men but ourselves, in similar circumstances, to be innocent blood. Except ourselves, all other men in history, who bleed for independence, and against lawless oppression and injustice, are the greatest and noblest of men. But we presume that no one will question that the blood of our wives and children, which you have already shed, and which you may shed hereafter, is innocent blood. We commit that innocent blood to the justice of that God whose ears are attentive to its cry, and to His almighty power, and to His infallible memory. He keeps the blood of the prophets, and apostles, and martyrs. Vengeance is His. Self-defence and cheerful trust in Him are ours. We accept war just as long as He may permit it to be waged upon us. We feel perfectly clear and certain that, in the strictest and most faithful interpretation of them, the oracles of Christianity give us a full support as to the righteousness and holiness of the war which we are waging. We are not at liberty or at leisure to spend a single thought upon submission to

the Government of Mr. Lincoln. It would be unfaithfulness to God, to our own liberties, and to those of our posterity. Even if we expected to be subdued, we have no alternative but unceasing resistance. But we do not expect to be subjugated. We build these expectations on many things. We know that this is not an atheist world. We know that might is *not* right. We know that no generation of men can destroy the existence of truth by pertinaciously refusing to look upon her fair face. We know that the race is not always to the swift, nor the battle to the strong. We know that there is a government of God, which can make David stronger than Goliath; that there are times appointed, when one shall chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight. We pray a great deal for our leaders, for our rulers, for our armies, for our cause. We can clearly see that God is the hearer of our prayers. We commit the events of the future to His disposal. The whole disposal of them is from Him. Moreover, although we desire to do no boasting, save that which speaks in the booming of our cannon, and the sharp volleys of our musketry, yet we do not so trust in God as to neglect the use of the means. We lean ever upon God, and as we consult one with another, we find that He infuses hope, comfort, and cheer into our people's hearts, over the whole land, amid the deepest waters and in the sharpest flames of trial. But we trust also in the brave hearts, and the steady hands, and the deadly aim, and the sharp bayonets, of our soldiers. We trust in the skill of our military leaders, the firmness of our civil Government, and the unflinching and self-sacrificing loyalty of the whole mass of the people. We are placed in precisely such circumstances as were our fathers of the first Revolution. Their example gives us light. Their grand forms, walking in the path of glory before us, appear to beckon and to lure us on. Their reproaches are our reproaches; they were called rebels, just as we are called rebels. Mendacity and barbarity were tried against them, just as

mendacity and barbarity are tried against us; though far worse are the mendacity and barbarity of these times than of those; of Yankees than of English. They maintained a seven years' contest for their independence. It may appear to an all-wise Providence not to be a real good to us to win our independence in a much shorter time. It would be a crying shame to us to estimate our own liberties, and those of our children, at less than seven years, or than any number of years which may be necessary for their achievement. And the final success of our forefathers, together with the long list of splendid victories already granted to our armies, and the answer of God in our hearts, when we commit our cause to Him—these things cheer us. Mr. Lincoln's proclamations have always done us great good. They are enough to beget courage under the ribs of death. They are more than enough to fire the hearts, and nerve the arms of Southern men. They seem likely to continue to perform that office for us.

Of course, we know that war is an immense evil; there is so much precious life lost, there are so many souls sent unprepared into eternity, there are so many widowed wives, and orphan children, such measureless woes of bereavement, such trampling down of Zion, such an arrest of all progress of society. It is a great evil; and upon those who are its authors, in the sight of a just God, it rests as a great crime. But in the hands of God, and in the far-reaching plans of His government, history shows war to have been, in various and wonderful ways, an instrument, also, of vast blessing to the world. We believe that our armies are exhibiting, to a considerable degree, the silver lining of the sable cloud. Their great self-denial and trials have been sanctified to the souls of both officers and men, in many instances. Many in the armies have passed from death to life. We have many godly officers and soldiers. There have been, in our great struggle, not a few instances of manifest divine interposition, and of

evident answers to prayer. It is believed by many that both our armies and our people are approaching nearer and nearer to that state of a brave and diligent use of the means, and, withal, a firm leaning upon God in faith, which will make us as invincible as the armies of Joshua, and by the same power. Heaven grant that it may be so.

Give me leave to tell you, in conclusion, that your Government and your people are laboring under that deep blindness and delusion which are the natural result of crime. You think that your monstrous wrongs against us have either been committed in a dream, or that they are *murdered* truth and *dead* history. You think that, some how or other, with compromise or without compromise, we shall some day have some political union again with you. If you but knew the simple fact on that subject, you would, unless you are in the full possession of the evil one, zealously labor to undo what you are now zealously laboring to do; and eagerly strive, by all the arts of a merely subjective species of truth, to prove yourselves not to be, and never to have been, what you are now eagerly striving to show that you are.

ARTICLE IV.

REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE CHURCH.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE SYNOD OF VIRGINIA, DURING ITS SESSIONS IN STAUNTON, OCTOBER, 1862, BY THE REV. A. W. MILLER, PETERSBURG, VA.

The present may be considered a critical period in the history of the Church. Horrid war has rolled its tide of desolation into her midst, extinguished many bright lights, and greatly crippled her resources. Some have yielded to the temptations of an evil time, and brought reproach upon the Christian name. An extraordinary providence addresses to her an extraordinary call to duty. Straited in herself the Church may be, but straitened in her Divine Head she never can be. The resources of Jehovah are pledged to sustain her; the influences of the Spirit animate her; ministering angels wait upon her; whilst all the wisdom, all the power, all the love of the Holy Trinity are engaged to uphold, preserve, and save her! The Lord in the midst of her is mighty. His kingdom can never be moved; no opposition can shake it; no internal decays ruin it. The spring of it is in Him who liveth for ever and ever, and hath the keys of hell and death. It survives amidst falling thrones and dissolving dynasties. Other kingdoms decline and perish. But their fall, equally with their rise, only contributes to its advancement. It takes no step backward. Its course is ever onward. For it was founded by its omniscient King, not only in full view of all the multiform hostility it would encounter, but with the fixed purpose of overruling and converting all opposition into instrumentalities for its developement, extension, and final triumph. The bruising of the serpent's head follows the bruising of the Saviour's heel. The kingdom of provi-

dence, with its ceaseless changes, its tumults, its revolutions, its wars, has been put in subjection to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, who has made it subservient to His great kingdom of grace, the design and end of all His works. Hence, the course of nature and the providence of God have, in every age, ministered to the Gospel, preserving, defending, opening before it its appointed way, and propelling it in its onward career over all opposition of individuals, kingdoms, states, and the embattled hosts of the mighty powers of darkness.

These thoughts afford encouragement in this day of darkness and rebuke. Zion shall not always be left to mourn. God is still in the midst of her. He will help her, and that right early. Though He chasten, He will not cast off for ever. He has come to quicken His Church—come to rouse her from her lethargy—come to rebuke her pride, wean her from self-confidence, reprove her for her unbelief, her indolence, her supineness, her neglect of duty, and excite her to call more earnestly upon the name of the Lord, that He may return to her, and show her His salvation.

Will she "hear the rod," and lay its lessons to heart? Will she humble herself before the Lord, and repent of her sins? Will she address herself to her work with redoubled diligence and ardor? Or will she, even under the chastening hand of God, sink down into torpor and indifference greater than before, and slumber over her tremendous responsibilities? responsibilities, too, that are greatly increased by the stirring events of our day. The successful termination of the war we are now waging against infidelity and despotism, will place our Southern Church more prominently before the world than ever she has been before. She will stand alone. The eyes of the world will be upon her. Her course will be watched—every act scrutinized by the nations—their sympathies not yet with her, and given only when forced to acknowledge the evident tokens of favor bestowed by her Divine Head, and her signal devotion

to His service. But, above all, the eyes of God are upon her. She has a great work to do. And it becomes her to realize its magnitude, and prepare, in the strength of the Lord, to do it. It is taken for granted that the discipline through which she is now passing will not be lost upon her; that she will come out of the furnace purified; the line that separates her from the world more distinct than ever; her standard higher, her aims loftier, her zeal more steady, her determination more fixed to consecrate to the service of the Master the great resources He has lavished upon her, and to signalize the power of His grace by a devotion more uniform, more intense, more universal, more constant, than has ever marked her history before. Her experience has taught her that sacrifices of one kind or another she must make; and that if she excuses herself from making easy sacrifices for Christ's cause, notwithstanding the priceless benefits He has conferred upon her, His righteous retributive providence will compel His people to make very painful sacrifices for the possession of jeopardized minor benefits, more valued, but infinitely less valuable, than those they had lightly esteemed. She has thus read her sin in her punishment. Shall not this lesson, so painfully learned, abide with her evermore? and the practical teaching of providence produce most blessed results hereafter? As the disasters which, months ago, befell the Confederacy proved the means of arousing it from its inaction, and exciting it to suitable efforts, which Providence graciously owned and blessed, so shall it not be with the Church now? Will she not with renewed assiduity and zeal prosecute her high and holy mission, address herself with greater fidelity to the discharge of her duties, and, in the boldness and confidence of a true faith and love, and in humble dependence upon the promised agency of the Spirit, take a firmer grasp of the appointed instrumentalities, for the ingathering of God's elect, the building up of the body of

Christ, and the complete establishment of the Redeemer's kingdom throughout the earth?

O for a fresh baptism of the Spirit in this, the outset of her new career! Some of those appointed instrumentalities have never been fully employed, not only by our Virginia church, but by the Presbyterian church generally, though again and again brought to her notice, and though appeal after appeal has been made to her to come up to the full measure of her duty. The Church, to this day, continues guilty of culpable remissness in regard to them, and the consequence is comparative leanness and barrenness. The fulness of the Holy Ghost will never be given, so long as the established order of Christ's house is broken down. "No revival of religion can adequately meet the necessities of the Church, which does not restore her ordinances and ministries to their true place and efficiency." And no revival of religion can have any permanent influence upon the Church, which does not tend to produce this blessed result. "It is only in the body of Christ, rightly knit together in all its parts by divine joints and bands, that the Spirit of Christ can do His mightiest works." If the Church will not honor her Divine King, He will not honor her.

I. One great instrumentality appointed by Christ, but neglected by our church, is the office of Evangelist. This is not an extraordinary or a temporary office, but a permanent office in the church, and will exist just as long as there are countries, lands, and settlements, that are destitute of the Gospel. It represents the aggressive feature of the constitution of the church, by which she invades the kingdom of darkness, the dominions of the prince of this world, where Satan reigns supreme. This aggressive feature strongly distinguishes the New Testament Church from the Old. The spirit of the latter was exclusive; that of the former is diffusive. The Jews had no intercourse with any but Jews. They were shut up within themselves. They were

forbidden to go out amongst the nations around them, and endeavor to propagate their religion. For wise reasons, this was made one distinguishing feature of their economy, in order that it might accomplish the design for which God had instituted it. But it is different now. The spirit of the Gospel is not exclusive. Partition walls are broken down. The old economy made the Church stationary, and expected the world to send to it. The new economy makes the Church missionary, and requires it to go into all the world. The character of the one, it is well remarked, was emblematically represented by the bending cherubim on the mercy-seat; that of the other by the mighty angel flying in mid-heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, that dwell upon the earth! The office of evangelist, then, represents the grand, distinguishing characteristic of the New Testament Church. The pastoral office represents the conservative feature of the church, by which the church, after it is gathered, is built up, edified, protected, fed, its energies developed and rightly directed; its members brought more and more into harmony with Christ, adorned more and more with the gifts and graces of the Spirit, and abounding more and more in every good word and work. Both offices are essential to the growth and prosperity of the church, and each is necessary to the other. The office of evangelist is incorporated in our Presbyterian system—has always been there—but it is the sin of the church that this feature of our constitution has been practically recognized only to a very limited extent. These officers are too few, by far, with us. They are our foreign and domestic missionaries. But many foreign missionaries are in reality pastors. We need, not one, but many evangelists in every Presbytery. It is not saying too much to affirm that not a few ministers who are now in the pastoral office have mistaken their calling, and would prove far greater blessings to the church as evangelists, than as pastors. This is proved by the fact

that, when settled, they accomplish little or nothing; but, when itinerating as evangelists, they are signally honored by the Spirit's blessing. Our church has suffered greatly from relying almost entirely upon one arm of her power only. And she will continue to suffer, if the experience of the past lead her not to alter her course. What is to be expected, but that she will more and more decline and droop, if she persists in contravening the appointments of her Divine Head, and ignoring the most distinguishing characteristics of the New Testament Church? The fundamental feature of that Church is its evangelistic, aggressive spirit. And yet, that which chiefly distinguishes the Presbyterian church in our day is the absence, to so great an extent, of the evangelist. How little, then, in this respect are we conformed to the New Testament Church! The great end for which the Christian Church is constituted is, in the name and stead of her ascended Head, to act unceasingly the part of an evangelist to all the world. And this is the appointed condition of her success. An evangelistic church is a flourishing church; and a church which drops the evangelistic character, speedily lapses into superannuation and decay. The cessation of its activity is the cessation of its prosperity. If it ceases to be evangelistic, it will ere long cease to be evangelical, and then it ceases to be a church of God. Not to advance is to recede, and to continue to recede, until it becomes extinct. Let the aggressive feature vanish, and the conservative feature will one day vanish too, for there will be nothing left to conserve. If the office of the evangelist is slighted, the slight will ultimately tell with wasting effect on the office of the pastor. The whole history of the Church affords striking testimony to the indispensableness of the evangelistic spirit to its vitality and growth. The period most marked by the exhibition of this spirit was the primitive, or apostolical. Then the entire Christian community seemed to act under an overpowering conviction of their responsibilities, as the

evangelists of a perishing world. The Redeemer's parting command seemed to ring in every ear, and influence every heart. All seemed to regard it as much their duty to propagate the knowledge of salvation, as to yield obedience to the Decalogue. And were not those the days when the Church shone forth in spiritual beauty and brightness, the luminary of the world, the theme of admiration and praise to all succeeding generations? But no sooner did she begin to contract the sphere of her efforts in diffusing the light of the Gospel; no sooner did she settle down to enjoy the glorious privileges bestowed by her great Head, forgetful of the multitudes around her famishing for lack of knowledge; no sooner did the evangelistic spirit decline; than she, too, began to decline under the hiding of Jehovah's countenance, and the frown of His displeasure. Look, too, at the condition of the Protestant Church at the close of the Reformation. "It would seem as if the very windows of heaven had been opened, and the showers of grace had descended in an inundation of spiritual gifts and graces, converting the parched lands into pools of water, and the barren wilderness into gardens that bloomed and blossomed as the rose. And now look at the same Church a century afterwards. What a poor, torpid, shrunken, shrivelled thing! As if the heavens were of brass, and the earth of iron, and no dew descending, the very waters of the sanctuary became stagnant, and bred and sent forth a teeming progeny of heresies, schisms, and dissents. Whence the cause of so sad a discomfiture? It was not from the violence of anti-christian adversaries, for never did the Church enjoy a safer respite from the myrmidons of her popish foes. It was not from the fires of political persecution, for never did the Church enjoy a more undisturbed security from the State. No; it was the blight and mildew of Jehovah's displeasure, on account of a neglected and unfaithful stewardship." Instead of extending the triumphs of Protestant Christianity over the realms of paganism, she cast

aside her weapons of aggressive warfare, and settled down in inglorious ease, to enjoy the conquests she had won. And what was the consequence? Her active energy, denied a suitable outlet in aggressive efforts beyond her domain, found ample vent for itself in fomenting intestine discords and divisions within her borders.

Will not our own beloved Presbyterian church lay this lesson to heart? Is it not high time for her to awake out of sinful sleep? Will she continue to be content with just "holding her own?" That she can not do. That she has not done. Failing to advance, she has receded. She has lost ground, and will continue to lose ground, so long as she neglects to use the great arm of her power. Will her slumbers be broken, or will they continue until she is completely shorn of her strength? What, then, is her first duty? Evidently, to call upon her God for help! The evil spirit of unbelief, supineness and indolence, which has possessed her so long, will not be cast out without much fasting, humiliation, and prayer. A call to prayer, then, is the first call which God gives her—to united, fervent, importunate prayer. Is Christ upon His throne? Are His ascension gifts still conferred upon His churches? Has He promised to bestow them when truly desired, and earnestly sought? Is there such an agent in His Church as the almighty Spirit of God? Is He present to animate her with the missionary spirit of her Master? to put her in sympathy with her Great King; to prompt and inspire her petitions for the Redeemer's royal gifts? and then, in His great name, to raise up, qualify, and lead forth to the Church for her acceptance, men called and qualified by Him; men of faith, wisdom, experience, ability, devotion, self-denial, such as Timothy was, "to do the work of an evangelist"? Is it true that the Holy Ghost is with us, to do for us these great things? and that His aid can be obtained by prayer? Do we believe it? Do we expect it? Oh, then, ye that love the Lord, keep not silence; send up a loud, long, united,

unsparing entreaty for His promised aid! "Prove me now, saith the Lord, whether I will not open the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing." Shall we not accept the generous challenge? May He open our hearts to expect, and then to receive the promised blessing? Let us never forget that a Pentecost of power was preceded by a Pentecost of prayer. When the disciples were all with one accord in one place, continuing in prayer and supplication, then was the promise of the Father fulfilled, and the powerful influences of the Holy Ghost were poured upon the Church. Were the Presbyteries, during their sessions, in the habit of setting apart a stated season for supplication and prayer, that the Lord Jesus would give to His Church "evangelists," as well as "pastors and teachers," would she not receive them? "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth laborers into His harvest." And were the churches also alive to the importance of this office, so as likewise in their meetings for prayer to put up earnest petitions for the same great gifts, would they not be bestowed; and would not the necessary support be, not grudgingly, but freely, liberally, provided? "According to your faith, so be it unto you," is the plain declaration of the Master.

II. A second great instrumentality, appointed by Christ, but neglected by the Church, is the office of the Ruling Elder—that office, we mean, as it exists in the word of God. According to the Scriptures, ruling elders are representatives, bishops, pastors, and watchers for souls.

1. They are representatives, not deputies. The distinction between these two has long been recognized and admitted. A deputy is one clothed with delegated power, the mere organ, tool, of his constituents, whose instructions he is bound to obey—a substitute, and nothing else. Ruling elders are not such, but officers divinely appointed, and elected by the people to discharge the duties Christ has connected with their office. Christ, not the people, is the

source of their power. And to Christ, not to the people, are they directly responsible. And it is a sad and painful spectacle, to see one invested with this high office recognizing his relations to his Master, not first of all, but last of all, if at all, and weak, timid, wavering, agitated by every breath of popular opinion. They are representatives of Christ—His rights—and the interests of His kingdom. They represent, not the wishes and opinions of the people, but their rights, their duties, their obligations, as these are laid down in the word of God. They are appointed to administer those laws which sustain Christ's authority, and uphold His government over the hearts and lives of His people. To no small extent, are the honor and the glory of the Master intrusted to their keeping. It is a solemn and an awful trust! If that trust is not sacredly guarded, if His rights are compromised, then His judicial visitations need not excite wonder and surprise. For He is God—jealous of His honor and glory. They are to beware, lest they be brought into bondage, either by the favor or the frowns of men. And they need ever to remember that to their own Master they stand or fall.

2. Ruling elders are bishops, the only bishops known to the word of God. "Presbyter" and "bishop" are interchangeable—the former denoting ruling, simply; the latter, the nature of that rule. The apostle Paul thus addresses elders: "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock, over whom the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers," or bishops. The oversight of the church, then, or its episcopacy, is committed to the elders. They are required to look narrowly into the state of the church, become acquainted with the spiritual condition of its members, counsel, direct, encourage, stimulate, admonish, rebuke, and lead them to a diligent use of all the means for the faithful performance of their solemn covenanted engagements. "Take heed to all the flock"—overlooking none. The very humblest member is to be cared for. The lambs, especially, are to be con-

stantly tended. "The Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." Solemn thought! It is not in the power of man to remove a particle of their responsibility.

3. Ruling elders are pastors. In common usage, this term is exclusively applied to the teaching elder. Such is not the usage of Scripture, which designates the rulers of the Church pastors. It does not belong to the teaching elder, as a teaching elder, but as he, too, is a ruling elder. The term pastor, or shepherd, expresses the general idea of guidance and authority. "Out of thee shall come a governor, that shall be the pastor, or shepherd, of my people Israel." "David, my servant, shall be king over them, and they all shall have one pastor." Elders are enjoined by the apostles Paul and Peter to exercise the pastorate, or shepherd the flock of God; guarding them from enemies, preventing them from wandering, restoring such as have strayed away.

4. Ruling elders are to "watch for souls, as they that must give account." The word "watch," used here, denotes a watchfulness with the greatest care and diligence, and that not without trouble or danger. "They watch for souls!" Words few, but solemn! How important and responsible the office of the ruling elder! It is any thing but a sinecure! They are to watch for souls. It is not a matter of indifference whether their flocks are saved or lost, for "they must give account." This watching implies laboring for their spiritual good with earnestness and self-denying zeal; looking out for opportunities of promoting their spiritual benefit, and then improving these to the utmost.

Ruling elders, then, are, in Scripture, representatives, (not deputies,) bishops, pastors, and watchers for souls. It is deeply to be regretted that these terms have not been uniformly applied to them by us, and that they have been suffered to be exclusively appropriated to the teachers of the church, to whom, as teachers, they do not belong at all.

We have suffered a prelatical mode of thinking, and a prelatical dialect, to intrude into our church, and partially to supplant that which is strictly Presbyterian. To such an extent has this been carried, that no habit is more common amongst us, than to apply to our elders certain terms which actually ignore and deny to them the position of officers in God's house. We call them "laymen," or, worse still, "lay-elders!" A "layman" is a man of the people, and designates a private member in the Church. How apply such a term to an officer? And "lay-elder" is an absurd contradiction in terms. "Lay" implies that he is a private member, and "elder" implies that he is an officer! And yet these ridiculous "nick-names," as Gillespie well characterized them, are constantly applied to officers of God's appointment! It is not a little matter to slight an office that the Holy Ghost hath instituted.

The duties, then, devolving on ruling elders, are the exercising of episcopal and pastoral functions—overseeing and shepherding the flock, and ever watching over precious, immortal souls. It is true that these duties belong also to the minister, because he, too, is an elder, a ruler. But they belong to him in a subordinate degree. They are not his highest duties. The duty of instructing the church is his first duty, his great work, to which, above all things, he must give himself, and to which he must make all things subservient. The duties that are common to the ministers and the elders can not be fully discharged by the former alone. It is impossible. In the vain attempt to monopolize the pastoral care of the flock, he is compelled to neglect the laborious study of the Word, and the requisite preparation for the pulpit. It has been well remarked, by an eminent minister of the Methodist church, Dr. Olin, that "nothing is more idle than the common plea of much preaching, or much pastoral visiting, as an apology for little study, and poor, stale sermons." This

remark is just, and will commend itself to the sober judgment of all. It is an unscriptural sentiment, which has found currency in our day, and is even some times uttered by ministers themselves, that "pastoral visitation is a more important exercise of ministerial duty than preaching the Word." This is either a pretext for the neglect of a most arduous duty, or it is a melancholy delusion. Visiting is, indeed, important; but it is less important and less laborious, in fact is light and easy, compared with that careful preparation necessary to meet the demands of the pulpit. Every student knows that much study is a weariness to the flesh. And the flesh would be more gratified in spending the week in making the tour of the congregation, than in devoting hours and days to exhausting mental toil. It is perfectly idle to quote the example of the apostle Paul, "teaching from house to house." It is perverting this much-abused text to derive from it an obligation on the part of ministers now to pursue a line of conduct similar to that of the apostles. Our circumstances are widely different. The apostolic churches had inspired teachers, who had no need of study, and could, therefore, well devote the whole week to pastoral visitation. But this is not the case with us. Diligent study is absolutely necessary. God's command to ministers is, "Give attendance to reading; meditate upon these things—give thyself wholly to them; if any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." "Approved unto God"—not merely to the people. A minister may succeed in pleasing his people, and yet offend his God! God requires that we honor Him with our best offerings, and will not hold us guiltless, when we bring our meanest. "The lame" He forbids us to sacrifice unto the Lord our God.

These considerations serve to show that it is quite impossible for the teaching elder alone to discharge all the duties

of the pastoral office, and meet the whole wants of the church. The coöperation of the other pastors, the ruling elders, is absolutely necessary. Whatever influence the pulpit may exert, how is it possible that it can be secured for the benefit of the hearers, unless it is followed up through the week? How is it possible that the public instructions of the sanctuary can exert a general, abiding, permanent influence upon the congregation, whilst a whole week intervenes, in which little or nothing is done to maintain that influence, and much is constantly occurring to dissipate and destroy it? How much will public appeals, repeated after an interval of six days, effect, if no subsidiary instrumentality is used during that interval? The links are separate from each other, and can not constitute a chain of living, holy, mighty influence to bind together the Church of God, and to cause each member to feel his or her connexion with the whole body, and with Christ, the common Head. What is needed to counteract that insidious influence which is ever setting from the world to the Church is, to employ that very agency which Christ has provided for her welfare, and defence; the faithful, united, constant oversight of elders. Have we not suffered sufficiently from the rebukes of the Master for our apathy and shameful neglect of duty? The church should expect of her elders the fulfilment of solemn vows, and the discharge of most important and necessary duties. She has no option, but is shut up to this by the injunction of her Divine Head.

Every church should be furnished with a sufficient number of pastors and bishops, and the congregation should be divided into as many districts as there are pastors, each having his own district, and each watching for souls as one that must give account. Thus every member of the church would be brought under the influence of this continued inspection, and never allowed to forget his union with the

body, or cease to feel its influence.* Thus, that unnatural distance and coldness which has been allowed to find a place amongst Christ's members would be banished. The vital fluid which flows from the heart of Jesus would circulate freely, unimpeded, throughout the entire body, conveying life and health to every member, and creating a sympathy between them all, which would afford a cheering and refreshing proof of the reality of the union; and which, whilst preserving to each its own relative importance, yet will not suffer the eye to say to the hand, "I have no need of thee," nor the head to the feet, "I have no need of you;" but will rather lead them to feel that, though the members be many, yet they are all members of one and the same body; so that if "one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or if one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it;" and thus a practical demonstration be given of the power of a genuine, living Christianity, to unite the various classes of society into one great body; so that, whilst the artificial distinctions that have been created by man are permitted to exist, it is only to show that these are controlled by that higher, nobler unity, which has been created by God—that the tie which binds is stronger than the influence which would repel—and that however diverse in intellectual endowments, in social position, in the gifts of fortune, they may be, they still are, ONE in Christ, their common Head!

Such, then, are the ends contemplated by the office of the elder, the most important, most honorable, most responsible office on earth. To the eye of the world, it is paltry and insignificant. They behold in the offices of Christ's

* Another denomination aims to secure this great and all-important end by its class-leader system. Our church has a system designed to accomplish the same end—a system free from those evils which pertain to the other—a system not of man's decree, but of God's appointment—and yet our system is neglected, whilst theirs is worked! They have elders in reality, without the name—we have the name only, without the reality!

appointment, as in Christ Himself, no beauty whatever, that they should be desired. But to the eye of angels and of God, the ruling elder in the Church occupies a position of greater honor, dignity, and influence, than the king upon his throne. The latter has intrusted to him the temporal welfare of his subjects; the former, the spiritual and eternal interests of his flock. The latter is Christ's servant in the state. "By me," says He, "kings reign, by me princes decree justice." The former is Christ's officer in the Church—the Church which sustains the closest relation to Him; purchased with His blood; upheld by His providence against the combined assaults of two worlds; for whose sake kingdoms rise and fall; for whose sake Christ wears many crowns upon His brow, being "Head over all things to the Church!" Surely, to be associated with Christ, the King of kings, in the government of His Church, which controls the destinies of a universe, is the highest honor that can be conferred upon mortal man! "Know you not," says the apostle to the saints, "that we shall judge angels?" If such be the exalted position the office of elder holds in the word of God, the inquiry naturally arises: Why does not this divinely appointed office hold the same exalted position in the eye of the church? Why this most unnatural and painful contrast between the elders of the Scriptures and the elders of the churches?—the great majority of them, we mean, for there are some noble exceptions, to whom all honor is due. Who is to be blamed for this sad declension, this marring the integrity and efficiency of our noble system, this mournful apathy, this death-like stupor, which, to an alarming extent, possesses our entire Presbyterian church, and stifles its energies? The answer which truth unhesitatingly gives, is: All are to be blamed—ministers, elders, and people, are all guilty before God.

1. Ministers are guilty, in not declaring the whole counsel of God upon this important subject, in not presenting before the Church a full exhibition of the teachings of Scrip-

ture with respect to this office. Some are even reluctant to admit the identity of the office of elder with their own, his parity with themselves, and degrade him to a subordinate and inferior rank; whether from prejudice, ambition, jealousy, or, as Ambrose, in the fourth century, thought, from pride; "they alone," says he, "wishing to appear something."

2. Elders themselves are guilty, in not fully recognizing and assuming the responsibilities which the Holy Ghost has devolved upon them. Some doubt whether these high responsibilities are, indeed, theirs, and say that they had no thought of assuming such when they accepted the office. The question is, not what their intentions were, but what do the Scriptures teach? "Whatever is not of faith, is sin." "He that doubteth is condemned," are solemn words, which they would do well to ponder. It is a matter of too great consequence to allow any doubting. They are bound to search the Scriptures, and see whether these things be so, and if convinced that they are, then, either in the fear of God and by the help of His grace, address themselves diligently to their work; or, if unwilling to discharge the legitimate duties of the office, to vacate the office itself; for woe to that man who persists in retaining an office in the church to which God never called him! It is a dangerous thing to trifle with the institutions of the Holy Ghost. It may be said that this doctrine would empty the church of its elders. If it did, it would only empty it of those who have no right to be elders; the loss of whom would be to the church great gain. For just as there may be ministers whom God never called to preach the Gospel, so also may there be elders whom God never called to rule. That this doctrine would remove from the eldership a single individual who had a right to be in it, is quite impossible. The providing the Church with faithful officers, is not the work of man, but the work of Him on whom the Church depends; her ever-living, glorious Head. Elders, truly called,

are among the ascension-gifts of Christ, and are kept in office just as long as it pleases their divine Master to keep them. To say that the promulgation of a doctrine founded on Scripture has a tendency to eject from an office, appointed by Christ, the men whom Christ called to it, is a horrible absurdity.

Again: Some elders there are, who do not doubt, but deny, that their office involves any such responsibilities as we have indicated. These are bound to maintain their position out of the Scriptures—which they never will do. As the doctrine of this paper is the doctrine of our Synod,* it becomes those who take this ground to vacate their office. If they do not, they should be required to discharge its duties. If they decline, they should be admonished; and if they still refuse, they should be deposed. And so should all who will not perform the duties of bishops and pastors, and watchers for souls.

Again: Some there are, who assume it to be their vocation to take oversight of the minister, instead of the flock, and are as willing to discharge the duty of the presbytery, in this respect, as they are to neglect their own. Narrow-minded, conceited, arrogant, and overbearing, they aspire to lord it over God's heritage, vainly imagining themselves to be the "main pillars" of their churches, whilst justly regarded by the spiritually-minded portion of the members as the main obstacles to its welfare. This class, we are happy to believe, is comparatively small.

But, to specify no others, how few of the large body of elders in our churches have any just ideas of the character and duties of their office! How many look upon it as a mere

* The proof of this will appear by referring to the carefully prepared "Report on the State of the Church," made to the Synod in Lewisburg, Sept. 4, 1857, and to the accompanying resolutions, adopted by the Synod; also, by referring to the excellent discourse of Dr. Ramsey, on the office of Ruling Elder, the re-publication of which, and distribution in every congregation, was recommended by the Synod.

human appointment, whose duties they may discharge only as inclination prompts or leisure permits! How general is the notion, that by serving the communion-table, by attending upon the meetings of session, and occasionally on other ecclesiastical bodies, they have exhausted the duties of their office! Whereas the first-named service, the distribution of the sacramental elements, so far from being their characteristic duty, is not their duty at all—it forming a part of that table-service which Christ has assigned to the deacons, and which was performed by them in the primitive church and subsequently, as is abundantly shown by the testimonies of Justin Martyr, who lived within fifty years of the apostle John; the learned Bingham; Dr. Owen, who, congregationalist though he was, recognized the distinction between ruling elders and deacons; Dr. Guyse; John Brown of Haddington, who has been well characterized as “one of the most decisive, consistent, and devoted Presbyterians that ever lived;” Rutherford; the Church of Scotland, as shown by the “Collections of Steuart of Pardovan;” and by the testimony of many others. And yet this is the service which is more commonly associated with the eldership, in the minds of most, than any other! How large a number are found treating as a sinecure the highest office on earth, to which they have been called, if called at all, by the Holy Ghost! How few are jealous of the sacred rights which Christ has given them! A neglect of the duties of an office naturally leads to a surrender of the rights pertaining to it. A return to duties will be followed by an acknowledgment of rights. For it is idle for any to dream that their rights will be respected whilst their duties are trampled under foot. A return to duties will do more than aught beside to recommend the symmetry, the beauty, and the power of the Presbyterianism of the Scriptures! Now, let us grant that, to constitute an efficient, active, zealous, devoted elder, much effort, self-denial, and sacrifice are necessary; what

then? Shall we shrink back on this account? Is any thing really valuable ever accomplished without sacrifice? Was not our salvation effected by sacrifice? Was not Christ, altogether, soul and body, a sacrifice for us? Is not heaven ours by sacrifice? And does not Christ promise to the faithful elder "a crown of glory that fadeth not away;" a richer crown in the kingdom above than will be allotted to the private Christian, whose duties and responsibilities are not so great, and whose sacrifices are less? And whatever sacrifice of feeling may be involved, should it not be made the more readily, when it is remembered that the cross feels heavy only because they have not been accustomed to bear it, only because of a long-continued neglect of most important duties? And if their inexperience renders them reluctant to act as spiritual overseers, yet habitual and intimate intercourse with their people will soon reconcile them to their employment, and ultimately convert into enjoyment what at first was felt to be a trial. The inquiry of the sincere Christian with regard to any point of duty is, not whether the performance of it is difficult, dangerous, or even seemingly impossible, but simply, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" "The practicability of a duty is felt to be properly judged of, not by the appearance it presents to our judgment, but by the command of our Lord. If He has commanded, we go forward, fearing nothing that may seem to lie in our way. The greater the task, the more real is the testimony and expression of love, and therefore the more acceptable to God. If the Israelites had, through fear, declined to obey God's command to go down into the Red Sea, the Church of God in that day would have been extinct."

3. The people, also, share, to no little extent, this guilt with ministers and elders. They do not look upon this office in its true scriptural light. Elders are among the ascension-gifts of Christ. "When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. And

He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for a work of service, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Here we are distinctly taught that pastors, or elders, are Christ's ascension-gifts to the Church, which she can not dispense with. To undervalue them, then, is to insult the Lord Jesus Christ, now upon His throne, by undervaluing His precious gifts to His Church. As gifts, they must be sought, and earnestly sought, from Christ. The appeal here is made, as every where else, to the faith of the church. The church must look upon these officers with the eye of faith, as gifts from Christ. The eye of faith only can see the divine appointment, and the obligations growing out thereof, and the excellence, beauty, and glory of the office. If not viewed by faith, if not sought by faith, if not received by faith, what right has the church to expect a blessing with them? "Whatever is not of faith is sin." Here we touch the root of the evil in the church. The office is looked upon with the natural eye, not with the spiritual. Hence, the same associations, the same views and feelings are generally connected with this, as with any other office. Many, very many, feel as little reverence when engaged in the election of a ruling elder, as in the election of an alderman. And yet, the election of a ruling elder is a solemn act of worship on the part of the church! The office is a divine appointment; the officer is a divine gift; for Christ not only founded the pastorate, but He gives the pastors. "He gave some, pastors." The men, then, are His gifts. When, therefore, the church assembles for the election of elders, for what does she assemble, but to receive Christ's gifts from Christ's hands? And how much solemn deliberation, investigation, patient reflection, above all, how much earnest prayer for divine guidance, is necessary, that the people of God may not err in their choice! If the appointed means have been faithfully used; if the qualifications for the office have been closely marked, as

these are laid down in the Scriptures; and if, with singleness of eye to the divine glory, they have, after earnest prayer, been led to cast their votes for those whom they judge to possess them; then, just as surely as Christ has promised His presence with His Church, just so surely are they warranted to believe that His Spirit and providence have led them to choose those whom He has chosen and set apart for this exalted office; an additional evidence of which is supplied by the conviction of duty which He fastens upon the minds of those thus chosen, so that they dare not disobey the divine call. Now, are the churches wont to exercise such care, such watchfulness, such an inspection into their own hearts, lest they be influenced by carnal motives; sending up to the throne earnest petitions for the guidance of the Spirit; pleading for Christ's gifts; acting as in the immediate presence of Christ Himself; and approaching a divine ordinance with so much reverence, that their act may justly be styled an act of worship; and then receiving from Christ's hands His own gifts, with some thing of that reverential affection with which He Himself receives them from the Father? When the Saviour was on earth, how did He act when about to engage in that most important work of choosing and setting apart His apostles? He spent the whole preceding night in fervent prayer to God! And then, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, whose influences were given to Him without measure, He chose the men who subsequently proved to be such distinguished ornaments and priceless blessings to the Church. And what were these men? As to their extraordinary office, they were apostles. But as to their ordinary office, they were elders. Peter, addressing elders, styles himself "also an elder." Now, did the great Head of the Church Himself, pure and holy though He was, deem it meet to prepare Himself for so important a work as the selection of the men who should control the destinies of His Church, by a whole night spent in fervent prayer; and yet, shall the

Church, without due preparation, carelessly, irreverently, approach the same solemn work? Oh! is there no profaneness in this monstrous indifference? Is she not signally rebuked by the example of her Divine Head? And will He not signally rebuke her, by a judicial visitation, for this her sin? As she dishonors Him, will He not also dishonor her, and permit unworthy, incompetent, unfaithful men to intrude into a sacred office, that they may be obstacles and stumbling-blocks, and prove thus to be the rod with which He chastens her for her unbelief, her irreverence, and her carnality? And as such officers were not the offspring of faith, but were chosen from carnal motives, mere natural preference or relationship—chosen because of their social position, their wealth, influence, prominence, with a view to render their church thereby more respectable, more influential, elevate its social status in the eyes of the community—what is to be expected but a low standard of piety in those churches? And such officers can not fail to react upon the churches disastrously to their spirituality, and reduce their standard of piety lower still. Knowing well the motives which swayed the people in their election, they will be more careful to maintain their standing and promote their popularity, than to promote the true interests of the churches, by resolutely opposing any evil practices which obtain in them. They will be much more apt to wink at sin than to censure it. And as for enforcing discipline against offenders of influence and power, that is a duty which no one need expect them to perform. The stream can not rise above its source. Men chosen from carnal motives, to an exalted office, which demands no little degree of spirituality on the part of those who fill it, can not fail to carnalize the church still more. The offence of the cross entirely ceases. Instead of a cross-bearing, Christ-following church, that has power with God and man, we have a “highly respectable,” “influential,” “fashionable,” “aristocratic,” church, after the Laodicean model, that God

abhors, and the world despises. This is no fancy picture, but a stern and humbling reality. Faithful ministers, faithful elders, faithful members, have again and again complained of this sad state of things; have again and again gone to the Master, and laid their burdens before Him. Is not Christ jealous of His honor? Will not a day of reckoning come—a day of fearful visitation? And who may abide the day of His coming, when a retributive providence will avenge the dishonor cast upon His name, and the insults offered to His Spirit; when the various idols which men have set up and worshipped shall be dashed in pieces; and a fearful sifting and overturning vindicate Christ's authority over His own house, and prove Him to be "a consuming fire" to a carnal, worldly-minded, corrupted church!

But again: The fact must not be overlooked that the insensibility of many church-members to the importance and value of the eldership, arises from their indifference to the whole subject of church government. How often is the remark made, "I feel but little interest in the subject of church government." But how strange does such a sentiment sound, coming from a member of the church! What! A Christian taking no interest in what Christ has instituted! A Christian regarding one of the most valuable features of Christ's kingdom a matter of little consequence! A Christian treating a divine institution as a mere human expedient for the preservation of order! Every element of Christ's kingdom—its government and worship, as well as its doctrines—in short, every thing contained in Christianity, addresses itself to the faith of Christ's people. And if any thing relating to Christ's kingdom does not interest a Christian, it is owing to a defective faith. But faith is not a blind, but an enlightened principle, and how can it be called into exercise, where sufficient knowledge does not previously exist? It is a great mistake to suppose that a particular form of church government is a matter of little

consequence. Christ has not only instituted government, but its form. The relation between a form of church government and its doctrine and worship, is direct, close, and intimate. It is the shell which guards the kernel. It is the body which covers and preserves the soul. Every student of ecclesiastical history is forced to see this. Why is it that certain forms of government, and certain systems of doctrine, and certain modes of worship, are found uniformly associated together? Why are Presbyterianism and Calvinism in such close sympathy and union? Many of the churches of New England were once Presbyterian as to church government, and Calvinistic as to doctrine. When the Presbyterianism was gradually supplanted by Congregationalism, how did it happen that the Calvinism was not retained, but in like manner was supplanted by Socinianism? This same result uniformly obtains. But how can it be explained, if a particular form of government be a matter of indifference, and have, as many suppose, no influence upon the doctrines and worship of a church? It has been well remarked by the Rev. Mr. Thompson, a minister of Scotland, that "the grinding persecution to which the Presbyterians of England were subjected by Cromwell, an Independent, and by the Episcopalians, under the Stuarts, prevented them from erecting the platform of their scriptural polity, and familiarized many to the more attainable, plastic, and accommodating institutions of Congregationalism. Presbyterians began to look upon forms of church government as not of divine institution; they regarded them as merely human expedients for the preservation of order; that, therefore, a church might be just as scripturally constituted under one form as another. They talked, indeed, of Episcopacy being adapted to rich and gorgeous England, and of Presbyterianism being adapted to poor and homely Scotland. The necessary consequence of this miserable delusion was, that the strictness of discipline gave way; Presbyterianism came to be branded as stiff, rigid, puritan-

ical, and unaccommodating; and numbers of the churches lapsed into Independency, and thence sank into Socinianism. Seldom were pains taken to instruct the people in the counsel of God respecting the form and government of the church. Every thing relating to such matters was rather, indeed, studiously kept out of view. The result was inevitable; the people became ignorant of the subject, and as indifferent to it as they were ignorant of it. The consequence was, that the frame-work of Presbyterianism was, in many places, gradually and utterly dissolved; and congregation after congregation passed into other communions, without even an effort being made to retain them!" The description that this writer gives of the sad decline of Presbyterianism in England, applies with equal justice to many other countries. In Scotland, during the time that the General and Provincial Assemblies were suppressed, and the Presbyteries neglected, ministers became negligent, immorality and heresy prevailed, and popery increased. In Germany, where infidel tenets were substituted for the pure word of God, this lamentable condition is traceable to the deficient constitution of the German churches, and their entire want of control over the opinions of their own ministers. In Geneva itself, where a pure Calvinism has, to a great extent, been supplanted by the Socinian heresy, this was owing to the worldly character of the elders, and their exclusion from the highest ecclesiastical court, which is composed of ministers only. By these means, unprincipled men were enabled gradually and insidiously to supplant with Socinian formularies all the existing standards of the church. These instances show that there is not a more unfounded notion than that a particular form of church government is a matter of indifference. Let us cleave to our simple, pure, consistent, scriptural Presbyterianism! Let the flock of Christ give to their rulers that honor which is their due; let them place a high estimate upon their office, for its dignity, importance, and value.

Let them expect much from their elders, and encourage them in going forward to carry out the true idea of their office, remembering that they watch for souls as they that must give account; and remembering, too, that they themselves are responsible to Christ for any obstacles they place in the way of His officers to the faithful discharge of their duty. "Offences," or stumbling-blocks, said our Lord, "must needs come, but woe to that man by whom they come!" There is reason to fear that, in this matter, also, offences will come, that the faithful elder will encounter these stumbling-blocks. But if he is counted worthy to suffer with Christ, he shall also be permitted to reign with Christ. There is reason to fear that many who, by their profession, are numbered amongst the disciples of Christ, and the subjects of His kingdom, are yet opposed to the administration of His laws. Such persons would be sure to regard it as out of character, nay, even officious, in elders visiting from house to house, in their official capacity, for the purpose of religious conversation and prayer. Whilst the truly pious membership would rejoice to see the day when the elders of the church should again appear in their ancient, honored character of bishops and pastors of Christ's flock; yet, it is equally certain that the worldly-minded portion would dislike any such spiritual oversight; and although their constituted guardians go amongst the flock, not for the purpose of prying into the secrets of families, or of being busy-bodies in other men's matters, but simply to watch over them in the Lord, and stir them up to love and good works, yet would they esteem such oversight as this an intrusion, an encroachment upon their lawless liberty—their liberty to disgrace their profession and crucify their Master! The yoke of Christ is to them an intolerable burden, and they do not wish this man to reign over them. Such persons are in the church, but not of the church. They belong to the world, are the friends of the

world, the partisans of the world; and are in the church, as spies in the camp of an enemy, only to betray it.

These, then, are the causes of our shameful delinquency as a church. We have a noble system, not of man's device, but of God's appointment, but we have failed to work it fully as we ought. The evil influences which withstand the operation of our ecclesiastical machinery must be overcome, or we shall continue to languish and droop under the rebukes of the Master. To contemplate the vast resources with which Christ has endowed our Presbyterian Zion, and then contrast with these her actual achievements, is enough to sicken the heart. The statistics of the Virginia church, in former years, setting forth the additions made to the churches, have been carefully collected, and submitted to this Synod. We have examined those of later years, and find that, upon the whole, we have made little, if any progress. The facts are briefly these: In one year an average of one member to each minister; in another year, two members to each minister; in another year, four members to each minister; in another year, five members to each minister; in another year, three members to each minister.

And is this all that has been accomplished? Can we be content with such humiliating results? It is true, that by resorting to unscriptural measures, as others do, we could fill our churches with converts; but converts of man's making constitute poor materials for a church of God. The question is not, what have we done compared with other churches, but what have we done compared with what, having the ample furniture that God has given us, we should have done? The facts adduced show our shortcomings to be painfully great. We have need, as a church, to humble ourselves in the dust before God, confess with shame our sins, and address ourselves anew to the work He has assigned us. We greatly need a fresh baptism of the Holy Ghost. Why are His influences withheld? The answer is, we have refused to honor Him, and He has

refused to honor us. The instrumentalities He has appointed to accomplish the results we desire, we have neglected to employ. We are not using the means of His appointment. If He has provided the Church with the officers she requires for her nurture and growth; if He has appointed some to the high and responsible office of overseers, or bishops of souls, shepherds, or pastors of His flock; and we are slighting this office and thus slighting Him, esteeming it of little value, not acting faith in God, and expecting much from the discharge of its duties, and so not employing the appointed instrumentalities, what need we wonder that our condition should be just what it is, unfruitful, cold, and almost dead? The common opinion is, that if additions are not made to the churches, the ministry must be in fault. Is this necessarily so? Who gave the church the right to hold such an opinion? Who gave any elder the right to hold such an opinion? The Scriptures? No! They teach that, though Paul were the minister, yet if Christ's institutions were not observed, His Church would wither and die. A church may try to escape from her obligations, but the day of reckoning will come for her. An elder whose conscience is seared may seek to elude his responsibilities, transfer them all to the minister, and complacently attribute to him the languishing, declining condition of the church; but the hour will come when an aroused conscience will make him writhe under her scorpion lash, as the words of the Master fill his soul with confusion, fear, and horror: "Thou wicked and slothful servant!"

It is idle for the church to wonder at her want of success, when the well-known means instituted to secure it are ignored and neglected. When they are used, and in faith, God's wisdom and faithfulness are pledged to crown them with success, and bestow the needed blessings. But the inquiry arises, how can elders discharge such duties consistently with their secular engagements?

As example is better than precept, we invite attention to the following notice of one who well illustrated the power of the eldership, and the strength it gives to the church:

“The late Patrick Falconer, Esq., was first called to the eldership in the Tron Parish, under the pastoral charge of Dr. Chalmers, and subsequently in St. John’s. Of all the active, laborious, faithful men with whom Dr. C. was surrounded and supported, this gentleman was in labors the most abundant, and in perseverance the most unwearied, and with one accord the session of St. John’s concede to their departed brother the preëminence in this work and labor of love. For the last seventeen years of his life, he gave all his leisure, and for the last ten, the whole of his time to the duties of his office. Whilst many retired—and fortunate merchants think they have no account to render of their time to God—this good man increased in well-doing, as he increased in years; whilst some grew weary of their labor of love, he grew more devoted; and whilst others doffed their spiritual office, and shrunk into mere men of the world, he became more single-hearted as he advanced in life, and lived more exclusively for the glory of the Master whom he served. Every day, when in health, was he to be seen wending his way from his residence in the west end of the city, to the farthest extremity of the east, where his poor district lay; and punctual to his hour, the shop-keepers inquired if all was well, when they missed his familiar face. Twice or thrice every year, he regularly visited each of the eighty-three families in his district, besides his visitation of the sick; and we are assured that he was three hundred days, out of the three hundred and sixty-five, in his district. No London magistrate ever acquainted himself more laboriously with the work-districts of the metropolis, in order to detect and punish, than this gentleman did in his district, in order to prevent crime, and reform the criminal. On the practi-

cal experience of this laborious office-bearer in the church, all good men will set a just value. That experience we shall give in his own words. 'Perhaps there is a general feeling,' says he, 'that a man needs to be disengaged from business, in some considerable degree at least, before he can efficiently undertake the office of elder. My experience leads me to think that a man who can spare an hour a day, or even two hours a week, may do as much good in that little time as one who has the whole of his time at his disposal. Besides, in the evangelizing of the world, it is evident the great power must come from the little of each agent, accumulated into the aggregate of the many. Each and every man doing the little he can, is the source whence the irresistible force at length is to come, which, in Christ, is to overcome the deadness, darkness, and depravity which now pervade the earth. I can not, while on this point, forbear to notice the importance of doing all to the glory of God, and to be seen of Him, and of coming, not only to the feeling of this, as our motive for doing, but also as our excitement to do whatever we have within the compass of our power. Such a feeling as this will not permit us to withhold what we can do, because it is little. Under any other feeling, no individual will do any thing, except it can be distinctly seen as a great thing; and this is the cause that vast power, which might be collected from the many, is lost. Proper division of labor is also vastly important. Various things, such as distributing tracts, or missionary intelligence, or reading to those who can not read for themselves, may be easily done by such as have no gift for exhortation or prayer. The exact plan which I think best for a spiritual elder to adopt, and which I am decidedly of opinion is requisite to an efficient religious superintendence is, that, together with the particular calls upon the sick, etc., he keep a regular progressive visit of the whole going on; so that he may visit every family once, twice, or as often as may be, within the year. I think it

very important that he do not allow himself to act as a judge or a divider, nor even very much as an adviser in worldly matters. Every elder should study to fill his mouth with arguments, in order to turn parental affection to the eternal interests of children, instead of allowing it to be absorbed entirely by their temporal concerns. Seek first, says Christ, the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you. We should keep eternity constantly in view, and act under the felt impression of the unseen world. Every spiritually-minded elder will endeavor to press these things upon the people of his charge; he will be earnest to stir up parents to their religious duties.' ”

May these weighty words of Mr. Falconer sink deep into the hearts of all elders! With such an example before us of the power, efficiency, and usefulness of the office of the eldership, and of the practicability, in any ordinary circumstances of business, of the duties it requires, are we not called upon, as we regard the purity, the peace, the stability, the increase of our church, to restore this office where it is wanting, and to perfect it where it already exists? We have here the testimony of a man of great experience, as well as great wisdom and piety. That testimony is entitled to be received. Consider what he says: “An elder who spares only two hours a week, may do as much good in that little time as one who has the whole of his time at his disposal.” Now, whose secular engagements are so absorbing as not to afford him two hours in seven days to the duties of this office? If any plead that they can not spare even this, then it is evident that the business of this world occupies more of their time than it should, and that the sooner they vacate an office of such tremendous responsibilities, the better.

We find, in the autobiography of that judicious man, Dr. James W. Alexander, the following brief notice of a faithful elder: “Our theory of a church-session,” says he, “is grand;

but O what a practice ! It is made for a church in a high spiritual state; and this, I think, is in its favor. One of my elders makes up to every man, woman, and child, who frequents the church. He visits as much as I do ; knows every church-member ; talks to every inquirer ; goes often to every house, and when I point out any place, is sure to be there within twenty-four hours. This leads me to two practical reflections: 1. How important to have a number of young men in training for such offices. 2. How desirable for a pastor so to labor as to leave the church in the best possible state for his successor ; in regard particularly to the children, youth, family habits, etc.”

Are there not such men also in our own Synod ? There are : would that there were more ! Such shall never lose their reward. Their names are honored on earth ; their names are honored in heaven. The gratitude of the church is due to those who open, and widen, and deepen the channels for those streams of living water which gladden the city of God. Angels contemplate their radiant career with admiration and rejoicing ; and Jesus, from His illustrious throne, looks down upon them with delight ; and when the chief Shepherd shall appear, He will confer upon them a crown of life !

As we pen these lines, we naturally call to mind a noble example of a faithful, untiring, consistent, and devoted elder, who realized the responsibilities of his high calling, and was enabled by grace to fulfil them. He has passed from the service of the Master on earth, to the rich rewards of the Master in heaven. A distinguished blessing to the church which he so faithfully served, the memory of his elevated Christian character, his holy life, the rich unction of his prayers and exhortations, is devoutly cherished ; and consecrated for ever in the affections of a grateful people is the honored name of JOHN B. MARTIN.*

* Ruling elder in Second Presbyterian Church, Richmond.

We conclude our remarks upon this subject by expressing the wish that the time-honored, God-honored custom of presbyterial visitations, which obtained in the palmiest days of the church in Scotland, may be restored amongst us. Let the presbyteries return to their duty. Let them visit, by committees, all the churches under their care, institute a close investigation into the spiritual condition of each, making minute inquiries as to the manner in which the minister, the elders, the deacons, and the people, discharge their respective duties. Will it be said that this practice requires too much time and trouble? Our honored fathers thought not thus of it, if thereby they could advance the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, and promote the glory of the Redeemer's name. And shall we shrink from the sacrifices which they cheerfully and joyfully made? Then are we the degenerate children of a noble ancestry! If this custom should not be at once revived, let us endeavor at least to approximate to it as much as possible. Let the presbyteries require of sessions a written statement, to be presented at each spring meeting, of the number of pastoral visits which each minister and each elder makes during the year, and of the manner in which each discharges his duty. If, in the judgment of presbytery, the number of visits be not sufficient, let such persons be urged to greater diligence, and a record be made of this. Let such as are negligent be faithfully admonished by the presbyteries. And if any continue in the persistent violation of their solemn obligations, after admonition given again and again, then let all such delinquents be deposed, as a duty the presbytery owes to Christ, and to His Church. Let the Synod enjoin upon the presbyteries to require this report from the sessions. This will make elders, as well as ministers, amenable to presbytery, which they are not now, but are virtually independent; for the amenability of elders to the session is just the amenability of elders to themselves! This is a regulation which is consistently

Presbyterian, and which is absolutely necessary not only for promoting the growth of our church, but maintaining its vitality. Such an investigation may extend the meetings of presbyteries; but the approbation of the Master, and the benefit accruing to the churches, will abundantly compensate them for all the time and labor they expend in this noble work.

III. Another instrumentality appointed by Christ for the well-being of His Church, but too much neglected by her, is the Deaconship. Our limits forbid us giving that extended notice which is due to it.

Many persons, without sufficient examination, entertain the opinion that this office was, for the first time, introduced into the Church of God on the occasion recorded in the sixth chapter of Acts. This is to overlook the fact, which has been abundantly proved by learned Jewish and Christian writers, Maimonides, Vitringa,* Lightfoot, Hammond, Neander, Mosheim, Burnet, Olshausen, and others, that the office of deacon existed in the church long before the days of Christ and His apostles. In the Jewish church—in the synagogue—there were not only elders, but deacons. “The office of the deacon,” says the learned Lightfoot, “was translated from the Jewish to the Christian church. There were in every synagogue at least three deacons, to whom the care of the poor was intrusted.” “The synagogue-deacons,” says another learned scholar, “collected money for the maintenance of the poor, and for the general support of the synagogue, including the stipends of the office-bearers.” Many learned Jewish theologians affirm that this office belonged to the synagogue. Here, then, we have clear proof that the Christian church is modelled after the Jewish synagogue, not only with reference to the eldership,

* “*Totum Regimen Ecclesiarum Christi conformatum fuit ad synagogarum exemplar.*” “Res adeo est clara, ut de Diaconis synagogæ nullus fere possit cogitare, cujus mens continuo non deflectatur ad Diaconos Ecclesiæ.” *De Synagogâ Vetere.*

but to the deaconship also; and that, in the language of Archbishop Whateley, "wherever a Jewish synagogue existed, that was brought to embrace the Gospel, the apostles did not there so much form a Christian church or congregation, as make an existing congregation Christian, by introducing the Christian sacraments and worship, but leaving the machinery of government unchanged, the officers being already provided in the existing institutions." "A synagogue became a Christian church as soon as its members acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah." Thus, the Old Testament Church naturally glided into the New Testament Church. The deacons of the converted synagogue became the deacons of the Christian church. This is the reason why no record exists of the original institution of this office by the apostles. For the narrative contained in the sixth chapter of Acts implies that the seven chosen and ordained on that occasion were added to the number already existing. The office is not mentioned in that narrative: only the duties of the office are incidentally alluded to, which would imply that the office was already in existence. Those elected on that occasion were the first Grecian deacons. There were Hebrew deacons before this—deacons in every converted synagogue. Besides, the New Testament Church must have had some dispensers of its bounty before this, and therefore, either the apostles officiated as deacons, or else this officer already existed, and discharged his duty. But that the apostles did not officiate as deacons, is evident from their own words: "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables;"—shewing that they had not left the word of God and served tables. And, therefore, this service was discharged by the deacons themselves. The seven who were elected afterwards, were all Grecians, as their names shew, because the Grecians (or foreign Jews) had murmured against the Hebrews, (or native Jews,) on account of their widows being neglected in the daily ministration. Now, this surely would have produced in turn

a murmuring of the Hebrews against the Grecians, unless they had some already in office interested in looking after their rights.*

This office is not a temporary institution, but is to abide in the Church throughout all generations: 1. A necessity will always exist for this office. Ministers and elders can not attend to their own duties, and to this also. 2. The work itself, as a distinct work of service, is never to cease. 3. Deacons are reckoned, in Scripture, amongst the fixed officers of the Church. 4. Direction is given for their continuance in all the churches, and their qualifications are mentioned. It follows, then, that to give up this office in a church, where there are members who possess the required qualifications, or to give its duties to another, is to take the work of the Holy Ghost out of His own hands, and to interfere with the order Christ has instituted in His Church. The remarks of John Brown of Haddington deserve to be well pondered: "There is no hint in Scripture that the offices of ruling elder and deacon were designed to be temporary. Both of them were appointed on moral grounds and necessities, respecting every church and period. The rules concerning them both are to be observed till the end of the world. No congregation, therefore, can answer to Jesus Christ for dropping of deacon, any more than for dropping of elder."

The principal business of deacons is to serve tables. The old distinction, current for ages past, to the present time, refers the term "tables" to three separate departments: the table of the Lord, the table of the pastor, the table of the poor. The whole fiscal concerns of churches should be committed to them, and it would be well if, in every church, a bench of deacons were incorporated by law, that they might be enabled to hold and employ all the property of the church. Let those who are known to the church as

* See *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*; Article, *Ecclesiastical History*.*

deacons, be known to the state as trustees. It is far better in keeping with the character of a church, that its fiscal concerns should be intrusted to Christ's own officers, a bench of deacons, than to a board of trustees, who are not known to Scripture, and who are often chosen without regard to piety.*

It was also the business of the deacons, in the primitive church, says Bingham, in his "Christian Antiquities," to be "the regulators and directors of men's behavior in divine service. They had power to rebuke the irregular, to overlook and superintend the people, that no one did talk, or sleep, or laugh, but give ear to the word of God." It belongs to them, also, to receive the stranger who may visit the sanctuary with a kind welcome, and provide him with a suitable seat. In the whole routine of duty, in every service, even the least important, they are to remember that what they do, they do unto the Lord. And the dignity of His great name is lent to the smallest service they discharge. The deacon represents a most important part of solemn worship. For alms-giving is an office of Christian worship; and collecting for the poor and the spread of the Gospel, is an ordinance of God. The very existence of such an officer in the church is strikingly significant, and represents most important and valuable features in the character of the Church of God. Just as the appointment of the teaching elder represents the Church as a school, where saving truth is taught, and instruction imparted; just as the appointment of the ruling elder represents the Church as a government, a republic, so does the office of deacon represent the missionary character of the Church, as it dispenses the collections for the spread of the Gospel. Again, it

* A worthy minister of the Synod of Virginia, formerly the pastor of a church in Philadelphia, informed the writer that, during his ministry in that church, the president of the board of trustees was a rich Jew, who often complained of the trouble he had in keeping the session in order.

represents the Church as a charitable institution, in providing for the poor. And it represents, too, the fellowship of Christians in each other's gifts, showing that they are united to the same Head, and are members of the same body.

The appointment of the deacon in the Church is a signal token of God's care of the poor. The poor will always be in the world, and will always be in the church, and ought to be in every church. Christ has made them peculiarly His representatives on earth, and by ministering to them the church is ministering to Him. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me." The presence of the poor in the church is absolutely necessary for its prosperity, as they furnish the occasion for counteracting the greatest evil of our fallen nature, selfishness, and for developing the brightest graces of the Christian character. The deacons should enter into the spirit of their high calling, and seek, as the organ of the church, to minister to Christ, by ministering to His poor members, and to promote the interests of Christ's kingdom, not only by visiting the poor of their own flock, but the poor who belong to no flock, who are destitute of the means of grace, either willingly or unwillingly. It was the custom in Scotland for deacons to divide the suburbs of the towns and cities, where the poor generally dwelt, into so many different wards, each deacon having in his ward a given number of families, which he was expected to visit regularly for the purpose of religious conversation and prayer, as well as of contributing to supply their temporal wants. Hear the testimony of one of these working, faithful deacons: "With fifty-six families, in ordinary circumstances, very little of my time was occupied, and my office was by no means irksome; but when the families increased to eighty, one hundred, and¹ upwards, I found it more difficult to keep up my acquaintance in the district, so that I had less comfort in going amongst them; and whilst my visits were in

reality more requisite, they became less frequent. It is easy to keep up a pleasant, familiar knowledge of a small number of families, which creates such interest as to carry one readily back to the district. My first aim was to become acquainted with all the families; and when any person applied for relief, I visited, and made a strict investigation, and then gave in a report of the case at our first monthly meeting. If the applicant was out of work, or had children able for work, we used such means as were within our reach to get employment for them. With few exceptions, I was well received; and in many cases most cordially welcomed, and much pressed to repeat my visit soon. The mainspring of my management consisted in kindness; prompt attention to every application, whether deserving or not; never administering help in ignorance, to save myself the trouble of a visit, rigid investigation, etc."

It is obvious at once what a prodigious influence for good the revival of this system of visitation on the part of the deacon would exert upon the poor, upon the church, upon society. A hallowed bond of union would thus be established between the various classes of society, differences would be softened, and jealousies and alienations, in great measure, checked. The Church would, through her organs, discharge the blessed office of the peace-maker in the world, binding the various classes together by sacred bonds, and causing them to feel a becoming interest in each other, and to realize that though the members were different, the body was one. The deacon thus represents the conservative influence of the Church upon society. How would the poor, too, be benefited by the working of such a noble system! How many vices would disappear, how many virtues would take their place, how would poverty itself, in many instances, be prevented or cured! With such a kind care exercised over the poor, looking mainly to their religious improvement, the exhortations and prayers of the faithful deacon, the Bibles, tracts, and re-

ligious newspapers with which he furnishes them, could not fail of elevating and blessing them for this world and the next. For the divine favor would crown this system with signal success. And how would the church herself be benefited? The blessing of the poor man, which is of no small price, would be her's; and, more than that, the approbation of her exalted Head. Seeking to do good in the way of His appointment, His special smile would rest upon her labors. What multitudes of poor would be added to her congregations, and ultimately to her communion! The present habitual non-attendance of thousands at any place of worship, is an alarming evil. Here is the divine remedy for correcting it. May we have grace given us to use it! Then will it be true of us, as it was of the church in apostolic days, that the appointment of faithful deacons was followed by this glorious result—"the word of God increased, and the number of the disciples was multiplied."

But the spirit that animated the primitive church must possess the church still, or the mere appointment of the deacon will be of no avail. That spirit was one of eminent liberality, the hearty consecration of the substance to Christ's cause. How poor are the offerings of the New Testament Church, compared with her high distinctions, her exalted privileges, her priceless blessings! Nay, how poor are the offerings of the New Testament Church compared with the offerings of the Old Testament Church. The great law of the tithe was then universally observed, but now how few there are who honor it! It is urged by some that this law, being a part of the Mosaic economy, ceased with it, and does no longer bind. Even if this were so, yet as our privileges far, far exceed those of the Jewish church, it would be a disgrace to us, if our offerings did not exceed theirs. But it is a mistake to suppose that the law of the tithe does not now bind. It existed ages before the Mosaic economy, and, of course, the dissolution of that economy affects it not. It is a patriarchal institution, ex-

isting in the earliest ages, honored by Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, ages before Moses was born—observed even by the Greeks, the Romans, and all heathen nations every where, who devote the tenth of their income to the service of religion. If this law has been abrogated, let the evidence be furnished, let the Scripture be produced. God's claims upon the Jewish church were numerous and heavy. Besides the tithes, there were the gifts; the meat-offerings, drink-offerings, firstlings, vast amounts for commemoration and consecration of events, persons, and things, and for the ransom of souls. Besides these, there were the sacrifices; burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings. So that it has been supposed, and with great probability, that the whole amount the Jews contributed could not have been less than one-third of all their income. And yet no community has ever been found on earth that was or is so prosperous, so rich as the Jewish community! Godliness is profitable for the life that now is, as well as for that which is to come. What the Church of Christ most lacks, is faith in God. Her unbelief dishonors God, and impoverishes herself. Were it not for unbelief and covetousness, what advances might she not have made! Did her fidelity answer in any way to the transcendent position she occupies, and the glorious privileges she possesses, did she freely give as she has freely received, the dark places of the earth, which are now full of the habitations of cruelty, would long since have been illumined by the glorious sun of the Gospel; the conquests of divine truth would have been complete; the empire of Satan would be dismantled and overthrown; and the glorious shout would thunder through the temple of God, "Alleluia! The kingdoms of the earth are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ!"

Other subjects claim our attention in this paper, but the time already occupied forbids their introduction here.

We close this report by adverting to one duty peculiarly binding upon our church, the neglect of which will bring upon her the frown of God—the partial neglect of which has brought upon her the frown of God. We allude to the religious instruction of our slaves. This is the great duty of the church in this Confederacy—the evangelization of that great multitude which the providence of God has subjected to us by ties so near and strong. The highest interests of these immortal souls are not in their own keeping, but in ours. Their destiny for eternity is dependent, to a great extent, upon us. It becomes us to contemplate seriously and steadfastly the mighty responsibility. If our Southern Zion shall fully awake to the magnitude of this great work, and address itself diligently to its discharge, then will she receive the rich smiles of her Divine Head, and the abundant tokens of His favor; then will the relation of master and slave, as it obtains with us, be vindicated in the eyes of the world; and then will our beloved Confederacy occupy a pinnacle of moral grandeur, and become a praise and a blessing in all the earth!

ARTICLE V.

PSALMODY AND THE UNION.

It is not our purpose, in the present article, to discuss the question of Psalmody, which has so long divided the Presbyterian and Associate Reformed churches. While the relations of the two bodies are so friendly and harmonious, it would not be prudent to revive a controversy which has been conducted on both sides with considerable warmth, and, in some instances at least, resulted in still further estrangement. We do not propose, therefore, by an ill-timed discussion, to disturb the *entente cordiale* which now so happily prevails; but, on the contrary, it will be our design rather to cultivate this good understanding, and thus to promote the desire for union which both parties profess to entertain. And in adopting this conciliatory course, we we are not insensible to the claims of truth; for we are admonished by infallible wisdom that there is a time for all things, and that every thing is beautiful in its season.

The subject of union between the Presbyterian and Associate Reformed churches has been agitated more than twenty years. As early as 1842, a committee was appointed by the latter, in reference to this subject. From a careful examination of the facts developed by the negotiations from that period until the last meeting of Synod, at Sardis, in Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, it is evident that *progress* has been made; gradual, indeed, but very perceptible. It will be seen that both sides were, at the outset, exceedingly cautious and reserved; and that, in consequence of this untoward disposition, the first attempt at union resulted in failure and disappointment. Indeed, so unsatisfactory was the result to the smaller body, that the committee was discharged, and the negotiations abandoned. And so profound was the disappointment that,

during an interval of eight years, nothing further was attempted. When at length the subject was again brought up for consideration, in a presbyterial report, it was dismissed without even the formality of appointing a committee, on the ground that it was better to "await the leadings of Providence to determine the course of duty." So discouraging was the prospect of union at that time. And so the matter remained for the present.

The next attempt was more successful. In 1854, the cause of union found eloquent and powerful advocates in the Rev. Dr. Palmer and his colleague, the Rev. Mr. Banks, delegates from the Synod of South Carolina; who, in behalf of the body which they represented, renewed the proposal previously made with so little success; although the report of the committee to whom the matter was referred by Synod was unfavorable, yet the *animus* or tone of the paper which they submitted was far from discouraging. It concluded by recommending that a committee be appointed to correspond with a similar organ of the other body. This recommendation had the effect, at least, of reopening the negotiations, which had long been suspended.

The discussion at Due West, in 1858, was one of extraordinary interest. The General Assembly was represented in our Synod by the Rev. Dr. Howe and Chancellor Johnstone, to say nothing of the other members of the committee. The debate was opened by the Rev. N. M. Gordon, in a speech of great eloquence and ability, who was followed by the Rev. Dr. Boyce, in a luminous and powerful argument. It was continued the whole of the next day, by various speakers, without any abatement of interest, calling into requisition all the learning, talent, and zeal of the Associate Reformed Synod of the South. Although no vote was taken, yet the discussion clearly developed the existence of a strong and growing sentiment in favor of union.

It is uncertain, however, when the subject would have been revived, but for that wonderful dispensation of divine providence, which has resulted in the disruption of the American Union. Under these peculiarly interesting and solemn circumstances the first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America convened in the city of Augusta, Georgia, in December, 1861. It was soon apparent that a new and powerful impetus had been communicated to the negotiations on the subject of union, by the extraordinary and unprecedented circumstances in which the parties were placed. The great heart of the Assembly went forth spontaneously in the strongest expressions of love, confidence, and esteem for the sister church. In the exuberance of her Christian affection, she proposed to publish, in the beginning of her book, the entire one hundred and fifty Psalms in the version used by the Associate Reformed Church. This proposition, as might have been expected, has been entertained with great and decided favor in the other body. It was laid before the presbyteries; and, after favorable consideration, referred by them to the supreme court of the church, which, owing to providential hindrances, postponed final action for the present. These facts, we think, fully justify the opinion that progress has been made; and they give rise to a confident expectation that a harmonious union between these churches will, sooner or later, be effected. It would be very unfair to conclude that the committees to whom was intrusted the delicate and responsible task of inaugurating these negotiations were deficient either in ability or discretion. The true explanation, undoubtedly, is, that they encountered peculiar difficulties. At any other stage of the proceedings, there is reason to believe that the result would have been more satisfactory. In this, as in all other cases, *ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte*.

It is evident, in the second place, that obstacles exist of the most formidable character. When we reflect that these

negotiations have been in progress nearly a quarter of a century; that they have been in charge of zealous, able, and prudent men, whom their respective churches delight to honor; that they have been the subject of frequent deliberation in the highest ecclesiastical courts; that an earnest and sincere desire for union is entertained on both sides; and, lastly, when we consider that, although much has been accomplished, the object contemplated is not yet *un fait accompli*, we are constrained to admit that obstacles intervene of no ordinary magnitude. The reasons for the failure which has thus far attended all efforts at union, are not to be sought in the particular version of the Psalms which is used by one of the contracting parties. We are furnished with the most explicit and authoritative declarations to the contrary. The committee of the Assembly have assured us, again and again, that they had no objection to our time-honored version; that they had no desire to see it displaced; and, indeed, that they decidedly preferred treating with us on the basis of the existing metrical translation. And they have assured us that such were the sentiments of the body which they represented.*

If this were the real difficulty, surely a version might be prepared which would be acceptable to both churches; or such alterations and amendments might be made in that which is now in use, as to free it from all serious objections. To accomplish an object of so much importance, and one so ardently desired, as the union of these two branches of the household of faith, such a difficulty as that under consideration would be speedily overcome. We repeat it, the difficulty is not to be sought in the version of the Psalms used by the Associate Reformed Church, but in the Psalms themselves; that is, in the views which are entertained by that body on the subject of Psalmody. A

* See letter of Assembly's committee, in the Minutes of the Associate Reformed Synod of the South of 1858, p. 21.

version might be made which would be, in most respects, unobjectionable. It might be at once literal and elegant—this is at least conceivable—and yet, after all, we would be still as far as ever from the attainment of our object. If there were no version at all, good, bad, or indifferent, the case would not be affected in the slightest degree. It is this difficulty which has embarrassed the negotiations throughout, and which still exists in all its formidable dimensions.

In the third place, it is manifest that a union is believed to be practicable. As a general thing, men do not desire that which they believe to be unattainable. Now, there is abundant evidence in the history of these transactions—the *res gestæ*—that an earnest and sincere desire for union influences the parties concerned. We can not believe otherwise, unless we are prepared to accept as true the celebrated paradox of Talleyrand, that language is intended to *conceal* our thoughts. Again, if we do not desire, much less do we *pursue* with an ardor and perseverance which nothing can discourage, some *ignis fatuus*, or visionary project, which we are assured is utterly unattainable. We find it difficult to persuade ourselves that such men as compose the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church would persist in making offers which they were convinced it was impossible to accept; or, on the other hand, that they would be entertained and elaborately discussed, during a series of years, in the other body, when it was perfectly apparent that there remained no alternative but to reject them! *Credat Judæus Apella, non ego.*

And we desire it to be distinctly remembered that all this must have been done with a full understanding of the real difficulties in the way of union. There may have been, and we think there was, more or less of misapprehension on this point, in the earlier periods of the negotiations, but there could have been none after that time. It is undeniable that these transactions, contemplating union, had their

origin in the conviction that such a measure was practicable; and were indebted for their continuance to the belief that it could be accomplished without a surrender of principle on either side. The very fact that propositions were submitted by one party and gravely discussed by the other, is proof unquestionable of this assertion. Either body being perfectly acquainted with the denominational peculiarities of the other, the inference is irresistible that, in the opinion of both, a union was not only practicable, but could be effected on *middle ground*.

It must have occurred to every one who has bestowed attention on the subject, that there are three possible ways in which a union may be effected between the Presbyterians and ourselves: 1. The surrender of the principle that, in the praise of God, the Church of Christ is confined to the use of the Inspired Psalter, or Psalms of David: 2. That, in addition to these Sacred Songs, she is at liberty to use others, composed by pious men, not under the special influences of the Spirit of inspiration; and, 3. The accepting by both churches of the fact of their difference in Psalmody. In other words, either the Associate Reformed Church must go over to the Presbyterian, or *vice versa*; or, lastly, they must meet on neutral territory.

It is manifest that a union is impracticable on the first or second basis. The history of these churches, and more especially of the recent negotiations, abundantly proves that each cherishes an unalterable attachment to its peculiar system of praise. The committee on union of the Associate Reformed Church, in their last report, declare that "The principle of an inspired Psalmody is *sacred* to us." The committee of the Assembly, in their last communication, use the following language: "We will continue to hope, until you shall inform us to the contrary, that among the terms you require of us, you will not press those principles so far as not to forbear with us, (either in union or intercommunion,) in our use of hymns." And a writer in

a recent number of this Quarterly expresses himself in the most energetic terms: "As to the fundamental question of *liberty*, we will not yield an inch, no, not to win a thousand churches." There is a very general, perhaps universal, conviction in the Associate Reformed Church, that the existing version, with its acknowledged merits, is in some respects defective; and attempts have been made, from time to time, to improve it, and even to secure a new version; but it does not follow from this that they are prepared to surrender the principle that the inspired Psalms are to be exclusively used in celebrating the praises of God. On the other hand, it is a well-known fact that the General Assembly have never been fully satisfied with their book of praise. They have appointed committees, from time to time, as well as we, who have devoted *years* to the improvement of their Psalmody; and yet the result is far from satisfactory. The conclusion would be equally unwarrantable that they were prepared to discard their system of praise for that which is approved by the Associate Reformed Church.

The exclusive use of the inspired Psalter in the worship of God, both public and private, is, to borrow a technical term, the *differentia*, or specific difference, of the Associate Reformed Church. It is that which distinguishes her from the Presbyterian Church. If this distinction were obliterated, there would no longer be any reason for a separate and independent organization, so far as that church is concerned; on the well-known principle in law, *cessante ratione, cessat et ipsa lex*. In such a case, it would be the easiest thing in the world to arrange the preliminaries to an organic union. There would be no greater difficulty than in receiving members by certificate. No necessity could arise for tedious negotiations, like the present, which have "dragged their slow length along" nearly one generation. If, on the other hand, in the providence of God, Presbyterians should be brought to see eye to eye with

their Associate Reformed brethren on this subject, the union could be effected with just as little delay as in the former instance. It would be the work of a day or an hour.

It is certainly very desirable that they should be of one mind, of one accord, in this matter; but, as the Assembly's committee justly remark, we are speaking of what is attainable in the present state of the Christian Church. It is impossible for them to unite on the first or second basis, so long as they entertain their present sentiments in relation to Psalmody. And so far as appears from the record, (*quod literis exstet*.) there has been no change in either church affecting the principle in controversy. There may be individuals in the Presbyterian Church who, on the subject of Psalmody, entertain those peculiar views which are prevalent in the other body. If we have not been misinformed, there is, in the Synod of South Carolina, an entire congregation holding such sentiments, and conforming their practice to them. And there may be in the Associate Reformed Church, both among the ministers and others, those who, on this *quæstio vexata*, are not at variance with their brethren of the other denomination. But in either case, it is still true that the church, *as such*, maintains the principles indicated; and, therefore, it is impossible for either body to go into the union *en masse*, or as a whole, except on the third basis—that of forbearance.

It is clear, then, that if such expectations are indulged on either side, they must inevitably be disappointed. But we hazard nothing in affirming that such is not the fact. The resolutions of the First Presbytery of the Associate Reformed Church declare: "We are in favor of a union with our Assembly brethren, if they consent to use and encourage, in all the congregations, the use of the Inspired Psalter, until it becomes the prevailing Psalmody of the United Church." Mark the language: not the exclusive, but the "*prevailing Psalmody*." The committee of the As-

sembly are equally explicit on this point: "We do not require you to abandon the Psalms, but, on the contrary, hold them as part of our Psalmody." Nay, their language is, if possible, still more unequivocal: "We require you neither to make such abandonment, nor to comply with any other terms or conditions whatever;" leaving the Associate Reformed Church to go into the union *lege solutam*, perfectly untrammelled. There can be no misunderstanding. The First Presbytery, distinguished among their brethren for the zeal and ability with which they advocate an inspired Psalmody, and a committee composed of such men as Dr. Howe, among the living, and the lamented Thornwell, have left no room for doubt.

But we need not confine ourselves to this part of the record. Is there any thing in the history of either body, antecedently to these negotiations, to encourage such an expectation? By the good hand of God upon her, the Associate Reformed Church in the South has been greatly prospered. She has lengthened her cords and strengthened her stakes. She has broken forth on the right hand and on the left. She has sent out her branches like the fruitful vine, or like the goodly cedar of Lebanon. She has gathered into her fold a numerous flock, although it may seem "little" among the thousands of Israel and the ten thousands of Judah. It is found in Virginia, in Texas, in Missouri, and all the intermediate States. Her bounds are coextensive with the broad limits of our glorious Southern Confederacy. But it is a remarkable fact that she has made few *proselytes*—we mean accessions from other religious denominations.* How far this is true of the other body, we are not prepared to say. But we make bold to affirm, that there is little in the history of the Associate Reformed Church, past or present, to encourage the former to antici-

* This remark is not intended to apply to those who were driven into her communion by the troubles growing out of the question of Psalmody.

pate such an accession to her numerical strength—to expect the acquisition of proselytes on so magnificent and altogether unprecedented a scale as is implied in the entire *absorption* of the sister church! Neither body is prepared as yet (if that period shall ever arrive, before the “watchmen shall lift up the voice together,”) to adopt the views of the other; and, therefore, the union must be accomplished, if at all, on the last basis. Can a union, then, be formed on this plan? Would such a connexion involve the surrender, or even compromise, of cherished principles?

To answer this question satisfactorily, it must be remembered that the Psalmody of the United Church would consist of the songs of inspiration, and such human compositions, additional to these, as might be selected by the Assembly's committee. It would, consequently, be of a mixed character. Now, it is evident that, so far as the Presbyterians are concerned, there could not be the slightest difficulty. They do not object to the Psalms. They do not object even to Rouse. They claim the privilege of singing, in addition to the Bible Psalms, other songs, composed by uninspired men. The exclusive use of the Psalms is the ground of their controversy with us. They insist most vehemently that the Psalms are theirs as well as ours; they will not allow us a monopoly of the songs of Zion; they claim to have a version of these divine poems in their own book, not so literal, they readily grant, as the Scottish, but in other respects superior; and hence, to sing the Psalms of David in Rouse's version, or in any other, is perfectly consistent with their principles. This is too plain for argument. The only question that remains in connexion with this, is, Can the Associate Reformed Church go into the union, with a due regard to her principles and usages?

More than three-quarters of a century have elapsed since the church which bears this name had her origin in the union of two branches of the great Presbyterian family.

The memory of this event is perpetuated in the name which she assumed, and still retains. During this long period, nearly commensurate with that which has elapsed since the Declaration of Independence, she has maintained a separate organization. The synods North and West have recently effected a union with the Associate Synod, and these bodies are known at present as the United Presbyterian Church of North America. The Associate Reformed Synod of the South, since the year 1822, has been an independent organization. Of all the religious denominations, she was the first to yield to what Calhoun calls the "explosive force" of slavery, which has divided not only the American church, but the United States themselves into independent and hostile confederacies.*

The Associate Reformed Synod of the South has preserved her distinctive principles with great tenacity and firmness. She has not been ashamed of them, but, on all proper occasions, has avowed and maintained them as her peculiar praise. In her communion was reared the Rev. Dr. John T. Pressly, now of Allegheny, whose volume on Psalmody must convince the impartial inquirer that the practice of the church, in this respect, has not been without the most solid and weighty reasons. Those who have read the "Letters on Psalmody," by another minister who is still in her communion, must admit that he was well prepared to give a reason for his opinion; and that he has constructed an argument which must have commanded the respect of his opponent, with all his acknowledged learning and ability. And the discussion at Due West must have impressed every one whose privilege it was to be present with the belief that, in reference to this matter, the church was intelligent, as well as honest, in her convictions of

* Strictly speaking, the division in the Associate Reformed Church, South and North, was made on *geographical* considerations; but a subsequent attempt at reunion was rendered abortive by the question of slavery, which, if it did not cause, has at least *perpetuated* the schism.

duty; that she did not cherish an unreasonable attachment to a practice adopted without consideration, and perpetuated through prejudice, but was in possession of all the knowledge necessary to form an enlightened judgment in the premises.

Be this as it may—whether her practice in respect to Psalmody has been the result of prejudice, or is founded on reason, it has been uniform, and, with few exceptions, invariable. In celebrating the praises of God, she has confined herself, rigidly and exclusively, to the songs of inspiration; to the “words of David and Asaph the seer.” And since the period of her independent organization, as well as before, she has deemed it a sufficient ground of separation from the Presbyterian Church. The prevailing opinion has, undoubtedly, been that a union with the Presbyterian Church would be incompatible with fidelity to her cherished principles; and hence she has persistently stood aloof from all the friendly overtures of that pious and venerable body.

When the fathers* of the Secession, Erskine, Wilson, Moncrieff, and Fisher, withdrew, in 1734, from the communion of the Church of Scotland, they made a statement of the reasons which impelled them to the separation. Of these reasons, none, so far as we know, have ever been assigned by the Associate Reformed Synod of the South as the ground of her separation from the Presbyterian Church, either in the United or Confederate States of America. They were peculiar to the Scottish establishment, and have long since passed away. That charity which believeth all things, forbids the conclusion that she would have persisted in maintaining a separate organization, without any satisfactory reason. Is it assuming too much to affirm that her ministers and people are inferior to none in the estimate which they place upon the importance of union? Toward the Presbyterian Church, especially, she has been sensible of a powerful and peculiar attraction. Being of the same

illustrious parentage with her, substantially one in faith and practice, cherishing an affectionate remembrance of common sufferings and dangers in the cause of civil and religious liberty, it is not at all strange that she should have been so powerfully impelled to unite with that beloved church. It is certain that nothing but a stern and imperious sense of duty could have enabled her to decline the repeated advances which have been made by the other party. Had a union, in her judgment, been practicable without a surrender of important principles, it is a breach of Christian charity to suppose it would not long since have been effected. The conviction that Psalmody was a sufficient ground of separation; in other words, that it could not be made a matter of forbearance, has hitherto operated as an insurmountable barrier to union. Does this obstacle exist at present?

We have seen that the Associate Reformed Church still maintains her principles; that she has not departed from the faith of the fathers, but is still walking in the old paths. On this point, there can, we think, be no reasonable doubt. But in one respect, we are clearly of the opinion that there has been a change. If we are not very much mistaken, she has yielded the position that Psalmody is a sufficient ground of separation; or, to express the same thought in a different form, she is now willing to make it a matter of forbearance. We have arrived at this conclusion after a most careful and patient examination of the facts, if, indeed, it is not self-evident; for what propriety could there be in any further overtures on the subject, without a mutual understanding to this effect? It is admitted, however, that it is only in the subsequent stages of the negotiations, she has been disposed to concede so much. The committee on union, in 1854, in reply to the proposal from the Synod of South Carolina, declare that "with our present sentiments on these points, (Psalmody and communion,) we could not, in our judgment, consistently go into

the union." This paper was adopted; hence, there can be no doubt that such was the position of the Synod at that time. But it is manifest that some change must have taken place in the public sentiment before the meeting of Synod at Due West, in 1858, or within a period of four years. The report of the majority of the committee on union merely complains that sufficient *prominence* had not been given to the principle of an inspired Psalmody, expressly leaving the way open for further negotiations. The report of the minority proposes a basis in which the principle of forbearance is distinctly recognized. In consequence of the indefinite postponement of the whole subject, neither of these reports was adopted; but the discussion to which they gave rise, as well as the character of the papers themselves, afforded unmistakable indications of a change—shall we not rather say, revolution—in the sentiment of the church.

But the favor with which the proposition of the Assembly has been received in the primary courts of the church, makes it morally certain that she is prepared to go into the union on the principle of forbearance. The reports of so many of the presbyteries as had the subject under consideration, that is, a majority, are clearly in favor of the application of this principle to the case in hand. The deliverance of the Second Presbytery is most explicit: "We will yield to our Presbyterian brethren the privilege of using Paraphrases and Hymns." The First Presbytery are willing to go into the union, provided the use of the Psalms be encouraged by the ministers and people of the Presbyterian Church, until they become the "*prevailing* Psalmody of the United Church." The report of the Alabama Presbytery is in more general terms, but plainly recognizes the principle in question. It expresses an earnest desire that the union "may be formed, and without damage to the principles or feelings of either party." It is not easy to understand how such a union could be formed without the exercise of for-

bearance. The Georgia Presbytery declare themselves in favor of union on the basis of the Assembly's proposition, as they understand it, viz., "first, the Sacred Psalter, then Paraphrases and Hymns." The Virginia Presbytery are willing to *forbear* with their Presbyterian brethren "in the use of Select Hymns and Paraphrases." The Tennessee and Kentucky Presbyteries, it seems, submitted verbal reports to the same purport. Owing to the absence of a majority of her ministers, the Memphis Presbytery declined taking any action in the premises. The Arkansas Presbytery was not represented.

If these courts represent the sentiment of the church, it is impossible to doubt that the principle of forbearance has received a public and formal recognition. The chairman of the committee on union gives the substance of these papers, when he says: "They (the Presbyteries) profess to entertain an earnest desire that a harmonious union between this church and our own may be effected, and a willingness to form a union as early as the preliminaries can be satisfactorily arranged." Thus it appears that the most formidable obstacle to union has been removed; that is to say, the conviction entertained, by one of the parties, that it could be effected only at the expense of principle. This obstacle was encountered at the very threshold of the negotiations, and, from its nature, was absolutely insurmountable. All that is necessary now to the consummation of the union is the satisfactory arrangement of the preliminaries. Of these, the most important is the preparation of a book of praise which shall be acceptable to both churches.

Hence, we are not required to discuss the question which we proposed to ourselves: *Can* the Associate Reformed Church go into the union, with a due regard to her principles and usages? This question she has decided for herself. It is no longer *res integra*.

To remove, as far as practicable, the difficulties which still obstruct the negotiations, the Assembly propose to incor-

porate the version of "the Psalms commonly known as Rouse's, with their own book of praise. They also propose to improve their Psalmody by a "vigorous process" of pruning and lopping, "omitting a great deal, at least one-half." To accomplish this important and delicate work, a committee of five, with Dr. Palmer as chairman, was appointed at the meeting of the Assembly in Augusta.

These hints enable us to form a tolerably correct estimate of the character of the book which it is the province of this committee to submit to the Assembly. It will consist, in the first place, of the entire one hundred and fifty Psalms in Rouse's version, or in any other which may be acceptable to the smaller body; and, secondly, of such Hymns and Paraphrases as may survive that vigorous process of pruning and lopping recommended to the committee. We are unable, of course, to determine the exact proportion of the two elements which are expected to enter into the composition of the new Psalter; but it may be confidently assumed that the number of hymns will not be so great by much as it is at present. Not only will the number of hymns be greatly reduced, but there is also reason to believe that their character will be more scriptural. The conviction seems to be gaining ground in the Assembly, that, while in the duty of praise the Church of Christ is not confined to the very words of inspiration, the *matter* of it ought to be directly derived from the revealed word of God. If we are not very much at fault, the recent history of this venerable body will bear us out in this assertion.

In like manner, the Associate Reformed Synod has appointed a committee of five, with Dr. Grier as chairman, to prepare a new version of the Psalms. The Assembly do not insist on this as an indispensable preliminary; but, independently of the question of union, it is certainly a very desirable object. No one, we presume, will carry his partiality for the present version so far as to maintain that it is absolutely perfect.

Such will probably be the character of the book which the committees are expected to submit to their respective churches, for their approval or condemnation. It will be a *tertium quid*, differing from both of its predecessors, and better adapted to the somewhat heterogeneous character of the United Church. Assuming that the churches are prepared for union on the basis of forbearance, we proceed to inquire, Will such a book as that which is here contemplated be satisfactory?

As already intimated, we have no reason to anticipate an unfavorable decision on the part of the Presbyterians. They do not reject the Psalms. They merely claim the privilege of singing, in addition to these, songs composed by uninspired men. Again, as the proposition emanated from the Assembly, it would be absurd to suppose that it would be rejected as soon as realized and embodied in a form prescribed by themselves. Of course, they are to judge of the ability and faithfulness with which their committee shall have performed its appropriate work; but, from the character of the men composing it, we have no doubt that the task will be eminently well performed, and that the performance will be entirely satisfactory. But will the book of praise be acceptable to the other body?

To give an intelligent answer to this question, it will be necessary to consider carefully the tenor and purport of the Assembly's proposition. The Associate Reformed Church is very jealous of the honor of the inspired Psalter. Hence she is not willing to see it assume an equivocal position in the Psalmody of the United Church—much less entirely supplanted. What, then, does the Assembly propose as a basis of union? As there seems to be some doubt as to the real meaning and intent of the proposition, we submit the following comment from a perfectly authentic source: "Here are two churches at one except on Psalmody. If they are to unite, they must have a common Psalmody. It is proposed to provide this by putting your Psalms and our Psalms

and Hymns together. Neither of the two being prepared to adopt the other's principles, we agree to disagree, and, leaving the question of Psalmody in abeyance, to join our books of praise together. Each church is to be at liberty to use either portion, and any minister of the United Church will always be able to find such sacred songs for the praise of God as will suit him and the people to whom he preaches." What, then, will be the effect of a union, on the terms here proposed? Will the Psalms become more popular in the United Church, or will they gradually fall into disuse, even in that portion of it which now uses them to the exclusion of all other songs?

Nothing is more certain than that the Associate Reformed Church is not willing to part with the Psalms, as a *preliminary* to union. Had such a condition been insisted on as an indispensable prerequisite, the negotiations would have been abandoned long since as perfectly preposterous; for they could not have been prosecuted with the least hope of success. She is still as much attached as ever to her peculiar system of praise. The agitation of the subject has only confirmed her in the resolution to abide by her principles; to guard with a jealous vigilance those sacred songs which have fed the flame of devotion in every age of the church; and to transmit them unimpaired, as an invaluable legacy, from generation to generation.

If she will not agree to make so costly a sacrifice in advance, as the price of union, it follows that she will not knowingly do any thing *leading by necessary steps to such a result*. The event would be the same in either case. It would be merely a question of time. It will also follow that if the Assembly have not felt themselves at liberty, (as manifestly they have not,) to require such a concession as a preliminary to union, they can not consistently invite their brethren into an alliance of which this would be the necessary and inevitable consequence. Hence, we are compelled to believe that, in their opinion, no such result

would ensue. And this fact of itself affords no little security against such a contingency. The opinion of such a body of Christians is certainly entitled to great consideration. Has the Associate Reformed Church, then, any sufficient ground for believing that this opinion is erroneous; that the Psalms would, in fact, be speedily supplanted in the United Church by their more popular rivals, and uninspired compositions become not only the predominant, but exclusive element of praise? This is the question which the Associate Reformed Church, in the providence of God, is now called upon to decide.

The fact can not be disguised that, in the minds of many in her communion, who are not at all averse to the measure in contemplation *per se*, considerable apprehension exists that the Psalms would suffer by the union; and hence, they are disposed to regard it in the light of a somewhat doubtful experiment. This fear, they think, is justified by the fact that the advocates of the Psalms, (meaning, it is hardly necessary to observe, their exclusive use,) would constitute, numerically, a small element in the United Church; and hence, it is apprehended, would not be able to resist successfully the influence of the majority, which, it is taken for granted, would be exerted in favor of human composition. This influence is already felt to a considerable extent, as the churches are at present related; and they apprehend it would be greatly increased when they should have become ecclesiastically one. On the other side, not a few are hopeful that the Psalms would not only maintain their present ground, but, to adopt a military phrase, make successful inroads into the neighboring territory; until, to change our metaphor, a little leaven should pervade the whole lump. If the smaller body has felt the influence of the larger, which is undeniable, it is equally true that the latter has not been altogether insensible to the influence of the former. This is shown by the fact that the Assembly already have in their book fifty-two of

the Psalms used by the Associate Reformed Church; and this, be it understood, not with any reference to union. This fact has some significance, and will assist us in estimating the probable effect of union on the use of the Psalms. There is another fact which should be remembered in connexion with this. At the last meeting of the Assembly but one, "it was *universally* conceded," says Dr. Lyon, "that our church Psalmody stood greatly in need of revision;" and that, as the result of this process, "at least one-half" should be omitted.* These facts taken together, viz., that the Assembly already have in their book more than one-third of our Psalms, and now propose, without a dissenting voice, to omit at least one-half of their Hymns, and this without any reference to union, prove that powerful influences have been at work, from whatever source they may have emanated; and we think there is no presumption in claiming that among the causes which have conspired to produce this general result, the example of the Associate Reformed Church has not been the least considerable. Will not this influence be exerted more powerfully and steadily, and lead to still more gratifying results, when the union shall have been consummated?

There are some other historical facts, not of so recent a date, bearing upon this question in both of its aspects. The Psalms, together with Paraphrases and Hymns, have long been used in the Church of Scotland, without that result which is apprehended in the present case. This example should tend to quiet the apprehension that the use of Paraphrases and Hymns, under any circumstances, necessarily results in the disesteem and neglect of the Psalms.

In the other aspect of the question, we are confronted by the stubborn fact that the Psalms, that is to say, a *literal* version, have for many years been disused in the Presbyterian Church; the very body which proposes to unite with

* Southern Presbyterian Review, Vol. XIV., p. 660.

us on the basis which we are now discussing. If, when they constituted the principal Psalmody of the church, they were set aside, and another system introduced, is it not exceedingly improbable that, after having been so long discarded, they will again come into general use among Presbyterians, or, indeed, be used by them at all? So far from this, is there not great danger that they will, in the sequel, be used by neither, and thus suffer a second *ostracism* from the church? But does it follow, the friends of this measure might reply, that because an event occurred many years since, under one set of circumstances, therefore it must occur again, under a new and very different combination? We believe it is Bacon who says: *tempus maximus est innovator*. We are far from asserting that any change has taken place in the Presbyterian Church on the subject of Psalmody, so far as the *principle* is concerned; or that the proposition of the Assembly proceeded from new views. We do not so understand the matter; but we more than suspect that there *does* exist among them a growing dissatisfaction with their Hymns, and a disposition to return to the practice of "the good old mother Church of Scotland and Ireland." There is another consideration. Both churches expect to be benefited by the union; the Presbyterian as well as the Associate Reformed. If the union is advantageous to the former, it will be both her duty and interest to maintain it. But the bond of union is the use of the Psalms of David in the United Church. Therefore, it will be both the duty and interest of the Presbyterian Church to encourage the use of the Psalms.

In this way, and this alone, can the harmony of the United Church be preserved. The general neglect of the Psalms would very soon result in a rupture, with all its attendant evils.

We have thus presented, in a very general manner, and without any attempt at discussion, some considerations which may be of assistance in enabling us to decide the

question, What will be the effect of union on the Psalms; will it be favorable or unfavorable? This passage may appear somewhat irrelevant to the readers of this Review, as the decision of this question belongs to ourselves; but we desire to call the attention of our Presbyterian brethren to some of the difficulties which environ the subject, as it now presents itself to the Associate Reformed Church.

Upon the whole, there can, we think, be no great difficulty in defining the present position of this church on the subject of Psalmody. Formerly, the question was, Can we go into the union *at all*? It now is, Can we accept the Assembly's proposition? Does it afford any assurance that the Psalms will continue to be sung? Formerly, it was a question of *forbearance*. Now, it is a question of the *permanent use* of the Psalms. The only difficulty now to be encountered is, the apprehension which exists, to some extent, in the minds of all, that in acceding to the proposition of the Assembly, we hazard the principle that the Psalms were designed by their Author to be permanently used in the church, and are eminently proper for this purpose. And we take it upon ourselves to affirm that no arrangement will be satisfactory to the smaller body, which does not contain some well-grounded assurance that the Psalms will be permanently used in the United Church.

We desire not to be misunderstood. By assurance, we do not mean a pledge, or a compulsory use of the Psalms. Both churches are to be left free. Our meaning is this: *The character of the Psalmody recommended to the United Church shall be so nearly conformed to that of the Church of Scotland, as to afford some reasonable prospect of a similar result.*

To be more precise: we do not think the human element, (we use the word in no offensive sense,) ought largely, if at all, to preponderate. If the number of Hymns and Paraphrases greatly exceed that of the Psalms, this circumstance will impart to the former an air of superior importance, and this seeming preference will operate to the disadvantage

of the latter. In our judgment, therefore, the inequality should not be nearly so great as it is at present. This suggestion, which might otherwise appear presumptuous, is made with the more confidence, inasmuch as the Assembly themselves have, from time to time, reduced the number of their Hymns, and now propose to make still further reduction, not with a view to union, but for the improvement of their Psalter. Poetry is one of those things in which quality is more to be regarded than quantity. And this is emphatically true of devotional poetry. A volume which consists of five hundred or a thousand Hymns is not, for that reason, superior to another which contains only half the number. The exquisitely beautiful Hymns of Cowper, particularly that touching one which sounds the depths of every pious heart:

"O for a closer walk with God,
A calm and heavenly frame!"

or Dryden's magnificent paraphrase, worthy of Milton himself, of the grand old lyric, *Veni Creator Spiritus*:

"Creator Spirit, by whose aid
The world's foundations first were laid!"—

a volume composed of such songs as these, although it might not be very bulky or pretentious, would be of far greater value than a much larger collection of decidedly inferior merit. We do not desire to be understood as intimating that the collection which obtains in the Presbyterian Church is of the latter character. Far from it. Many of them have stood the test of time, and, like sandal-wood, continue to shed a precious perfume, which rejoices the heart. They are enshrined in the affections of God's people, and have become, as it were, a part of their spiritual being. But are we guilty of presumption or intrusion, if we echo the voice of the whole Presbyterian Church, which declares that many, very many, are not up to this high standard, and have a place in the collection only by sufferance?

Under cover, therefore, of this recommendation of the Assembly, we have no hesitation in saying that such a reduction would go far to reconcile the Associate Reformed Church to the Presbyterian Psalter.

Suffer another remark. Our people would much prefer that the Hymns should be of a more *scriptural* character. And here, again, we must beg that we may not be misunderstood. We disclaim any intention to insinuate that the sentiment of the Hymns, or any of them, used in the Presbyterian Church, is unscriptural. We have no reason to believe that their Psalter is not perfectly *orthodox*. But the sentiment of a Hymn may be unexceptionable, and, at the same time, in the sense here intended, not scriptural. The sentiment of "Paradise Lost" is, with rare exceptions, unobjectionable; but we can not affirm that it is directly or immediately derived from the Scriptures of truth. The "Course of Time" is, in a higher sense, a religious poem. It could not have been written, had the heart of the author not been thoroughly imbued with divine truth, which often finds its most appropriate utterance in the very words of inspiration. Much of the sentiment of this poem is scriptural, because it is borrowed from the inspired writers; and the language also partakes of the same character for precisely the same reason. If a collection of sacred songs were composed on this model, with such differences as are required between the epic poem and the ode, it would afford some idea of what we understand by a scriptural Psalmody. A paraphrase is a versification of some particular portion of Scripture. The sentiment of a hymn, or spiritual song, such as we have in view, might be taken *ad libitum* from any portion of the sacred volume, with unlimited freedom of selection from its rich and inexhaustible stores. The "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," which are scattered up and down, with magnificent profusion, by the sacred historians and poets, by prophets and evangelists, and other holy men of old, would be appropriated without

stint by the author of such a composition. It would be something between a paraphrase and what is generally understood by a hymn. The sentiment, and even the language, would be adopted, as nearly as might be without making a paraphrase or translation. A literal version of the Psalms, as a *point d'appui*, or foundation; next, paraphrases, either of the Psalms themselves, or of other portions of Scripture; and, lastly, hymns, the sentiment of which should be eminently scriptural, and expressed, as nearly as convenient, in the language which the Holy Spirit indited, would, in our opinion, meet the requirements of the case, constituting a broad platform, with "ample room and verge enough," on which both churches might safely and comfortably stand. Such a collection would possess a more homogeneous character than a volume composed of Psalms, together with hymns written without any regard to these restrictions. And being of this character, there would not be the same danger of *exclusive preference*. The sentiment would be the same in all, substantially, with greater or less freedom of expression. In the Psalms, the mind of the Spirit would be expressed in His own language, so far as this is possible in a metrical version; while in the Paraphrases and Hymns, the *sentiment*, (and the language also, to a certain extent,) would be scriptural; not only agreeable to the word of God, but, in its *substance*, directly derived from it. Thus the same spiritual palate which received gratification from the latter, would not be so likely to conceive a disgust at the former, because, to pursue our metaphor, there was not so much spice and seasoning.

From all which we conclude that, if the hymns were of a more scriptural character, as well as fewer in number, the probability of an early union would be increased. We have made these suggestions with great diffidence, and should not have presumed so far, but for the persuasion that we have been anticipated by the General Assembly. If they were prepared, as we have seen, to make these

changes without any reference to union, they will not take it unkindly if we recommend them, with this important object in view.

What the Associate Reformed Church desires is, *that the Psalms shall constitute an indispensable and essential part of the book of praise in the United Church.* And surely this is a moderate and reasonable demand. If she go into the union, she desires to do so with the distinct understanding that the Psalms—not Rouse, but the word of God, that liveth and abideth for ever—shall be “part and parcel” of the common Psalter, as long as the connexion shall be maintained. She is “willing and desires” to enter into the union, but not at the expense of those celestial songs which the sweet Psalmist of Israel, in his seasons of exultation and despondency, was wont to accompany with his “harp of solemn sound, and grave, sweet melody.” Whatever importance she may attach to union, abstractly considered, she will never, for the sake of accomplishing it, surrender her distinctive principles, which have given her character and individuality in the great Presbyterian family.

The present is the most favorable opportunity for consummating the union that, in the providence of God, has yet been presented. In 1852, as we have seen, the Associate Reformed Church resolved to “await the leadings of Providence to determine the course of duty.” This was, no doubt, a wise conclusion. But a few years have elapsed, (only one short decade,) and what a change! A mighty revolution has been accomplished. Its effects have not been confined to the State. The Church, also, has been deeply agitated by these political convulsions. By the blessing of God, aided by her own prudence and wisdom, the Presbyterian Church had been able to preserve her unity, and, to a considerable extent, her peace, in the midst of the division and strife which distracted the counsels of the nation. At length, however, in the fervent heat which

dissolved the political elements, ecclesiastical ties fell asunder as flax at the touch of fire. The Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America became a separate, complete, and independent organization. No sooner was this change in her relations effected, than she was powerfully drawn toward other branches of the Presbyterian family in the South; and especially toward the Associate Reformed Church, with whom she had long been conducting a friendly correspondence.

It is wonderful to contemplate the effects of this gigantic revolution in moulding and harmonizing public sentiment at the South, both in Church and State. It has united the people of the South as one man in fierce and unconquerable opposition to the tyranny of the North. Never before, perhaps, in the history of our race, has any great popular movement been characterized by more unanimity. Party lines, which time had deeply drawn, have disappeared as foot-prints before the rising tide. The animosities of the past have been buried and forgotten. In the majestic language of the prophet, the hearts of the people have been bowed as the winds bow the trees of the forest. The inhabitants of these Confederate States present to the world the sublime spectacle of a whole people rising up as one man to vindicate their insulted majesty, and to establish upon a new basis the immutable principles of justice.

The Southern Church has no less distinctly felt the tremors of this political earthquake. She is beginning to recognize, as perhaps she never did before, the great and paramount truth that in Jesus Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free. And hence, denominational distinctions do not assume that undue importance which we are so prone to attach to them in seasons of profound peace and tranquillity.* Christians

* "While the great doctrines which distinguish revealed religion are attended with such evidence that to reject them is a crime, we can not say the same of those minor forms which divide one denomination from

of the different persuasions are brought into more intimate association with each other, in their common efforts to provide for the wants of our destitute soldiery. Not unfrequently they meet together in circumstances well adapted to chasten and subdue the mind, and moderate the zeal of party. They are found side by side and shoulder to shoulder, on the tented field, upholding the honor of our common flag, now full high advanced in the sight of the nations. The ministers of every communion are united in a common labor of love—proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ in the cheerless hospital or under the broad canopy of heaven. It were passing strange if in such circumstances they were not more than ordinarily disposed to regard each other as brethren in Christ, engaged in the same glorious work, which is to promote, according to their several ability, the spiritual and everlasting well-being of their common countrymen. If this is true of the Church in general, it is emphatically true of those different divisions which are marshalled under the broad banner of the Presbyterian faith and polity. And with yet greater emphasis may it be affirmed of those two branches of this numerous and important family, which, during a series of years have been actively negotiating in reference to union. Hence it behooves both, under a deep and solemn sense of their accountability to God, to consider whether, in “the leadings of Providence,” the path of duty is not *now* plain before them.

It is a remarkable fact that the Associate Reformed Church had her origin near the close of the first American Revolution. The political sky was still overcast, but the

another. On this debatable, or at least debated ground, we may agree to differ. In seasons of controversy, we magnify these topics, until enmities are begotten which remain for a generation. It is some times a blessing when some foreign enemy attacks our common faith, and when, contending for one common cause, we bury our enmities, and remember that we are brethren.” *Sermon before State Bible Convention, by the Rev. Dr. Howz.*

clouds had a silver lining; the night was not yet gone, but the morning of a glorious day was beginning to "purple the east." The foundations of our beloved Zion were laid in troublous times :

"In darkness, and with danger compass'd round ;"

but, like the fabled Minerva, she sprang from the vortex of revolution, clothed in her celestial panoply. It may be the purpose of the Head of the Church, that the union which is now in contemplation shall be formed under circumstances nearly similar. Although it is impossible to predict the duration of the terrible conflict in which we are engaged, we have yet a strong persuasion that the Lord will cut it short in righteousness; that He will arise to shake terribly the earth; and that our enemies will experience as signal an overthrow as the haughty king of Assyria, when he came up against Jerusalem and Hezekiah, with his hitherto invincible legions!

There is a tide in the affairs of men; and if we would "take it at the flood," let us avail ourselves of the present auspicious moment. There is danger in delay. There is no reason to believe that the parties will ever be more favorably disposed. If they fail to improve the present opportunity, both will naturally settle down in the conviction that the difficulties are of such a nature as absolutely to forbid all further communication on the subject. Let both, then, rise to the grandeur of the occasion, which rebukes all selfish and mercenary considerations. The motives which should influence the contracting parties, tower immeasurably above all schemes of denominational aggrandizement. The grand design of the union should be to promote the peace and harmony of the Church, with a view to the glory of God, the honor of Christ, and the salvation of immortal souls.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—NO. 4.

APRIL, MDCCCLXIII.

ARTICLE I.

THE WAR OF THE SOUTH VINDICATED.

“Whatsoever,” saith the divine oracle, “is not of faith,” that is, whatever we do, as moral and responsible beings, that is not based upon a well-grounded conviction of its rectitude, “is sin.” Where there is a faithful and enlightened conscience, it will regard such conduct, whether it involves commission of what is wrong, or failure to do what is right, with self-condemnation; and the result of such a state of mind must be doubt, irresolution, and imbecility.

It is all-important, therefore, not only to act right, but to *know* that we are doing so, in order to do and to dare, to endeavor and to endure, to perform and to persevere in doing, all that, as men, we can achieve. A mind conscious of its sincerity of purpose, and of the righteousness of its desired end—of having a good cause, and justifiable means for its accomplishment—is essential to success. This alone

VOL. XV., NO. IV—61

can now animate and sustain the people of the South, whether in the army or out of it, in the patient endurance of past misfortunes, present calamities, and possibly increasing difficulties and dangers.

Such a faith will be found to have constituted the vitalizing principle of all successful wars, the secret power of all celebrated warriors, the soul of the Reformation, and the indomitable spirit of our revolutionary fathers.

We have seen, therefore, with what witchcraft the North has succeeded in leading its people so generally to believe that our cause is wicked, and theirs righteous, sacred, holy, divine. We are rebels, traitors, criminals, execrable sinners, and deserving the uttermost punishment on earth, and everlasting damnation in hell. The highest sanctions of piety and patriotism have been made to overcome all natural feelings of sympathy and compassion; to inflame malice, hatred, and all uncharitableness; to call down fire from heaven to destroy us; to sustain their present government in its suppression of all their own liberties and fundamental rights, of all freedom of speech, of the press, and even of thought; and to overwhelm them with a debt of many hundred millions of dollars, and increasing at the rate of six millions a day; and to justify a war of rapine, rape, murder, vandal destruction, inquisitorial espionage, ecclesiastical despotism, and servile massacre. Our enemies, it must be admitted, display terrible earnestness, and almost superhuman malevolence. They have a zeal of God, but it is not according to knowledge. Their faith is, therefore, fanaticism. They substitute opinion for truth, dogmatism for doctrine, philosophy (falsely so called) for religion; and, adopting as a maxim the jesuitical dogma that the end sanctifies the means, they stop at nothing, and are willing to be branded by an outraged world as infamous, for their mendacity, perfidy, shameless brutality, and an unbridled despotism, more execrable than that of Bomba, if by any means they can subjugate and enslave the South.

What melancholy evidence of the overwhelming force of this fanatical fury, and of its blinding delusion, is given in the transformation effected in the principles and character and conduct of such men as Drs. R. J. Breckinridge, Spring, Hodge, Jacobus, and Plumer, and Sidney A. Morse, Mr. Dickinson, etc. Such men now profess to have lost confidence in our morality. And well may they and we alike lose any confidence we ever had either in the sincerity, uprightness, or power of the human mind, and even in Christian principle, in its present imperfect development. Well may we say, "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man;" for surely the wisdom of the wise has become foolishness, and the purity of the pure tainted with the corruption of selfish and sectional prejudice.

To this blind, fervid fanaticism, the South must oppose the only invincible shield, and that is faith, faith in God, faith in His word, faith in His omnipotent providence, faith in the righteousness of a cause sustained by His immutable and everlasting truth. She must be able to give a reason for the hope that is in her, to herself and to every one that asketh it, that so, being clad in divine panoply, she may be able to withstand in the evil day, and bear up, with unshrinking fortitude, against the heart-sickness of long-deferred hope, and the manifold disappointments, disasters, privations, losses, and bereavements of a protracted and barbarous war.

I. THE WAR OF THE SOUTH IS IN SELF-DEFENCE.

Now, for such a faith there is adequate foundation, in the first place, in the defensive character of the war of the South. That war, as we have already proved,* was provoked, threatened, perfidiously commenced, and openly proclaimed by the North; and as sure as there is a righteous God, they that take the sword shall perish by the sword.

* See the article on the Battle of Fort Sumter, in the Review for 1861

Accursed by God are they that delight in war. For the battle is not to the strong, nor victory by might, or power, or wisdom, but by God's providence, who giveth it to whomsoever He will; saving by few or many, as it pleaseth Him, and executing judgment for the poor and oppressed.

Should any doubt attach to the conclusiveness of the facts adduced, in proof of the aggression of the North in originating this war, it will be more than silenced by the correspondence, since made public, between Governor Pickens and the United States Government, and between that Government and its own foreign Ambassadors, and by General Scott's letters; in all of which it is incontrovertibly shown that the whole scheme of a perfidious attack upon Charleston, by Fort Sumter within, and a fleet without the harbor, was actually arranged by that Government at the very time it was giving Governor Pickens solemn assurances of peaceful intentions, and of the early evacuation of the fort.

By every instinct, therefore, of self-preservation and defence, by the divinely authorized as well as inherent natural right of all her citizens in the government ordained by them, as "free," and "using their liberty," (1 Pet. 2,) the South was imperatively required to defend life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, even unto blood, against the arrogant and rapacious usurpation and tyranny of the North.

Coming events, now a part of history, cast their shadows before, and the portentous magnitude and character of this war darkened with their terrific shade the perilous course of a Southern Confederacy. But God's manifest presence and providence, in the bloodless and yet triumphant victory of Sumter; in the electric sympathy with which eleven States rushed into each others' arms; in the peaceful, prayerful unity with which a constitution and a confederation were ratified on earth, and sealed in the chancery of heaven; all this seemed to be the evidence of God's presence with us.

God seemed thus to command His people in these Southern States, to whom, as the divider of nations, He had apportioned their inheritance, and imposed upon them the solemn trust of an organized system of slave labor, for the benefit of the world and as a blessing to themselves, while imparting civil, social, and religious blessings to their slaves; now that His word and providence were denied, and covenanted rights and immunities were withheld, and the annihilation of that system of labor was made the basis and cohesive bond of a dominant mobocratic and sectional party, inaugurated as the government of the United States, and invested with absolute power, God now spake as with a voice from heaven, saying, "Come out of the Union, my people. From such withdraw thyself, for 'all the men of thy Confederacy have brought thee even to the border: the men that were at peace with thee have deceived thee, and prevailed against thee: they that ate thy bread have laid a wound under thee: there is none understanding in them.'" The heart of the South was bowed before the Most High, the Lord God omnipotent that reigneth, and with one voice they cried unto Him, and said 'unto Him, "If thy presence go not with us, carry us not up hence: for wherein shall it be known that we, thy people, have found grace in thy sight? Is it not in that thou goest with us? So shall we be separated from all the people that are upon the face of the earth." Then came up from millions of hearts the shout, "Go forward, for God is with us of a truth."

But Abraham Lincoln neither heard nor heeded this voice that spake so audibly from heaven, in the otherwise inexplicable events that were occurring around him. He hardened his heart, and stiffened his neck, and would not let the people go. The Constitution of the United States must be set aside, and all rights under it, however fundamental, ignored. The collateral power of the Supreme Court is denied, and its decisions set at nought. The powers of an autocratic despotism are assumed. War, war to the hilt, a war of sub-

jugation or extermination, is proclaimed. Beauty and booty became the earliest war-cry. Murderers, thieves, and the veriest offscourings of jails and cities, were consecrated to their work of lust and rapine by woman's benediction, and the grasp of hands reeking with pollution, and were canonized in advance by priestly absolution. Edicts have been issued, and practically carried out, under the sanction of the government, which, for brutality and ferocity, have thrown into the shade the infamy alike of Bomba and of Alva. A President, not the choice of the people—having a majority against him of two-thirds of a million out of four millions, even in the Northern States, while from the Susquehanna to the Rio Grande, in fifteen States, neither a popular nor electoral vote was given him, and who only became President under, and in subordination to, that very Constitution now trampled beneath his feet—has, by the arbitrary and despotic exercise of illegal and unconstitutional power, rendered the United States Government, as one of their own orators is reported to have well said, “the most contemptible on the face of the earth.”

What, then, was the South to do? What could she do, but declare, with Patrick Henry, “resistance to tyrants is obedience to God;” buckle on her armor, and contend to the last extremity, to the last man, and to the last dollar, for “the redemption of our country from all impending slavery?” We have taken up arms for the defence of our civil and religious rights, and God, our country, and the world at large, call upon us to quit ourselves like men, for our wives and little ones, for our homes, our sanctuaries, and even our religion itself.

II. THE WAR OF THE SOUTH VINDICATED BY THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF AMERICAN LIBERTY.

The war of the South is vindicated by those principles of civil liberty and free government acknowledged by our forefathers, and by our enemies, and imbedded in the fun-

damental charters of our national and constitutional rights.

The principles which entered into the controversies and struggles of our revolutionary fathers, were found in the works of Locke, Hoadley, Sydney, Montesquieu, Priestley, Milton, Price, and Gordon's Tacitus, which were all in Franklin's library. Pitt declared "the American controversy to be a great common cause, and that if she fell she would embrace the pillars of the State, and pull down the Constitution with her." "The natural rights of man, and the immutable laws of nature," said Lord Camden, "are with that people." General Burgoyne declared in Parliament, in 1781, that "he was now convinced that the principle of the war against America was wrong;—* * * only a part of a system levelled against the Constitution and the natural rights of mankind." The high-minded men of that day rejoiced in our resistance to tyranny. "The Englishman in America," says Burke, "will feel that to bear the burden of unlimited monopoly and revenue is slavery, that it is legal slavery, and that the payment of twenty shillings on the principle on which it is demanded, would make him a slave."* This spirit was the soul of the American revolution. The maxims adopted from the above and kindred writers, and published in popular writings, and proclaimed in every gathering of the people, by such men as Franklin, Paine, and Jefferson, and now become household words, were such as these, "that governments rest on the consent of the governed, and any other government is tyrannical; that resistance to oppression is obedience to God; that there should be a strong people and a weak government; that every nation, when aggrieved, that is able and agreed, has a right to set up over themselves any form of government which to them may appear most con-

* See quoted in "The Pulpit of the American Revolution," Boston, 1860, p. 112.

ducive to their common welfare." The term "nation" was employed to denote Massachusetts and the colonies severally, in their as yet disunited and unfederated capacity.* Thus, in 1774, "the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, in a message sent by John Hancock to General Gage, declares, 'that the sole end of government is protection and security of the people.' Whenever, therefore, that power, which was originally instituted to effect these important and valuable purposes, is employed to harass, distress, or enslave the people, in this case it becomes a curse, and not a blessing." And he adds, at the very time that domestic slavery, under a very rigid code, existed in that "nation," and when the clergyman and his wife walked to church with a negro man and woman on either side of them, "*the little negroes being distributed, according to their size, on either side of their respective parents,*"* "we are not afraid of poverty, but we disdain slavery."

So universally had these principles become inwrought into the public mind, that, in the eloquent language of Dr. Styles, "the soul of the American continent was poured out in the Declaration of Independence," by which the colonies proclaimed to the world that they, severally, "are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States, and that, as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do." The Declaration, in which Mr. Lincoln professed to believe, as both his law and gospel, proceeds to embody substantially the principles already mentioned—declares that all government has its foundation in the consent of the governed, and repeats the very words used by John Hancock.

* See Pulpit, p. 240.

† See Pulpit, ¶ xxxv, and pp. 193, 194, 195.

No terms could more perfectly declare the sovereignty of each of the States severally, than this Declaration, considered as the embodiment of preëxisting and proclaimed principles. The rights of absolute sovereignties, with power both to make and unmake a government, are attributed not to any Union or Confederation, but to "free and independent States."

Let it be remembered, that the States have been established at different times, and by separate charters.

They continued to exist in this separate and independent form, for a period greater than they have coexisted in union. When Great Britain began to treat them as dependents, and parts of a consolidated empire, they separately protested, and when she proceeded to employ force to compel obedience, they also separately resorted to arms.

They also organized for themselves independent governments, and in every respect acted as sovereign commonwealths.

Under these governments the war of the Revolution was carried on, and every act of sovereignty performed.

In vindication of their war, they appealed to "their natural and constitutional rights, in opposition to the machinations of wicked men, aiming to enslave and ruin the whole nation."*

It was only when all were endangered, that, in 1777, these sovereign States entered into the Articles of Confederation, calling themselves, not a "nation," but "the United States," and affirming, in Article II., "Each State retains its SOVEREIGNTY, freedom, and independence, and every POWER, jurisdiction, and right, not expressly delegated," etc.

In this constitutional compact, it was provided that the Union shall be PERPETUAL, and that no alteration should hereafter be made in it, unless first agreed to by Congress, and afterwards confirmed by the Legislature of EVERY STATE."

* See Pulpit, pp. 285, 287.

Was the constitution of the subsequent Union an alteration of this constitution, so as to secure "a more perfect union," or was it a new compact altogether? In either case, it was the work of a SECESSION of States, in the exercise of their sovereignty. If, therefore, the Union was justifiable, then secession is a fundamental American doctrine, and the Confederate States are based upon the same foundation of authenticated right as the Union was. And if secession is rebellion now, then it was so in 1786, and the whole country is bound by the "PERPETUAL" compact of 1777. The facts are these: In 1786, a "Convention," called by the State of Virginia, which represented only *five* out of thirteen States, met to propose amendments, which, *when unanimously ratified by every State*, might be adopted by the Congress of the whole. But what was the actual result? Against the wishes of many of the States, and without any ratification of it by them, or in the way the Constitution required, a new constitutional compact was formed, with no allusion to that one, still binding and "PERPETUAL." It even goes so far as to declare, in Article VII., that this new compact shall go into operation when any nine (instead of all, as required) States shall ratify it. This was as many as Mr. Madison thought could be induced to adopt it. And thus *the present United States was framed upon a perfect theory of SECESSION.*

But the fathers and founders of the Union not only recognized and acted upon the doctrine of SECESSION from a PERPETUAL UNION, by as many States as would agree to secede, against the Constitution and the wishes of the remaining States; they also based the doctrine of SECESSION upon the doctrine of the indisputable SOVEREIGNTY of the States. In *form*, the Constitution says, "We, the people of the United States, do ordain and establish." The form, however, had no power or life until that was infused by the ratification of the States respectively. It was the action of free, sovereign, and independent States, and this alone, that ordained and established the Union. It is a union of States,

and not of the people. Its Senate, therefore, which participates in the executive government, represents the legislatures of the States, and not the people.

The doctrines of secession, and of the sovereignty of States, are, therefore, fundamental American doctrines, for they constitute the very foundation on which the Union rested. In coming into it, all the States tacitly, and Virginia, New York, and Rhode Island, as representatives of the Southern, Middle, and Eastern States, embodied these doctrines in the very act by which they ratified the Union, so that you can not prove that they—any of them—ever entered the Union without establishing the doctrines of State sovereignty and secession. “The powers of government,” says New York, in her ratifying act, “may be re-assumed by the people, whensoever it shall become necessary to their happiness; and EVERY power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not CLEARLY delegated to the Congress of the United States, remains to the people of the SEVERAL STATES.”

As early as 1798, while the Constitution was yet in its infancy, Virginia and Kentucky spoke unmistakably of the limited powers of our general government. Mr. Madison was the author of the Virginia, and Mr. Jefferson of the Kentucky resolutions. The third of the Virginia resolutions is, “That this Assembly doth explicitly and peremptorily declare, that it views the powers of the Federal Government, as resulting from a compact to which the States are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument constituting that compact, as no further valid than they are authorized by the grants enumerated in that compact; and that in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of other powers, not granted by the said compact, the States who are parties thereto have the right, and are in duty bound to interpose, for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights and liberties appertaining to them.”

The doctrines of State sovereignty and secession, against which the North is now compelling the South to wage a defensive war, are, therefore, fundamental to the American mind, and to the history of its governments, in each State separately, and in all combined, and through every change.

In 1811, Josiah Quincy boldly and emphatically affirmed both of these doctrines, on the floor of Congress, declaring that if the people of Orleans Territory were allowed to form a constitution, "the Union, or bonds of the Union, are virtually dissolved; that the States that compose it are free from their moral obligations; and as it will be the *right*, so it will be the *duty*, of some, to prepare definitely for a separation, *amicably if they can, violently if they must.*" Being called to order, and declared out of order by the Speaker, Mr. Quincy was sustained in an appeal to the House. And so universally popular were these doctrines then, that they elevated Mr. Jefferson to the Presidential chair.

Let it also be well considered, that while these doctrines were tacitly and generally admitted and acted upon, and the school of strict construction prevailed pure and uncontaminated, which was for a period of some forty or fifty years, the country enjoyed uninterrupted union and domestic tranquillity, in an eminent degree. They led to mutual forbearance and compromise then, and afterwards, in 1814, saved the country from civil war. Feeling sectionally aggrieved in her commercial interests by the last war with Great Britain, Massachusetts, who regarded it as "not becoming a moral and religious people," declared the united Constitution a failure, called for a convention, and recommended to officer ten thousand men, and provide one million dollars for their support. In this she was seconded by Connecticut and Rhode Island. The Hartford Convention declared the Constitution of the United States to be "incurably and intrinsically defective," and the administration "a military despotism." It declared that dissolution of the Union was preferable to radical and permanent abuses, and

that it should, if possible, "be the work of peaceable times and deliberate consent." They appointed another convention to await the action of Congress, and, in the mean time urge upon every State "effectually to protect their own sovereignty, and the rights and liberties of their citizens." Thus, according to New England, endangered State sovereignty and economic prosperity make secession an imperative duty, peaceably if possible, but by force if necessary.

It is most manifest, from this review of facts, that the United States compact was the result, and itself an act, of secession, based upon State sovereignty, and that it provided for secession at any future time. *It omitted all reference to any clause of perpetuity.* The plan of a strong central government, offered by Mr. Hamilton, was utterly rejected. Any attempt to coerce States into the Union, or, when in it, to a compulsory obedience, was, after full discussion, also repelled, as in its very nature suicidal, and involving, as Jefferson styles it, "the violent death of the Union." The introduction of sectional jealousies and divisions was prefigured by Washington, as the sure precursor of disunion. The Missouri Compromise, forced upon the South by the North, only to be immediately and constantly resisted and perverted, rung the death-knell of the Union. The sage of Quincy long ago foretold, and by his teachings prepared the way for disunion. Seward boasts of having long foreseen this as the result of his "irrepressible conflict;" and the sure beginning of the sad end was formally laid down in the platform of the Republican party, on whose basis the present Abolition administration was clothed with power to rend the Union, and to involve in one common ruin the happiness of both North and South.

The war of the South is, therefore, in vindication of the doctrines of State sovereignty and of peaceable secession, which has always constituted the predominant idea of the American mind. Hamilton* foresaw that "the first war of

* Federalist, p. 172.

coercion would probably terminate in a dissolution of the Union." John Quincy Adams taught, that every State had the same right to secede from the Union that, as a colony, it had to separate from Great Britain, and that disunion was much better than alienation. Webster declared, in October, 1832, that "the President had no authority to blockade Charleston;" the President had no authority to employ military force, "till he shall be required to do so by law." Mr. Rawle lays down the constitutionality of secession, and teaches that such secession leaves the Union intact; since the life of the Union does not, as Dr. Hodge gratuitously affirms, depend on the number of States, but on the union of any number. The Hon. J. K. Paulding said, in 1851, that "the first attempt to coerce any one State will be the handwriting on the wall, predicting the speedy and certain fate of the Union."

In standing, therefore, upon the fundamental doctrines of State sovereignty, and the right of secession, the South has built her house upon the primitive rock of American liberty, which can not be overthrown, nor questioned, without giving the lie to themselves, by either the Northern or New England States.

The only point necessary to make this argument conclusive is, the prior and paramount authority of each State over the citizens of said State, and the prior and paramount obedience due by every citizen to the State. Just as in a family, or city, the authority over their members is immediate, and paramount to that of the State, or country, in all that is within their sphere of jurisdiction, so it is with the State in relation to the United or Confederate States. Such paramount authority was exercised by each State over its citizens, long anterior to any confederation with other States. It was only through the exercise of this power, any State became united in any compact with any other, so that a portion of the allegiance due to it was by it transferred to other States, under definite limitations, constitu-

tionally defined. But if each State had power to transfer and limit the allegiance due by its citizens to the States united, it still retains power to recall that allegiance, and to concentrate it again upon itself, or transfer it to some other confederacy. The primary and paramount allegiance of every citizen of any Confederate State is now, therefore, as always, due to that State, and so far as the Constitution ratified by it has provided, is now transferred from the United States to the Confederate States. The State alone, however, has absolute possession of the person, life, and property of her citizens, except in cases of treason, and crimes against clearly intrusted Federal powers; and she alone defends these inestimable rights of her citizens, levies taxes, etc. This power of each State is original, inherent, and sovereign. It never was delegated to it by a more general government, which is itself its creature.

But further: the United States in organizing their present government, not only did so upon the principle of the admitted sovereignty and independence of each of the States, *then* bound together by a constitutional compact declared to be permanent and unalterable by any State or States separately, and of the consequent right of any number of them, in order to secure more perfectly, as they believed, their peace, safety, and happiness, to *secede*; and, without leave asked or obtained, to adopt a constitution and organize a new and independent government—they have *never* yet been recognized by foreign nations except in their separate, free, sovereign and independent character as States.

Besides, in all that relates to the exercise of government as free, sovereign, and independent States, the united government has always recognized the inherent, unchanged, prerogative of every State in the Union, and has refused to interfere with them, even at the instance of Great Britain; as in the case of repudiated State debts, and the law of South Carolina respecting colored seamen.

"The letter of Mr. Webster to Baring Brothers & Co., in 1839, and which may be considered an exposition addressed to European nations, is a more recent explanation of the relations of these States to the common Government. The opinions of that distinguished man will be scarcely considered as affected with prejudices in favor of the slaveholding States. 'Every State (said he) is an independent, sovereign political community, except in so far as certain powers, which it might otherwise have exercised, have been conferred on a General Government, established under a written Constitution, and exercising its authority over the people of all the States. *Its General Government is a limited Government.* Its powers are specific and enumerated. *All powers not conferred on it still remain with the States or with the people. The State Legislatures, on the other hand, possess all usual and ordinary powers of Government,* subject to any limitations which may be imposed by their own Constitutions, and with the exception, as I have said, of the operations on those powers of the Constitution of the United States.' The circumstances which called forth this letter, and the character of the persons to whom it was addressed, give to it much more significance than otherwise would be attached to the opinions of an individual, however distinguished.

"This view of the relations between the States and the General Government came to be practicably understood in a very striking manner, by the law of the State of South Carolina, establishing the regulations which must be observed in the case of colored seamen arriving in any of its ports. This matter has been particularly offensive to Great Britain, it would seem, from the pertinacious opposition made to it some time since by a former representative of the British Government. The authority of the Government of the United States was invoked to remove the objectionable law. The consequence which the remonstrance to the Government of the United States was intended to develop, was a conflict between the treaty-making power of the Government and the sovereign authority of the State. The conflict, if established, it was supposed, would conclude the question. And it was so. But it did not conclude it in the manner supposed. For the sovereign power of the State was paramount to the treaty-making power, if there could arise an actual conflict between them. A proper conflict, however, could not arise between them; for the fact that the operation of a treaty would affect the sovereignty of a State, was in itself the conclusive evidence that the power to make treaties had been abused, by involving in its operation that which it could not reach."*

* See the exceedingly lucid and able papers of Juridicus, (the Hon. A. G. Magrath,) on "The International Doctrine of Recognition," in "The Charleston Courier" of February — and —, 1863, and published, therefore, since this article was in press.

The States of this Southern Confederacy having, therefore, united in a common government, against which the United States have feloniously, wickedly, and without cause, and against every principle fundamental to American liberty and constitutional right, waged war, it is made the primary and paramount duty of every citizen to come up to the help of his State and country, in maintaining their freedom, sovereignty, and independence.

III. THE WAR OF THE SOUTH IS JUSTIFIED AS A DEFENSIVE WAR
AGAINST FANATICAL ABOLITION.

The war now carried on by the North is a war against slavery, and is, therefore, treasonable rebellion against the Constitution of the United States, and against the word, providence, and government of God.

It might be shown that slavery is not in itself wrong, any more than monarchy, aristocracy, or autocracy; and that, as a form of organized involuntary labor, it has always and every where existed among the negro race, and has been found to conduce, under proper moral and religious direction, to the best interests of that race, and of the world at large; and, therefore, can afford no warrantable pretext for waging war against these Southern States. But it is enough to know that, let slavery in the South be right or wrong, and injurious or not, to the United States, that it existed, as a common institution, in every colony and State before and during the Revolutionary war; that it was considered as perfectly consistent with the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation; that the United States Constitution was a compromise, by which the agriculture of the South, with its slave labor, and the commerce of the North, with its free labor, should be equally provided for and protected; that but for this guarantee, embodied in several provisions of the Constitution, the United States never would have included a single Southern State; that for an allotted term of years, fixed by the North, it

carried oivul home and foreign slave trade, and supplied the South with all its present slaves; from its own bleak and unprofitable climate and from Africa; that the unexampled prosperity and growth of the United States, have been in exact accordance with the development of the slave population, the slave territory, and the slave products, cotton, rice, tobacco, sugar, and naval stores, of the South; and that the South never sought any thing under the Union, beyond that equality and community of rights, privileges, and immunities, with which she entered it, and only to enjoy which she ever did enter it. The North, therefore, had no right, any more than a dishonest partner, thief, or highway robber, to interfere with the institution of slavery, in its progressive development in the States and territories, so long as the compact of union remained unchanged. And if it was led to believe that the coexistence of the two forms of organized involuntary service, (for all hard labor, free or slave, is a part of the original curse, and only performed from necessity,) could not longer profitably and pleasantly continue, then she was bound, by every principle of honor, of justice, of truth, of common honesty, to propose a dissolution of partnership. And when the South, as the weaker party, did propose it, and ask for a peaceful adjustment of all claims arising under it, it was dishonorable and disgraceful in the North, like a monstrous bully, to make might right, and in order to have no rivals and no participant in the glories of American liberty, to wage a war of subjugation and the extermination of slavery. The meanness, perfidy, hypocrisy, and diabolical heartlessness of a war for such an end, is without parallel in the history of the world's worst despots. Not only to entrap the North first entrapped the South into the Union under false pretences and hypocritical promises; she then aggrandized herself, and developed her wonderful prosperity, by selling to the South slaves, and then selling the products of their labor, and now, in a spirit of selfish,

fanatical ambition, she urges war to exterminate slavery, and destroy the South. But the argument is lifted up to a far higher platform when we consider slavery in relation to the word, providence, and government of God. That God's providence is holy, wise, and powerful, that it extendeth to all things and all events, our enemies themselves profess to believe, even in their catechisms. Slavery, therefore, whether as a form of temporal, political, organized society, it is good or evil, is, like other similar forms of evil, providential; and as such, is under God's holy, wise, and powerful government, and to be acted upon only in accordance with the principles of His word and gospel, that by them God may, as it pleaseth Him, continue, remove, ameliorate, or modify it, as it seemeth to Him wise and good. And to wage a war of extermination against slavery is warning itself wicked and unconstitutional, and carried on in a spirit of diabolical perfidy, and inhumanity, is to fight against God, and to rush against the thick bosses of the Almighty. It is rebellion against the Lord God omnipotent, who ruleth to participate in it, is to join in conspiracy against the throne and empire of heaven. And did not the South come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty, she would involve herself in the divine malediction with which the inhabitants of Mezzo were cursed.

But what if God made slavery a part of man's and woman's original curse; what if God ordained, as a part of that penalty, that the earth should be brought into universal cultivation by a universally diffused race, through slavery in some form of involuntary servitude; what if God, by a positive divine enactment, ordained, that through the history of the world, slavery should exist as a form of organized labor among certain races of men, and that lordship over such slaves should be a part of the perpetual blessing of the races of Shem and Japheth; what if God has actually embodied slavery in His moral law, and by

there guarding, and protecting, and regulating it, has made it appertain to the present condition of humanity; what if He ordained and regulated it under the patriarchal, Mosical, prophetic, and Christian dispensations; what if in the New Testament a curse is pronounced against fanatical opposition to slavery as anti-Christian, and a sentence of withdrawal from such as heretical, both in Church and State; what if, in these and other ways, God claims slavery, like other forms of government adapted to sinful human nature, as His own ordinance for good; what, then, must be thought of this war of the North against slavery, and this war of the South in its defence, as inwoven by providence into the very texture of its body politic?

This war is a judgment upon the North, for its persistent, perjured, Abolition fanaticism. Nearly severing the Union in 1790, it rung its death-knell in 1820, and has since then inflamed an irrepressible conflict, which has now destroyed the Union, and is overwhelming the North in inextricable difficulties.

God is working out a problem in the physical, social, political, industrial, and world-wide beneficial character of slavery, as a great missionary agency, of unexampled prosperity and success, which He is now demonstrating to the family of nations.

In this war the South, therefore, is on God's side. She has His word, and providence, and omnipotent government with her. And if she is found faithful to Him, and to this institution, which He has put under her spiritual care, then the heavens and earth may pass away, but God will not fail to vindicate His eternal providence, and defend and deliver His people, who walk in His statutes and commandments blameless.*

* Already has that vindication come from the most powerful organs of European, and even Northern opinion. We will give an extract from one out of many:

“There is no form of mendacity,” says the London Dispatch, of Oct. 21, 1862, “more pernicious in its consequences, or more insidious in its tempta-

IV. THE DIVINE RIGHT OF SECESSION.

We proceed to vindicate the war of the South by an appeal to God's word. To the law and testimony God has

tions, than that which imposes pious frauds on society. The sanctification of means, by consideration of their ends, is a vice inherent in religious people; and no offenders have been more shameless in this regard than the Abolitionists of America and the anti-slavery ('Clapham Sect,') persuasion in England. Their lecturers, their travellers, their talkers and tourists, their historians and novelists, have seen in slave countries, and as the effect of slavery, phenomena which the slightest reflection would contradict and belie. Every man at all well read—any one, indeed, who can but read his Bible—knows that slavery has been the normal condition of human society, and that it has been found compatible with, to have been even promotive of, power, wealth, civilization, nay, even humanity. The Scriptural nations, the very patriarchs, all were slaveholders. Sparta, in the glory of its purity and virtue; Athens, in the zenith of its glory in arts, arms and literature, had a vast majority of their subjects 'held to labor.' The Jewish law of Moses is full of provisions for the making, transfer, and manumission of slaves. The Tenth Commandment tells us not to covet our neighbor's manservant, or his maid-servant, in the very same category as his ox and his ass. Rome conquered the world, and civilized it, under a dispensation of slavery. The West India Colonies flourished while slavery prevailed. They went to ruin, both of white man and black, the day they were emancipated. All the experiments that have been tried of the self-elevation of the colored races, or, indeed, of even white races of aboriginal savages, by manumission or colonization, have been conspicuous failures. King Lincoln calls the negroes together to tell them that their contiguity is odorous to his subjects, and that they must clear out for Central America. He assured Horace Greeley that if the Union can be saved by riveting the chains of the slave, he will rivet them.

"As for the slaves themselves, crushed with the wrongs of Dred Scot and Uncle Tom—most provoking—they can not be brought to 'burn with revenge.' They are spies for their masters. They obstinately refuse to run away to liberty, outrage, and starvation. They work in the fields as usual, when the planter and the overseer are away, and only the white women are left at home. The black regiments of insurgent Unionists have proved a failure and been disbanded. We wonder how 'Professor' (!) Olmstead and Horace Greeley look now that their tours through the slave States are compared with facts, and laid alongside with the despatches and the telegrams of the belligerents. Stowe, Wendell Phillips, Garrison, insured us a servile war the moment an army of liberation was marched into the South; but the soda-powder won't fizz; the lucifer match has been

bound himself by His word, and by this word we shall be judged, and our cause tested. To this standard our enemies

rubbed, but obstinately refuses to flare up. We were assured the Southerners were indolent, and their soil stricken with hopeless and growing poverty. They have sustained for nearly two years the shocks of a war to which those of Napoleon were skirmishes, rolled back the tide of battle and are now thundering at the very gates of a quaking enemy that have brought thirteen hundred thousand warriors into the field, and equipped, paid, fed, and furnished them, as never army and navy were sustained before. We were told that the Southerners were sunk in listless luxury and self-indulgent sensuality; that they were depraved by self-will and viciousness below the capacity for administrative government. What are the facts? Never we assert with the utmost confidence, was there known a people so able in public affairs, so heroic, so brave, so prudent, so devoted. Whatever may be the issue of this war, planters and slave-owners have reared up by their deeds an imperishable monument of their greatness and magnanimity. In little more than a month they extemporized and matured a Government, a Constitution, a Legislature, social authority, that have stood the test of the most critical experiment with triumphant success, and are more workable, consistent, stable, and free than the institutions they disowned. The border slave States have left them to their fate; have armed against them. Twenty millions of Unionists have attacked six millions of rebels, and the free States men have been beaten back to their very trenches by less than one-third of their number of slave-drivers. The latter had no navy, and had to fight in every river and struggle in every town against a powerful fleet. They had not the nucleus of a regiment, a company, or a squadron, scarcely a piece of artillery. They had to raise regiments without any great centres of population; they had no powder-mills, no foundries, no paper for cartridges, leather for shoes and harness, no thriving industry and production were paralyzed, and their intercourse with the world shut out by blockade. They had to destroy their produce, abandon their cities to the invaders, and their villages to the flames—they were besieged with, and had to provide for, the contingency of a servile war—they have been left without the countenance of Europe, and opposed by the border planters; yet behold the result of slavery, as against equality and fraternity. It is quite evident that the resources of the South must be prodigious—that the state of society must, at least be up to the standard of the greatest and most enlightened nations—that the culture of the people must be sober, self-denying, and refined—to produce such fruits as these. These proofs of wealth, strength, intelligence, and virtue, are more than borne out by the decennial census made by the Federal Government itself when no disturbing cause threw suspicion upon the returns. In 1850, the

and have brought us, and condemned us; and multitudes who once admitted the justice of the course pursued by the South, up to the very act of secession and resistance, have found in these an unpardonable sin, according to the divine record, and have become our most implacable enemies, and the most earnest instigators of war in all possible ferocity, until it leads either to subjugation or extermination. The relation of Christianity to civil government, and of Christian liberty to political freedom, was one of the first practical doctrines on which authoritative divine teaching was required. The apostles, and especially Paul and Peter, develop, therefore, the general teaching of Christ in full and frequent directions, teaching us that civil government is ordained by God for man's present life and temporal concerns, and is entirely distinct in its sphere from that included within His spiritual kingdom. Christianity, therefore, requires as implicit and conscientious obedience to civil government as to ecclesiastical authority, and has made civil governors a terror to evil doers, and His appointed revengers, to execute wrath upon the disobedient.

From these admitted premises, divines at the North, of every denomination, with amazing unanimity, have drawn breadstuffs of the free States were given at 554,000,000 of bushels, and of the South at 283,000,000; potatoes in the North 68,000,000 bushels, and in the South 44,000,000; milch cows, 4,000,000 and 2,800,000, respectively; sheep, 15,000,000 in the North against 6,600,000 in the South; swine, 10,000,000 in the North and 20,000,000 in the South; Northern bullocks, 4,200,000 and Southern 6,085,800. This proportionate produce is 18½ bushels breadstuffs per head in the free, and 32 bushels in the slave States; of potatoes, 8½ bushels each; of rice, 18 pounds in the South, and none at all in the North; of sugar, 20½ pounds in the South, and 7½ in the North. Besides all this, the South exports £45,000,000 sterling in cotton and tobacco, for which the North has no equivalent. In a word, without the South, the Republic will fall to the state of Russia, for its resources are really not greater, and the charity of Europe, in emigration alone raises it above the Muscovite level. Let but the South go on fighting, *pro aris et focis*, until its armies become as seasoned and thoroughly military as the cohorts of Cæsar, Napoleon, or Wellington, and they will need but a secession.

the conclusion, that the secession and defensive war of the South is rebellion and treason against God's ordained government, and are, therefore, to be "crushed out" with all the weight of unmitigated and pitiless destruction. The cool ferocity or raging vengeance with which this interpretation of God's word has envenomed the hearts of the most humble and venerable Christians at the North, is perfectly appalling. Not Saul, in his career of murderous persecution, nor the disciples, when they would call down fire from heaven to destroy, were more inflamed with pitiless malevolence, by the infatuated thought of doing God service, than are modern successors to their misguided zeal. Earthly suffering to the uttermost is not enough. Swift destruction does not slake their fiery vengeance. It is not enough, like Dr. Stanton, to gloat their eager thirst for our misery; to anticipate, in fiendish joy, the hanging of their *Christian brethren*, and the helotry of our wives, mothers, and sisters; pandemonium must be prepared; purgatorial fires must be made a reality, and hell's fiercest flames must everlastingly torment us.

In this argument the South has not even the benefit of a doubt, or the privilege of a hearing; but, sitting in God's temple, they deliver to us God's will, and wield God's thunderbolts against those whom they consider too weak and helpless to resist their overwhelming might.

"Oh! blest is he to whom 'tis given,
The instinct that can tell
That God is in the field,
Where most invisible.
And blest is he who can divine
Where real might doth lie,
And dares to take the side that seems
Wrong to man's blindfold eye."

This inferential argument of our Northern enemies, is as weak as it is wicked. It is a huge, monstrous sophism, as baseless as it is brutal, and as futile as it is fiendish. It takes for granted that civil government is, in any natural

order of events, the ordinance of God by a direct institution, which it assuredly is not. It assumes that the government of the United States was thus ordained, while it declares itself to be the product of "we, the people." It assumes that, while originated by the people, as a protection of the minority against the power of an irresponsible majority, that minority has no right to interpret what this Constitution is, or to contend for the rights it was made to guarantee, preserve, and perpetuate. It assumes that a constitution, which was framed by a convention representing only five States, and representing only the legislatures, and not the people of those States; which was made while those States were constitutionally bound to eight other States in a federal government, which they had solemnly declared was perpetual, and unalterable except by a congressional amendment, ratified by every State; that this constitution, thus unconstitutionally made and adopted, and urged to acceptance, and which was not declared to be perpetual; from which all power to coerce obedience, or centralize a "strong government," was peremptorily excluded; and to withdraw from which *every* State *tacitly*, and three, in the name of all, *explicitly*, claimed, in ratifying it, the right; that this Constitution shall be perpetually binding, even when perverted to oppression and injustice, and shall for ever destroy that State sovereignty and right of framing a new government, which were guaranteed in the Federal Union of 1777, and acted upon by the five States that organized the Union of 1789. This inferential argument assumes that the accidental success of a minority of the people, in putting into temporary power the Lincoln administration, under pledges of an unconstitutional policy, destructive of fifteen States, is the Constitution and Government of the United States, and the positive ordinance of God, to which, under peril of damnation, implicit obedience is in all things due. It assumes that, while thirteen Northern States, by legislative action, passed

laws in open conflict with constitutional guarantees, and fostered and encouraged within them seditious and treasonable parties, and measures against the peace and rights of fifteen States; that the violated Constitution still binds to continued and increasing insult and infamy these injured States, although Daniel Webster declared that in such circumstances "the South would no longer be bound to observe the compact. A bargain broken on one side is a bargain broken on all sides."

Such are some of the monstrous falsities assumed as true, in the inferential argument which justifies Dr. Stanton, as the mouth-piece of multitudes, in the atrocious language attributed to him. If this argument is correct, then any resistance, negatively or positively, to the advancing military despotism of Lincoln, deserves hanging on earth, and damnation in hell; then every principle of American liberty is a delusion of Satan, and a damnable lie, originated by the father of lies; then every form of "the powers that be" is by divine right, and the grace of God, immutable and absolute; then Milton, and Sidney, and the signers of our Declaration of Independence, and our patriot fathers, and ministers of the Gospel, were all arch-traitors and heretics, and deserving only the gibbet or the stake; then the slavery of Dahomey, and the blind despotism of the Turk, are "the ordinance of God;" and what are we to think of themselves, who have decreed the emancipation of four millions of people from "the powers that be," and which by this argument are made the "ordinance of God," which he that resisteth bringeth to himself damnation!

And still further. The Southern Confederacy is now, by permission of divine providence, one of "the powers that be," and is, therefore, the "ordinance of God;" and this war is, therefore, a damnable resistance of God's ordinance. "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself!"

In the name, therefore, of eternal justice, sacred truth, and divine charity, we protest against an inferential argument from Scripture, which delivers over millions of people to temporal and everlasting destruction; which converts the best of Christians into the worst of persecutors, and transforms even the love of Christ, our common Saviour, into the heartless malice of His crucifiers.

The teaching of Scripture is, that civil government is ordained by God, in accordance with the nature of man and of society, and of man's present sinful and selfish character; that He ordained it, not directly, nor in any particular form, but through the instrumentality of man; that its end is the security and happiness of the good, and as a terror to the evil; that He ordains, also, that in this agency His people shall be free, and "use their liberty" under the guidance of His word and providence; that when a government is thus "the ordinance of men," and so long as it is faithfully and purely administered, He approves of it, and blesses it, and requires a faithful and conscientious discharge of all the relative duties of good citizenship, according to the provisions, privileges, and obligations of the constitution. Government is designed by God as much for those that rule as for those under their rule. It is designed as certainly to restrain usurpation of unconstitutional powers, as insubordination to that which is constitutional. There is as certainly sin, and guilt, and treason against God and man, in the arbitrary exercise of unconstitutional authority, as in rebellion against that which is just. Both are alike rebellion against the ordinance of God and of man, the constitution, which is the supreme ruler over all, the source and limit of all power, and of all obedience. And when, therefore, in the good providence of God, a people have been prepared and permitted to "use their liberty," "as free," in framing a constitutional government, to be exercised over them with their own consent, they also are made the conservers of that constitution, and it

becomes their duty to see it maintained, and all their rights under it preserved. And whenever, in the judgment of that people, such government is perverted, and their rights withheld, it becomes their duty to secure its restoration to original purity, or to withdraw from it, and to set up another for themselves. This course is not only proper, but a high and holy patriotic duty they owe to themselves, their families, and their posterity after them. To act otherwise is a base betrayal of the trust imposed upon them, and of the "free liberty" with which Providence has honorably endowed them, and a guilty connivance at corruption and tyranny. It is, Esau-like, to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage, and to enslave themselves and their children to a government which is no longer their ordinance, or the ordinance of God, but a wicked corruption of both.

This doctrine of civil government is embodied by the apostle Paul, in his dogmatic teaching in Romans, thirteenth chapter, and it is explicitly taught by the apostle Peter, 1 Peter, 2 : 13, *et seq.*:

"Submit yourselves," says the apostle, "to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: as free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. Honor all men."

Civil governors, whether kingly or republican, are, as the apostle teaches, "the ordinance of men," who are "free" men, and "all to be honored," and only responsible for the exercise of their "liberty" to God, "as the servants of God," and under obligation to Him not to "use their liberty as a cloak of maliciousness," that "with well-doing they may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. "This," says the apostle, "is the will of God," who, in

this way, "ordains governors," who, while chosen and appointed by men, "are sent by him;" and hence, when a government ceases to be "for good," and promotive of happiness, then it becomes a tyrannous usurpation, and secession from it, or a revolution under it, becomes a divinely imposed duty.

"Obedience is due to any government," says Dr. Hodge, (on Romans, 13,) "only within the sphere of legitimate authority," "in the exercise of its lawful authority;" that is, only so far as may be determined by the Constitution and the rights, in this country, of "free, sovereign, and independent States," by whom all constitutional limits were prescribed. The sphere of legitimate authority was assigned to the United States Government, not by the people, but by the States, each for itself, in sovereign convention; and no accidental majority of electoral votes, against a majority of nearly a million of voters, out of four millions, in the Northern States, and the concentrated opposition of fifteen States, could make it lawful authority in the Lincoln administration to transcend all limits of constitutional authority, and assume absolute and despotic power.

The inferential argument of the present vindictive and persecuting clergy of the North, is precisely that of the Romish Church and the dark ages—the divine right of absolute government, and of implicit passive obedience. It is that doctrine which was preached from the pulpit and the press by tory divines, at the time of the Revolution, who anathematized our fathers as "rebels," guilty of damnable sin, and against which the divines who favored liberty, and "resistance to tyrants as obedience to God," openly protested as heretical, anti-Christian, and slavish. In proof of this our readers are referred to the work already referred to, "The Pulpit of the American Revolution," published in Boston, in 1860:

The first discourse is an elaborate discussion of the present Northern doctrine of "unlimited submission and non-resistance to the higher powers," by Jonathan Mayhew, of Boston, preached in 1749, and published in 1750, from the very passages quoted by our enemies. He speaks of it as a known and admitted truth, that "rulers are not the ordinance and ministers of God, *but only so far forth as they perform God's will by acting up to their office and character.*" Only "*good rulers*" are to be obeyed. (669.) "Rulers have no authority from God to do mischief." (p. 73.) "Such are not God's ministers, but the devil's." (p. 75.) "*Open and avowed resistance by arms, against usurpation and lawless violence, is not rebellion, by the law of God or the land.*" (Do., note.) "The argument here used (by the apostles) no more proves it to be a sin to resist such rulers than to resist the devil." (p. 77.) "*Not to discontinue our allegiance in this case would be to join in promoting the slavery and misery of society.*" (p. 79.) He thus proves that it would be criminally sinful in any people not to resist, passively if they must, but openly and by force if they can, unconstitutional usurpation! And this is the doctrine of the whole volume.

Did time permit, we are prepared to show that the interpretation we have given is in most perfect and literal accordance with the Declaration of Independence, and therefore with the principles which led our revolutionary fathers to resist the usurpation of unconstitutional power by the government *under which they lived, and to which they had rendered, and still acknowledged, all rightful obedience.*

It was upon this interpretation and received doctrine of God's word, the original colonies entered into a compact to carry out their resistance to unconstitutional and usurped authority. They became a confederacy, and framed a constitutional form of government for themselves, each State retaining its sovereignty, and yet the Union to be perpetual so long, and so far, as it accomplished its intended purposes.

This interpretation and belief of God's teaching and their right, privilege, and duty to secure for themselves, in the best manner possible, the divinely ordained end for which all government is instituted—that is, good order, security of person and property, justice, and equal and impartial rights—led the States, a few years afterwards, to modify their union, and again afterwards to amend it. This was done by each State separately and independently, and at different times, and under solemn reservations and limited grant of power, and only after all that pertained to the common protection and exclusive State control of the system of slavery had been most clearly and inviolably guaranteed. This alone made any one Southern State unite even in a limited union with the North.

This interpretation and doctrine has governed the conduct of the United States Government and Congress since its foundation, hitherto, in their recognition of the independent nationality of States which, by revolution or rebellion, had thrown off their previous allegiance to a recognized government, as in South America, Italy, Hayti, Greece, France, etc.

This is known to have been the doctrine of most, if not all the founders, including Washington, and of the successive leaders of opinion of the United States Government.

The right of peaceable secession by a free people, in the just and proper exercise of their liberty, from any government, with a view to restore to themselves a more perfect administration of it, or to form another, is, therefore, a right given by God, and sanctioned by His holy word.

This right is inwoven with the fundamental facts of American history, from which alone, as Daniel Webster well says, "the true nature of the Government of the United States can be learned."

This doctrine has been the avowed faith of multitudes of our present enemies, and of many leading organs of public

opinion at the North, and is still promulgated by Horace Greeley, in the *Tribune*, which first raised the shout of war, and gave forth the banner of "beauty and booty," of blood, murder, rapine, and extermination.

"In yesterday's *Tribune*," that is of September 26, 1862, says *The New York Herald*, of the next day, "over his own proper signature, Horace Greeley published a letter, in which he declares in favor of the right of secession, not only in the case of the rebellious States of the South, but even of the Pacific States and Territories, should they desire to get up a new government for themselves. He lays down this general principle, applicable to every State in the Union: 'What I have taught and believed, and still maintain, is the right of a people to form and modify their political institutions without the necessity of fighting for such change.' He denies that a county, or two or three counties, can lawfully secede from a State. For example, the people of Nantucket could not be permitted to secede from Massachusetts, nor the people of Long Island or Staten Island, from the State of New York. But the case is different with a sovereign State, or even a colony which is not sovereign. For example, he says, 'I believe our revolutionary fathers had a right, for reasons which were cogent, and seemed to them conclusive, to terminate their connexion with Great Britain, and that the British were wrong in resisting their claim to do so. And the right which I claim for our fathers and for ourselves, I will not deny to others.'

"Then he goes on to say that, 'if the people of our Pacific States and Territories shall, at some future time, have very generally attained the conviction that they could do better as an independent nation than as a part of this country, and should kindly, frankly, firmly express that conviction,' he would say let the bonds be dissolved. And so likewise in the case of the Southern States. The following are his words:

"This is the doctrine I tried to promulgate in the winter of 1860-'61, it seems, with ill success. But I still insist that it has been proved that if the people of the slave States, or even of the cotton States alone, had really desired to dissolve the Union, and had peacefully, deliberately, and authoritatively expressed that wish, we should have assented to it. At all events, I should. But they chose another method. The leaders assumed their right peacefully and summarily to dissolve the Union without the consent of their fellow-citizens, at least their close allies, their equal copartners of the free States.'

"It is said that an honest confession is good for the soul. Greeley has owned up at last. Many a time we charged him with promulgating these doctrines, and quoted extracts from his journal in vain. He either denied the soft impeachment, or was dumb. Now, after contributing in so vast a degree to break up the Union, he expects forgiveness for his treason, like the penitent thief on the cross; but his

repentance is not sincere. Let him, therefore, like Judas Iscariot, go and hang himself 'on a sour apple tree,' so as to save the people the trouble of doing it hereafter. *If the right of a State* peacefully to secede exists, the accident of war cannot alter the right; and if the cotton States had a right to secede, on the ground that they had 'very generally attained the conviction that they could do better as an independent nation than as a part of this country,' then we had no right to prevent their doing so by force, *and were the aggressors in making war upon them*, whereas, in taking up arms they were only defending a sacred right. Even in the case of seizing the forts and other property of the United States, they were only seizing a part of the common property, to which they had as good a right as the free States, 'their equal co-partners.' If this was all that was the matter, the account could have been easily settled, and war would not have been necessary. In fact, the war, according to the reasoning of Greeley, is on our part the most atrocious ever waged against any people, and even more unjustifiable than that which Great Britain waged against these States when they were colonies under her sovereign sway, and threw off her yoke. There can be no doubt that the people of the States which have seceded are more unanimous than were the colonies at any time during the Revolutionary war."

THIS IS THE TRUTH, BEFORE GOD, by whom the guilt and misery of this war will be righteously adjudicated and avenged. The South adopted her course slowly, during forty years of patient forbearance, entreaty, and warning. Every step was taken prayerfully, and with anxious desire to be guided by divine wisdom, in sovereign convention of the people of our several States, after reiterated proposals for compromise or peaceable separation, by our members of Congress and the Convention of Virginia; and without the remotest design, or desire, or even serious expectation of war; with no spirit of retaliation or revenge, or injury to the North; but, contrariwise, of continued alliance, intercourse, and profitable relations. But all was vain. We were the sheep, and they the wolf, and we must be humbled, crushed, impoverished, and subdued. The cry of treason, rebellion, and murder, against the very life of the Union, must whet the teeth of blood-thirsty rapacity, and give sanction to a fierce and fanatical war of lawless violence.

But,

“No claim hereditary—not the trust of frank election ;
 Not even the high anointing hand of heaven ;
 Can authorize oppression ; give a law
 To lawless power ; wed faith to violation ;
 On reason build misrule ; or, justly, bind
 Allegiance to injustice. Tyranny
 Absolves all faith ; and who invades our rights,
 Howe’er his own commence, can never be
 But an usurper.”

Resistance, or base subjection, is, therefore, the alternative of the South. She fights for no abstraction. That ordinance of our fathers which, by solemn compact, and a seven years’ war, was ratified in heaven, as the ordinance of God, the South has rescued out of the hands of an unreal and sectional majority, who would erect upon it a Moloch despotism, and cause our children to pass through fire and blood ; and has again enthroned it in its incorrupted purity in the hearts of eight millions of loving and loyal citizens ; and for this—for this we are contending unto blood. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness ; the right to be free, and call no mobocratic sectional majority master ; the right to govern ourselves ; the right to enjoy the peculiar privileges and blessings, as well as to endure the peculiar trials of our climate and institutions ; the right to sit under our own vine and fig-tree, none daring to make us afraid, and gratefully to acknowledge that we have a goodly heritage ; the right to believe the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as God’s own and only infallible and unalterable truth ; the right to search and interpret those Scriptures for ourselves, and to hold fast their truth against all gainsayers ; liberty of thought, of speech, of life, of worship, of family, social and municipal government, free from all doctrines and commandments of men, and high and lifted up above any higher law ; the right to free trade, free imports, and free exports, and free expanding progress,

prosperity, and glory; these are the rights for which we are contending.

The truth of God; the rights of man; the peace of the present, and prosperous harmony of all future generations; the purity of religion; the piety of our homes; the sanctity of our dwellings; the undefiled purity and honor of our wives and daughters; unpillaged property; unravaged fields; uninjured harvests; uncontaminated servants; all—every thing that is sacred to honor and to happiness, temporal and eternal—all are involved in this contest.

Neither can they be secured to us without war, and war to the bitter end. Those inestimable blessings, the inheritance of blood-bought victories, must be again secured by contending for them in the high places of the field—contending until the last man falls, and the last drop of blood is spilt. Death is infinitely preferable to the loss of these blessings—to defeat, disgrace, and degradation. He who would choose life at such a sacrifice, is not worthy of life, or fit to die.

Fight, then, we must, come life or death—

“’Tis come, the hour of martyrdom
In freedom’s cause is come;
And though blest lives shall pass away,
Like lightning on a stormy day,
Yet shall their death-hour leave a track
Of glory, permanent and bright,
To which the brave of after times—
The suffering brave—shall long look back
With proud regret, and by its light
Watch, through the hours of suffering’s night,
For vengeance on the oppressor’s chain.”

Let the spirit of resistance be infused, with its mother’s milk, into the baby in its cradle. Let it mingle with the plays of childhood. Let it animate the boy in his mimic manhood; the maiden in the exercise of her magic, spell-binding influence; the betrothed in her soul-subduing trance of hope and memory; the bride at the altar; the wife

in the arms of her rejoicing husband; the young mother amid her whirl of ecstatic joy; the matron in the bosom of her admiring children; and the father as he dreams fondly of the fortune and glory of his aspiring sons*—let it fire the man of business at his place of merchandise; the lawyer among his briefs; the mechanic in his work-shop; the planter in his fields; the laborer as he plies his pruning-hook and follows his plough;—let the trumpet blow in Zion, and let all her watchmen lift up their voice;—let all the people, everywhere, old and young, bond and free, take up the war-cry, and say, each to his neighbor, “Gather ye together, and come against them, and rise up to the battle.”

“Rise, fellow-men, our country yet remains!
By that dread name we wave the sword on high,
And swear for her to live, with her to die.”

* “Let them teach their infant tongue,
To call upon the heroes old,
In their child language, and thus mould
Their growing spirit in the flame
Of patriot love, that by each name
A patriot's birth-right they may claim.”

ARTICLE II.

ON THE NATURE AND USES OF ART.*

10. Of all departments of Art, perhaps the most difficult to reduce to the principles laid down above, is *Landscape Painting*. This fact, however, only shows that landscape painting is less understood, and less capable of analysis, than other departments of art; and it still remains true of this, as of other departments, that only in so far as the foregoing principles are, either consciously or unconsciously, embodied by the artist, does it deserve to rank among the fine arts. As we have already said, to the popular mind the ideal of the landscape picture is one in which, taking the frame for a window, we are supposed to be looking out upon an actual scene in nature. Now, we do not hesitate to say that such deception is not the object of true art. A true landscape picture is not a mere copy of nature, but some thing different from nature; and the difference is made with the design of opening the eyes of the spectator to what he, perhaps, would not see in nature, viz., her divine ideal beauty.

The object of all art is to exhibit the divine in nature, whether human or external. But human art, like human thought, employed itself first in exhibiting the divine as displayed in *man*, and only later the divine as displayed in *external nature*. There has been a gradual change in art, similar to that which has taken place in science. The tendency of ancient civilization was to degrade nature, in comparison with the god-like dignity of man. In modern times, on the contrary, the dignity of man is in danger of being lost in the bewildered contemplation of the immen-

* Continued from page 348.

sity and grandeur of external nature. The Greek looked upon man alone as divine, and, therefore, alone as the worthy object of philosophy and art. Nature, to him, was of importance only in its subserviency to man. The infinite, the divine, the sacred, the holy in external nature was hidden from his eyes, or else took the *human forms* of nymphs and dryads. That intense, almost morbid, love of external nature, *for its own sake*, so common in modern minds of a poetic turn, seems to have been entirely wanting among the Greeks. In such a condition, neither a science nor an art of external nature could possibly exist. If there was any representation of external nature, it could only be a pure imitative representation of those products of nature most useful to man; as, for instance, the painted fruits of Zeuxis, which deceived the birds. In a word, in such a condition of things, landscape painting, which is a representation of the divine in external nature, could not exist. For this reason, landscape painting is, even yet, less mature and less understood than any other species of art. Statuary culminated among the Greeks; painting of human figures in the sixteenth century of our era; while landscape painting is only now culminating, as the natural result of the increasing knowledge and increasing love of nature. Even yet, however, to attain the ideal in landscape painting is more difficult than in any other species of art, and the genuine appreciation of landscape painting the rarest accomplishment among connoisseurs. The pleasure, however, to be derived from a truly great ideal landscape, though less intense and less readily excited, is purer, calmer, holier, and more truly æsthetic, than, perhaps, that derived from any other species of art.

It will be easily understood, therefore, why it is more difficult to define in what consists the ideal in landscape painting, and why it is more difficult to apply the principles laid down in the beginning of this article, with clearness, to this department of art.

In landscape, as in all art, the object of the painter should not be to reproduce what every one already sees much better in nature, but to open our eyes to what we do *not* see, and thus to teach us *how* to see the divine in nature. This is done in landscape, in the same manner as in other species of art. External nature may be perfectly adapted to cultivate the unfallen man; but to the fallen man, nature conceals, instead of revealing the divine. To the fallen man, the divine in nature is involved in and obscured by the material; the *noble* is hidden by the *common*; the general conception of the whole is lost in the distraction of apparently insignificant and conflicting detail; the æsthetic is overborne by the sensuous impression; and thus our higher nature is brought into bondage to the lower. If in the contemplation of nature as displayed in humanity, the high and the noble is involved in and *overborne* by the passionate and emotional, and the result is *intoxication*; in the contemplation of external nature the high and noble is involved in and obscured by the merely *common*, and the result is either stolid indifference or a pleasurable sense of agreeableness. In both, the object of art is to set our higher nature free. The external world addresses both our highest nature—the divine within us—and our lowest animal nature; but we do not, any of us, see all that she reveals to us. Some see only what she reveals through the senses, such as the greenness, the flatness, the freshness of meadows, the coolness and shadiness of woods, the sparkling of dew, the wetness after rain, the comfort and plenty indicated by grazing herds and substantial farm buildings; others, in addition to these, see also the harmonious relation of parts, of mountain crest and slope with plain and lake, of nestling cottage and nibbling flocks, and all the infinite associations of antiquity, of eternal endurance, of power and grandeur, of peaceful happiness and domestic love, which cluster around these; to still others, she reveals the divine in its oneness, as perfect beauty and holiness, and teaches the

innermost secret of secrets—her connexion with the invisible. Now the common artist, seeking only popularity, strives to reproduce, with the utmost accuracy, what every one, even the clown or the contemplative ruminant, might see; in other words, he strives to make a deceptive imitation of nature. This deceptive imitation exhibits a certain cleverness in the artist, which is easily appreciated and universally admired. The artist, therefore, gains his end, which is popularity. The great ideal artist, on the other hand, in his picture, sacrifices in some measure the superficial, sensuous, and therefore deceptive resemblance to nature, for the deep, spiritual, and therefore non-deceptive resemblance—the divine significance of nature. He softens somewhat, or at least neglects somewhat the sensuous impression, that he may bring out in bolder relief the higher, intellectual impression; he selects the really characteristic and significant from the obscuring multiplicity of insignificant and distracting detail, and by *gentle emphasis* here and there, directs the imagination and excites the æsthetic faculty; he sets the intellect free from the bondage of sense, and brings the whole nature into a condition of healthy and harmonious spiritual activity.

The test of the noblest in landscape painting is also similar to that in other species of art. The more truth of all sorts, both high and low, the artist crowds upon the canvass, the nobler the work, provided always the emphasis on the high be sufficiently strong to make these predominant. The greater the variety of impression, high and low, which is made upon the mind of the spectator, the nobler the picture, provided always the artist has succeeded in coördinating these into a harmonious, living unit. If the commoner truth, the truth of the senses, is too much neglected, the work is unreal and cold; if the higher truth is not seen, or is neglected, the work is low and imitative. Judged by this standard, the best modern landscape painting is far superior to that of any previous period, for it contains much more

truth. It is the result of a more complete knowledge of nature than that of the school of Claude and Poussin; these latter sacrificing all truth of detail to what they conceived to be general effect.

11. POETRY, like all art, addresses itself to the whole spiritual nature of man, the highest æsthetic nature or sense of beauty, the imagination, the understanding, the emotion, the passions, and the senses. Poetry differs from prose, both in its *essential nature* and in its *form*. It differs in its essential nature, inasmuch as prose addresses only the emotions and the understanding, while poetry, in addition to these, addresses also the imagination and the æsthetic sense. Whatever in literature addresses these latter, is in so far poetic, whatever be its form. But poetry, again, differs from prose also in *form*. Poetry is written in verse. This form, however, is only significant, in so far as it serves to carry out and more fully express the essential nature of poetry. Form which is not the embodiment, and the express image, of essential nature—form without substance, mere hollow form—is always detestable. On the other hand, essential nature, without appropriate form, only imperfectly affects the human mind. Thus there is much verse which deserves not the name of poetry, since it has only the form, without the essence; again, there is much in the form of prose which, as it touches the imagination and the æsthetic sense, is essentially poetry, though the full effect of such poetry is marred for the want of appropriate form. But as form must for ever, in the popular mind, stand for substance, and must, therefore, always determine the names of things, we shall speak of *poetry only in the form of verse*.

We have already said that form can not be of any use, unless it be *appropriate*;—that the only object of verse must be to assist in carrying out more perfectly the essential object and end of poetry, viz., to touch more strongly the imagination and æsthetic faculty. But it may be asked, how does verse contribute to this effect? This is a question

the complete answer to which is very difficult. Verse bears the same relation to poetry which marble does to sculpture, or pigments and canvass do to painting. It is its *appropriate material*. But, as the sculptor may use *clay*, so may the poet use prose, though with infinite loss of effect. The effect of the use of verse by the poet, is similar to the use of appropriate materials in the other departments of art; it *removes the work out of the realm of mere common nature, into that of the ideal*; and this always contributes, as we have already abundantly shown, to set free the imagination and the æsthetic faculty. Verse, too, like the material of other departments of art, from the very fact that it is, in the ordinary sense of the term, *unnatural* and *unreal*, less powerfully affects the common emotions and passions, and is, therefore, (strange as this may seem to some,) less deceptive than prose. If the artist wishes to produce a deceptive imitation of nature—to affect us exactly as nature usually does—he uses prose. Thus in the drama, the most deceptively natural works—the plays, the acting of which seem most like *real* life, and which attempt to delude the spectators into a belief of actual occurrences—the plays, too, which most completely unman and prostrate an audience with emotion—are written in prose. Verse, by a certain air of unreality, removes the work into the realm of the ideal, and we are not cheated. Thus, the best dramatic works are always written in verse, and only low or mistaken art makes use of prose. The Greek drama, and the highest ideal plays of Shakspeare, are written in verse, while much of the modern drama, intended only to intoxicate, is written in prose. Schiller's earlier dramas, such as "The Robbers,"—while he was yet young, his feelings tumultuous and taste unformed, when he strove only after violent effect—are written in prose; while "William Tell," "the Piccolomini," and "the Death of Wallenstein," the products of his mature genius, when he had risen into the calmer, purer region of the ideal, are written in verse. In

the Greek drama, the ideal effect of verse was still farther enhanced by the use of the mask and the cothurnus. These, by giving noble repose and calmness to the face, and superhuman stature and dignity to the form, together with the absence of any elaborate scenery or stage effect, still farther removed the work from the actual into the ideal, and prevented any possibility of delusive belief in reality.

There is another effect of verse, which eminently adapts it as a material of art; an effect which is found, also, in all genuine art, but which, like every thing highest in our nature, is undefinable to the understanding, because not capable of complete analysis. Those who have felt it will understand; to others, we shall speak unintelligibly. There is some thing in the best verse, aside from the thoughts which it is supposed to embody—the thoughts which would still be embodied, if changed into prose—some thing contained in the very form itself—in the music of the verse—in the harmony of numbers—some thing which does not embody, but suggests ideas—ideas which can not be expressed in words, but only in music. This musical element, as we shall call it, for want of a better name, touches the highest æsthetic sense, and is, in fact, the highest and most ethereal essence of poetry; it teaches nothing, perhaps—it conveys no distinct and definite thoughts—but, like music, it simply removes the veil which separates us from the higher ethereal region of pure spirit, and permits us a moment to gaze. This musical rhythm of harmonious numbers must not be confounded with the regular, beating measure of verse-makers—the “false gallop of verse.” Regular beating of time is not music. Pope is the most dexterous of verse-makers, but there is not one particle of genuine music in his verse. Shakspeare is often irregular, and yet his verse is full of the most exquisite music. In fact, really musical verse can not be written, unless the soul is full of music in the highest and holiest sense; unless it be inspired

with the divine harmony of the universe—the music of the spheres. Among English poets, Shakspeare and Milton stand first in this respect. They are always full of it. But it may be found, also, in many pieces of Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, and particularly, we think, in Tennyson.

But poetry, like all other species of art, may fail of its high mission, by attempting a low and servile imitation of common nature. Like painting, it may imitate nature, by addressing itself only to the understanding and the lower feelings, and thus become merely *common* and *prosaic*; or, like the drama and the novel, it may imitate nature, in its overpowering emotional effect, and thus become *morbid* and *intoxicating*. Thus, then, there are two kinds of poetry which fail of the true mission of art. One is, in fact, not poetry at all, except in *form*. It is nothing more than good composition, full of acuteness and sense, done into verse. Such is the poetry of Pope and his school. The other is, indeed, poetry, since it appeals powerfully to the imagination; but only of the second order, since the pure æsthetic sense is overpowered by emotion and passion. This species of poetry, therefore, is always more or less morbid and intoxicating, and in extreme examples, unless rejected at once by the instincts of good taste, actually and virulently poisonous. Most of the modern English poets, and, we believe, modern poets generally, are more or less infected with this fault. It is detectible, in various proportions, in Byron, Shelley, Keats, Tennyson, Mrs. Browning, Edgar Poe, and becomes disgusting in Bailey and Alexander Smith. But the best and truest poetry, like all truest art, produces entirely different effects upon the mind. It excites, like the last, the passions, emotions, imagination, but also, and in the highest degree, the pure æsthetic sense. Instead of unhinging, unsettling, intoxicating the soul, producing ennui, lassitude and discontent, it strengthens, braces, purifies, and elevates the soul, producing noble calmness and exalted harmony. The best Greek poets,

and, among moderns, Dante, Chaucer, Spenser, Shakspeare, Milton, and, in their best pieces, Goethe and Schiller, are examples of this class. There are, then, three classes of poets. Commencing with the lowest, they are: First, the unimagi-native poets, like Pope and the whole tribe of verse-makers—poets only in form, not in substance: Second, the imagi-native and passionate poets: Third, the true ideal poets. The first, in their best examples, are apt to please men of mere cleverness, without imagination; or, as they are commonly called, men of common sense and judgment: the second are apt to please the young and imagi-native, but unformed: the third, men of true æsthetic culture.

The difference between these classes may, perhaps, be brought out more distinctly, by characterizing the state of mind under which each produces a work of art. Suppose some object, event, or condition, which powerfully moves the whole soul, is presented to the mind for contemplation. It may be the present condition of society, its abuses, its vices, its injustice, its oppression, as affecting ourselves or others; it may be our own internal distractions and struggles; it may be the loss of a dear object of affection, after the first storm of agony is past. The man of mere sense or understanding, with sufficient cleverness, embodies it in verse without *real* feeling or imagination, although there may be affectation of both in conventional phrases; or, if the object contemplated be society, or humanity in general, his verse is apt to take the form of clever wit or satire. On the other hand, a man of keen sensibilities and fine imagination, but without sufficient religious or æsthetic nature; a man of fine, but not strong nature—delicately organized, but the *equilibrium trembling and unstable*, like Keats or Shelley; or, perhaps, a man, like Byron, of strong volcanic passions and powerful imagination, but without sufficient ballast of self-control—without strength of intellect and will sufficient to bring his internal tumult into

harmony; such a man will embody his mental condition—his breathing, laboring thoughts—in words which burn like a consuming fire. He is overmastered by his emotions and sensibilities; his mental balance is overthrown; and his poetry is the image of his own tumultuous feelings—of his own condition of unrest; imagination is active and strong, but involved in too strong emotion, and struggles in vain to be free. Only he who can subdue this internal tumult; who, if his sensibilities and emotions are strong, his æsthetic faculty and will are still stronger; who subordinates his emotions to his higher nature, and stands serene and calm, though at white heat; only *he* can be the great poet. In him only is the imagination entirely free to soar unto the purer regions of thought, above the smoke and vapors of the reeking earth. His poetry expresses this internal condition of calmness; his imagination warms and vivifies, but scorches not, nor blasts; his thoughts illumine, but dazzle not.

But by many, in fact, most persons of poetical temperament, particularly among the young and ardent, the second class is most appreciated and most loved, because they are essentially the poets of *the age*. The first class of poets are above their age; in fact, above all ages. They see through the fashion in which each age clothes itself, into the very heart of humanity itself. They stand above, as calm, though not unsympathizing spectators, while the turbid, tumultuous stream of time and human life rushes by. The second class of poets, like common mortals, are involved and struggling in the stream beneath. Is it to be wondered at, then, that these should be the most prized by the young and imaginative, since they echo their own longings, their own strugglings, their own cries of agony and despair? This class of poets and their sympathizers would seem to be particularly characteristic of the present age. In all previous ages, it would seem that men were mostly referable to two classes: those who stood above the age,

and those who were completely and tranquilly immersed in it. In this age only—this age of intellectual anarchy, this age of transition and unrest—do we find many strong, manly spirits, struggling nobly, but unavailingly in the boiling flood, and crying for deliverance. But alas, it is an age without faith. To whom shall they cry for deliverance?—who shall say to the raging waters, “Peace, be still.”

A little while ago, we used the expression, “poetical temperament,” an expression which is perfectly familiar and intelligible to all, and yet, we think, characteristic of the present age, and of the second class of poets. Art, and particularly poetry, is now looked upon as the result of a particular temperament; a peculiar unbalance of the mind, resembling madness; “a fine phrensy,” which “robs the mind of itself;” a temperament and character of mind utterly unlike that which excels in other and more sober departments, and, therefore, which utterly unfits for the practical duties of life; and some silly young persons, in the conceit of this temperament, even affect to despise these practical duties as unfit for their soaring spirits. Now, we are satisfied that such a view of poetry would have been quite unintelligible to the ancient Greek, or even to a modern, in the golden period of art. The famous Greek poets were possessed of the best culture of their times, in every department; many of them were skilled in mathematics, in science, and in philosophy. See, again, the general culture of Michael Angelo, and, still more wonderful, of Leonardo da Vinci; the symmetrical, though incomplete culture of Shakspeare; the all-sidedness of Goethe. In fact, it may be asserted that a really healthy and great art is always the result of a complete culture; the flower and fruit of a perfected humanity. It is only in this age, when symmetrical culture is so rare; when the demon of utilitarianism has subdivided all pursuits, both intellectual and physical, to such a hurtful extent; when even education itself is made a mere apprenticeship to

business pursuits; until all symmetry of proportion, all resemblance, and, therefore, all sympathy between men of different pursuits is destroyed;—it is only in this age, when, by the hot-house culture of the school and college, humanity has been forced into an inconceivable number of permanent varieties, almost simulating different species;—it is only in this age, and under these unnatural circumstances, that humanity gives rise to monstrous blooms; splendid, it may be—wonderful, surprising, the pride of the gardener—but without fragrance and without seed. And thus we have poet-fanciers, as we have rose-fanciers; some fancying one variety and some another, according to temperament; while many look upon the whole art of floriculture as frivolous, and the cultivation of good pot herbs as much more sensible. But, must this be always so? No; this transition state of anarchy and unrest, of division and want of sympathy, must pass away; there must come a time (are we not all yearning for it even now?) when the hearts of men shall beat more in unison; when, in fact, there shall be a common human heart pulsating and sending life to every class of society, and uniting all in the bonds of sympathy and love. In this *great* and common heart of humanity, a great and healthy art will again take root and bloom.

12. Music can not, in any sense, be said to be an *imitative* art. It is strictly and purely *human*; there is nothing in external nature which at all resembles it, and of which it purports to be a representation. Still, as being a human product, it is in some sense a representation of *human nature*—addresses itself to our human nature, high and low—and is, therefore, subject to the laws which we have applied to other branches of art. In some respects, however, music is superior to all other branches, as a means of illustrating the true nature of art.

We have already said that music, like all art, addresses both our lower and higher natures—both the sensuous, the

emotional, and the highest æsthetic. Hence, like all other branches of art, music may enervate and enslave, or may purify, elevate, and strengthen the mind. If the sensuous predominates, it simply enervates, lulls into repose, or steepens in delicious dream; if the emotional predominates, it lashes into undue excitement, and intoxicates. Only when all these exist, but are subordinate to the æsthetic impression, does it purify and strengthen. There are thus three different kinds of music, essentially distinct, although running, through infinite gradations, into one another. The first is the ballad music, or the original music indigenous to every people—sweet, simple, and natural. The second is the Italian; and the third, the German school of music. These may be considered to rise in the order in which we have mentioned them. And yet, the first and last may be considered the purer and more healthy; the second, more morbid and dangerous.

Let us, then, compare these three kinds of music, as to their effects upon the human mind. The best ballad music is pure, healthy, but simple, and therefore comparatively low. It induces a condition of serenity and harmony of mind; but, as the harmony is simple, and the sensuous and emotional impression is gentle, the mental harmony induced is, also, rather passive than active; rather *pure* than *noble*; we have the æsthetic condition, but not of the highest kind. In the Italian music, on the contrary, the emotional impression is often too powerful, the mental balance is overthrown, the highest æsthetic pleasure is overborne by the strength of emotion. It is, therefore, to some extent unhealthy and intoxicating. In both ballad and Italian music, melody, or *consecutive harmony*, is the distinguishing characteristic, *chordal harmony* being entirely subordinate. Now, it would seem that melody more powerfully affects the emotions, and harmony, *i. e.*, chordal harmony, the æsthetic sense. In ballad music, the melody is simple, and the passion is not sufficient to overthrow the mental equilibrium;

but in Italian music the melody is more complex, and the emotion is so powerful as to endanger the intellectual harmony. In German music, on the contrary, chordal harmony is no longer subordinate to melody, but is itself the distinguishing characteristic. In the two preceding, we have only a melody, with an *accompaniment* intended to add to and improve the air. In German music, there is no accompaniment in this sense. The accompaniment (so called) is an organic portion of the work of art, inseparable from it. A simple and, perhaps, by itself an unattractive melody, is combined with an exceedingly complex harmony, and the connexion is so close and organic that a single note in the complex arrangement omitted, destroys the whole beauty. The accompaniment is not here added as ornament, as a rich dress enhancing the beauty of what is in itself beautiful, but is a necessary part of a complex unit, of a perfect organism. Now, as complex harmony touches only the highest æsthetic sense, it is evident that in German music the æsthetic predominates over the emotional, and, therefore, the effect upon the mind is that of elevated serenity; no longer, however, like ballad music, *passive serenity*, but harmonious *activity*; an activity which is proportionate to the complexity of the elements which are combined into organic unity, *i. e.*, to the complexity of the musical harmony and the strength of the emotion, subordinated to the æsthetic faculty. In comparing these three again, it is seen that the first and third are truly healthy; the second somewhat morbid. The first is simple, natural harmony: the third, the harmony of perfect culture: the second is comparable to the unsettled transition state between nature and perfected art. The first is the purity, simplicity, and innocence of childhood: the second, the turbulence of passionate youth: the third, the calmness, the peace, the harmony, which comes of self-conquest and victory over the world. The first is like the simplicity, the purity, the completeness of Greek art: the second, the incomplete-

ness, the morbidness, the enthusiasm, the craving unrest of modern art: the third is the type of the completed modern art; higher in its ideal, more complex in its harmony, but, for that very reason, not yet attaining completeness, except in music. The first is a *relaxation* from the harassing cares and anxieties of life; a *rest* from the weariness of unsatisfied desire; a rest which reminds us of the simplicity of early periods, and "dallies with the innocence of love like the old age;" a rest which carries us back to the purity of childhood, and thus purifies the mind, recuperates the strength, and prepares for *renewed* activity. The second excites, intoxicates, unfits for life. The third is *recreation*, rather than *relaxation*; it is *harmonious activity*, rather than *rest*; it not only *purifies*, but *ennobles*.

Ballad music, we think, will be admitted by all cultivated persons to be a simpler, and, in so far, a lower order of music. But the Italian and German schools have their advocates for supremacy, even among the most cultivated persons. Let us further compare these, as to their effects. We listen to an Italian opera; perhaps one of Bellini's is the best type. The whole power of the opera is concentrated in the solos and duets, because melody and emotional effect are, in the end, to be accomplished. Everything else, the chorus, the recitative, the orchestral accompaniment, all are subordinate to this end—all are but effective ornament and dress—all are but means to keep up the interest, and prepare the mind for the brilliant and passionate *arias*. In the execution of these gems of the Italian opera, the most passionate acting is added to increase the emotional effect. The result is, that the combined effect of acting and singing, upon susceptible minds, is overpowering. The spectator and listener is unmanned, dissolved in tears, crushed, and subdued; in a word, intoxicated with emotion; his mental strength prostrated, and himself unfitted for life. The whole object of the Italian opera is thus to storm the citadel of the human soul, and carry it away captive. In

the best German operas, on the contrary, such as those of Mozart, or better, as being more typical, those of Weber, Meyerbeer, or, yet still better, (for the opera does not completely embody the idea of German, as it does that of Italian music,) in the oratorios of Handel and Haydn, and the complex music of Beethoven and Mendelssohn, the effect is quite different. The German opera, for instance, does not, like the Italian, consist of gems strung upon a silver thread—every thing is not subordinate to the arias; on the contrary, there is an organic connexion in every part; the scenery, the orchestral accompaniment, the arias, the recitative, the choruses, all combine to produce one single effect, and that effect is high and noble in proportion to the diversity of the parts thus combined into unity. The culminating points of this general effect, the flower and fruit of this organism, are not the solos, but rather the trios, the quartettes and the choruses. Chordal harmony prevails over passionate melody. The soul is not overwhelmed, *unmanned*, led away, a submissive captive, into sweet slavery; but carried upwards to the seventh heaven, calm, strong, pure, deeply moved, but master of itself; the countenance transfigured, by noble emotion, into some thing divine; perhaps in tears, but tears of joy and ecstasy, rather than grief; tears which indicate strength, not weakness; tears which show the earthly casket giving way under the pressure of the swelling spirit. This effect, too, is more purely musical, more entirely independent of adventitious aid, than in the case of the Italian opera. It has been truly said, by Goethe, that musical effect is always greater when the singers are concealed. There is no doubt that the purest æsthetic effect of music is greatest when every other sense is shut; hence the habit of shutting the eyes when deeply affected by music. Now, German music will stand this test infinitely better than the Italian. The whole effect of a well-executed Italian solo is far greater with the eyes open. Why? Because the powerful emotional effect is the *combined result* of

the music and the acting. The German quartette or chorus, on the contrary, only expresses *noble* emotion, and noble emotion is always calm and self-possessed, and all violent action is therefore unbecoming. The German, it is true, is less universally appreciated, because less passionate. It is, also, less vociferously applauded, even by those who do appreciate; for this, also, is unbecoming holy and noble emotion.

Perhaps, in philosophic strictness, there are but two kinds of *perfect* music, viz., ballad music and German music. The first is simple; the second, complex. In the one, melody predominates; in the other, harmony. But each of these may be again divided into the true and the false, the healthy and the morbid. In the first, the false consists in the predominance of the sensuous, and the effect is to steep the soul in delicious dream and weak reverie; in the second, the false consists rather in the predominance of the emotional and passionate, and the effect is delirious excitement, intoxication. The simple music, however, is much less apt to be false than the complex; and falseness is, also, less dangerous in this case; hence it is more natural to distinguish, as we have done above, three kinds. The true and false in music are admirably expressed and distinguished in Milton's "Comus." Comus himself, speaking of the Lady's singing, says:

"I have oft heard
My mother, Circe, with the Syrens three,
Amidst the flowery-kirtled naiades,
Culling their potent herbs and baleful drugs,
Who, as they sung, would take the *prisoned* soul,
And lap it in *Elysium*,"

"Yet they in pleasing numbers *lulled the sense*,
And in a *sweet madness* robbed it of itself;
But such a *sacred* and home-felt delight,
Such *sober certainty* of *waking bliss*,
I never heard till now."

We can illustrate the three different kinds of music still further, by reference to the musical instruments which best express each. Perhaps the best expression of ballad music is the *flute*. The music of this instrument is sweet, simple, pure melody, but apt to pass into sweet melancholy, sentimentality, and lovesickness; lulling the sense, like an opiate, into a state of passive happiness, weakening, instead of strengthening the mind. Italian music is best expressed by the *violin*. No instrument so touches, so sweeps over, and sways every emotion and passion of the human soul, as this. The most extravagant merriment, the most touching melancholy, the most overpowering pathos, are evoked by turns, and with equal ease. The violin is certainly the most powerful of all instruments, in its effects on the human soul; in some sense, the most thoroughly human instrument which exists; but it touches most powerfully the feelings and emotions which belong to this world, and, therefore, is in some sense the most worldly of all instruments. There is, therefore, a philosophic foundation for the religious objection to this instrument, although the objection has been blind, and therefore absurd in its expression. The German music can not find fitting expression in any single instrument. A chorus of voices, or a full orchestra, is necessary for its full expression. Perhaps, of single instruments, the organ best expresses it; but its essential and distinguishing peculiarities are brought out in strongest relief by the piano. The power of the violin consists in passionate melody; the power of the piano, in the expression of complex harmony. Of course, the highest effect of music can only be produced by the union of these. The organ approaches nearest this ideal—is, therefore, the noblest of musical instruments, and therefore very properly dedicated to the church. But, in the expression of the most complex harmony, even the organ is inferior to the piano. The great weakness of the piano consists in its inability to sustain its

notes, and therefore the very imperfect manner in which it expresses melody; and therefore, also, its impotence in expressing strong emotion. But this very weakness on one side constitutes its strength on another, and that the highest. The very imperfection of its melody gives a power of harmony beyond all other instruments. There are chords and successions of chords in German music, so complex as to be entirely beyond the power of the human mind to grasp as perfect 'chords. The chord must be *broken* before the effect of the whole can be felt, and at the same time each note distinctly heard, and its part in the general effect truly weighed. This capacity for *broken chords*—upon which the highest effect of the piano is dependent—is itself dependent upon the inability of sustaining notes; and hence every attempt to remedy this defect, by æolian attachments or otherwise, must prove a failure. Broken chords, however, like “grace notes,” “runs,” “trills,” and all other artifices of brilliant effect, in the hands of second-rate performers, are liable to much abuse and affectation. It should seldom be used, unless the harmony is too complex to be otherwise grasped.

The piano, then, bears somewhat the same relation to German which the violin does to Italian music. The violin moves us more deeply, but the piano touches a higher sense. The violin is appreciated by all, and under all circumstances; amid the excitement of the concert or ball-room, no less than in the parlor; it compels admiration; it compels attention, because it touches strongly. The piano speaks only to those of cultivated minds. The mind must be prepared, the soul must be attuned, or no note vibrates in unison. In the concert-room it is nothing; the sense which it touches is too high and delicate to withstand noise and glare. “And yet,” it will be objected, “the piano is the most common of all instruments; the piano is used constantly in the concert-room.” The reason of this is, that the piano is also remarkable for brilliant mechanical execution. Every body

appreciates this, and admires it. But brilliant mechanical execution is comparatively a very low species of art. This is the reason why so many frivolous persons admire the piano, and so many persons of strong but uncultivated musical feeling despise it. The piano is really the poorest of instruments, unless one appreciates the most complex German music.

There is a story told of Beethoven, which, whether true or not, illustrates admirably the German ideal of musical art. It is said that the celebrated song, so well known to lovers of music, "*the Adelaide*," was composed by Beethoven, as an expression of his despair, on the night of the nuptials of the woman he passionately loved. Every one who is acquainted with the piece knows what agony of emotion, what wailings of grief, are expressed by it. It is universally acknowledged to be a masterpiece, in which the most powerful emotional melody is combined in a wonderful manner with the most complex harmony. But it is also said that Beethoven, in the full maturity of genius, acknowledged that he was ashamed of the piece. He composed it when he was not master of himself; when he was writhing in agony; when his emotion had, to some extent, enslaved him, and when, therefore, he could not be in the æsthetic condition; and therefore the piece was not a true work of art. His reverence for art was such that he looked upon it as sacrilege to express by it any but the highest and holiest feelings.

What we have said above completely settles the disputes concerning the relative merits of the different schools of music. It is not uncommon to find men with strong and genuine, but uncultivated musical feeling, who contend that no music is real and genuine but the simple ballad; that the Italian is but wild and phrenzied screaming, and the German unintelligible and discordant jargon; and the admiration of these is either the result of perverted taste or of affectation. On the other hand, how common to find the

“professor” of music turning up his nose at ballad music and negro melodies, as unworthy of notice. Now, all this is evidently either the result of imperfect culture or of affectation. In case it is genuine, we have here two classes of men, each despising the taste of the other; each feeling music in one of its phases, and unable to appreciate it in another. The two classes have been cultivated in different directions; their natures have become essentially different; and, of course, their taste and feelings, being the image of their natures, must also entirely differ. It is this condition of things, so common among men, especially in modern times, which gives rise to the adage, “*de gustibus non est disputandum*,” and to the philosophy that “taste and sense of beauty are mere things of association and education.” The same difference of culture and of nature gives rise to endless differences in the department of philosophy, and to the adage, “every man has a right to his own opinion;” as if truth was of no importance, but only individual subjective opinion. Thus both taste and philosophy become the result of subjective temperament and education. But, in fact, as a true philosophy includes, understands, and rationally interprets all mere opinions; so a true æsthetic culture includes all partial cultures. As in the field of intellect, no man who has only *his own opinions*, has any right to erect these, (which are the mere result of feelings, passions, interests, etc.,) into a philosophy; but only he who has gone through and included within himself all partial and subjective opinions, and interpreted them by the laws of reason—who, in a word, has no longer any opinion, but a philosophy, in which subjective opinion becomes sober certainty—has any right or any power to teach other men: so, also, in matters of taste; no one who does not include within himself the partial tastes and cultures of other men, has any right to judge between them. The man who does not actually feel, and deeply enjoy, any department of art, has no ability to judge at all where that department is con-

cerned. Only he who deeply feels every species of music, from the simplest negro melody to the most complex German oratorio; who has passed through the successive stages embodied permanently in other men; who, in his childhood, has been deeply moved, even to tears, by simple melody; in his ardent, impulsive, and unbalanced youth, has been wild with delight and extravagant excitement, on hearing the Italian opera; but who, in his maturity, has recognized the higher and purer beauty of the German music, and who, moreover, has included all previous epochs and tastes in his completed culture: we repeat, only *he* is in a position, or has any right, to judge as to their relative merits.

13. There are certain philosophical principles connected with the nature of art, which are best discussed at this point, since, for reasons which will presently appear, most of the illustrations will be drawn from music.

(a.) Music is the simplest and purest embodiment of the principles of art. The essential nature of art is here divested of every complication; the problem of the philosophy of art is reduced to its simplest terms. If in any department we can discover the essential nature—the simple and general principle which underlies all the various and complex forms of art, and concerning which there has been so much dispute, surely we are most likely to do so here. This is but the application of the “*comparative method*,” which, on other occasions, we have shown to be so successful in all the higher and more complex departments of knowledge. As in organic science, the study of the higher organisms has been barren of results, so far as concerns the establishing of any philosophic principles of organization, so in art, the study of the higher and more complex departments, such as poetry, will be equally barren in philosophic results. But, as in organic science, philosophic insight is obtained by the study of the simplest organisms, and extensive comparison of organisms in the scale of in-

creasing complexity; so, also, in art, the essential principles are only to be understood by an attentive study of the simplest departments, and by extensive comparison of different branches with one another.

We have said that music is the simplest department of art. We ought rather to have said that music shares this place with *sculpture*. The one is the simplest embodiment of the laws of *harmony of sound*; the other, of the laws of *harmony of form*. These, therefore, it seems to us, form *the two bases of art*. All other arts are the meeting and mingling of these two in various proportions. One might be called the *spiritual*, and the other the *material element*. Now, in the construction of a science of æsthetics, we must evidently build upon these two bases. In this respect, the science of æsthetics is similar to sociology, and for the reason that they are both equally connected with our material and our spiritual nature. As the science of sociology is built up first upon the facts of history—and thus we have descriptive sociology—then these facts are reduced to formal laws, and we have phænomenal or formal sociology; lastly, these phænomenal laws are reduced to the more fundamental laws of organic science, on the one hand, and of psychology, on the other, and we have a scientific sociology: so, also, a truly scientific æsthetics must commence with the facts of art—*descriptive æsthetics*; it must then reduce these to formal laws of its own—*formal æsthetics*; lastly, it must subordinate these phænomenal or formal laws to the more fundamental laws of organic forms, or morphology, on the one hand, and of spiritual harmony, or psychology, on the other; and thus we have a *scientific æsthetics*. These connexions, on the one hand with morphology, and on the other with psychology, are made directly and most simply through sculpture and music. But, as in sociology, on account of our more complete acquaintance with material sciences, the connexion with organic science is much more complete, and capable of being traced minutely in

doctrine and method, (as we have attempted to show in an article on sociology,)* while the connexion with spiritual science can only be indicated: so, also, in æsthetics, and for the same reason, the connexion with morphology can be traced with some distinctness, (as we have attempted to show in an article on morphology and its connexion with fine art;) † but its connexion with psychological science we at that time saw too imperfectly even to indicate distinctly. In both cases, *i. e.*, in sociology and in æsthetics, the *spiritual* connexion is *most essential*—the spiritual basis is most fundamental, though least understood. In art, whether *social* or *fine*, the human *spirit* is the active agent, but the material upon which it operates is matter. It acts according to its own laws, but, at the same time, conditioned by the laws of matter. In sociology, we have the laws of the human spirit, conditioned by the laws of *organic force*; in æsthetics, we have the laws of spirit, conditioned by the laws of *organic form*. Thus, the laws of spirit and the laws of matter are impressed both upon sociology and upon æsthetics, one as the active agent, the other as the limiting condition; but in both, also, we must exhaust the laws of the limiting conditions before we can eliminate these, and begin to understand the laws of the active spirit. Thus, the scientific connexion of sociology and æsthetics with organic science must be fully understood, before we can begin to understand their connexion with psychological science. We have attempted to do this in the two articles already referred to.

Now, as we have already said, in both social science and æsthetics the psychological basis is the most essential and fundamental; and social organization, or art, is high and pure in proportion as the laws of spirit predominate over the laws of matter—in proportion as the active spirit controls the limiting conditions—in other words, in proportion as the spirit is *free*; but it is, at the same time, great, and

* *So. Pres. Review*, Vol. 18, p. 89.

† *Do.*, Vol. 12, p. 88.

noble, and strong, in proportion to the strength and complexity of the limiting conditions thus overcome and coördinated. This is but another and more fundamental form of stating what we have already so often insisted on. Our lower nature, emotions, passions, senses, etc., as being more intimately connected with our material nature, stand as conditions limiting, often involving, obscuring, overpowering, the pure active spirit, which must be set free by art, or by culture of some sort. Now, these two elements, the spiritual and the material, the active and the limiting, exist in all art, as in every human work, but in different proportions. The spiritual element predominates in music; the material element in sculpture. But, as the spirit is the active agent, and, therefore, the spiritual element of art the most fundamental and essential, it follows that music is really the purest and freest embodiment of art. The free activity of the human spirit is here less entangled in the limiting conditions of our material nature, than in any other species of art. It follows, then, from what we have said, that although music and sculpture are the two coördinate bases of art, yet that music is really the most essential and most fundamental; and therefore a true philosophy of art—a true theory of the beautiful—aside from its connexion with morphology, can best be obtained by a profound study of the philosophy of music, and then, by comparison, tracing the principles of this philosophy through other departments.

It is not our intention here to propose any theory of the beautiful. We have only pointed out one method, and we think the only scientific method, by which a sound theory can be arrived at. We wish now to test by this method some of the theories which have been proposed.

According to a large class of writers, the perception of beauty is a sensuous perception—the pleasure derived from the contemplation of beauty is a purely sensuous enjoyment—and therefore incapable of analysis. “Beauty of

color, or beauty of sound," they say, "is, surely, a pure sensuous perception." True: but it does not, therefore, follow that the enjoyment of art is a sensuous enjoyment. The mistake here is the common one among a certain class of philosophers; in fact, the mistake of all the old philosophers, viz., that of the mere systematizing of notions embodied in popular terms, without sufficient analysis. The fact is, beauty of color or sound is not beauty at all, in any philosophical sense. If a mere agreeable impression on the sense of sight or hearing is beauty, then an agreeable impression on any other sense should equally be termed beautiful. Then the smell of otto of rose, the taste of sugar, or the feel of velvet, is beautiful. Thus our New England BRETHREN are thoroughly consistent in the use of this word, when they speak of the taste of good bread, or the sensation produced by a fine day, as beautiful. But true beauty, as distinguished from sensuous agreeableness, is a mental and not a sensuous perception; like the perception of *law* in nature, it is always a *perception of relation*. Let us illustrate by a simple case. We sound a certain note in music. The simple impression of the sound upon the ear, if it be a pure and sweet sound, is *agreeable*. After a while, we sound the third or fifth above it. This, also, produces an agreeable impression. We now sound both notes together, or in rapid succession, so that the mind can *compare* them. A *relation* is at once perceived, which is called a *chord*. *This is the simplest expression of beauty*; so simple and easy that it seems like a pure sensuous impression. The whole of music consists in the combination of such pleasant relations; becoming higher as the relations are more complex. The same truth may be equally well illustrated by the sense of sight, in the enjoyment of color or form. A single color, as blue, if it be pure and clear, will produce an agreeable impression; so will any other single color—as orange. Now, place these side by side, so that they may be *compared*; instantly there is a mental perception of the relation of these

colors to one another. If this relation is pleasant, it is called harmony, or concord; if unpleasant, discord. The perception of this harmony of colors is, again, the perception of beauty in its simplest expression. The same is true with reference to form. The straight line is not beautiful, although it may produce a pleasant impression on the sense, because the impression is single. But the curved or waving line is beautiful or the contrary, because here we have many impressions of lines in various positions, the *relations* of which to one another may be compared by the mind. If these relations are pleasant, it is called beautiful. From the various combinations of these relations of *color* and *form* arise the whole art of sculpture and painting. In the simple cases we have mentioned, the relation is so simple that it seems almost like a pure sensuous impression; but as the relations become more and more complex, as in actual art, the mental perception recedes farther and farther from the sensuous, and becomes more and more elevated and pure. We said that the perception of pleasant relation is purely mental, and similar to the perception of law in nature. The ancients understood this, and gave most beautiful and significant expression to it, when they called the beautiful arrangement—the harmonious adjustment—in a word, the law of the universe—“*the music of the spheres.*”

It may be asked, why is there not a perception of beauty, and a fine art, connected with the other senses? The reason is very obvious. Sight and hearing are the senses most immediately connected with the mind; they are, by far, the higher senses. Taste and smell are far lower, being connected almost purely with our material nature. But the perception of pleasant relation is purely mental. Therefore the perception of relation, in the case of these sensuous impressions, must be exceedingly imperfect. There is, however, a perception of relation (though very imperfect), and a fine art, (but one of a very low order,) connected with sensuous impressions of taste and smell also. Yes,

French cookery and perfumery are fine arts, though of the lowest possible kind; and the term beautiful might be truly applied to a *pleasant combination* of tastes and odors; and, perhaps, even the refining effects of these arts are not to be despised. In all notions embodied in popular language, however, there is a germ of truth when properly understood. The term *beautiful* is popularly applied to agreeable impressions on the sense of sight and hearing, because of the less gross nature of these sensuous impressions, when compared with others; because of the closer alliance between them and the mental perception of true beauty; because we rise by almost insensible gradations from these sensuous impressions to the perception of simple beauty; and from this, again, through imperceptible gradations, to the perception of the highest and most complex beauty. Other sensuous impressions are not called beautiful, because they are not thus connected with the higher forms of true beauty.

2. There is another theory, that of Alison and Jeffrey, which makes beauty altogether arbitrary, and dependent upon accidental association; a thing of mere fashion, the result of circumstances and education. This is surely an easy way of getting rid of the difficulty and the labor of attempting a true philosophy; a method very common, and characteristic of the present age; characteristic of the trifling, superficial, sceptical, but acute and ingenious philosophy of the beginning of the nineteenth century. Religion, morals, virtue and vice, individual differences of character—every thing most sacred and every thing most degrading in our nature, is treated in the same summary way; it is all fashion, education, circumstances, and the whole subject is dismissed with a shrug of the shoulder. The answer to all this is simple. As circumstances, education, etc., may modify, improve, or degrade, but can not constitute humanity; so, also, education and accidental circumstances may improve or injure the sense of beauty—associations may cluster around and enhance or destroy

our perception of beauty—but can not constitute beauty itself. As there is a true ideal of humanity, amid the infinitely diversified modifications existing in every individual mind, and still more in different races; so there is a true ideal standard of beauty, in spite of diversity of individual, and still more of national standards. This ideal standard of beauty is evidently the image of the ideal humanity. To prove that beauty is not the mere result of accidental association, we have only again to reduce it to its simplest terms, as the perception of harmonious relation of sensuous impressions. The pleasure taken in a simple chord in music, or in the combination of complementary colors, surely can not be reduced to any principle of accidental association. If there is any association in the matter at all, it must be innate and intuitive—connected with the essential nature of man; and if so, beauty is no longer arbitrary.

It is evident, then, that beauty is but another expression for harmonic relation, and the perception of beauty is the perception of harmonic relation. That certain relations are harmonious and pleasant, while others are discordant and unpleasant, is an ultimate fact, incapable of farther analysis, unless we assume (what is almost certain) that there is and must be some inscrutable connexion (“*correspondence*”) between harmonic relations in the external world, and that spiritual harmony which constitutes holiness. Beauty is the type of spiritual harmony—of a perfect humanity. Man, in his fallen state, still retains some “*reminiscences*” of a happy state, in which all the powers of his soul and body acted spontaneously and in perfect harmony. Every thing which *suggests* this spiritual and bodily harmony is called beauty. Why certain combinations of sounds, or colors, or forms, should suggest this, is an ultimate fact, no more capable of farther analysis than why vibrations should produce sound or light. A true theory of beauty, therefore, is not to be sought by vain attempts to explain the *essence*

of this sentiment, but by the discovery of its *laws*. These laws constitute the science of æsthetics.

(*b.*) There are two fundamental conditions of material existence, viz., space and time. There are, also, only two senses through which the mind perceives harmonic relations, viz., the eye and the ear. Through the eye we take cognizance of harmonic relations in *space*; through the ear, of harmonic relations in *time*. Now, the comparison of these two organs of sense, as to their power of perceiving* relations, leads to some curious and interesting results, not hitherto noticed by any writer on this subject.

If we take any *single* pure color, and place it before an observer, the eye unhesitatingly determines the color, and the exact shade, with great accuracy. If the same color be placed before the same person many times, or before many different individuals of good eyes and ordinary practice in their use, it will always be perceived as the same thing, and called by the same name. But if, now, we sound a single pure musical note, and ask a listener what note it is, he can not determine with any accuracy whether it is A or B, or C or D, or any other note of the gamut. He may guess, but can not be certain. If the same note be sounded at different times, at long intervals, he will call it some times one note, some times another; and so, also, different persons will, perhaps, disagree as to its exact pitch. Hence, in singing, the absolute necessity of an instrument, or a tuning-fork, to give the pitch. Thus far the eye seems vastly superior to the ear in accuracy of the knowledge which it conveys. Next, let us take any *two* pure colors, as blue and yellow, and lay them one on the other, if the pigments are transparent, or mix them if opaque, (*superpose them in space*). In this case we see no longer either

* To avoid circumlocution, we have adopted this expression, although, as we have already shown, the perception of relation, even the simplest, is a mental process one degree removed from pure sensuous perception.

blue or yellow, but an entirely different color, apparently equally simple and pure, viz., green. The two original colors are both lost in an intermediate color—a sort of *semitone*. But if we take two pure musical notes, and sound them together, (*superpose them in time,*) we do not, in this case, lose the original notes, nor do we get an intermediate resultant, or semitone. On the contrary, we perceive three distinct things; we hear distinctly each of the original notes; and, in addition to these, we perceive, with the utmost mathematical accuracy, the relation, harmonic or otherwise, existing between them. The least variation from perfect harmony is detected, with an accuracy which surpasses any thing else which the human mind can do. This relation of sensuous impressions *superposed*, whether in space or time, we shall call *chordal harmony*. Again, if we take two pure colors, and, instead of superposing them, place them *side by side*, (consecutively in space,) we see each color distinctly, and also, but *indistinctly*, the harmonic relation between them. The exact shade which is necessary to produce perfect harmony, can not be determined with any certainty; different observers will differ in opinion; and when there is a true harmonic relation, the perception of it is not full, and clear, and certain. But, if we sound two musical notes *consecutively*, (*side by side in time,*) the relation, harmonic or otherwise, is perceived with the utmost mathematical accuracy, at all times, and by all persons with normal ears. This relation of sensuous impressions placed, as it were, *side by side*, we shall call *consecutive harmony*, or melody. In all these latter cases, *i. e.*, in the perception of harmony, we find the ear far superior to the eye. The eye perceives *properties* with the utmost accuracy, but *relations* imperfectly. The ear, on the contrary, perceives *properties* very imperfectly, but *relations* with the utmost accuracy. The one would seem to be the organ of the *mind*, the other the organ of the *soul*.

We have spoken thus far only of sound and color. Associated with these, *form* is generally placed, as one of the fundamental sensuous impressions, the relations of which constitute beauty. But form is already a *relation*, and not a simple sensuous impression. The simple sensuous perception is *direction*, or position. The combination of many sensuous impressions of direction into one mental perception, is form. Thus, the expression, *beauty of form*, is philosophically correct; but beauty of color, or sound, is not. Now the ear perceives *direction* very imperfectly, while the eye does so with mathematical accuracy. The relation between directions, or form, the ear is utterly incapable of perceiving, while the eye perceives form with the utmost precision.

In conclusion, then, we may say that there are really only two entirely distinct sensuous impressions—direction and tone. The one belongs to space, the other to time; the one perceived by the eye, the other by the ear. From one comes sculpture, from the other music, the two fundamental bases of art. Color occupies, in fact, a sort of middle ground. It is allied to tone, in that it consists of *vibrations*, and, in fact, may be arranged into an imperfect gamut. It is also allied to direction, inasmuch as it is the necessary *content of form*, and is perceived by the eye. Sensuous impressions, upon which are founded the fabric of art, therefore, when analyzed to the last degree, consist of *direction* and *vibration*. In comparing the eye and ear, with regard to these, we find that, in the ear, the simple *sensuous* perception, whether of *direction* or *vibration*, (tone,) is imperfect, but the perception of *relation* in the case of vibration is wonderfully accurate: while, in the case of the eye, the sensuous impression, whether of direction or of vibration, (color,) is very accurate; but in the perception of relation, its accuracy extends only to the relations of direction, (form,) but not to those of vibration. Again, that the ear, in so far as it is capable of perceiving relation at all, is

capable both of *chordal* and *consecutive* harmony; and that in the highest degree: while the eye is capable of perceiving only consecutive harmony—in the highest degree, in the case of direction, (form,) and imperfectly in the case of vibration (color,)—but is entirely incapable of perceiving chordal harmony.* In a word, perception of relations by the eye seems to be more *extensive*, since it comprehends both the relations of direction and of vibration; but the perception of relation by the ear is more *perfect* and mathematically accurate. The connexion of fine art with the eye is more extensive, but with the ear more intimate. And hence it follows that the branches of art founded upon visual impression, are more complex, and various, and elevated, but, at the same time, far less perfect and reducible to rule; while the branch of art immediately connected with the ear is less complex and extensive, but much more perfectly developed. Thus music and sculpture—the simplest expression of harmony of form and harmony of sound—form the coördinate bases of art; but music is the most fundamental, because the simplest and most perfectly developed.

But it might be objected that, if music is the simplest department of art, how is it that it has been the last in the order of historic development? How is it that, while sculpture culminated among the Greeks, and painting in the fifteenth century of our era, music has only now reached its culmination? We answer, it is not the simplest in the sense of the rudest and most obvious, but is simplest in its scientific principles; simplest in the sense in which mathematics is the simplest of all sciences, as being the most *abstract*, simple, and universal in its principles. And it is for this very reason that it has been latest in development. The law of development of human knowledge is from the

* Unless, indeed, depth in space, with objects one beyond another, may be compared to an imperfect chord, a broken chord in music.

concrete to the abstract, and then back again to the concrete, through the abstract; from popular notions to sciences the most abstract, and then gradually to the rational interpretation of popular knowledge by scientific principles; from the complex to the simple, and back again, through the simple, to the complex; from instinct, downwards to reason, and then again upwards, to interpret all knowledge by reason; from art to science, and back again to art perfected by science. Thus popular knowledge, commencing first with man, (the most complex of all subjects,) and things most immediately connected with man, extended to animals and plants, to inanimate nature, and so downwards until it reached the simplest abstract principles of mathematics. From this point commenced scientific or rational knowledge, and slowly travelled back again up the scale, through physical, organic, and social science. The progress of art has followed the same law. It commenced with sculpture and architecture, as the most *concrete*, and poetry, as the most *complex* of arts, and passed gradually through painting to music, the most abstract and simple. But when the first principles of art are thoroughly understood in music, then there will be a new and complete development of art upon rational principles, in the order of complexity. In the history of art, we are now exactly in the middle ground, between instinct and reason. We are exactly where the Greeks stood in science. This law of human progress is every where detectible, but, like every other law of progress, is most distinct in science, because this is the simplest department of human activity. Thus, by an independent train of thought, are we again led to the same conclusion to which our reasonings in so many previous articles have led us, viz., the transcendent importance of a sound philosophy of science, not only in itself considered, but as a solid basis of philosophy in almost all other departments.

ARTICLE III.

GEOLOGY AND ITS ASSAILANTS.

The progress of the science of geology has at every step been resisted with singular obstinacy and bitterness. The world opposes every new doctrine, on its first promulgation, unwilling to confess its previous ignorance. We are offended when our fixed opinions are rudely disturbed; when we are called upon to admit that we have been proclaiming as truth that which is false. And however unreasonable this may appear, if we confine our attention to the efforts made to destroy doctrines which we believe to be true, it is not unattended by valuable results; for many a false doctrine is thus detected and exposed; while every truth, before it is permitted to take rank among the clearly established and undeniable, has its real character evinced by the scrutiny to which it is subjected, and by the tests applied to it, as it never would have been, had it been suffered to pass unchallenged. But geology, besides undergoing this rigid examination, as a new comer upon the field of truth, has been assailed with unwonted vehemence. From the formation of its first provisional hypothesis, to bind together the few imperfectly known facts, down to the present time, when its leading principles must be looked upon by all who have adequately examined the subject as firmly established, it has been forced to meet and to overcome such violent, and even virulent opposition as has been made to perhaps no other science. The reason of this is, that it has been regarded as the enemy of the Holy Scriptures. These we receive as containing truths, compared with which all others sink into insignificance; and so fully authenticated by the strongest evidence of every kind, that it is impossible for a reasonable mind to doubt them, or to receive as true any

thing that is really inconsistent with them. But instead of causing such unseemly opposition to the progress of knowledge, this faith should rather lead those who are actuated by it to further all inquiries after truth; believing, knowing, that the final result of every investigation will be to strengthen the foundations of natural religion, and to show that entire harmony subsists between every truth thus discovered and all that is taught in the word of life, whenever they relate to the same subject. It is difficult to repress a doubt as to the genuineness and strength of that faith which would check the freest search after truth in the works of God. It must often be the result of weak faith, and a secret dread that, after all, some thing may be found out, that will compel an abandonment of belief in the Bible. But in many cases it would be unjust to attribute this course to a want of faith. There is one other source of suspicion and hatred of scientific discoveries, and apparently but one: it is that while we have undoubting faith in the word of God, we have equal confidence in our ability to interpret it, and are influenced by that intolerance towards all who believe either less or more than ourselves, which is the disgrace of our kind. It is time that this virulent opposition were laid aside, and that we who know the truth of the Bible should act, neither as though we feared every moment that it may be proved to be a mythical collection of questionable traditions, nor in wicked violation of the spirit of forbearance and love taught in its pages.

Geologists have seldom taken any notice of attacks, either upon themselves or upon their science, knowing that the science needs only to be studied to evince its truth to any fair mind; and believing that every effort to convince, by sound reasoning, those who could adopt the prevailing anti-geological hypotheses would be utterly futile; that those who adopt their opinions without reason can not be convinced by reason. Such contemptuous neglect may seem supercilious; and yet it is hardly to be wondered at

or condemned, so wild and absurd are many of the guesses which it would be necessary to controvert. But we think that this silence has, to some extent, been injurious to the cause of truth; for, by many who can not examine for themselves, it has been construed into an acknowledgment of the success of the attacks. Therefore we propose to consider a few of the most plausible objections which have been urged against geology. We design not so much to advance arguments in favor of the truth of the science, as to exhibit, in the present article, the character of the assaults upon it, and to point out some of the mistakes of anti-geologists concerning its nature; and, at some future time, to present specimens of the hypotheses which they would have us receive instead of the established geological theories.

In the war against geology, as in most other wars, there have been many classes of combatants, and it has been waged with various degrees of fairness. A few of the assailants, perhaps, really know what the science is, but have been unable to satisfy themselves of the certainty of its fundamental principle; and have honorably attempted to destroy it, by showing that it has nothing to rest upon. We express ourselves doubtfully here; for while it is possible that this class may exist, we have to confess our ignorance of its actual existence. Another class attack it without professing to know any thing of it, except that it is charged with teaching that which is inconsistent with the Bible. Without waiting to learn whether or not the charge is true, they forthwith do what they can to expel it from the domain of the credible. We have no hesitation in saying that, if this charge could be substantiated, we would at once join this attacking party; believing that the truth of the Bible is established by evidence, external and internal, of such overwhelming strength, that whatever is inconsistent with its ascertained teachings is, by that fact alone, proved

to be untrue; just as we would pronounce that course of reasoning to be untrue, without waiting to hear any part of it, which ended with the assertion that the sum of the angles of a plane triangle is greater or less than two right angles.

Another class, with some knowledge of the subject, but this distorted, because it is imperfect, or because it has been sought not with the desire to reach the truth, but to establish a foregone conclusion, are conspicuous upon the field. Often their arguments are well constructed, of undoubted facts, bound together by undeniable first principles, and would utterly demolish the scientific claims of geology, did these involve the absurdities or depend upon the untruths thus prostrated. But, unfortunately for the conquerors, it is not geology that they have attacked, but some thing else, that they have oddly mistaken for it. The caricature receives a death-blow from the same hand that has brought it into existence, but geology remains unharmed.

But, perhaps, it has happened still oftener in the history of this conflict, that not merely has some thing different from geology been mistaken for it, but the assailing arguments have been even more grotesque than the caricature of geology assailed. For striking illustrations of this, we refer our readers to Art. V., No. 3, Vol. XIII., of this Review. And others we will give as we proceed.

Of the modes of warfare practised, some, as we have intimated, are perfectly honorable; but others, we must say, are just the reverse, unworthy of honest combatants or of a just cause. No one can or does object to the attempt to prove that geology is not a science; that its advocates are in error; that its principles have not yet been, and can not, from the nature of the subject, hereafter be established. If success attend these efforts, great good will have been effected; the cause of truth will have been promoted. If success be unattained, and unattainable, the only painful

consequence will be loss of time and reputation to the mistaken anti-geologist.

It is also quite fair to try to set aside geological principles, by showing that all known facts may be explained quite as satisfactorily, or even more so, by other theories than those advanced by the geologist. This course is attended by consequences of the same kind as in the last case; but hitherto the inconveniences have been more serious in degree; for every effort of this nature has evinced such remarkable ignorance, either of the facts to be accounted for, or of the general physical laws involved in the hypotheses advanced, that all reputation for exact scientific knowledge has been immediately lost to the author, and he has become a laughing-stock to all who are really acquainted with the subject.

Thus far, however, no moral obliquity has been manifested; nothing disgraceful has been done; no poisoned arrows have been employed. But what shall we say of the last mode to be noticed, which, unhappily, is more frequently resorted to than all others? This consists in exciting suspicion and prejudice against the geologist, by raising the hue and cry of "rationalist," "sceptic," "infidel," "atheist." Unable to refute his arguments in an honorable way, he who adopts this plan represents him as systematically laboring to prove that to be false and worthless which the Christian heart prizes above every thing in the world besides. Some times he charges him with open infidelity—with assailing the Bible without disguise; at other times, with consciously desiring to cause the Bible to be rejected as untrue, while he hypocritically professes to be a believer; at other times, with holding such loose views of inspiration, that, although his professions of belief may be sincere, his rationalistic opinions are even more dangerous, if possible, than those of the other classes. Now, that there have been geologists justly liable to these charges, we do not deny; but we protest against the generalization of

the charge; against imputing such antagonism to the Bible, in whole or in part, to geologists as a class. It is untrue; it is unkind; it is unworthy a good cause, especially the cause of Christian truth.

Near akin to this is the practice of representing the contest as one between Christians, and especially ministers, ("parsons," as the clerical writer will some times say, in order to gain the sympathy always freely accorded to the persecuted,) on the one hand, and unclerical and uninformed geologists on the other. All professional expositors of the Sacred Scriptures, whose orthodoxy can be admitted; all sound believers of sufficient knowledge and discrimination to prevent their holding, at the same time, irreconcilable opinions, are anti-geologists; while those whom they oppose are half-learned laymen, who either do not know what the Bible teaches, or do not care. Now, would it not surprise those who have been believing such representations to learn that just the reverse is true? And yet such is the fact. The leading writers on the geological side have, with few exceptions, been ministers of the Gospel, of every denomination, whose profound reverence for the whole Bible as the very word of God, has never been called in question; while the leading anti-geological writers have been laymen; some of whom have taken the most unwarrantable liberties with the sacred text, and have without scruple rejected those parts of it which would not agree with their hypotheses. This is so well known to all acquainted with the literature of the controversy, that that it might seem superfluous to substantiate it by an enumeration of the various authors. But the frequent reiteration of erroneous assertions on this point makes it necessary to give at least a few names.

Let us see, then, among the more prominent writers, who are the self-styled defenders of Bible truth, in the controversy between geology and the Bible, as this strife is incorrectly termed, and who are the infidel geologists.

Among the latter we find the ministry of every branch of the Christian Church well represented. Among the Presbyterians in Scotland, Dr. Chalmers, the champion of the Free Church, maintained so earnestly one geologico-scriptural hypothesis that he is frequently referred to as its author. It is hardly necessary to assert his orthodoxy. The geological works of Dr. David King, of the United Presbyterian Church, and of Dr. J. Anderson, of the Established Church of Scotland, must be generally known. The orthodoxy of these writers is also above suspicion. Of the Independents of England, none are regarded as sounder in the faith than the late Dr. Pye Smith and Dr. Harris. The Congregationalist Dr. Hitchcock, the chief advocate of geological views in New England, is one of the most evangelical divines in that region. And we have yet to hear the charge of rationalism or infidelity, latent or avowed, brought against Professor Sedgwick, Bishop Sumner, and Dean Buckland, of the Established Church of England, except as it is brought against all who do not adopt the peculiar views of anti-geologists. And yet all of these have maintained the infidel geological views! The only very prominent layman among the authors on that side is Hugh Miller; and his orthodoxy was so undoubted that he was chosen the editor of the organ of the Free Church of Scotland.

The chief of those who have gratified their enemies, (if they have any,) by writing books on the other side, are the laymen, David N. and Eleazar Lord, of this continent, who, we doubt not, are sincere believers in the word of God, as they understand it; and Granville Penn and George Fairholme, of Great Britain, who deliberately set aside such parts of the first chapters of Genesis as will not bend to their unscientific notions.

If we turn to the writings of those Romish and Puseyite authors who are characterized by the profoundest reverence for the Holy Scriptures, errorists though they are, we

find the same thing to be true. We need only refer to Dr. Pusey and Cardinal Wiseman, to prove the correctness of this statement. The work of Cardinal Wiseman, on the connexion between Natural Science and Revealed Religion, in which he shows how the principles of geology may be consistent with the biblical record of creation, is justly admired as evincing the most sacred regard for God's word; and, at the same time, a competent knowledge of natural science, united with remarkable philosophic fairness of mind.

When we examine the works of authors who have written in foreign tongues, the very same fact presents itself. The most thoroughly evangelical ministers of the Gospel, the professional expositors of the word of God, who most cordially and unreservedly believe in its plenary inspiration, maintain at once the truth of geological teachings and their harmony with the more precious doctrines of revelation; while many, we believe most, of the principal non-clerical writers, both believers and unbelievers, of all shades, and those who, from their training, may reasonably be expected to be imperfectly acquainted with one side of the subject or the other, deny that it is possible for both the Bible and geology to be true. For full illustration and proof of this, we need only compare the views of the theologians, Kurtz, Hengstenberg, Tholuck, and Delitzsch, with those of the laymen, Wagner, the believer, Bunsen, the rationalist, De Luc, De Serres, down to Vogt, the scoffing disbeliever.

In the selection of the above named authors, we have endeavored to bring forward those who fairly represent all the principal writers on the subjects involved: a full enumeration, we believe, would lead to the same conclusion. Thus is demonstrated the serious (yet, we hope, unintentional) mistake of anti-geologists, who are so fond of classing geologists with infidels, or with those who know little of the Bible and its teachings, or care little for them.* It

* It is true that the names of many ministers might be given who have, in pamphlets, etc., denied the possibility of any agreement between geology

must not be supposed that we regard the point at issue as one which can be settled by vote, or by the authority of the learned and godly Christian ministers to whom we have referred. But we do think that the opinions of such men ought to silence the cry of "infidel," "rationalist," etc., which many are so ready to raise against all who believe the doctrine of the earth's antiquity. We think, too, that we are entitled, as ministers, to no special privileges in our discussions with geologists. If there is a contest, it is not between "parsons" and geologists; and we must not falsely assume, if we attack geology, that we go forth as standard-bearers of the Church against infidelity, or to sustain the doctrines of the Church; when the Church catholic, during the last forty years, has given forth the opinion, as far as can be learned from the writings of its leading spirits, that the Bible no where teaches any thing that is inconsistent with modern geology.

The first mistake of anti-geologists concerning the nature of the science which we will notice is, that they generally suppose it to be cosmogony, or, at least, geogony; a history of the origin or creation of the universe, or, at least, of our earth. Accordingly, if it fail to give a satisfactory account of the creation, to demonstrate in what state matter first appeared, and what were all the successive steps, from the very first, by which the earth assumed its present form and condition, it is held to be worthless, and to have failed in all that it proposed to do. This shows an entire misappre-

and the Bible: as the Rev. Mellor Brown, Dr. Dickinson, Prof. Baden Powell, and others; and we would be sorry to deprive such excellent laymen as Dennis Crofton, Dr. R. Poole, Gibson, Pattison, and others, of the credit which they deserve as defenders of the truth of both the Bible and geology. But this does not affect the truth of the assertion, that most of the professional expositors of the Scriptures who have written at length upon the subject, during the last half-century, in every branch of the Christian Church, have believed that the doctrines of geology are in no way inconsistent with those of sacred writ.

hension of its character and its aim. No reasonable geologist has ever claimed this for his science. He regards it as a history of those changes which have distinctly left their record in the earth's crust. Many of these records are now read as easily, and with as much certainty as to their meaning, as state papers in government archives relating to the events of the last century; while others resemble rather the faded and tattered fragments of ancient documents, in almost obsolete tongues, from which we can with the utmost toil learn only the leading characteristics of the ages to which they refer. In tracing the history of any nation towards its origin, we at length reach a point where historical truth begins to be mingled with doubtful traditions; still beyond this, we are either left wholly to conjecture, or are dependent for a few glimpses of possible truth upon fabulous legends. Thus, in Roman history, we gradually pass from the certain, through the period of Curtius's self-sacrificing leap, the divine origin of Romulus and Remus, and their preservation by the she-wolf, to the wanderings of Æneas and Iulus. We trace with considerable confidence the history of Egypt to the time of the great Rameses Miamun, whose predecessors we see with increasing dimness, as far as the looming figure of Menes, beyond which all is lost in the night-gloom of fabulous reigns of gods. So it is in geology. We trace with perfect distinctness the general course of events, through the comparatively recent period of the tertiary, through the stirring times of the secondary, and almost to the beginning of the ancient fossil-bearing primary strata. During this time, it is true, there are many events over which doubt hangs, as in other histories; but this does not affect the truth of what we know. Our knowledge becomes more fragmentary beyond this point, as we penetrate the non-fossiliferous strata, because they are marked with but few characters now legible; nearly all that we understand having been obliterated, if they ever existed. When we reach the unstratified rocks,

we can learn nothing from them, except here and there an isolated fact. Of the changes which these may have previously undergone, we *know* nothing. But just as speculations concerning the possible meaning of the story of Romulus, or the possible basis of fact which Egyptian mythology may have, do not invalidate the truth of succeeding history, so speculations concerning the possible previous condition (if such there was) of the oldest unstratified rocks, do not affect the truth of the account of succeeding events that lie within the geological historic period. Hence the assaults upon the nebular hypothesis, upon the assumption that the earth was at one time a molten globe, and even upon the doctrines of central heat and metamorphism, do not touch geology; and if it could be demonstrated that these conjectures are wholly unphilosophical and untrue, the scientific history of the earth, as presented to us by the geologist, would be no more rendered doubtful than would the history of Julius Cæsar, by proving that he was not descended from Iulus; or the existence of Rome, by proving that Mars was not the father of Romulus, and that a wolf was not his foster-mother.

It will be seen, from these considerations, that the greater part of every anti-geological argument at once tumbles to the ground, as soon as it has been ascertained what geology professes to be. No part of the doctrine of the earth's hoary antiquity rests upon what we may term the mythical period of the earth's history—that antecedent to the formation of the oldest stratified rocks. And the semi-historical period of the non-fossiliferous strata might also be omitted, without at all endangering it.

This limitation of geology to its proper sphere might have been expected to mitigate the violence of its assailants; but when one of its most distinguished founders ventured to disclaim for his science the power of seeing back to the first moment of creation, or of looking forward to the final consummation of all things, saying that he could

“see no traces of a beginning, or indications of a coming end,” a reserved guard of anti-geologists denounced him as an infidel, who flatly denied the truth of the biblical account of the creation, and of the predicted end of the world; his modest disclaimer of omniscience concerning the entire history of the earth, was distorted into an atheistic assertion of the eternity of matter. And to this day, the luckless Hutton is the standing illustration of the atheistical tendencies of natural science generally, and especially of geology. The unhappy science is thus placed in this dilemma: if it attempt to go beyond its admitted boundaries, and to approach nearer the mysteries of creation by means of probable conjecture, it is frowned upon as impiously presumptuous, and it is falsely represented as requiring its conjectures to be received as certainties; on the other hand, if it modestly confine itself to rigid reasoning and ascertainable truths, it is angrily driven away as grossly atheistic.

Another mistaken view of the science—quite a favorite with anti-geologists—is, that there is nothing settled in it; that its votaries do not agree on a single important point, except in asserting the antiquity of the earth. The following extracts from Lord’s *Geognosy* will show how this is presented:

“That so mistaken a system should have gained the assent and advocacy of so large a body of studious and talented men, is truly a matter of astonishment. The fact, indeed, that they universally and unhesitatingly concur in assigning a vast period to the formation of the strata, is sometimes alleged as a proof of the validity and amplitude of the evidence on which their judgment is founded. The unanimity and ardor with which they maintain it, and the disquietude, and not unfrequently discourtesy, with which they receive a doubt of its truth, are certainly remarkable. The concurrence, however, is seen to be entitled to but little weight, when it is considered that it is almost absolutely confined to this branch of their speculations;—that there is not another question in the whole range of their system in regard to which they do not entertain a wide diversity of opinion. They are not agreed, for example, whether the world, at its creation, was in a gaseous or in a solid form. They are not agreed in respect

to the processes by which granite, gneiss, schist, and the other primary rocks were produced. They are not agreed in respect to the point at which the secondary series commences, the order of the strata, the sources from which some of their elements were drawn, nor the agencies to which they owe their peculiar structure. They differ in respect to the point at which vegetable and animal life commenced, and the forms which it first assumed. They entertain the most diverse and absurd opinions respecting the origin of limestone, coal, gypsum, chalk, magnesia, iron, and salt. They hold conflicting views in regard to the state of the globe at the epoch of the different formations, the forces by which the strata were dislocated, the causes by which the mountains were upthrown, the period at which land animals were first called into existence, and the origin of the races that now inhabit the globe. They differ, likewise, to the extent of countless ages, in regard to the period that has elapsed during the formation of the strata. In short, beyond the simple facts, that the strata have been formed since the creation of the earth, that chemical and mechanical forces of some kind were the principal agents in their deposition, and that the fossilized forms that are imbedded in them once belonged to the vegetable and animal worlds, there is scarce a topic of any moment in the whole circle of the science in respect to which they do not maintain very diverse opinions; there is scarce a solitary point so fully ascertained as to be placed beyond doubt."—Pp. 303, 304, 305.

We have selected this, because it is an exhaustive enumeration of the discordant opinions which prevail. It is certainly a formidable one; and with the exception of the clause respecting the "order of the strata," it is correct. But as far as the *historic* period of geology is concerned, these discordances are of little importance. The arguments which are supposed to prove that the earth and its earlier inhabitants were called into being more than ten thousand years ago, are not touched by a single point in the enumeration. We say ten thousand years; for if this period be admitted, it matters little, as regards any imaginary connexion with biblical chronology, whether the time of creation was ten thousand or ten thousand million years ago. If even the numbers six thousand or seven thousand be abandoned, it must be on the ground that the Bible does not fix the time of the creation. Therefore, the only point which, at first sight, seems to bear materially upon the question at issue, does not really affect it; for, after "differ-

ing to the extent of countless ages, in regard to the period that has elapsed during the formation of the strata," all agree that the shortest possible period immeasurably exceeds ten thousand years. The whole argument rests upon "the simple facts that the strata have been formed since the creation of the earth, that chemical and mechanical forces of some kind were the principal agents in their deposition"—forces ascertainable from an examination of the strata and their contents—"and that the fossilized forms that are imbedded in them once belonged to the vegetable and animal worlds." It is not pretended that there is a want of agreement as to these facts; and the chronological question is settled by them. And even the great majority of those who have begun to study them with the sole design of showing that they do not prove the earth's antiquity, have soon become convinced of that which they set out to overthrow.

We have already said that the diversity of opinion among geologists is of little importance. It no more weakens the confidence due to the science as a whole, than the differences among British historians make us doubt the principal facts of British history. And yet, what a startling list of discordant views and statements might be given! They are not agreed, for example, whether Great Britain, when first visited by man, was an island or a part of the continent of Europe. They are not agreed in respect to the origin of the races by which it was first peopled. They are not agreed in respect to the time when the Cymry obtained possession of the island; whether their settlement was opposed by wild beasts or human beings; or when their power was finally broken, and they were forced to yield to the Teuton. They entertain the most diverse and absurd opinions respecting the origin and design of the so-called runic inscriptions, the remarkable circles of stones near Stonehenge and elsewhere, assigning them to the Phœnicians, the British Druids, and to the Romans.

They differ in respect to the point at which parliaments began to assemble, and the forms and powers which they at first assumed. They hold conflicting views in regard to the social condition of the people at different epochs, the moral forces by which society was convulsed, and even in regard to the causes of the last revolution—whether they were political or religious. They differ, likewise, to the extent of many centuries, in regard to the period when the Phœnicians first visited their shores. And so the enumeration might proceed indefinitely. But who regards British history as rendered thereby so uncertain that it would be unsafe to say that the Celts, the Saxons, and the Romans successively governed the island, and that it has certainly been inhabited for not less than two thousand years? Of no greater weight are the objections urged against geology from this source.

We might here leave this objection, were it not for the deep impression which it has made upon the popular mind; from the incessant reiteration of the assertion that there is nothing settled in geology, and of the advice to wait until it has settled itself before an effort shall be made to settle its relations to revealed truth. Even if there were serious differences among geologists—which, as we have seen, is not the case in respect to the question at issue—it would be unwise to conclude that the subject is worthy of no consideration on the part of sensible men, until these differences are adjusted. This principle would prevent our giving our attention to any subject whatever, or believing any thing whatever, except, perhaps, our own existence. We could not believe in the existence of a material world; how often has its existence been denied by learned philosophers! We must refuse our assent to the truths of mathematics, astronomy, optics, chemistry, electricity: to what must we not refuse it? Mathematicians are not agreed even as to the definition of a straight line. Astronomers hold the most conflicting views respecting the nebulae, double stars,

the nature and orbits of comets, the origin of meteors, and the condition of interastral space. Philosophers have wrangled without ceasing over the questions, whether light is material substance, or the effect of mere motion; whether the so-called elements are simple substances, or compounds; whether matter is infinitely divisible or composed of atoms; whether the phenomena of electricity are due to one fluid, two fluids, or none. But who, for this reason, says that he will wait until they are settled, and then he will listen to the conclusions reached? Before deciding that it would be wise to avow or advise such a determination, it would be well to observe the force with which the principle might be turned against us, when we are seeking to win the attention of unbelievers to our holy religion. Scarcely any objection to pure and scriptural Christianity is oftener upon the lips of its opponents. The work of the eloquent Bossuet, *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, ought to be regarded as conclusive against protestantism, if such a principle satisfy us. And how shall we answer, when we are called upon to state what one point in the Christian system is settled? To what extent is the book containing its principles to be received as true? Is it alone sufficient to reveal to us the whole will of God, or do we need the traditions of the Church besides? Does it teach that God exists in one person, or in three? What was the design of Christ's death? What is taught as to the future state of the wicked? What is the scriptural system of Church government? And so the objector proceeds. Let the advocates of Christianity, says he, settle among themselves what their principles are, and then it will be time enough for us to look into the matter. If we condemn such cavils as weak and foolish, in this case, let us not expose ourselves to similar condemnation. We can not heed the advice to wait until there shall be no cavillers. And if we proclaim the untruth of geology, let it be after a candid examination of the evidence by which it is supported, and not because

we have found that there are differences among its votaries, on some points on the outskirts of the science.

In the next place, the combined influence of preconceived opinions and imperfect knowledge on the part of anti-geologists, is strikingly exemplified by their misconception of arguments in the proper domain of geology. It is not that they have not examined the subject; but that they have examined it with the predetermination to find nothing but absurdities and contradictions. An admirer and intimate friend of the most prominent anti-geological writer in America once said to us, when an apparent want of knowledge was attributed to him, "He has studied more works on geology than any man in this country; I know he has read a pile that would more than reach from the floor to the ceiling of this room." To what purpose all this reading and study have been, let one example show. Geologists hold that the materials of which the stratified rocks are composed were derived from the disintegration of previously existing rocks. On this doctrine, this author remarks:

"The strata of the earth are held by geologists to be, on an average, about ten miles in depth. To maintain, therefore, that their materials were derived from continents and mountains of granite, and were borne from them by torrents and rivers to the ocean, is to imply that these granite continents and mountains, even if they covered as large an area as the strata now occupy, were at least ten miles above the level of the ocean; and if the mountains from which it is represented the matter of the strata was chiefly drawn, were of but half or two-thirds the extent of the strata that are supposed to have been formed from them, then they must have been elevated at least fourteen or fifteen miles above the level of the ocean. But mountains elevated to such an enormous height, and extending over vast areas, could never have been disintegrated by the action of the air, water, and heat. There would have been no air, except of the most attenuated kind, and no water at all, probably, at such an elevation. On the supposition that vapors could have ascended to such a height, and fallen in the form of snow, they would for ever have remained congealed. No heat could have been developed there sufficient to dissolve them. No rivers, therefore, could have flown from them, and consequently no

detritus could have been borne from them to the sea, to be distributed over its bottom, and form layers like our present strata."—Lord's *Geognosy*, pp. 21, 22.

Now, in the first place, no geologist holds that "the strata of the earth are, *on an average*, about ten miles in depth." They do hold it as an indisputable truth, that the combined thickness of overlapping strata, which have certainly been formed successively, is ten miles or more; but not that all the strata making up this thickness occur in any one place, much less in every place. It is clear, from a consideration of the manner in which the strata were formed—by deposition from water—that they could not have been formed simultaneously over every part of the earth; and further, many strata and parts of strata have been removed by denudation. In the next place, these continents ten miles high, and these mountains fourteen or fifteen miles high, where there could be no air and no water, are required by no geological theory, but exist only in the imagination of the anti-geologist. Daily observation teaches us that the surface of the earth does not stand at a fixed level, but, on the contrary, that it is sinking here and rising there. And the absurd hypothesis of the geologist is, that changes like those in progress now have always been going on; and that as at present, so during the past, detrital matter has been conveyed from such parts of the earth as have been for the time elevated, to such as for the time have been depressed. Thus does this anti-geologist, after all his study, show how ignorant he is of the most familiar principles and facts of the science he would overturn.

Such misconceptions of geological reasoning are not confined to this writer. Illustrations might be multiplied indefinitely; but we will content ourselves with only one more. Many efforts have been made to estimate approximately the length of time necessary for the excavation of the gorge below the falls of Niagara, and for the formation of the

delta of the Mississippi, two of the most recent events in geological history. Lyell, after pointing out the great difficulties in the way of reaching any trustworthy result, conjectures that perhaps thirty-five thousand years may have been required for the former, and one hundred thousand or more for the latter. Now, anti-geologists have spent much labor in repeating the statements of geologists, that the data on which these calculations are based are not perfectly determined or determinable; and not unfrequently they point out additional grounds of doubt, which are somewhat amusing. They have intimated, for example, that the transporting power of the Mississippi is usually greatly underrated, inasmuch as the water near the rough, uneven bottom of the channel, flows more rapidly than that near the surface. It is to no purpose to refer to the principle in hydraulics, that the velocity varies inversely as the friction, and therefore that the velocity must be greatest near the surface; for, in this discussion, the opinions of illiterate boatmen, who have no means whatever of testing the accuracy of their impressions, are always preferred to the most careful measurements of engineers and men of science, and even to a well-established law in physics. When, by these means, it has been shown that such calculations, confessedly only conjectural, can not determine the exact number of years required by a given series of events, it is maintained that the worthlessness of all geological reasoning concerning time has been demonstrated. It is forgotten or unknown that the geological argument is cumulative; and that it might be admitted that, instead of one hundred thousand, or thirty-five thousand years, only one thousand or less may have been occupied with these events; and yet that the proof remains irresistible that the time required for these, together with other events necessarily anterior to them, was ten thousand years or more.

It is some times assumed that if men of acknowledged ability, and of well-trained reasoning powers, fall into such

palpable errors, after much study of the subject, the fault must be in the subject; it can not possess the scientific character claimed for it. There might be some weight in this objection, if it were true that *classes* of educated men, after due examination, fail to comprehend the principles of geology, and to acknowledge the validity of the evidence by which they are sustained; but this has not been asserted of any class except that of ministers; and we think we have shown that it is not true of it. We hope we have effectually freed the class to which we belong from this aspersion upon its intelligence and its ability to reason. That there are individuals of this and other classes who reject the teachings of geology—individuals, too, of the highest attainments, and whose judgment we value most highly in other directions—is admitted. We do not profess to explain these cases, except so far as they can be fairly referred to the influence of a predetermination to reach a certain conclusion, whatever facts may oppose; and we do not feel called upon to explain them, any more than to say why it is that many intelligent, honest, and learned men, who have spent their lives in studying church government, prefer prelacy or independency to presbytery; or why even honest and learned men, of confessedly high logical powers, prefer popery to protestantism. The difficulty is certainly not in the science; for the labors of modern geologists have so simplified it, and have placed the evidence of its leading principles in so clear a light, that in order to acquire a knowledge of it, no very great amount of study is needed. It has not yet reached that degree of simplicity that its principles, and the evidence on which they rest, can be fully presented in an evening lecture, any more than a course of Christian theology, and the evidences on which it rests, can be similarly compressed. But it has reached such order and simplicity that it is with propriety included among the subjects of study in all our higher seminaries of learn-

ing. That, unlike all other sciences, it will ever be able to force conviction upon the unwilling mind, can hardly be expected. This has been done, and can be done, by no system of truth, not even by Christianity itself.

ARTICLE IV.

RELIGION AND POLITICS.

That religion and politics should be separated, the one wholly divorced from the other, is a popular fallacy so assiduously cultivated by a certain interested party, and so widely disseminated, that it may be justly termed one of Lord Bacon's "idols;" that is, an erroneous impression universally received as a self-evident proposition, without investigation or contradiction. Of the many popular fallacies that are generally afloat in society, there is perhaps none that is deeper rooted or more damaging in its effects than the one just stated. How it originated, and became so deeply implanted in the popular mind, it may be rather difficult to explain. It is, however, a modern notion. The records of the past do not recognize that absolute divorcement between religion and politics required by the fallacy in question; not certainly in Adam's immediate family, until the wicked Cain drew off and set up for himself; not in the family of Noah; not in that of Abraham, or his descendants; or even amongst the ancient pagans. Priests and kings were at first identical. The father was both priest and king of his family. The Roman Emperor was at the same time the Pontifex Maximus. The fact is,

the separation of religion and politics, as a cardinal maxim in the foundation and superstructure of civil society, is of recent growth, the birth of modern infidelity.

Here, perhaps, we shall be met with the objection, at first blush potent and irrefragable, that Christ and his apostles taught that "His kingdom is not of this world." True; but at the same time they taught, with equal explicitness, that the "kingdoms of this world should become the kingdoms of the Lord." Christ's kingdom is not of this world, because the world has apostatized and become anti-Christ. And the design of His kingdom is to bring it back to its lawful and divine allegiance. Nothing is more clearly and repeatedly announced by Christ and his apostles, than that Christ's kingdom is *aggressive*, and will be satisfied with nothing less than the conquest and subjugation of the whole world. The clear and manifest idea, therefore, contained in the declaration that "Christ's kingdom is not of this world," is, not that Christianity takes no interest in, and exerts no influence over the civil and political well-being of its followers and professors, but that the principles that govern Christ's kingdom are not to be confounded with, nor conformed to the principles that govern a wicked and apostatized world. The notion, therefore, that religion and politics should have nothing to do with one another, is of recent date; the birth, doubtless, of that monstrous triumph of infidelity and atheism developed in the French revolution, when priests and high church dignitaries were forced to renounce Christianity, in order to save their lives.

Again, this injurious error has been artfully and insidiously instilled into the popular mind, under the odious names of "priest-craft," of "jesuitism," of the "union of Church and State," etc.; names and epithets which, in this country at least, carry with them the ideas of hypocrisy, ambition, avarice, and spiritual despotism. But the union of Church and State is a very different thing from the union of religion and politics, as we shall see in the sequel.

In the next place, and more especially, this error has grown in the popular mind from the fact that, owing to an inexcusable negligence, if not a criminal indifference, on the part of religious people, political power has been allowed to slip, for the most part, into the hands of wicked men. This, we are aware, is a bold assertion, and perhaps may be deemed by some imprudent and rash; and did we not know it to be true, we should not venture it. It is true, that amongst the governors, legislators, and politicians of the land, there are a few noble exceptions—men of piety, and of prayer, and of great moral worth; (what would our state and national assemblies be without such salt?) ornaments in the house of God, as well as in the councils of State. But the sad part of it is, that they are the rare exceptions, and not the rule! Who does not know (we challenge contradiction) that, taking our rulers and politicians as a body, they are not godly, but godless men?—that some are blasphemers, some are gamblers, some are drunkards, some adulterers, some sabbath-breakers, and alas! some are all these characters in one? Who would not, in these days, be laughed to scorn, who should require, as a *sine qua non* in a candidate for office, that he be a good man, a man of prayer, “trusting in the Lord with all his heart, and leaning not unto his own understanding”? Every intelligent reader knows what is here affirmed to be true. No wonder, therefore, that unreflecting people should conclude that there is no natural connexion between religion and politics, when the majority of our rulers, and the character of our legislative bodies, is a practical demonstration of the fact. And alas! no wonder that the decided *tendency* of legislation, in many parts of the land, should be to overthrow Christianity, by undermining its principles, setting at naught its precepts, degrading its ministers, and thwarting its benevolent and charitable designs.

This is evinced, in the first place, in the enactment, by our national assemblies, of such laws as set aside the

obligations and sanctity of the Sabbath day; laws which require a very large number of government officials—all connected with the post-offices and the transmission of the mails—to violate the fourth commandment of the decalogue, and therefore indirectly exclude from that important department of the public service, where more, perhaps, than in any other, the influence of an enlightened and tender conscience is needed, all who endeavor consistently and conscientiously to live up to the spirit and precepts of the Christian religion.

This anti-Christian tendency is apparent, in the next place, in the enactment, in some States, of such laws as, in open defiance of the often repeated utterances of the Bible, abolish capital punishment—a device by which the murderer is protected, to the detriment of society.

Again, the same infidel spirit is manifested in some sections of the country, and especially in some of the southwestern States, by such legislation as interferes with and perverts that holy and divine institution, established by the Creator himself, in the garden of Eden, on the morning of man's creation, MARRIAGE between man and woman, constituting them "one flesh," in indissoluble bonds. Marriage is not a human, but a divine institution, as sacred and as intimate as that existing between Christ and his Church, which is his "bride." And yet, the laws of the land, in some parts of the country, degrade it virtually into a copartnership relation, entered into from prudential and economical considerations, just as any other business relation or political alliance is formed, with separate, and often antagonistic rights; and which relation may be, like other copartnership concerns, dissolved almost at will. We do not now refer to such legislation as ignores entirely the very existence of the marriage relation, as well as the parental, amongst a large class of human beings in our midst; but to those laws known in common parlance as "Woman's laws;" laws designed, it would seem, for the express pur-

pose of encouraging vice, villainy, and imbecility, on the part of the husband, by taking away all incentives to honor and high-toned responsibility in maintaining his wife in a condition at least equal to that which she enjoyed when she became his wife, and enabling him to run his career of dissipation and recklessness, without endangering her pecuniary interests. Nay, more, it is a device by which he can, with the appearance of wealth, swindle his neighbor, and then shield himself from the consequences of such villainy behind the ægis of the "Woman's law."

Such legislation brutalizes the holy estate of wedlock, perverts its true intent, violates its nature, and blasts many of its sweetest enjoyments. In many instances, it transforms it from an Eden of bliss, as it was designed by the beneficent Creator, to a bed of brambles and a home of discord. Man is the natural lord and protector of the woman; so proclaimed by the laws of nature, as well as the ordinances of revealed religion. Woman, according to the laws of God, is the complement of the man, and her temporal being is merged into his. Whatever, therefore, degrades the man, of necessity degrades the woman. Whatever disparages the father's authority, as the head of the family, injures the children. Whatever tends to make a man effeminate, or a woman masculine, degrades both. This is effectually accomplished by the "Woman's laws." It takes the crown from the head of the man, and places it upon that of the woman. The woman becomes the protector, and man the protected. He eats at her table, is clothed with her bounty, rides in her carriage, and has a life interest in her estate, in consideration of his being the *overseer* of her property. She can even sue him at law, and recover damages for mismanagement or malfeasance. Is it possible to conceive of any thing more unnatural, humiliating, and degrading than such a perversion? If there be upon the face of the earth one object more contemptible and disgusting than any other, it is this reversing of the

sexes, when the husband and the father lives by the sufferance of wife. But our object at this time and place is not to depict the evil consequences of the "Woman's law," but to allude to them as an illustration of the anti-biblical legislation of certain portions of the country.

Still further, and more insidiously, this bitter antagonism against Christianity, as developed in legislation, is illustrated by disfranchising ministers of the Gospel; depriving them of some of their political rights. This is done in several of the States, by such constitutional enactments as disqualify and prohibit ministers of the Gospel from occupying posts of honor and trust in the councils and executive department of the State. The question is not whether the "ambassadors of Christ," whose proper business it is to preach the Gospel, should come down from their high vocation, and become mixed up with party politics. The impropriety of this we shall discuss fully in the sequel. But the question is simply whether ministers of the Gospel have the *right* to participate in the making and the administering of the laws of the land, provided their fellow-citizens see fit to elect them for that purpose? In some of the States this right is wrested from them, and the dangerous precedent is established of depriving by legal enactments a certain portion of the free citizens of the land of their political rights, on account of their chosen and lawful profession. We term this a *dangerous* precedent; for if a party, or a faction in power, may deprive ministers of the Gospel of their political rights, another party or faction in power may, in like manner, and with like authority, disfranchise physicians, or lawyers, or planters, or printers, or merchants, or mechanics. The principle is the same in both instances. It is plain, therefore, that reason and justice have not guided in such despotic enactments, but feeling, hatred to religion itself. Who can not see that such legislation is a deadly thrust at the very vitals of Christianity? A minister of the Gospel is made an alien; nay,

more, he is reduced to the same level, so far as his political rights are concerned, with the felon, the traitor, the convict, who has forfeited his rights by being convicted of crime! Those who stood around the cross of Christ, and wagged their heads, crying "Crucify him, crucify him," did not manifest a more vindictive and anti-Christian spirit than is manifested by such despotic legislation. To blaspheme, to break the Sabbath, to drink liquor, to gamble, to commit adultery, to lie, to swindle, does not disqualify a citizen for a seat in the legislature of the State; but to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ does! Is it possible to conceive of any thing more inconsistent with the declared principles of our republican government, unjust, tyrannical, and cruel, than such a barefaced assault upon the Christian religion, in the persons of its ministers. Is it, or ought it to be, praiseworthy to occupy posts of honor and trust in the government of the land; and does not that legislation which disqualifies a minister of the Gospel for occupying such posts, *degrade* him? And is not its natural tendency to deter high-toned young men of talents and moral worth from taking into serious consideration their duty to enter the ministry, if they are to be proscribed by the State for so doing? Has not every free-born citizen civil and political rights, and is it not his privilege, according to the principles of our national government, to participate in those State councils where those rights and immunities are protected and defended? And are not ministers of the Gospel free, and equal with others? And have they not property, and families, and rights, to be defended and protected, as well as others? Are they not liable to taxation, and amenable to the laws of the land, and shall they be excluded by law from all participation in the ordaining and regulating of those laws by which they and their families are taxed and governed? The great cardinal principle which was the corner-stone upon which the fair fabric of our once glorious government was reared, and for the maintenance of which

our fathers fought, and bled, and died, was that we should *not* be taxed and ruled without the right to participate in the taxing and ruling power. And yet ministers of the Gospel, and only they, of all the professions and avocations in life, are, in certain States, taxed and ruled, and held amenable to the laws, while, at the same time, their right to take part in the enactment and the execution of those laws is wrested from them! Is it not in the highest degree unjust, therefore, to say nothing of its inconsistency with the principles of a free government, to single them out from every other calling and pursuit in life, and place them in the same category, so far as these political rights are concerned, with felons, convicts, and slaves?

How perfectly sickening it is to listen to the silly pretexts and subterfuges by which the authors and advocates of such legislation attempt to disguise their real motives and impious designs. "Ministers of the Gospel," says one, "ought not to turn aside from their holy avocation, and become mixed up with secular politics, since they by so doing diminish their ghostly influence, and bring reproach upon their sacred calling," etc. Admit it: but because a few mis-named ministers of the Gospel are unfaithful to their sacred trust, or rather have mistaken their proper calling, is that any just reason why the whole profession should be disfranchised, proscribed, and stigmatized? If other professions, the legal, the medical, the mercantile, etc., should be held responsible for the inconsistency and misconduct of some of their members, and proscribed in like manner, we apprehend that we would have to look exclusively to the idle and loafing class who have no profession for our legislators and rulers! But why stop short with prohibiting ministers of the Gospel from engaging in politics and legislation? Why do not these zealots for the consistency and immaculateness of the clergy, pass laws prohibiting them from engaging in other secular pursuits, equally damaging to their clerical standing and ghostly influence,

such as trading, speculating, swapping horses, writing novels, etc.? If they have the right to prohibit ministers of the Gospel from participating in one kind of secular pursuits, they have in another. Why, therefore, do these self-constituted censors of the clergy restrict the prohibition to politics? Is it because politics are more contaminating than all other secular pursuits? This surely does not imply much in favor of the virtue and moral integrity of politicians. The fact is, when we take into consideration the source from which this pretended zeal for the purity of the clerical profession emanates—the moral character of the men, for the most part, by whom ministers of the Gospel are disfranchised of their political rights—the plea in question sounds precisely like “Satan reproving sin!” It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that such tyrannical legislation proceeds, not from a zeal for the honor of religion, but from hatred to Christianity, and a jealousy of its ministers.

To regulate the moral character and ecclesiastical standing of ministers of the Gospel, is a matter that belongs not to the State, but to the Church—not to legislative assemblies, but to ecclesiastical courts. If the State may look after the standing of the ministers of the Gospel, as such, they may, with the same propriety, look after their faith and their ecclesiastical polity, which is an interference with the liberty of conscience; it is the virtual union of Church and State; it is undisguised Erastianism, since the legislature has just as much power, in religious matters, to say you shall, as to say, you shall not, and to inflict *positive* as well as *negative* penalties; they have just as much right to say, you shall not preach without gown and bands, as to say, you shall not have a seat in the legislature. In this particular, therefore, the legislature sets itself up to be the head of the Church, and the expounder of Christian duty.

Another attempts to justify this legislative discrimination against the civil and political rights of ministers of the

Gospel, by the plea, that "ministers are at the same time *exempted* from the performance of certain civil and military duties, such as working on the public highways, sitting on juries, and rendering military service." True, ministers, being *public* servants, are exempted in these particulars, not as a favor to them, but because the performance of such duties would often interfere with the faithful discharge of their own proper functions as public servants, such as visiting the sick, burying the dead, comforting the distressed, and attending to the moral and spiritual wants of the people. This plea might, at first blush, possess some speciousness, if other classes and professions were not also exempted from the rendering of the same services from like considerations. The physician, the judge, the district attorney, the court clerks, and other county and state officers are all exempted. Why not, therefore, for the same reason, deprive them, as well as ministers, of a portion of their political rights, by excluding them from posts of honor and trust in the legislative and executive departments of State? If there were the slightest force in the specious plea, it would be as applicable to the one profession as the other.

But still another frankly avows, that he has no use for rude and ignorant talking parsons in legislative bodies; that such, by their priestly influence at home, bring about their own election, and then consume the time of the legislature in everlastingly talking about matters that they do not understand; therefore, he is in favor of getting rid of such annoyance by constitutional bars and restraints. This is commendable candor, to say the least of it, for which we have far more respect, than for the hypocritical pretexts and subterfuges which we have already exposed. But, whilst we respect the candor of the plea, we have infinite contempt for its logic. In the first place, what reason or justice is there in placing a ban upon a whole profession, distinguished for its talent, learning, piety, and great moral worth, simply because an unworthy member of it, once in

a while, happens to get into the legislature? Why disfranchise such men as the great Dr. John Witherspoon and Dr. James Wilson, the brightest ornaments of the Continental Congress, because now and then a "babbling parson" out-talks a babbling pettifogger, and is elected by a free people to represent them in the legislature? Nay, why not discriminate against the babbling pettifogger, as well as against the babbling parson? Why not also exclude the babbling gambler, and drunkard, and demagogue, irrespective of class or profession? A legislative body has just as much right to exclude one as the other. Why, then, discriminate only against the clerical order? It is not only unjust in fact, but it is utterly inconsistent with, nay, subversive of the cardinal principles of a free government; since it would be very easy to show that the pushing of the practice complained of would soon result in the overthrow of a republican government, and in the establishment, first of an oligarchy, and next of an iron despotism. It is clearly manifest, therefore, that all these pleas in extenuation of the disfranchisement of ministers of the Gospel, as is characteristic of the constitutions of many of the States, resolve themselves into a secret antipathy to religion itself, and a covert design to sap the foundations of Christianity, by stigmatizing and degrading its ministers.

This tendency in legislation is further manifest in some States, (Mississippi, for example,) by such enactments as blast the fruits, and thwart the benevolent designs of Christianity. If we blast the choice fruits of a tree, what use shall we have for the tree itself—"why cumbereth it the ground?" The great and distinguishing feature of Christianity is *charity*, benevolence, "good will to men." Destroy this characteristic of the Christian religion, and you rob it of its chief glory; you efface from it the lineaments of its divine author. This is actually done by the existing laws of Mississippi, (Revised Code, page 302,) where it is made contrary to law for a dying Christian to

“will, devise, or bequeath,” one dollar to any Christian charity whatsoever! The statute aforesaid is drawn up with consummate adroitness, so as to defeat the possibility of the dying Christian leaving any thing for the advancement of the Christian religion amongst men. Take, for illustration, the following as a sample of the manner in which the law in question is skilfully and elaborately framed. After guarding most carefully against the possibility of allowing any real estate being left by will for charitable purposes, the law proceeds: “Every legacy, gift, or bequest of money or personal property, or of any interest, benefit, or use therein, contained in any last will and testament, or codicil, in favor of any religious or ecclesiastical corporation, sole or aggregate, or any religious or ecclesiastical society, or to any religious denomination or association, either for its own use or benefit, or for the purpose of being given or appropriated to charitable uses, shall be null and void, and the distributees shall take the same, as though no such testamentary disposition had been made.”

Yes, an infidel may leave by will as much as his hatred to religion dictates, for the publication and circulation of the blasphemies of Tom Paine; but the benevolent Christian can not leave a dollar to publish and circulate the Bible, or a religious tract! An Atheist may leave his entire estate to establish an infidel college, to corrupt the minds of youths, and poison the fountains of all genuine morality; but one actuated by Christian benevolence dare not leave a farthing to establish schools and institutions of learning under the influence of religious societies, and the Gospel of Christ! If there be any more effectual way of destroying Christianity, and banishing it from the land, we do not know what it is.

The only plea urged in justification of this odious law is, that “men ought to give in their life-time.” True, men ought to give in their life-time, and all their life long, as God prospers them; but how often is it the case that it is

impossible to give all that they wish to give until life is ended. Here, for example, is an old man living on the interest of twenty thousand dollars. He can not give away that capital during his life-time, for that would reduce him to beggary. His great desire is, that this fund, at his death, may go to establish a professorship in a theological seminary, or to educate poor young men for the ministry, or to sustain self-sacrificing missionaries who are toiling to Christianize and civilize our frontier borders; but in the State of Mississippi this can not be done! The business of another man is such, that he can not withdraw from it the capital necessary to its successful continuance, nor can he know, it may be, what will be the residue of his estate until the business of the firm is wound up; yet, in the State of Mississippi, he dare not make any religious charity his residuary legatee! It is not necessary to discuss any further this anti-Christian enactment. It is highly unjust and discreditable, in whatever aspect it may be viewed. It is not only contrary to the spirit, but to the example, set us in the Bible. Did not David leave by will the magnificent legacy out of the proceeds of which the great temple of God was built? Were not the vast majority of all the charitable institutions of Christendom founded in the same way?

It has been shrewdly intimated, in order to reconcile protestant denominations to this insidious encroachment upon their dearest rights—the rights of conscience—that the “Religious Law” was aimed against the Roman Catholics! This is simply ridiculous, since the adherents of the Romish faith are, where the law exists, in an exceedingly small minority, in comparison with the entire population of the State; and it is perfectly certain that, from the force of circumstances, they will never increase in the State to any great extent. But this flimsy subterfuge does not help the matter in the least; it only makes it worse. It would imply that the authors of such proscriptive enactments were impelled by a low, narrow bigotry, as hostile to the princi-

ples of freedom as it is to the liberty of conscience. Is it not one of the great and distinguishing principles of our boasted government, that "the liberty of conscience" shall not be interfered with? And is it not another cardinal principle of republican liberty, that no sect of Christians shall be proscribed for their faith? Consequently, if this law was secretly aimed, as pretended, against the Catholics, then it is anti-republican and despotic. But if it was levelled against all Christians alike, which is the true state of the case, then it violates the great principle of the liberty of conscience; and not only liberty of conscience, but liberty of judgment, civil liberty itself; for has not a man a right to do as he pleases with his own honestly earned money, provided he does not interfere with the rights of his neighbor?

That which lay at the foundation of the ordaining of this odious law, the secret and impelling motive to its enactment and adoption, was the presumption, not that Christians would, of their own accord, bequeath too liberally of their goods for purposes of Christian benevolence, but that ministers of the Gospel would avail themselves of the influence which they might acquire over the minds of men *in extremis*, to induce them to *devote* an undue proportion of their estate for the benefit of the church and clergy. What is this but a covert stab at the character and moral influence of ministers of the Gospel? It is based on the presumption, either that they are not honest men, or that they are fanatics—that they are either knaves or fools! Its tendency, therefore, is to destroy confidence in the ministers of religion, than which there is not a more effectual way to dethrone Christianity in the minds of the people.

We have thus, at some length, illustrated the anti-Christian *tendency* of the legislation of different portions of our country, as a proof of the irreligious character of many of our rulers and law-makers. It is no marvel, therefore, in view of the foregoing facts and considerations, that unre-

flecting people should conclude that there was no natural connexion between religion and politics, whilst the moral character and work of so many of our politicians is a practical demonstration of the same.

Having now explained, in part, the origin of the popular fallacy that religion and politics should be divorced, the one having nothing to do with the other, we shall next proceed to show its falsity, and point out the injurious and dangerous results to which it legitimately leads.

It takes it for granted that man's true temporal interests and his eternal welfare are incongruous, or rather, that they are diametrically opposed; whereas, in truth, they are, in a certain sense, identical. "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." Politics are to religion what the body is to the soul. A sound body is essential to the facile and successful operations of a sound mind. There is an intimate relation between them. The health of the one is essential to the health of the other; and the disease of the one operates injuriously upon the other. Hence the interests of the one are, to a certain extent, the interests of the other. The same is true in relation to religion and politics. The one is, as it were, the soul, the other the body. Religion is the spiritual, and society the physical part of the State. So that there would be as much propriety in putting asunder the interests of the soul and body of an individual, as religion and politics in a State. The supposition that man's temporal and eternal interests are antagonistic, takes it for granted that man's nature is not in harmony with itself; that his constitution combines rival interests and adverse claims; that what is for the advantage of the body, that is, his personal welfare in his business and social relations, is to the disadvantage of the soul; and that man, as a whole, is composed of discordant, jarring elements; than which nothing can be farther from the truth, or more de-

rogatory to the goodness and wisdom of the Creator. On the contrary, God, in His beneficence, has so constituted man, and so circumstanced him in this world, that all his true interests, both temporal and eternal, run parallel one with the other; or rather flow in the same channel. There is not one interest pertaining exclusively to time, and another exclusively to eternity; but they are, if not identical, yet inseparable. "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things," (viz., true temporal interests,) "shall be added unto you." Time is no other than the beginning of eternity, as childhood is the beginning of life. As, therefore, we can not separate the true interests of childhood from those of mature life, no more can we separate the interests of this life from that which is to come. Eternity is time drawn out. If these views be correct, then it will be impossible to divorce religion and politics, except on the supposition that the latter (so called) do not contribute to the true interests of humanity. If by politics we are to understand that system of arts and devices—that chicanery and machination by which usurpers overthrow the liberties of the people—by which despots maintain their iron grasp upon the necks of their victims—by which tyrants absorb the blood and substance of their slaves—by which a corrupt party keeps in power, and fattens upon the government spoils—by which a faction swells its numbers and increases its power—and by which an ambitious and unprincipled demagogue blinds the people, seduces them from their own true interests, and inspires them with *furor* in favor of a party, irrespective of patriotic principles—if *this* be what is meant by politics, then, of course, true religion can have no fellowship whatever with it, any more than "righteousness with unrighteousness," or than "light with darkness," or than "Christ with Belial." But whilst we are constrained to admit that this is a fair description of what the world calls politics, yet it is a misnomer in fact, and deserves not so honorable an

appellation. The science of politics, properly so called, defines the theory and practice of legally controlling the business pursuits and social relations of society, so as to develop humanity as God made it; and consequently to produce the greatest amount of general well-being. When, therefore, we take into consideration the true nature of man as a physical, moral, intellectual, and religious being, it would be difficult to separate true religion and true politics, since the domain of each trenches upon the other; nay, they are, in a certain sense, almost identical, except that religion is more comprehensive than politics, the greater including the less. The moral law is the foundation of religion; the second table of the moral law, the foundation of politics. Politics are concerned about human relations; religion, about both divine and human. Politics look after the body; religion, after both soul and body. Politics inculcate love to our neighbor; religion, love to God and our neighbor. The grand design of politics is to develop the good and suppress the bad in humanity, to the advantage of the State. Religion does the same thing, to the advantage of the individual, the component element of the State. Strictly speaking, the State is but the individual multiplied. Or more properly, the State is the family enlarged. So that whatever is for the true interest of the individual or the family, becomes, *mutatis mutandis*, the true interest of the State. It follows, therefore, that if religion and business may be united in the individual, and religion and domestic government in the family, so, on the same principles, religion and politics should be united in the government of the State. The popular fallacy, therefore, which would dis sever religion from politics, would, on the same principles, divorce it from every pursuit, calling, and relation in life, except what is called "divine worship" in the sanctuary. This is wholly contrary to the teachings of the Bible, which clearly set forth the idea that religion is to be mixed up with all that we do, say, think,

and feel; "in that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD." So that whatever we do, "whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we are to do all to the glory of God." Nay, more, the Bible teaches that the principles of the world are to be changed and conformed to the principles of religion; and that the kingdoms of the world are to become the kingdoms of Christ; when kings and queens shall be "nursing fathers and nursing mothers" to the Church. This, surely, does not look as though politics were to be divorced from religion. It is the confident expectation of Christians, that the principles of Christianity, hitherto triumphant, will finally prevail over the whole world, and embrace the entire family of man. This glorious vision of the future is called, in homiletic language, the "*millenium*." Then, of course, there can be no separation between religion and politics. And if not *then*, there should not be *now*, since the principles that will characterize and predominate in the millennial state, are the very same that are at work now in bringing it about. It is a great mistake to suppose that one kind of principles will work in bringing about the millenium, and another kind will predominate during the millenium. This would be to imagine that like effects were not produced by like causes! Consequently, if religion and politics will be necessarily and legitimately united during the millennial state, they are, and must of necessity be, united in bringing it about.

The popular dogma that takes it for granted that religion and politics should be divorced, is owing in part to the mistaken supposition that there is an intrinsic incongruity between the two; that both are necessary; that both are right; and that both are opposed to one another; which is absurd. Two truths can not be opposed the one to the other; no more can two things that are intrinsically right. Wherever there is antagonism, there is error on one side or the other, or both. The reason why religion and exist-

ing politics are incongruous, is that politics are wrong, based upon unholy principles, and promulgated by unholy men. Hence, this being true, it would be exceedingly unbecoming for good men, and especially the professed "ambassadors of Christ," to "come down" and conform themselves to, and become mixed up with wicked, worldly politics. Nothing so much disparages the usefulness, and tarnishes the honor of a minister, or a professor of religion. So that if the question were whether ministers of the Gospel should participate in party politics, in the popular acceptation of that term, and turn the pulpit into a rostrum, and the house of God into an arena for the discussion of subjects purely political; or even whether private Christians should be mixed up with the clamorous zeal amongst the followers of partisan demagogues; (alas! as too many are;) then there could be no dispute on the subject; since there is not a more contemptible—perhaps it would be more appropriate to say *lamentable*—spectacle in the world, than to see a so-called minister of the Gospel, a professed "ambassador of the Lord Jesus Christ," "come down" from his "great work," don the garb of the politician, and participate in the rough-and-tumble conflict of contaminating party politics! Nay, is it not a just cause of grief to the true child of God, or even to one penetrated with a just sense of decency and good taste, to witness the ambassador of the court of heaven, clothed with a delegated character none other than that of the Lord Jesus Christ, participate with fervor in wordly affairs of any kind, whether civil or military? Would we not be horrified, nay, would not the very conception itself be blasphemous, to imagine the Lord Jesus Christ on earth, girt with sword, and sporting a military cap and feathers? Or even the pugnacious Peter, after he was imbued with the spirit and graces of an apostle, at the head of a band of soldiers, gallantly leading them to mortal conflict? How low the character of Saint Paul would instantly sink in the estimation of the world, could

we conceive of him in the Agora of Athens, making a furious speech on the subject of party politics! If, therefore, the question were whether ministers of the Gospel, and the meek and humble followers of Christ, should condescend from their exalted station, the highest and most revered in the world, and turn aside from their sacred calling to become followers of demagogues and participants in the devious ways and infamous practices of party politics, it would be idle, nay, ridiculous, to discuss it. And yet, with sadness unfeigned, and deep mortification, we are constrained to confess that there are not a few so-called ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ who have brought dishonor upon themselves and shame upon their profession, by bounding into the arena of secular politics, and engaging fiercely in party strife; whilst multitudes of the professed followers of Him "who strove not, neither was His voice heard in the streets," encouraged, if not emboldened, by the clerical examples, glory in being hangers-on of corrupt and unprincipled demagogues, coming at their beck and call, and bowing submissively to their every command! Let every such hybrid minister of the Gospel, every reverend, and honorable and reverend, and gallant "ambassador of Christ," be assured that they gain nothing worth having by their double and abnormal character. They lose the confidence of the good, and the respect of the bad. The wicked rabble, delighted more by their degradation than pleased with their partisanship, will huzza to their faces, and curse behind their backs! So that a minister of the Gospel, participating with zeal in secular and worldly affairs, scarcely ever fails to sink below the common level of the secular class with which he identifies himself. We earnestly hope that the time is not far distant, when provision will be made, in our branch of the Church, at least, for the voluntary or forcible demission of the holy office of the ministry, by all who give unmistakable evidence that they have mistaken their calling.

It is with sincere sorrow that we have felt constrained to make the foregoing remarks. We have not been insensible to a painful struggle going on in our own bosom between personal friendship on the one part, and a sense of duty on the other—tenderness for the feelings of some of our ministerial brethren, who have allowed themselves to be drawn into the great whirlpool of purely worldly affairs, and an uncompromising allegiance to Him whose “kingdom is not of this world.” But, however sorely tempted, we dare not expunge what has been written, in order to save the feelings of some of our excellent, but misguided brethren. “He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me.”

But whilst we inveigh most zealously and emphatically against ministers of the Gospel condescending to participate in party politics, and can not but regard the “ambassadors of Christ” as decidedly out of place, (except in some very rare instances,) seated in a legislative hall, or occupying a position other than that of chaplain in the army or navy, yet we are equally earnest in opposing the popular and injurious fallacy that would divorce religion from politics. It seems never to have come into the mind of the advocates of the false theory which we are combating, that Christianity is essentially aggressive in its nature—that its tendency is to impregnate all that belongs to humanity with its own principles—all worship, all science, all art, all legislation, all commerce, all business, all amusements, all pleasure, so that whatever we do, we shall do all for the glory of God: that it can make no compromise with the world; that it rejects with scorn a niche in the pantheon; that its avowed aim is to overthrow every institution of degenerate man that is not in harmony with itself; that its sceptre is destined to rule over all other sceptres, and its kingdom to swallow up all other kingdoms! Consequently Christianity, according to the teach-

ing of its founders, and the faith and hope of all its true disciples, is, in due time, to become the law of the whole world! Then, of course, there can be no disseverance between religion and politics.

But it is of the utmost importance to have correct views as to *how* Christianity is to achieve this glorious triumph, and as to the *manner* in which the Church and people of God are to exercise a controlling influence over politics, as over all other human pursuits and relations. It is not by being conformed to the world as it is, but by transforming the world to Christ; not by a union of Church and State in formal bands, any more than by a union of church and commerce, the church and manufactures, or church and law, or medicine, or any other calling or pursuit in life, but by transfusing the principles and spirit of the Gospel into politics, governing, law-making, and every other lawful employment of mankind. This accords with the explicit teachings of the Scriptures in delineating the NATURE and DESIGN of the organized Church of God, and the true MISSION of Christians in the world.

As to the *nature* of the Church, it is wholly and exclusively a divine institution. It is to represent, not the world, but God; it is to reflect, not the sentiments of earth, but of heaven; it is to be the exponent, not of unsanctified public opinion, but of the Bible; it is to derive its authority, not from human government, or the laws of man, but from the revealed laws of God. Consequently, the Church of God can, in no possible sense or degree, be a world-representative institution. It is intended by its Founder to be wholly separate and distinct from the world. The Church is the "Lamb's wife;" and as man and wife are declared by divine law to be one, as Christ and His Church are one, therefore it is impossible for the Church, as the pure and faithful bride of Christ, in any sense to represent the world. Christ is the "head;" the Church is the "body," and as the head and

its several members are one body, so Christ and His Church are one, and separated from the rudiments of the world; as the vine and its branches are in unity, so Christ and His disciples are indissoluble.

And what is true of the Church collectively, is equally and necessarily true of the Church in its constituent elements. Its duly qualified ministers and members are required to present themselves a "living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is their reasonable service," and not to be "conformed to this world, but to be transformed by the renewing of their mind, that they may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." The ministers and members of the Church can not, as such, be representative men, except as they represent God. Every true minister of the Church is an "ambassador of God," which is the most exalted office under heaven, because he represents not man, but God—not the governments of earth, but the court of heaven. And each and every member of the Church, however humble and obscure, represents God. Consequently, as the world lies in wickedness there can be no consistent fellowship between the Church and the world: "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world; therefore the world hateth you." It is clearly manifest, therefore, from these and like utterances of God's word, that it is impossible for the faithful and fearless "ambassador of God," and the consistent and persevering member of Christ's Church, to do their whole duty without coming in collision with and increasing the enmity of the world; "yea and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."

We conclude, then, that the Church, whilst it may be encumbered with many errors and defects, which weaken its power and detract from its glory, yet in its essential

nature, it is wholly separate and distinct from the world; and that, consequently, for the Church to succumb to the world, to conform to its principles, or reflect in any degree its character, is not only without warrant from the word of God, but a perversion of its own intrinsic and essential nature.

In the next place, as to the DESIGN of setting up an organized Church, whilst it becomes incidentally a *fold* into which the people of God may be gathered for their individual instruction, comfort, and safety, yet it is mainly intended to be an *aggressive agency*. It is set up in the world to teach the world, to reform the world, and to bring the world back to its allegiance to God. It is to lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes, until the whole world shall be embraced within its pale. It is to be a city set on a hill, that can not be hid; a light upon a candlestick that giveth light to all that are in the house. True religion, vital godliness, is not designed to be locked up in the bosom, like a jewel in a casket, for the secret and isolated enjoyment of the individual; but it is to be a pungent, active, and self-diffusing principle, a "light," a "salt," a "leaven," a "grain of mustard seed," multiplying, increasing, diffusing itself until the whole world is evangelized.

It is evident, therefore, from the Scriptures, that the Church is aggressive in its design, and that the true mission of the people of God, both in their organized and individual capacity, is to enlighten the world, mould public sentiment in accordance with the word of God, and thus win the world to Christ.

As to the lawful instrumentalities of the Church in making the spiritual conquest of the world, we state in the outset that, "though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of

strong-holds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." The aggressive agencies of the Church are such as make conquest of the "thoughts," the "imaginations," the minds and souls of men, and not of their bodies.

The Bible in its various utterances proclaims the final triumph of the Gospel, and reason and providence corroborate the same; but, it is all important to guard against error as to *how* this glorious result is to be effected. We must not, in order to evade responsibility, and excuse ourselves for doing little or nothing, lean upon any other agency, or trust to any other instrumentality, than that pointed out in the Bible. We must not sit still and imagine that the world is to be converted by *miracle*, or by what may be termed marvellous and extraordinary providences. This is not only *error*, but pestiferous error; since it cripples the very means designed by God to accomplish this end, the active instrumentality of Christians. There is no doctrine more clearly taught in the word of God than that the Gospel is to be spread, and the world evangelized, by the instrumentality of Christians. Vain is the hope, and groundless the delusion of such as imagine that the world can be reclaimed to God by any or all the so-called civilizing agencies that have been and are influential in developing and cultivating mankind. Such may prove valuable helps, efficient handmaids of the Gospel, but are powerless in regenerating the *hearts* of sinful men, and bringing them into subjection to Christ. Nay, it is absurd to look to worldly institutions to remove sin, and to reform the moral evils that afflict fallen humanity. Worldly institutions, however much they may contribute to alleviate the mere physical ills that flesh is heir to, yet are unable to regenerate the world, and to bring it back to God. They, of

necessity, represent the world as it is, reflect the sentiment of the world, and are "of the earth, earthy;" consequently, as the stream can not rise higher than the fountain, nor a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit, the institutions of the world, even the wisest and the best, can not do more than represent the world; they are *sample* institutions; they reflect the world with all its evils. We have no warrant, therefore, either in Scripture, or reason, or the history of the past, for expecting the world to regenerate itself. Nor is this great consummation to be expected by miracle, in the strict sense of that word, except as God's glorious providence, and the operations of His Holy Spirit, in answer to the prayers and efforts of Christians, are a standing and a constant miracle; a miracle that is effective in encouraging and stimulating, instead of retarding Christian activity. In all the teaching, both of the Saviour and His apostles, the idea is prominently set forth that the kingdom of God is to be built up in the world by the people of God. They are commanded to "preach the Gospel to every creature." "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another." "For we are laborers together with God."

Since, therefore, it is TRUTH, and the MORAL INFLUENCE of Christians, (that is, the power they exert when acting in accordance with truth,) that is blessed by God to the conversion of sinners, and the reformation of the evils that are in the world, it follows that every one is not only bound, but encouraged to speak the TRUTH, and set the EXAMPLE in accordance with it, which God has promised to make efficacious in the advancement of His kingdom. Moral power is the most potent of all powers; it is a power not brutal, not physical, not natural, not intellectual merely, but it is a power whose ingredients are *faith* and *virtue*. It is truth, or that which is supposed to be truth, that constitutes the essence of moral power; and

when presented to the comprehension of others, is just as efficacious in the hands of one as another. This being true, it follows that every individual in the possession of truth, it matters not what his rank or station in life may be, possesses the essence of moral power; and consequently, must be held responsible for the use he makes of it; power goes with the truth. Here, then, is encouragement for the humblest Christian to speak the truth. Our vocation is that of *truth-telling*. The diffusion of truth is all that God requires of us towards advancing His kingdom in the world. If we will sow the seed, He will take care of it. "His word shall not return unto Him void."

Therefore we conclude, as the great province of the organized Church of God, and the great mission of its constituent membership, is to speak the truth—preach the Gospel, proclaim the law of God, "whether men will hear or whether they will forbear"—accompanied by a consistent walk and conversation; that this is the chief, if not the only instrumentality that the Spirit of God uses in the conversion of sinners and evangelizing the world.

It legitimately follows from what has been said, *first*, that the Church and people of God are responsible for the removal of the moral evils that are in the world, and for the final triumph of the Gospel; *second*, that this is to be effected, not by falling into the ways of the world, grasping the reins of government, and seizing the civil sceptre, but simply by proclaiming the truth—teaching kings and governors, rulers and the ruled, their duty—and, as the ambassadors of God, to speak with the authority of God; *third*, that they are not, from a carnal or timid policy, to *wail* until the popular sentiment becomes right in relation to the evils that are abroad, before they attempt to set it right. This would be to expect an end without the use of the appointed and appropriate means; to look for an effect, without the natural cause. No; the very design of the organized Church, as we have seen, is to teach the world, to

enlighten the world, and to mould public sentiment in accordance with the laws of God, and thus win the world to Christ. "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?" And *fourth*, this is to be effected in all popular governments, not by petitioning legislative bodies or executive departments, and thereby forcing legislation in advance of popular sentiment. This results in no good, but much evil, since, in popular governments like our own, legislative enactments, unless they reflect the sentiment of the people, are of no permanent force. Moreover, and more especially, for the organized Church of God, and the ambassadors of Christ, in their official capacity, to send up humble petitions to kings and governors, and legislative bodies, is inappropriate and degrading. God would not *petition* a king or a law-maker to do right; no more should His ambassadors. Jesus Christ did not humbly *request* the rulers of the earth to refrain from doing wrong; no more can His "bride," which is the Church. It is not the part or province of the ambassadors of God, or the Church of Christ in its organized capacity, to knock at the door of legislative bodies, and hand in their petitions, begging them to enact laws in accordance with the word of God, and to rescind such as are contrary to it. They might command despots, as the ancient prophets did, in the name of the Lord God; but, in popular governments, their whole and sole duty is with the *people*, who alone are the responsible sovereigns and law-makers—it is to tell them the truth, teach them, and thereby mould public sentiment, which is law, in accordance with the revealed word of God. Then legislation, and all other things pertaining to social relations, will come right of themselves, as a natural consequence. This moulding of public sentiment in accordance with righteousness, is the legitimate province of the Church and people of God; and is accomplished simply by TELLING THE TRUTH, the whole truth, plainly, fearlessly, boldly, kindly, earnestly, perseveringly; giving line upon line, and

precept upon precept, here a little and there a little; unflinchingly, unceasingly, until the strong-holds of error are undermined, and the bulwarks of wickedness are overthrown. Every one that has the truth is armed with moral power, and is bound to wield it. Every man is responsible for the trust committed to him, and there can be no possible justification, or even excuse, for his abusing this trust, burying his talent. The day of reckoning will surely come, when every one to whom has been committed the truth must give an account of his stewardship.

The conclusion, therefore, is irresistible, that the grand design of setting up an organized Church in the world, and the great mission of the Christian, is, by the zealous and active diffusion of light and knowledge, and moral and evangelical influences, to reform the world, and to bring it into complete subjection to Christ, until "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of the Lord." Consequently it is not only the privilege, but it is the duty of the Christian, whatever may be his standing, to endeavor, by all lawful means, to impregnate every profession, calling, and pursuit in life, with the principles of religion.

Few, perhaps, will deny the right and the obligations of the Christian to transfuse the principles of the Gospel into commerce, trade, and the business pursuits of life. They will grant that he may endeavor to Christianize literature, science, and art, because of the influence which they exert upon the minds and morals of men. Much more is it his duty to endeavor, with all his might, to evangelize politics, since there is nothing in the whole range of human pursuits that exerts half so powerful an influence upon popular sentiment. So tremendous is this influence, that the terms *unlawful* and *immoral* have become, in the minds of unreflecting people, synonymous! To pronounce an act contrary to law, is regarded by many as the same thing as pronouncing it morally wrong. Consequently, in the minds of multitudes, the standard of moral right and wrong is

not the table of the ten commandments, or the precepts of the Gospel, but the civil code. Is not this ascendancy of politics over the Gospel, in its influence upon the moral sentiments of men, a most startling consideration, well calculated to excite the fears, and arouse the listless energies of all Christians who will but seriously reflect on the danger? In our opinion, there is nothing, not even the solemn worship of the sanctuary, so potent in moulding the tastes, opinions, and characters of men, as politics; from the fact, in the first place, that but few wait on the sanctuary, in comparison with the multitudes that crowd the hustings; in the next place, the faithful dispensations of an evangelical pulpit are adverse to the natural taste of unregenerate men, whilst those of the stump and the forum are in harmony with it. In addition to this, governors, legislators, and such as are elected to posts of power and trust in the State, whatever may be their moral character, are, for the most part, men of energy and talent, combining in one both moral and political power: so that, even should they fail to convince the understanding, they can compel the action, even in matters the most adverse to Christian duty, (as illustrated in the case of the Mississippi religious law, already discussed in this article,) until obedience becomes the established custom. And the whole history of the race, in every age and clime, testifies to the fact, that *custom* soon becomes the test of right and wrong in the estimation of the populace. Indeed, there is no wickedness so vile that custom, sustained by legislative and political power, will not justify in the minds of the ignorant. Tremendous, therefore, is the moral influence of political power, because it can establish *custom*; and custom becomes the popular standard of moral conduct. Moreover, and especially, political power, in popular governments, is intensified by the fact that it is *delegated*; it emanates from the people, and therefore its reflex influence, in a moral point of view, is much greater than that which flows from a monarchy or a

despotism. Hence there is no influence on earth so potent in moulding the minds and characters of men for good or evil, as that emanating from political sources. Christianity has no greater enemy, or more efficient friend, than may be found in politics and legislation. In nothing is the antagonism between the Christian religion and the world more manifest; whilst, at the same time, there is nothing that exerts so fearful an influence upon human opinions and practice. This being true, it would be a monstrous conclusion to suppose that religion should not endeavor to transform into congeniality with itself that which may become, and of necessity must become, either its greatest friend or its most terrible enemy. Nay, Christianity, as a radiant light, as a pungent "salt," as a diffused "leaven," is, as we have seen, necessarily aggressive in its nature; its tendency is to impregnate all that belongs to humanity with its spirit and principles; consequently it is not left to the mere discretion of the Church and the people of God, whether they will endeavor to christianize politics or not; they are bound to the utmost extent of their ability, to cast the "leaven" into that fermenting mass, so as to impart to it its own properties, and transform it into an engine for the advancement of Christ's kingdom.

Since, therefore, politics, in legislation and government, is an engine of such fearful power, in its moral influence over the minds of men, it is of transcendent importance that they be thoroughly imbued with the principles and spirit of Christianity. But by *whom* is it to be done? Who is responsible for this great transformation? Surely we can not expect godless and wicked men to transfuse into politics the principles of the Gospel. This is a moral absurdity. It would be to expect a bitter fountain to send forth sweet waters; a corrupt tree to bring forth good fruit. The inference is plain, that this is to be done by religious people; they are bound to look with a jealous interest after politics and government, and

to use all their efforts to bring this mighty agency for good or evil into complete subjection to the Gospel.

Let it be granted, therefore, that it is not only the privilege, but the *right*; not only the right, but the bounden *duty*; of the Church and people of God, to do all that in them lies to exercise a controlling influence over the politics of the world.. It is their privilege, because the fact of being a Christian does in no possible manner or degree disqualify them for taking an active part in civil government. It is their *right*, because they, as free citizens, are a constituent part of the body politic, possessing the same interests and immunities in society with others. It is their *duty*, because they are divinely commissioned to evangelize the world, and therefore to bring all the agencies by which the opinions and characters of men are formed under the influence of Christianity. It only remains for us, in the further discussion of this subject, to investigate the manner in which Christians, in their organized and individual capacity, are to infuse into legislation and politics the holy principles and benign spirit of the Christian religion.

In the first place, it is very clear, from what has been said relative to the true nature and design of the organized Church, that, as such, it has no right or authority to administer civil government, or to participate in any respect whatever in purely secular affairs: that it is a depository of divine truth, from which religion and moral instruction only are to be dispensed: that the Church, as the peerless bride of Christ, is not allowed to petition kings and governors, and legislative bodies, to do right, and to refrain from doing wrong. This would be inappropriate and degrading. She may command, but not beg, in the name of the Lord God. The Church may not, in its organized capacity, engage in or even recommend, by way of deliverance, any worldly pursuit, calling, or enterprise whatever; not even the most philanthropic and civilizing, such as colonization, scientific discovery, asylums, nor even the

education of youth, except as one of the means of dispensing religious knowledge. All these enterprises are noble and praiseworthy, and may be engaged in by Christians, as the legitimate fruits of the benign and humanizing effects of Christianity upon their hearts; but they do not come properly within the province of the organized Church of God. But it is the prerogative and the duty of the Church, in its collective capacity, as the great depository of divine truth, and the great fortress of moral and religious influences, to *testify* in favor of virtue and against vice, and to make deliverances touching moral and religious truth and practice. When, therefore, the State trenches upon Christian morals, and politics invade the rightful domain of the Church, then it is not only the privilege, but the *duty* of the Church to lift up her voice on high, and in the name and by the authority of God, to proclaim the divine law on the subject. This will embrace a much wider field than many, without reflection, would imagine. It not only embraces the moral law, as contained in the decalogue, but the whole scope of Christian ethics, as promulgated in the New Testament. It includes the moral obligations growing out of the various relations of society; such as ruler and subject, husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant, friend and neighbor, pastor and people. In fact, the moral domain of the Church, in which it is altogether proper and right for her to make deliverances, includes a very large portion of the field embraced (whether rightfully or not we shall not now debate) by politics, so that it is both the right and the duty of the Church to watch with a jealous eye the encroachments of the State, and in her organized capacity to *testify* against all iniquitous legislation. Farther than this, she can not go; with less than this, she dare not rest satisfied. The Church of God, in its simplicity and purity, is, in a moral point of view, the highest and most authoritative institution in the world, and to it the

world must look for wisdom and guidance on all moral and religious subjects.

In the next place, ministers of the Gospel, as the ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ, are bound, equally with the organized Church, to dispense divine truth, and testify against sin and iniquity in every form and shape; with this difference, that the Church, from the necessity of the case, testifies at long intervals of time; and possibly one deliverance on any one subject, on the part of the Church collectively, is sufficient, as its utterance is intended to be a guide and authority, not only for the people, but mainly for the ministers; whilst the ambassadors of Christ, in imitation of the apostles and prophets of old, are bound to cry aloud and spare not, give line upon line, and precept upon precept, here a little and there a little, without intermission or cessation. As "watchmen upon the walls of Zion," they are bound to give the alarm, whenever they detect the approach of danger, and to repeat the alarm as long as the danger exists. It is the inexorable duty of the ambassador of Christ, faithfully and fearlessly to oppose iniquity in every disguise it may put on. Vicious politics, unrighteous legislation, come just as much within the purview of a minister's animadversion as vice any where else. Iniquity in "high places" must not be winked at, any more than iniquity in low places. It was the peculiar prerogative of the prophets of old to denounce judgments upon kings. In like manner, it is the inflexible duty of the ambassadors of Christ to tell the rulers of the earth their duty. When, therefore, politicians insidiously instill infidelity into legislation, and when they impinge upon the domain of Christian morals, or dare to interfere with the right of conscience, it is not only the privilege, but the duty of ministers of the Gospel, as faithful and fearless "watchmen unto the house of Israel," to expose the danger and to denounce the iniquity.

How sadly do ministers mistake, or rather consciously shrink from the discharge of their duty on these and kindred subjects! The fear of coming in collision with what he supposes (and often erroneously) to be public sentiment, and dread of incurring the enmity of some individual or family of standing in society, on whom, it may be, he is in part dependent for his bread, cause him, the ambassador of God, to cower before the face of a man. Alas! what a monstrous spectacle! What a hideous perversion, when those who claim to be clothed with the delegated authority of "the Son of God," bow to a vitiated public sentiment, or quail in the presence of a sinful mortal! What! is the profession of the holy ministry nothing but a bread-making calling, as we fear many regard it? and are preachers of the Gospel to regard themselves as representative men, reflecting public opinion, instead of opposing it, controlling it, moulding it, in accordance with the principles of Christianity? Let all such—and sad to tell, their number is multitudinous—reëxamine, in the light of the teaching of the Saviour and the practice of the apostles, their claims to be the ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ. Moral courage should be made an indispensable qualification in a candidate for the Gospel ministry. Let all timid and faint-hearted ministers of the Gospel remember that their sole duty consists in telling the truth; proclaiming the divine law; nothing more; nothing less: not in their own *name*, or by their own *authority*, but in the name and by the authority of the Lord God. The world is prone to regard the message from the pulpit as the message of the *man*. But see to it that they receive it as the message of God. Then your duty is done, God will take care of His word; it shall not return unto Him void. "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dis-

mayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest."

But whilst it is the duty of the organized Church of God, and of the ambassadors of Christ in their official capacity, to *testify* on all subjects pertaining to Christian faith and practice, and to proclaim the law of God in favor of virtue and against vice, in all the pursuits, callings, and relations in life, which of course includes politics and legislation wherever and whenever they overlap the province of Christian morals, yet the duty of the private Christian does not stop here. He is bound to regard with an active interest so mighty an agency for good or evil as politics, and see to it that it slips not into the exclusive control of wicked men. Here, in this particular, moral and religious people have committed a very grave error. They have slept whilst the enemy sowed the tares. They have stood silently and idly by, and have allowed this greatest of all merely human instrumentalities for effecting good or evil to pass without a struggle into the hands of men, the majority of whom make no pretension to vital godliness, nay, rather glory in the fact that they are not governed by the principles of Christianity; influenced in part by the fallacy, the futility of which we have already attempted to expose, and which their own conduct has not a little contributed towards establishing, and in part by the criminal disinclination, as contrary to the precepts of the Gospel as it is to the best interests of society, to enter the lists and lift the arm of antagonism against the railing opposition of irreligious men. Thus this tremendous power has, contrary to the design of the Gospel, been allowed to be usurped by men not only devoid of the spirit, but hostile to the principles of Christianity.

The Holy Scriptures teach explicitly that civil government is ordained by the authority of God: "For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of

God." "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto the governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of them that do well." The fact, therefore, that civil government is "ordained of God," is evidence that it is not the intent of the Scriptures that it shall be administered by wicked men, but by God-fearing men. He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God. "Thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place such over them to be rulers." The injunction to pray for kings and all that are in authority implies that rulers are to be ministers of God for righteousness: they are to "judge not for man, but for the Lord." At the same time the Scriptures are equally explicit in warning against the elevation of bad men to power; "The wicked walk on every side, when the vilest men are exalted." "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth mischief by a law." "As a roaring lion and a ranging bear, so is a wicked ruler over the poor people." "When the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn."

But why quote Scripture in proof, when the whole history of the past demonstrates the fact that the rule of wicked men never fails to result sooner or later in national misery and ruin? Nay, why even appeal to history, when the *a priori* deductions of reason itself will show that wicked men are not qualified to administer civil government in that way which will develop humanity in the line that the Creator designed it to be developed in, and result in the general diffusion of the greatest amount of human happiness? It will scarcely be denied by any one, that wicked men, in seeking political power are actuated by motives of ambition, avarice, or vanity. Their object is to promote self in some way or other. This being true, there would be just as much reason in expecting to gather grapes of

thorns, or figs of thistles, as in expecting the rule of such men to promote righteousness and the best interests of society. It is clearly absurd. Moreover, unregenerate men are, in the very nature of the case, disqualified for legislating and ruling in all respects for the benefit of every class of the community, from the fact that they are incapable of knowing all of the wants, and appreciating the rights of the regenerated, as such; for "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned;" so that if they had the disposition, they have not the capacity, the spiritual endowment which will enable them to enter into and appreciate the rights of an enlightened and a tender conscience, and the privileges and pleasures of a regenerated heart. In some things, therefore, and they are the most important that belong to humanity, wicked men are no more capable of ruling for the best interests of religious people, than the blind man is to be the guide of the wayfaring. Consequently, it is unequal, it is improper, it is unjust, to elect men to legislate and rule for an entire community, who are incapable of appreciating all the wants, and discerning all the rights of a portion of that community. The inference is not only plain, but inevitable, that Christians can not, dare not, without violating their allegiance to Christ, and the law of true charity, vote for, or in any wise contribute towards the elevation of ungodly men to posts of political power and trust. It is, therefore, manifestly a sin, which never fails ultimately to bring with it its own punishment. To vote for or elevate bad men to public office, is not only to put men in power who, as we have seen, are incapable of ruling and legislating for the best interests of Christ's kingdom, but it is to arm wickedness, and to increase the power of ungodly men for evil. When a Christian elevates to office a fellow-man by his vote, he thereby delegates to him his own moral and political power. Fearful, therefore, is the

responsibility of arming bad men to do evil. It is every whit the same as though you did the evil yourself. In view of these facts, how is it possible for the sincere Christian, with the Bible in his hands, which gives explicit directions as to the character of the men who should be made rulers over the people, consistently with his fealty to Christ and His Church, to vote for other than good men? It is directly contrary to the principles of the Gospel; he can not do it with impunity.

But the obligations of the Christian, in relation to this very important subject, are not restricted to *negative* actions, they are also *positive*. He is not only to refrain from voting for bad men, but he is bound to do all that is legitimately within his power, to defeat their election, and to elevate good men, praying men, god-fearing men, in their places. In this particular, religious men have been very derelict in their duty. Many of them (alas! there are some exceptions) have not been *active* in elevating bad men to office. They have stood aloof, but they have stood idly and silently. Restrained by a weak timidity, or a criminal disinclination to encounter opposition, and under the impression that the popular current is so strongly set in favor of bad men and principles that it is in vain to attempt to arrest it, they do *nothing*, and congratulate themselves that they have not contributed towards the unhappy result. This, however, is a great and reprehensible mistake. They have, by their silence and acquiescence, contributed to intensify public opinion in favor of wrong, whilst, at the same time, they have discouraged and weakened whatever remaining inclination there was in the public mind to do right. They are, therefore, not innocent, but guilty, in the sight of God, of a grievous error. Idleness is not innocent. "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord against the mighty." "If the salt have lost his savor," etc.; "Every tree that bringeth not forth good

fruit," etc. One of the deplorable effects of this neglect of duty on the part of the sober, quiet, and religious part of the community is, in many parts of the country, to deter the right kind of men from offering themselves, or allowing their names to be brought forward as candidates for what was once esteemed high and honorable office. Consequently, this most potent of all human agencies for good or evil has, in too many instances, passed into the hands of incompetent and bad men. It is, therefore, not a matter of indifference, or of mere choice, whether the moral and Christian people will or will not take an active interest in politics. The responsibility and danger of neglecting it is too great. They are solemnly bound, by the precepts and spirit of Christianity, to have an opinion in relation to political matters, to express it, and to act according to it in voting and exerting their whole moral influence in favor of good and against bad men and principles. Let every moral, sober, order-loving, good man, adopt it as a maxim from which he can not be induced, either by love or temporal interest, in the slightest to swerve, that he will never cast his vote, nor lend his influence, in favor of a candidate for public office, who is not, in the first place, in all respects competent to discharge the duties of the office; and in the next, a good man, in the proper acceptation of that term; or, in the language of the Bible, who is not an "able man, such as fears God, a man of truth, hating covetousness." But suppose no such man becomes a candidate for office; but instead of such, there are two bad men, one, however, worse than the other; what, in that event, is the duty of the Christian? We answer: it will be his duty not to vote for either, and to make known his reason for his course. In this way, his influence would be cast decidedly against the evil; and it would not be long before there would be a visible accumulation of moral opposition, that would soon be felt, against the rule of bad men and principles. Suppose, for illustration, that a town or a county contains one

thousand voters, six hundred of whom, though they may not all be members of the Church, yet are in favor of infusing into the legislation of the country moral and Christian principles, and elevating only good men to office, and act accordingly; and that there are in that community two bad men, candidates for office; one or the other, it is true, will of necessity be elected; it may be, however, by receiving only a few over two hundred votes; what will be the effect? It will be that, although he is duly elected to office, yet he is manifestly *not* the choice of the people; he does not carry with him the moral power of the community; his moral influence for evil is crippled; whilst, at the same time, the real strength of the moral and religious element in the community will be developed, and ere long, good men can be induced to represent them in governmental affairs.

Let it be granted, therefore, that it is the prerogative of the organized and visible Church of God, to *testify* against all iniquitous and unrighteous legislation: that it is the duty of the ambassadors of Christ to proclaim the law of God, and tell kings, and governors, and law-makers, their moral and Christian obligations: and that private Christians of every name, and good men, whether in the Church or out of it, are solemnly bound by their allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ to take an active interest in governmental affairs, and vigilantly guard against their being administered by other than "able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness."

In conclusion, the patient reader of this article may agree in the abstract with every point made in it. He may pronounce them all right in a speculative point of view; "but the attempt to carry them out in actual practice," he objects, "would array all the wicked of the world in fierce antagonism against the Church." We answer, that there is not a doubt of it. There could be no greater evidence of the truth of the sentiments contained in the

article. The most alarming symptom in relation to the state of the Church is to be found in the quiescent harmony, nay, the apparent amity, existing between the Church and the world! What has our Saviour taught us on this subject? What did the apostles inculcate? What is the confirmation of history until the Church became worldly? The pure Church of Christ has no greater enemy than the time-serving spirit, "the conferring with flesh and blood," existing within its own pale! "Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?" "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword." "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution." But from which has the Church of Christ to apprehend the greater danger, from the fierce opposition of the world, caused by the zealous and consistent discharge of duty on the part of its members, or from a state of tolerance on the part of the world, induced by the conformity of Christians to its ways and principles? The answer is plain. The efficiency of the Church of Christ does not consist in numbers, but in purity; not in worldly wealth, but spirituality; not in magnificent and gorgeous array, that captivates the eye of the vulgar, but in consistency of character and conduct. Therefore, let not the followers of Christ "confer with flesh and blood," but go forward in the fearless discharge of their great mission, which is to disseminate divine truth, and afford a demonstration of its power in their daily walk and conversation. This done, their duty is done. God is competent to take care of his own method of evangelizing the world. "So shall my word be, that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void; but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

The portrait of the late Rev. Dr. Thornwell, which we had hoped to send with the present number, is not yet finished, but we confidently expect that it will be ready for distribution with the January number.

We appeal again to our subscribers to whom we sent bills for arrearages in the last number.

We thank those who have remitted to us the respective amounts of their bills, but we are sorry to add that not more than one in five of all thus appealed to have made any response.

We ask attention once more to the statement before made, that during the last year our receipts were not sufficient to pay the expenses of publication, by several hundred dollars. And although our terms call for payment in advance, we have not yet received enough on Vol. XV. to pay for the two numbers issued, by several hundred dollars. Will our subscribers suffer this to continue to be the case? Or will they not rather aid us by making vigorous efforts to increase our subscription list, as well as by forwarding to us, as soon as possible, payment of arrearages, and of the amount due for the present volume?

The portrait of the late Rev. Dr. Thornwell, which we had hoped to send with the present number, is not yet finished, but we confidently expect that it will be ready for distribution with the January number.

We appeal again to our subscribers to whom we sent bills for arrearages in the last number.

We thank those who have remitted to us the respective amounts of their bills, but we are sorry to add that not more than one in five of all thus appealed to have made any response.

We ask attention once more to the statement before made, that during the last year our receipts were not sufficient to pay the expenses of publication, by several hundred dollars. And although our terms call for payment in advance, we have not yet received enough on Vol. XV. to pay for the two numbers issued, by several hundred dollars. Will our subscribers suffer this to continue to be the case? Or will they not rather aid us by making vigorous efforts to increase our subscription list, as well as by forwarding to us, as soon as possible, payment of arrearages, and of the amount due for the present volume?

H. C. Bronson.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XV. OCTOBER, MDCCCLXII. No. 2.

COLUMBIA, S. C.:
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF C. P. PELHAM.

1862.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—DELITZSCH ON GENESIS. By the Rev. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., - - - - -	161
II.—SUPERIORITY OF THE GREEKS IN LITERATURE AND THE FINE ARTS. By the Rev. Prof. E. F. ROCKWELL, Davidson College, N. C., - - - - -	198
III.—THE RELATIONS OF LANGUAGE. By the Rev. R. C. KETCHUM, Clarkesville, Ga., - - - - -	205
IV.—THE PURITANS. By the Rev. JOSEPH M. ATKINSON, Raleigh, N. C., - - - - -	230
V.—LIFE, CHARACTER, AND GENIUS OF THE LATE REV. JAMES H. THORNWELL, D. D., LL. D. (With a Portrait.) By the Rev. B. M. PALMER, D. D., New Orleans, La., - - - - -	255

ERRATA.

- In the first Article, p. 161, in the third sentence, for "the principles," read "the study of the principles."
On p. 168, 15th line, for "exist," read "arise."
On p. 249, 26th line, for "worship," read "headship."

AGENTS.

Rev. A. W. Miller,	Petersburg, Virginia.
Rev. A. A. Morse,	Anderson C. H., South Carolina.
Rev. John R. Dow,	Aiken, South Carolina.
Mr. Wm. E. Mills,	Mayesville, South Carolina.
Rev. Wm. Flinn,	Milledgeville, Georgia.
Mr. J. Whiting,	Montgomery, Alabama.
Rev. R. S. Gladney,	Aberdeen, Mississippi.
Rev. Wm. Brown, D. D.,	Richmond, Virginia.
Mr. James Armour,	Memphis, Tennessee.
Rev. J. P. McMullen,	Pleasant Ridge, Alabama.
Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,	New Orleans, Louisiana.
Rev. T. A. Hoyt,	Louisville, Kentucky.
Rev. S. D. Campbell,	Geneva, Alabama.
Rev. W. T. Richardson,	Waynesboro', Virginia.
Rev. James B. Ramsey, D. D.,	Lynchburg, Virginia.
Rev. J. C. Barr,	Lewisburg, Virginia.
Rev. G. W. Boggs,	Camden, Alabama.
Dr. Jesse Carter,	Mobile, Alabama.
Rev. Jos. B. Wilson, D. D.,	Augusta, Georgia.
John C. Whitner, Esq.,	West Point, Georgia.
F. N. Watkins, Esq.,	Farmville, Virginia.
Dr. E. Nye Hutchison,	Charlotte, North Carolina.
Mr. John Rosser,	Kosciusko, Mississippi.
Rev. J. C. Alexander,	Greensboro', North Carolina.
Rev. B. L. Beall,	Lenoir, North Carolina.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in July, October, January, and April.

TERMS.—Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance. Five Dollars for two years, strictly in advance. Two Dollars per annum to Theological Students and Young Men's Christian Associations.

✎ All Communications should be addressed to the Rev. JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued until a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, or after the first number of a volume is published. The volume commences with the July number, and is published at the beginning of the year.

✎ A few complete sets of the back volumes can be had at Three Dollars per volume. Single back volumes, when they can be furnished without breaking a set, Two Dollars per volume. Two Dollars will be paid for any copies of Vol. I., No. 1, and One Dollar for any of Vol. VIII., No. 1, which may be returned to our address.

✎ Ministers of the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain five new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the Review for one year, or, if they so prefer, fifty cents for each new subscriber.

✎ Subscribers changing their Post Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Editors, or their Review will be sent to their former office.

✎ The Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review think it is due to themselves and to their subscribers to announce that they do not endorse in every particular what is uttered in their pages. Each author is responsible for the views he expresses. This is a matter of convenience where there are minor differences between editors themselves, or between them and their brethren. Free discussion, too, is important to the interests of truth, if kept within just limits. These limits must be strictly observed. Editors would be worthy of censure, should they allow opinions to be expressed, subversive of any doctrine of the Gospel; nor would it be becoming to allow their own views, or those of their contributors, to be rudely attacked in their own pages.

Their desire is, to make the Review worthy of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States—the representative of its views and of its literature, the means of disseminating sound doctrine, and a stimulus to the genius and talent of our Ministers and people.

H. C. Brown

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XV.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXIII.

No. 3.

COLUMBIA, S. C.:
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF C. P. PELHAM.

1863.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—ON THE NATURE AND USES OF ART. By JOSEPH LE CONTE, M. D., Professor of Natural Science, South Carolina College, - - - - -	311
II.—THE PEOPLE AND LANGUAGES OF WESTERN AFRICA. By the Rev. J. LEIGHTON WILSON, D. D., Secretary of Foreign Missions, Columbia, S. C., - - - - -	349
III.—LETTER TO THE REV. DR. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE. By the Rev. JOHN H. BOCOCK, D. D., Appomattox C. H., Va., - - - - -	372
IV.—REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE CHURCH. By the Rev. A. W. MILLER, Petersburg, Va., - - - - -	405
V.—PSALMODY AND THE UNION. By the Rev. EDMUND L. PATTON, President of Erskine College, S. C., - - - - -	448

AGENTS.

Rev. A. W. Miller,	Petersburg, Virginia.
Rev. A. A. Morse,	Anderson C. H., South Carolina.
Rev. John R. Dow,	Aiken, South Carolina.
Mr. Wm. E. Mills,	Mayesville, South Carolina.
Rev. Wm. Flinn,	Milledgeville, Georgia.
Mr. J. Whiting,	Montgomery, Alabama.
Rev. R. S. Gladney,	Aberdeen, Mississippi.
Rev. Wm. Brown, D. D.,	Richmond, Virginia.
Mr. James Armour,	Memphis, Tennessee.
Rev. J. P. McMullen,	Pleasant Ridge, Alabama.
Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,	New Orleans, Louisiana.
Rev. T. A. Hoyt,	Louisville, Kentucky.
Rev. S. D. Campbell,	Geneva, Alabama.
Rev. W. T. Richardson,	Waynesboro', Virginia.
Rev. James B. Ramsey, D. D.,	Lynchburg, Virginia.
Rev. J. C. Barr,	Lewisburg, Virginia.
Rev. G. W. Boggs,	Camden, Alabama.
Dr. Jesse Carter,	Mobile, Alabama.
Rev. Jos. R. Wilson, D. D.,	Augusta, Georgia.
John C. Whitner, Esq.,	West Point, Georgia.
F. N. Watkins, Esq.,	Farmville, Virginia.
Dr. E. Nye Hutchison,	Charlotte, North Carolina.
Mr. John Rosser,	Kosciusko, Mississippi.

AGENTS.

Rev. A. W. Miller,	Petersburg, Virginia.
Rev. A. A. Morse,	Anderson C. H., South Carolina.
Rev. John R. Dow,	John's Island, South Carolina.
Mr. Wm. E. Mills,	Mayesville, South Carolina.
Rev. Wm. Flinn,	Milledgeville, Georgia.
Mr. J. Whiting,	Montgomery, Alabama.
Rev. R. S. Gladney,	Aberdeen, Mississippi.
Rev. Wm. Brown, D. D.,	Richmond, Virginia.
Mr. James Armour,	Memphis, Tennessee.
Rev. J. P. McMullen,	Pleasant Ridge, Alabama.
Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,	New Orleans, Louisiana.
Rev. T. A. Hoyt,	Louisville, Kentucky.
Rev. S. D. Campbell,	Geneva, Alabama.
Rev. W. T. Richardson,	Waynesboro', Virginia.
Rev. James B. Ramsey, D. D.,	Lynchburg, Virginia.
Rev. J. C. Barr,	Lewisburg, Virginia.
Rev. G. W. Boggs,	Camden, Alabama.
Dr. Jesse Carter,	Mobile, Alabama.
Rev. Jos. R. Wilson, D. D.,	Augusta, Georgia.
John C. Whitner, Esq.,	West Point, Georgia.
F. N. Watkins, Esq.,	Farmville, Virginia.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

Is published Quarterly, in July, October January, and April.

TERMS.—Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance. Five Dollars for two years, strictly in advance. Two Dollars per annum to Theological Students and Young Men's Christian Associations.

☞ All Communications should be addressed to the Rev. JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued until a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, nor after the first number of a volume is published. The volume commences with the July number, and not at the beginning of the year.

☞ A few complete sets of the back volumes can be had at Three Dollars per volume. Single back volumes, when they can be furnished without breaking a set, Two Dollars per volume. Two Dollars will be paid for any copies of Vol. I., No. 1, and One Dollar for any of Vol. VIII., No. 1, which may be returned to our address.

☞ Ministers of the Gospel, and others, who shall obtain five new subscribers, and remit the regular price, (Three Dollars each,) will be entitled to a copy of the Review for one year, or, if they so prefer, fifty cents for each new subscriber.

☞ Subscribers changing their Post Office are requested to give immediate notice of the same to the Editors, or their Review will be sent to their former office.

☞ The Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review think it is due to themselves and to their subscribers to announce that they do not endorse in every particular what is uttered in their pages. Each author is responsible for the views he expresses. This is a matter of convenience where there are minor differences between editors themselves, or between them and their brethren. Free discussion, too, is important to the interests of truth, if kept within just limits. These limits must be strictly observed. Editors would be worthy of censure, should they allow opinions to be expressed, subversive of any doctrine of the Gospel; nor would it be becoming to allow their own views, or those of their contributors, to be rudely attacked in their own pages.

Their desire is, to make the Review worthy of the Southern Presbyterian Church—the representative of its views and of its literature, the means of disseminating sound doctrine, and a stimulus to the genius and talent of our Ministers and people.

H. C. Branson,

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Vol. XV. APRIL, MDCCLXIII. No. 4.

COLUMBIA, S. C.:
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF C. P. PELHAM.

1863.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I.—THE WAR OF THE SOUTH VINDICATED. By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., - - -	479
II.—ON THE NATURE AND USES OF ART. (<i>Concluded.</i>) By JOSEPH LECONTE, M. D., Professor of Natural Science, South Carolina College, - - -	515
III.—GEOLOGY AND ITS ASSAILANTS, - - -	549
IV.—RELIGION AND POLITICS. By the Rev. JAMES A. LYON, D. D., Columbus, Miss., - - -	569

We take pleasure in acknowledging the promptness with which so large a proportion of our subscribers have paid their subscriptions during the present year. But there are still more than three hundred to whom we sent bills in our last number, who have thus far overlooked them. If these also will remit to us the amounts due, the continued appearance of the Review will be secured beyond all ordinary contingencies.

We are glad that we are able to add that, during the last six months, we have had such accessions to our subscription list, that there are at this time as many subscribers within our reach as before the contraction of our lines by the advance of the enemy in the West. We hope we may continue to receive the aid of our friends in extending our circulation.